

**A BIOGRAPHY OF THE LATE
ELDER THOMAS P. DUDLEY.**

Georgetown, Kentucky, Jan.1,1891.

DEAR BROTHER SMOOT: - In preparing a series of articles for publication in the *Sectarian* upon the life and labors of the late Elder Thomas P. Dudley, of Lexington, Ky., I shall follow no particular system of arrangement. The incidents were gathered from an intimate acquaintance and companionship with him as an ordained assistant in the Gospel ministry of the churches he served so long and acceptably.

His own writings for publication and private correspondence, written in his own familiar style, are so characteristic of the eminent minister, that he was, as to speak for themselves. I had not seriously thought until recently of attempting such a work, feeling that Elder Dudley needed no biographer to attempt to crown with laurels of eulogy a life so devoted to the cause of Truth. But at the earnest solicitation of many brethren of like precious faith and order, I have reluctantly consented to make the attempt, believing that, if what I write should be acceptably received by the brethren, I should have my reward, in the feeling that, as a servant, I have endeavored to comply with their request. In writing upon this subject, it is forced from the nature of it to make some reference to the origin and history of the Licking Association of Particular Baptists, and this because, as Luke says, "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us." Luke 1:1.

Many have evidently manifested a spirit, showing that their ultimate objective has been to pervert, divide, and destroy that which they could not successfully controvert. "For from the least of them, even unto the greatest of them, every one is given to covetousness; and from the prophet even unto the priest, every one dealeth falsely." Jer.6:13. And to those who will stand in the "ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein," the following pages are humbly submitted.

J. Taylor Moore.

CHAPTER I.

THE LATE ELDER THOMAS P. DUDLEY.

A Short Biography Of The Late Elder Thomas P. Dudley Of Lexington, Kentucky; Together With Some Of His Writings.

According to the family register, Thomas Parker Dudley was born in Fayette County, Kentucky, May 31, 1792. He was the son of Elder Ambrose Dudley, who emigrated to Kentucky from Virginia in the Spring of 1786. Settling about six miles east of Lexington, where he raised a family of eleven sons and three daughters, than whom none perhaps stood higher socially, morally, or intellectually. The name has been prominent since Ambrose Dudley first settled in the neighborhood of Bryan's Station. He was regarded as a man endowed with superior faculties, liberal education and a profound judgment, that well fitted him as a prominent figure in the business affairs of churches and associations, especially for the times in which he lived when the storm cloud, pregnant with the inventions of men, began to gather with dark and threatening foreboding to the Baptist of the West, and which was soon to break in all its fury on the head of himself and his contemporaries, with a violence that was to snap asunder ties, the nearest and dearest known on earth.

Inventions and innovations now began to sow their poisonous effects, which, up to that time, had been unknown among Baptist, and of which the Bible is as silent as the grave, except to warn the children of the Most High against them in most clear and emphatic language that "he that runneth may take heed." The Author of the inspired record well knew that the camps of many of the little trembling ones would be wrecked upon by different *isms* that would be sprung upon the church in the latter times from the wisdom of this world, so prolific of ways that "are not as God's ways, and thoughts that are not as God's thoughts." He well knew that the hypocrite and false professor would and could but indulge a vain deception and act a lie, when with glittering profession and vaunting pretensions, paraded before men, they claim to love and serve God, while at the same time they deny Him, his Godhead and power, and worship the creature of their own inventions more than the Creator of all things. And it cannot be successfully denied that this is done in all of those denominations wherein works, instrumentalities, creature merit, together with free agency is held up to view as the procuring cause of the salvation of sinners and where the fear of God and the knowledge of His name is attempted to be taught in the schools of men, it matters little by what they are called, whether Catholic or Protestant. The blessed Master says of such: "Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, this people draweth nigh unto me with their

mouth, and honoreth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me; but in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.” And again: “But have removed their heart far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men.” These solemn warnings and admonitions are of serious import, and should receive the most earnest consideration and attention of every one who loves the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth. For those who are led to know and love Him have certainly tried the vanity and foolishness of men, and have felt them a burden and reproach; and the sincere prayer of their heart is, “Turn away mine eyes from beholding vanity; and quicken thou me in thy way.” For by Thee have I been warned against the doctrines of men, evil communications, and those organizations having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof. For with such there is no fellowship, communion, concord or agreement, in doctrine, church order, or the free gifts and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of life and glory, who lives in his people, for they are the temple of the living God. As God has said that he will dwell in them and walk in them, and that he will be their God and they shall be his people. “Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters saith the Lord Almighty.”

But these things, and the circumstances leading to these thoughts, will be treated more fully in their proper place as we trace the biography of Elder Dudley, and in our brief sketch of Licking Association.

When Elder Dudley was born, the territory of Kentucky belonged to Virginia, but was ceded to the United States Government on the first day of June, 1792, and became the fifteenth grand pillar of the Union. I have frequently heard him say that he was born on Virginia soil, but the very next day after his birth, became a “full-fledged Kentuckian.” He was reared and schooled in the neighborhood where he was born, and when little over sixteen years of age removed to Frankfort [now the capital of the State,] where he engaged in the mercantile business.

In very early life there were times when he was rendered very unhappy when reflecting on death, judgment and eternity; and on one occasion, when he was from ten to twelve years old, his mind became very much exercised. His own account of the occasion is that he thought he beheld a beauty in religion and desired to possess it, and engaged in many attempts at prayer that he might be made the subject of it. But in a short time these impressions wore off and he soon became as careless and unconcerned as ever. He says that while in Frankfort most of his young gentlemen acquaintances were addicted to dissipation and gambling, but that he could not be induced to embark in such an abandonment of the principles instilled in his young life. He therefore, with two or three companions like himself, sought the society of ladies, because he felt safer with them than with those who were urging him to a

life of dissipation; and with his lady associates he engaged in what he felt was a more innocent amusement – that of fiddling and dancing – but said he had to confess that he did not feel as easy with that indulgence as he desired, because he had never indulged in such amusement while with his father, and felt sure he would not approve it. He lived in Frankfort, about four years, and was now about twenty years old. In 1812, the year in which the second war with Great Britain was declared, he being sprung from a patriotic stock [his father held a captain's commission in the Revolutionary War,] though young and in delicate health, was filled with a desire to join the U.S. forces, hostilities having already begun along the border of Canada. He made a visit to his parents to get their consent for him to join the Army. They both objected on account of his delicate health; but his mother seeing his anxiety to go, finally told him that a certain friend of the family thought of making up a company of cavalry, and if he did, she would permit him to go. Shortly after this a regiment rendezvoused at Frankfort, and the friend to whom his mother referred was elected captain of a company in the regiment. He being urged by the friend of the family, and now captain of the company, to join the forces, he determined to equip himself and go, fearing to run the risk of going to his parents the second time for their consent. He executed his determination by setting out and overtaking the company on the Ohio River, opposite Cincinnati, where his name was enrolled as a soldier of the War of 1812.

Now begins the interesting features of a most eventful life, in which the protecting power and preserving care of an overruling Providence is displayed, that exhibits something of the goodness, mercy and wondrous power of that God who has said: "Thou shalt not be afraid for the pestilence that walketh in darkness, nor for the destruction that wasteth at noonday. A thousand shall fall at thy side and ten thousand at thy right hand, but it shall not come nigh thee." The display of such power and glory makes even skepticism to cover its face with dreadful awe and smitten silence.

Elder Dudley has said that about the only embarrassment that he now felt, was that he had not obtained permission of his father to join the army, something he always did before embarking in any important matter.

About this time he had many serious thoughts on the subject of religion, and in his feeble way often asked direction of the Lord. Shortly after his arrival in the neighborhood of Detroit, with the American troops, a detachment was sent to Frenchtown, on the river Rasin, about twenty-six miles from Detroit. He asked leave through a friend of the commanding general to go, but was refused permission. He, however, went, and was in the battle of the 18th of January, 1813, and escaped unhurt. He could not on such an occasion curb his heroic, dauntless spirit, although he had failed to get permission to engage in the battle. It has been truly said, "that of the men who lived in that heroic age of Kentucky, as the

contemporaries of Clay, Rowan, the Breckenridges, Wicliffs, and others, who gave such high type of character to her manhood, that none deserve a more honored place in the history of Kentucky than the Dudley brothers, of Lexington." Some of their posterity yet fill places of prominence, in which they have distinguished themselves.

Our young hero was in the second engagement on the 22nd of January, 1813, in which he received a severe wound. It is this engagement, in which General Winchester, with five hundred of his troops, were taken prisoner, Elder Dudley among them. He says, in speaking of this: "I had many serious reflections during that day, and also during the following night; being in too much pain to sleep much, I thought it not improbable that I might die from the wound, or be massacred by the Indians." And well might he have been apprehensive, for, notwithstanding General Proctor, the British commander, had pledged his honor in the terms of capitulation that the lives and private property of the American soldiers should be respected, he marched off with his British troops, leaving his prisoners in the care of a depleted guard, exposed to all the cruelties of his merciless savage allies, who scalped the dead, butchered the wounded, tomahawked the living, or reserved them to be roasted at the stake. Few of them, very few, lived to be exchanged. I have frequently heard Elder Dudley reflect in severe terms on the treacherous course of General Proctor. His description of scenes enacted on the morning of the 23rd [the day following the battle,] is almost too shocking to describe. As he lay in a room, in Frenchtown, with three or four wounded comrades, four or five stalwart savages entered and immediately tomahawked two of his comrades lying on the opposite side of the room. Elder Dudley and a companion arose from their couch and walked out into the open air, followed in a few moments by those relentless demons, with the reeking scalp of their murdered comrades dangling at their sides. His fellow soldier, who came out with him, was now tomahawked and scalped in his presence. As he now stood alone in the snow, several inches deep, an Indian having taken his shoes, another warrior approached and snatched his army cloak from his shoulders, which gave him great pain, as the ball lay deeply buried in his wounded shoulder. Shortly after this occurrence a fifth warrior approached him, took him prisoner, threw a blanket coat around him, and handed him a large red apple, which Elder Dudley regarded as a token of friendship. His young captor now set out with his prisoner for Detroit, and after traveling some five miles through snow about eighteen inches deep, they came upon the ground where the combined forces of the British and Indians had camped the night before the battle. Here the young brave met his father, an old chief, with his squaw. Here, too, the Indians massacred several more of their prisoners. The old chief and his son manifested a good deal of concern for their young captive, by taking him out of camp, and resuming their journey toward

Detroit.

An incident worthy of note occurred on that day's travel, which shows with what tenderness and care the young brave regarded his captive. Traveling over the ice and snow in his stocking feet, his feet became very sore. The young Indian, noticing this, drew from his own feet his buckskin moccasins and put them on the feet of his captive. Another remarkable instance of the kindly feeling of this young warrior occurred during the night, which was very cold. He shared his only blanket, and throughout the night gave his vigilant attention to keeping him covered, he being now restive from his painful wound. How truly in all of this do we witness the Providential reign and absolute control of that God, who rules the armies of heaven, and reigns among the children of men, and according to his pleasure, "maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth," melting the heart of a blood thirsty savage to deeds of tender kindness toward one of his predestinated vessels of mercy, an exhibition of His truth! He has said: "Touch not mine anointed, do my prophets no harm." Such display of His awful majesty and power is enough to put to silence forever the "disputers of this world" on the subject of predestination, and it would if they believed the Scriptures or the testimony of Jesus. "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." Rev.19:10.

The disputers of this world will not believe that "the preparations of the heart in man, and the answer of the tongue, is from the Lord;" neither will they believe His predestinating purpose, which says: "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations." "Thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak." Such testimony saps the foundation of man's free agency. Here we see a helpless youth in the hands of these wild creatures of the forest, and with what inspiring wonder must he have looked back at the wondrous preserving care of Him who knew the end from the beginning, and from ancient times declaring the things that are not done, "saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all of my pleasure!" His captors bestowed him further kindness the following night at Brownstown by securing quarters in the house of an English, or Canadian lady.

Elder Dudley used to relate with considerable levity a display of hospitality on the part of the old squaw, who arose very early the next morning, took her camp kettle, and going to a stream of water near by, she filled it and placed it on the fire in order to dress an old chicken, which her chief had killed along the road the day before. After picking the feathers off, she placed it in the same water in which she had scalded it, without drawing, and made a broth for his breakfast. But he could not partake of it, of course. The lady of the house came in just at this time, and relieved his embarrassment for declining her hospitality, by asking the old chief if she might go and prepare the young man a cup of tea and some toast, to which he

nodded his assent. This she quickly did, and he breakfasted with a relish.

The Indians held another council [on this morning, the 24th,] to determine [as he was informed] who of their prisoners they should kill or torture at the stake. He noticed considerable anxiety in the countenance of the old chief and young warrior, and in order to save him they set out about daylight for Detroit. After traveling several miles over the ice and snow, they stopped and painted him again – having painted him the day before. They arrived at Detroit that evening, he remaining with the Indians that night, and the following evening he was released from Indian captivity, a British officer paying a ransom for him, consisting of a keg of whiskey, and an old pony. This extraordinary escape from Indian captivity is more like a tale of fiction, than reality, and in our next chapter we will give his own written reflections, and an account of his exchange and return home.

CHAPTER II.

“Suffering as I was with my wound, yet my marvelous escape filled me with wonder, and I was constrained to acknowledge the hand of God in my deliverance. It seemed that I met friends, not only among the white inhabitants at Detroit, but also among the savages. The question would frequently arise in my mind: Why have you been spared, and so many slaughtered who were not half so severely wounded as you? I could only answer: The Lord has done it.

After being in Detroit a few days, I was conducted across the Detroit River to Sandwich, where I met several of our officers, to their astonishment, they having supposed I was massacred. On the following morning, when the prisoners were about to leave for Fort George, there was a proposition made that I should remain under medical treatment, as I could not travel on foot, and there was no conveyance for me. My spirits seemed to sink at the thought of being left. A few minutes after my friends left the room, a British or Canadian lieutenant came to me and remarked, “I have a good carryall sleigh and a pair of good horses, and you are welcome to a seat with me to Fort George.” This, as you may suppose, raised my spirits considerably, although I thought it improbable that I should ever reach home. I found the most astonishing kindness, both from the lieutenant and from the people, as I passed through Upper Canada to Newark, at the mouth of the Niagara River. Reaching the heights above Newark, my eye caught sight of the American flag floating over Fort Niagara; my feelings were totally indescribable. I had now

traveled about three hundred miles, badly wounded, through ice, snow, and intense cold; met with much kindness from strangers, and arrived in sight of American soil; saw the much loved flag of our Union floating on the breeze. Really it seemed to me like a dream; the hand of the Lord seemed visible. Here I was paroled, and put across the Niagara River, where I met a warm-hearted American officer, who proposed to take care of me, and accompany me to Pittsburg, some three hundred miles. He proved a friend indeed, and did not leave me until we arrived there. After remaining in Pittsburg about a week, a gentleman from an adjoining State approached me and observed, "I have a good boat, and should be gratified to have you accompany me to Maysville, Kentucky." I arrived home in the month of March, and could but look back with amazement on what had befallen me; and above all, the reflection that I had been taken care of through all of those trying scenes, made the deepest impression on my mind. Numberless times I had serious impressions about my future state, but they would soon wear off. In the month of June, 1814, I think, I was exchanged; and the war continuing, I determined to carry into execution a threat I had made in Canada, before I was paroled, namely; I would have revenge. In the fall of that year, I joined a detachment sent from this State to New Orleans; was in the battle of the 8th of January, 1815, and escaped unhurt; came home at the close of the war, and again engaged in my former business."

Thus far we have traced, in condensed form, the history of our young hero through an interval filled with romantic adventure and hazardous trials, in which he was exposed, alike with comrades [few of whom escaped to tell the tale,] to all the tactics that savage warfare could invent, connecting his life with some of the most thrilling historic events that have occurred to any of the chivalrous sons of Kentucky since our pioneer fathers set foot on the "dark and bloody ground;" and through it all we witness the predestinating hand of Him of whom it is written: "Thou hast a mighty arm; strong is thy hand and high is thy right hand." "Being predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will," regardless alike of the counsel of savages held at Brownstown or the devices of wicked men there or elsewhere, and in all ages.

Kind reader, have you ever stopped long enough to consider the mystery of your own being and surrounding? Have you noted that to every birth that brings sunshine and happiness to some mother's heart, some parental home spreading out to almost illimitable bounds, there is set over against it somewhere a birth that casts its baneful shadow by a life of vice and crime, that only God can tell the extent of misery it has gendered? In considering the mystery of your own being, have you also considered the mystery of iniquity? That iniquity is a mystery whose working is as hidden to man as the "mystery of godliness!" The words of inspiration informs us that, "the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only He

who now letteth will let, until he [the man of sin] be taken out of the way.” “Whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs and lying wonders.” We live in an age in which revealed religion is scoffed at by a majority of those who profess religion, and the Bible doctrine of God’s electing love, distinguishing grace and predestinating purpose, is as much a hidden mystery to the so-called religious world today as when the inspired apostle uttered the language: “But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory, which none of the princes of this world knew; for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.” We would take occasion to say here that while it may be a riddle to the non-professing world, an incomprehensible mystery to the majority professing religion *why* we are the kind of Baptist we are, and why we cannot fraternize with other religious sects, we can but answer that with the Bible before us, and regarding its certain rule and final authority for all doctrine, faith and practice, we can be nothing else! The characteristics of the Church are so visibly in the words of revelation, we wonder that any who have tasted that the Lord is gracious can profess to see her visible organization anywhere else save among the Old School Predestinarian Baptist. The question may be asked, Do you believe, or mean to say that none are destined for the Heaven of eternal glory, but those of your faith and order, who make their profession of religion according to what may be termed Old School or Predestinarian Baptist? We answer, Far, very far, from such a thought. That spirit of truth we profess to be guided in our church organization has penned the language that should lay hold of our hearts with awful solemnity: “Come out of her, [Babylon, or the anti-christian church, or body embracing the religion of Babylon and her daughters] my people, that ye be not partaker of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.” Rev.18:4.

Thoughtful reader, if you indulge such questions as the above in your mind regarding Old School Baptists, it is because you do not know them. Oh, no, no; we indulge the positive side and cheering hope that many of the heaven-born are found amongst those outside of our circle and indulge the honest conviction that there are many, who in the confusion of tongues, have never attached themselves to any professedly religious body. And now, as we are Baptist of a peculiar order, we would ask the religious world who question our authority to the exclusive right of the name “Baptist.” Who was it that was sent to make ready a people prepared for the Lord? Let the Bible answer, *John!* And did not the Holy Ghost distinguish him from every one else who bore the name of John by adding *the Baptist?* We will now ask, Was not his name significant of the mission on which he was sent and the work assigned him by Him who sent him? The Bible answer is, “There was a man sent from God whose name was John.” “In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, repent ye; for the kingdom of

heaven is at hand.” Repent, who? Let the Bible answer, “A people prepared for the Lord,” for “the preparations of the heart in man, and the answer of the tongue, is from the Lord.” “Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins.” Three words, used in the foregoing expression, have a wonderful significance. Jerusalem – vision of peace; Judea – the praise of the Lord, confession; Jordan – the river of judgment. But the Holy Ghost is not more faithful in pointing out to His servant those who are the proper subjects, or candidates for baptism, than He is in pointing out those who are not. There were those who had visions of peace, with their mouth filled with praise, brought to the judgment, “confessing their sins,” “fruits meet for repentance.” “But when he [John the Baptist] saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance; and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees; therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.”

If John the Baptist had been as liberal in his views as modern evangelists, and even some claiming the name of Old School Baptist of the present day, who are no better; the one so liberal that they would give every body a chance for Heaven by baptizing them, the other so abundantly good and charitable as to try and make believe that grapes may be gathered of thorns and figs of thistles; would he have turned these Pharisees and Sadducees away with such harsh language: “O generation of vipers!” The world is yet full of just such self-righteous characters, and the Scriptures point them out as clearly in this day as then. They were then, as now, of opinion that good works, or what they term good works, might claim reward of God; and they ascribed an extraordinary degree of merit to the observance of rules which they had established themselves as essential duties of moral virtue, in order to obtain favor with God, thus trusting in themselves that they have become righteous, by their own voluntary act, or its facsimile – the modern popularized Old School theory – the operation of eternal life on a corrupt tree, which makes the corrupt tree produce good fruit, the one as unscriptural as the other. The Savior said: “The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a spirit; and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth.” And again: “In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.” We would not underestimate the obligation resting upon man of moral rectitude, or countenance licentiousness, of which the apostles were charged by the same class of opposers: “Let us do evil, that good may come.” But when those things are set forth as the procuring cause of *grace* and *salvation*, we

meet it with the language of the inspired testimony: “Now to him that worketh, is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt; but to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.” Rom.4:4,5. It is when we arrive at the truth that “God hath concluded them all [Jew and Gentile] in unbelief that He might have mercy upon all,” that we realize, and know, that “it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.” Then we are made to cry out in triumph with the apostle, “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been his counsellor? Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and to him are all things; to whom be glory forever. Amen.” Rom.11:32-36. There is mercy to the chief of sinners.

“Thy mercy in Jesus exempts me from hell,
Its glories I’ll sing, and its wonders I’ll tell;
‘Twas Jesus, my friend, when He hung on the tree,
Who opened the channel of mercy to me.

Great Father of mercies, thy goodness I own,
And the covenant love of thy crucified Son;
All praise to the Spirit whose whispers divine,
Seals mercy and pardon, and righteousness mine.”

Then my Father’s dear children, take courage; “fear not,” for the combined wisdom of this world can no more successfully refute this truth than they can hush to silence the bellowing thunder or turn from its course the wild hurricane, or still the violence of an earthquake, for it is not against you that they strive, but against their Maker, and it is written: “Woe unto him that striveth with his Maker! Let the potsherd strive with the potsherds of the earth. Shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, What makest thou; or thy work, He hath no hands?” Isa.45:9. “I have made the earth, and created man upon it; I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens, and all their hosts have I commanded. I have raised him up in righteousness, and I will direct all his ways; he shall build my city, and he shall let go my captives, not for price, nor reward, saith the Lord of hosts.” Isa.45:13. This sublime language is no little expression, for the “Ancient of Days” sits in judgment; “and the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him.” And it takes all the tyranny of decaying dynasties to fill the measure of

what He knew from the beginning and what He declared from ancient times.

After Elder Dudley's return from the war, in the course of the next three years, he was married to Miss Buckner, who bore him one child [a son,] after which she went hopelessly deranged; and after years of confinement in the Asylum at Lexington died; an affliction that almost blasted every earthly hope, and to which he makes a slight reference in his written experience and call to the ministry, which we will now insert:

“In the early part of the year 1818, I frequently retired to ask the Lord to have mercy upon me. This state of things continued until the fall of that year, when I met with a domestic affliction, which seemed like overwhelming me. All my prospects for earthly happiness seemed gone; indeed I felt little desire to live, and I was very sure that I was not prepared to die.

Sitting in my room alone one night, and reflecting upon the heavy bereavement I had met, I found myself complaining that the Lord had dealt hardly with me, and that I did not deserve the severe affliction I was then experiencing. In a moment the thought occurred to me, What am I at? Who has preserved me from my youth up? Who has protected me from the danger through which I have passed? I was astonished and alarmed at my presumption; and the scenes which I have heretofore recorded rushed into my mind; the goodness and sparing mercies of the Lord overpowered me, and I felt constrained to fall on my knees, to ask forgiveness for my many sins; all I could say was, Lord be merciful to me a sinner. Immediately after rising from my knees, the thought occurred to me, this is not prayer; it is only repeating what you have learned.

I confess, the same thought frequently occurs to me now [54 years later.] It did appear to me that I had the most cause to be thankful to God of all creatures, that I was out of hell, and yet I believed there was none less thankful. I felt as though my ingratitude was such that the Lord would not much longer bear with me. My leisure moments I spent in reading the Scriptures, and when any opportunity occurred, in attending preaching. It seemed that my situation was peculiar; that I deserved the lowest, hottest hell. I think I loathed sin, although I was continually sinning, yet most ardently desired holiness of heart and life. I now embraced almost every opportunity of hearing preaching, and as long as the preacher was engaged in portraying the awful condition in which sin has involved its subjects, and the awful doom to which it had exposed them, I thought I understood him, and felt that I was the man and that an awful destiny awaited me. I could not feel my convictions as deep and pungent as I desired, nor could I feel that my exercises were such as those who are under the teachings of the Holy Spirit. When the ministers would describe the exercises of my mind, and then say, “Such are the effects of the new birth, and those who are thus exercised, may be assured that the Lord is at work with them,” I have been many times led to say in my heart, that the

preacher was deceived, for such are my feelings, and I know that I am no Christian.

I knew, nor thought of no other way to escape the judgment of God, but by getting better; this alas I found I could not realize. The poet's language suited me then, and I think it suits me yet:

“Worse and worse, myself I see,
Yet the Lord remembers me.”

I recollect a certain night about eleven o'clock, on my bed, the thought occurred to me, *Hell*. I was pleased, not because there was such a place as hell, but I thought that I had now got hold of something that would make me live more uprightly. I immediately began to draw in my mind a picture of hell and the torments of the damned; and if I should make you sensible of that picture, you would think it an awful one indeed. I had not progressed far with my picture, until I began to find as I progressed it lost its terrors; hence I was constrained to conclude there is no mercy for me; the Lord has given me over to hardness of heart, and reprobation of mind. Hell with all its terrors seemed to have no impression on me. Had I been asked, what do you want? I think I should have replied instantly, Holiness of heart and of life; and yet I seemed farther from obtaining my desire, than any other living being.

The thought not infrequently occurred, if you really desire to be holy in heart and life would you not be more so than you are? I answered, Yes. In sincerity then, as now, a want of devotion to God, greatly distressed me. I felt that my prayers were too weak, too much mixed with sin to reach the ear of him to whom the Christian makes supplication. I labored on in this way for about nine months, when on a certain night, whilst lamenting my awful condition, concluding there is no mercy for me; I justly deserve the wrath of God; if he saves all the rest of Adam's family and consigns me to endless woe, it is just; the awful thought intruded itself into my heart, that I should have to preach the gospel. This seemingly presumptuous thought alarmed me greatly, and I endeavored to cast it from me as quickly as possible, but in vain. It occasionally intruded itself, until it was painfully realized. Shortly after this occurrence, I went to hear a Methodist preacher, who I learned preached a great deal about hell and damnation, fire and brimstone. I concluded he was the sort of preacher that I ought to hear. I went. He talked much about the terrors of hell, and the torments of the damned, but my heart was unmoved. I left the house at the conclusion of his discourse, and I well recollect that on my way home the thought occurred, well you have proof now that the Lord has given you over; you must be hardened indeed, when hell, with all its horrors cannot move you; you may now surrender all hope that the Lord will extend mercy

to you. A few days after this an old-fashioned Baptist preacher visited the town where I resided. I concluded to see him. He dwelt much on the goodness, mercy and love of God to poor sinners, notwithstanding all their ingratitude. I found the tears stealing down my cheeks; my heart seemed to be softened. I felt to confess my ingratitude. In this situation I left the meeting. I reflected much on the preaching; one thing I could not then explain, which I trust I now understand something of. When the Methodist preacher had a few days previously described what I felt I was destined to experience it made no impression; but when the old Baptist preacher tells of blessings of which you can never participate, your heart is softened and the tears run freely; often did I conclude with the poet:

“Surely the mercy I have sought,
Is not for such as I.”

And that it was worse than useless for me to hope the Lord ever would extend his mercy to me, still I could not help begging for mercy, if it could be extended to the worst of sinners. It would occasionally occur: You have not been engaged in cursing and swearing, lying and gambling, and other sins, why then conclude there is no mercy for you? Immediately the response would be: “My heart is deceitful and desperately wicked;” others show what they are. I have concealed from man what sort of a heart I have; and I felt that if my friends could look into my breast, how they would gaze with strange surprise. My distress resulted mainly from what I felt within. I felt that I would willingly exchange situations with the dumb brutes that had no soul, for when they died there was no more of them; but I had a soul, susceptible of everlasting punishment. I felt I deserved it, and could see no way of escape. If sentenced to destruction, I had one request to make, namely; “That I might not sin against God, or hear his name blasphemed.” About this time, while meditating on my wretched situation and trying to conceal from others what I felt, the thought occurred: Suppose you could change the word of God so as to admit you into heaven, would you do it? I immediately replied aloud, No. A second question occurred: Why would you not change the word of God so as to admit you into heaven? The answer to this question was immediately at hand: Heaven is a place of holiness; the inhabitants of heaven are holy; the employment of heaven is holy; and could I go there as I am, it could be no heaven to me. And I yet believe, if we are not prepared for that blessed abode it can be no heaven to us. My prospects of escape seemed to be becoming gloomier, until I felt I dared not bow on my knees to ask for mercy of the Lord. I was too polluted, too unworthy. God was too holy to listen to the cries of one so unworthy. Still I found my cry internally was, Lord, save! Lord, deliver!

On the third Saturday evening in February, 1820, I went to my father's where there was preaching in the evening. I concealed myself, feeling as though despair was about to seize hold upon me. The preacher described my situation infinitely better than I could have done it, and then said; These are the exercises of such as the Lord is at work with. I could not believe him. I felt it was impossible for God to save me, without his changing, and this I was assured he could not do. I spent a most restless, awful night, and the following morning when I awoke it seemed surprising that the Lord had spared me. I suppose that more than one hundred times during the morning, before going to preaching, on my way, and after reaching the meeting house, the following petition in substance was raised: O Lord, as I am to be lost at last, let me hear something today that may afford me comfort whilst I live. The minister proceeded, and after singing and prayer, read for his text Isa.28:16 – “Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation; he that believeth on him shall not make haste.” On hearing the text read I was led, as I trust, to a view of the Lord Jesus Christ, as that tried and precious corner stone, and that it was alone through his merits that God could be just and save poor sinners. My heart seemed softened indeed, and tears of joy flowed copiously for a time. I raised my head, when the congregation seemed to be changed; they seemed the loveliest assemblage I ever witnessed. My feelings were again overpowered. When I was enabled again to raise my head, the language of Doctor Watts occurred, when with difficulty I refrained from crying aloud:

“All over glorious is my Lord,
Must be beloved, and yet adored;
His worth, if all the nations knew,
Sure the whole world would love him too.”

I thought, indeed, if all could see themselves as I saw myself, and then view the Savior as I viewed him, they would be constrained to love him. Nor am I yet convinced that I was wrong in that conclusion. I retained no special recollection of the sermon; the text, with its import, as it opened up to my mind, was enough for me. I think I then felt what the poet expressed:

“Here, Lord, I give myself away,
‘Tis all that I can do.”

At the conclusion of the discourse, [delivered by brother Samuel Trott] my father arose and made a few remarks, when he said, “Sinner, suppose you were called to the judgment bar of God tomorrow. How would you feel?” I found myself

just about to speak out and say, I am perfectly willing, if he sinks me to hell; I feel that I deserve it; and if he saves me, free and sovereign grace alone shall have the praise. To this day, although it has been well nigh thirty-one years, I have never found another resting place. I say with the poet:

“None but Jesus, none but Jesus,
Can do helpless sinners good.”

On the third Saturday in March, 1820, I related to the Particular Baptist church at Bryans the reason of my hope, was received for baptism, and on the following day was baptized by my father, Elder Ambrose Dudley, and up to this day, unworthy as I am of a name and place among God’s children, I retain my membership with that church.

There may possibly be some difference between other brethren and myself, with regard to my exercise of mind, after becoming a member of society. I saw so much of my imperfections, that if a brother asked me aside, my heart began to palpitate, for I concluded he saw these imperfections, and was about to deal with me. The intruder [I mean the thought which had occurred some six months previous to my entertaining a hope, that I should at someday have to try to preach] made his visit more frequently, to my great distress; but I determined to conceal my exercises on that subject from mortal ears.

In the course of a few months I learned that some of the brethren had expressed the opinion that I ought to preach. At this I was greatly distressed. Although I could not avoid the painful thought, I had hoped it had not entered the mind of any of the brethren; and thus I could, without risking the displeasure of the Lord, and bringing his chastening rod upon me, refrain. [If the impressions I had were from that source, which I often doubted. Believing that if the Lord had called me to the work, he would prepare me for it; my youth, as a professor of religion, want of experience, and with all, very limited knowledge of the Scriptures, led me many times to exclaim within myself, I had rather die than attempt it, as it seemed to me the attempt would but bring reproach on the cause of Christ.] The subject was very soon brought before the church, and resulted in a unanimous request that I should exercise my gift, as they called it. In vain did I remonstrate. In vain did I tell them I had all the liberty I wanted. In a short time it was proposed to give me a written license to preach wherever the Lord might cast my lot. I opposed this move, but in vain. Not many months elapsed until I had to undergo another and severer trial; my ordination was called for, when all my pleas against it were unavailing.

It is now nearly thirty years that I have been trying to preach “the unsearchable riches of Christ;” about twenty-six of which I have attended four churches stately. I have many times concluded the churches must have had great forbearance, or

they would not have continued my labors for them so long. I have utterly failed, and have found an utter failure in my ministering brethren, to describe the sinner, as poor and helpless, or the Savior, as rich and all-powerful in the salvation of his chosen people, as I believe him to be.

Rather an extraordinary providence was witnessed on the occasion of my ordination. The presbytery that ordained my father some fifty years before, in Virginia, were present, and assisted at my ordination.

In my earlier ministry I had hoped as I grew older I should find fewer difficulties in the way of trying to preach *Christ crucified*, as the only refuge for the weary and distressed penitent; but I have to acknowledge that thirty years experience has not relieved my difficulties, or satisfied my mind that the Lord requires of me to “preach good tidings to the meek, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.” I have despaired of becoming entirely satisfied whilst in this vale of tears. I have waded through deep water, passed through many fiery trials, and many times felt that my way was hedged up; but hitherto I have found a sustaining hand, though unseen by outward sense, and hope I feel to say, Hitherto the Lord has sustained me.

Most truly and affectionately your brother in tribulation.

THOMAS P. DUDLEY.”

Who among the children of our ever gracious God can read such an experience without having the feelings of their own infirmities by way of remembrance; and as we remember the gall of bitterness and bonds of iniquity, together with deliverance from captivity, we cannot refrain from crying out, “How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out.” Our God not only reveals the weakness of His chosen vessels of mercy, but also “the hiding of His power” at the brightness of His coming. “Behold, is it not of the Lord of hosts that the people shall labour in the very fire, and the people shall weary themselves for very vanity? For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.” “Before him went the pestilence, and burning coals went forth at his feet. He stood, and measured the earth; He beheld, and drove asunder the nations; and the everlasting mountains were scattered, the perpetual hills did bow; His ways are everlasting.” Hab.3:5,6. Ah, it is when He shows that we are without strength that His strength is “made perfect.” In His matchless grace, superlative glory, and power He reveals to His chosen that the bonds of sin are so strong that all the powers of nations, men, angels or the hiding places of mountains are not sufficient to break them so as to liberate the captive. He teaches that all that bow to the Most High with acceptance must come with an offering more pleasant in His sight than thousands of rams, or ten thousand rivers of oil, or ten times the multiplied gold of Ophir, added even to that the giving of their first born for their

transgression; yea, together with all the fruit of their bodies for the sins of their soul, for “the soul that sinneth it shall die.” “The Lord’s voice crieth unto the city, and the man of wisdom shall see thy name; hear ye the rod, and who hath appointed it.” Micah 6:9. “All flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.” Gen.6:12. It is only such as are tried by that fire that is to test every man’s work, who have the eyes of their understanding enlightened, “that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints. And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to usward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named [even those of whom it is written; He called their name Adam,] not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all under his feet and gave him the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.” Eph.1:18-23.

O my soul, what wondrous fulness! For all through their after experience and pilgrimage every one that is born of the Spirit has a repetition, or additional testimonials, that the same *Mighty Power* works in them as independently and as all powerful as at its first awakening or revelation. They realize that they can no more govern their emotions, alay their fears, soothe their sorrows, heighten their joys, or brighten their prospects for eternal felicity than they can command or awaken the morning light at midnight, or speed the rising of the morning star before his time, or make the storm cloud retreat behind its own dark and threatening folds beneath the horizon, or still to silence its boisterous rumbling. Oh, no; it requires the teaching of Him who answers prayer “by terrible things in righteousness” [Ps.65:5,] whose power and might alone can teach the lesson. “My doctrine shall drop as the rain, my speech shall distil as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass, because I will publish the name of the Lord; ascribe ye greatness unto our God. He is the Rock, his work is perfect; for all his ways are judgment; a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he.” Men may arrogate to themselves the power and authority of qualifying themselves and qualifying their fellow creatures to publish the NAME OF THE LORD and cause His doctrine to drop as the rain from gospel clouds, or distil as the silent dew on earth’s verdant plains. But Jesus said, “I will declare thy name unto my brethren.” “O righteous Father, the world hath not known thee; but I have known thee, and these have known that thou hast sent me, and I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it.” These positive declarations of the “beginning of the creation of God,” “the only begotten of the Father,” “the first born of every creature,” and “first born from the dead,” fill the humble penitent with melting gratitude and unspeakable joy, thrilling the soul with inspiring hope and

triumphant faith to exclaim in rapturous melody with the inspired apostle; “I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in *Christ Jesus our Lord.*”

“Oh! That the sons of men would praise,
The goodness of the Lord,
And those that see thy wondrous ways,
Thy wondrous love record!

And for such love let rocks and hills,
Their lasting silence break,
And all harmonious children’s tongues,
Their Savior’s praises speak.”

Here is presented is such an experience, in such a deliverance “the wisdom of God set up from everlasting, from beginning, or ever the earth was, the *mighty power* by which any are led to believe, who do believe on the precious name of Jesus. For said the Savior: “This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.” Here, too, is presented that name called *Wonderful*, and to whose potent command the prison doors swing open and galling shackles fall from them who are bound. Here, too, is a gospel of peace that is as much the “power of God” today as when first proclaimed by the *PRINCE OF PEACE*. “For the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power.” And says the apostle: “For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance.”

And so, the testimony runs. “And this gospel of the kingdom [a gospel peculiar to the subjects of the Kingdom of God] shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations.” And as an unimpeached witness it stands as firmly established today as the throne of God, standing out in bold relief and living contrast with all the boasted systems of men's inventions as a means of salvation to an apostate world – a witness, whose Author “clothed with a vesture dipped in blood,” whose name is called THE WORD OF GOD. Rev.19:13. Who speaks and says, “I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save;” “and I looked, and there was *none* to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold; therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me; and my fury, it upheld me.” Isa.63:5. Yes, a witness who clothes the heavens with blackness and makes sack-cloth their covering, and to whom is given the tongue of the learned “to speak a word in season to him that is weary,” who in his majesty and power calls and sends by

whom He will to bear testimony to His power and glory, regardless of state, position, condition, surrounding objects, or circumstances! Coming to the humble penitent, it comes with an awful solemnity and momentous impetus, impelling the humbled vessel of God's choice, however weak, ignorant, or slow of speech, to stand in defense of that testimony that permeates his entire being, reverberating through the heavens and the universe of God, from heaven's exalted height to hell's lowest depths.

No wonder the old pioneer fathers, the early Baptist ministers of Kentucky who "sucked honey out of the rock, and oil out of the flinty rock," should have their faces set as a flint against the overflowing deluge of falsehood, of which those times as well as the present, were and are so prolific. They saw the dreadful influence that would result from those men made efforts to proselyte the world, popularize the "gospel of the kingdom," to prostitute the "spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him." John 14:17. No doubt they witnessed with grief the warning admonition of the apostle. "Also of your own selves, shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them," resulting in the first separation of the Baptist in the West; known far and wide, as the split in the Elk Horn Association, which virtually took place in the year 1808, resulting in those maintaining the former order of the Church and Association, adopting the name, "Licking Association."

It was about 14 years after this separation that Thomas P. Dudley became a member of Bryan's Church; soon after which, as we have already shown, was licensed and ordained to the ministry. "His praise in the gospel," soon spreading "throughout all the churches," soon taking rank as an able expounder of gospel truth, and as one of the most popular pulpit orators of that day. In a few years he became one of the most prominent members of the church in opposing the many innovations that were then introduced among the Baptist of Kentucky, exciting the most bitter persecution and opposition from those who had departed from the Baptist faith, and also, soon to arouse the most cruel jealousy on the part of some aspirants to leadership, of some who had professed to stand opposed to the many gross heresies that the Baptist knew *then* and *yet* know, are not of God, leading us here to revert to our former claim to the exclusive right of the name "Baptist."

The phrase, "The Baptist," as applied to John, is specific, definite, particular, and as applied to Baptist who are sent or come from God in all ages, its meaning is the same. "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption. That according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." I Cor.1:30,31.

How significant, then, the name, *the Baptist, Particular Baptist, Old School Baptist*, antedating all other schools or names! And how vain the claim of modern historians in laying claim to the name, or to apostolic succession, without one

feature of that history given by the Holy Ghost – the *Bible*. “O earth, cover thou my blood, and let my cry have no place. Also now, behold, my witness is in heaven, and my record is on high.” And as time speeds its onward course we witness the fulfillment of that declaration of the inspired record; the Spirit speaketh expressly, that some shall depart from the faith.

We will now call attention to the split in the “Elk Horn Association,” and origin of the name, “Licking Association.”

As we proceed with the life and character of this sketch we feel it due to his memory to say of him that, while he never seemed to be fond of or to seek polemic strife, yet he never quailed before an opponent, or curried favor to promote popularity. He appeared to be moved by a power and wisdom that preeminently set him forward for “the defense and confirmation of the gospel,” that his brethren might be partakers of his grace. And in the many heated controversies on the vital points of doctrine in which he was engaged, he never seemed to lose his dignified, courtly elegance, or stoop to the cunning stratagem of those who had to resort to other testimony than the word of God to sustain their position.

In prosecuting this work we have already stated that we felt forced from the nature of it to make reference to the origin and give a brief sketch of the “Licking Association of Old School Baptists.” In giving a concise history of the causes leading to the organization and adoption of the *name*, “Licking Association,” we shall offer no apology other than that our prime object is, in our humble capacity, to vindicate the truth of history; and if what we here record is not supported by unimpeached testimony, an apology would be no excuse.

The writer is well aware of the generally accepted version, by an overwhelming majority of the professors of religion, of the origin of the split in the Elk Horn Association of Kentucky. Very much has been said and written as to the cause of the division in that body by those chroniclers who have undertaken to defend that body, her doctrines and order, and those writers have invariably stigmatized the “Licking” as a faction which split off from the Elk Horn in the year 1810. It has been asserted over and over that the split was caused because of an exchange of servants by Elder Jacob Creath and Thomas Lewis [Thomas Lewis was the grandfather of my wife; whose maiden name was Sophie Lewis,] both of whom were members of Town Fork Church, near Lexington, Kentucky; Creath giving a note for a certain difference agreed upon in the value of the two servants. The servant which fell into the hands of Creath died in about six or nine months after the exchange, after which Creath refused to pay off the note held by Lewis. The matter was finally brought before the church for settlement. The church called a council of helps from other churches. The majority of the council decided, as Lewis was a man of wealth and Creath a poor man, that he should not pay off the note. This decision was well calculated to arouse the just indignation of all un-

biased minds that had any knowledge of justice and equity. But this was not the cause of the separation in Elk Horn Association, for I have been told that Lewis submitted to the decision of the council and did not attempt to force Creath by law to pay off the note. It was sometime after this occurrence that charges of a much more serious nature were preferred against Creath in Town Fork Church. Two witnesses, members of Bryans Church, were notified to appear at the trial. After proving the guilt of the accused most positively, the testimony of the two witnesses not being controverted, Creath arose and said: "You cannot hurt me; the Bible says, 'against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses,' and the same Bible says, 'a man and his wife are one.'" After his speech the church acquitted him, as the two witnesses from Bryans Church were man and wife. This shows to what extent some men will go when driven to extremity, who make a vaunting pretense to religion rather than confess their fault. Creath was ready to hide himself behind his official position and cover himself with the dignity and ermine of *elder*; yea, it shows more, and proves what we have heretofore asserted or hinted at; namely, that it was an age pregnant and prolific of disorders, and to what extent even professors of religion will go to hold on to one who is considered a champion. Creath at that time was considered one of the first pulpit orators of Kentucky, endowed with an active, projective mind to seize hold and champion all the newly-invented novelties now begun to be urged upon the Baptist as was claimed "to advance the Redeemer's Kingdom." In view of such arrogant claims, well might the poet ask:

"Eternal Father, who shall look,
 Into thy secret will?
Who but the Son shall take the book,
 And open every seal?

He shall fulfill thy great decrees,
 The Son deserves it well;
Lo! In his hand the sovereign keys,
 Of heaven, and death, and hell.

He needs no creature's power or skill,
 His finished work to mend,
But works his own eternal will,
 As wisdom did intend."

It was this act of gross disorder on the part of Town Fork Church, together with the helps called in, that gave the Bryans Church just grounds of complaint in her

letter to the next session of Elk Horn Association, held with the church called Silas, in Bourbon County, in the year 1808. It is a very noticeable fact that the writers of Baptist history have invariably touched very lightly on this – one of the most important sessions ever held by that body, characterized by a filibustering spirit on the part of Creath and a majority of the promoters of the disorders with which the body was now so contaminated, that it died a violent death of a most malignant disorder as an organized body.

The Elk Horn Association some years ago appointed one of her members, Dr. _____, to write a condensed history of her body, and he gives this brief notice of the session held that year, 1808: “This is the last Elk Horn Association over which Elder Ambrose Dudley presided as moderator.” [Elk Horn Minutes, 1878.] And J.H. Spencer, who spent much time and labor, has written a very extensive history of the Baptist of Kentucky, in which there is much useful information, a history perhaps as acceptably received by his people [Missionary Baptist] as has been written by any modern historian now living, gives this matter this very hurried notice: “A great spiritual dearth prevailed in the bounds of the Association from 1806 till 1809, so that in four years only 53 baptisms were reported. During this period the influence which resulted in a grievous split in the body and organization of Licking Association was at work.” Mr. Spencer, however, details at length in another part of his work the trouble between Creath and Lewis, and attributes *that* as the cause of the split; we, however have shown that the church at Bryans complained in her letter to the Association of Town Fork Church about another matter entirely different, and when the matter of complaint was called up in the Association, Elder Ambrose Dudley, who was moderator at the time, vacated the chair and requested Elder Lewis Corbin to occupy the chair in his stead. In order that the reader may know something of what did transpire at that meeting of the Association, we will here give an extract of a manuscript written by the late Elder T.P. Dudley expressly for the writer of these pages, in his own hand writing, referring to the matter of complaint having been called up in the Association as soon as Elder Corbin took the chair:

“Jacob Creath arose and said: ‘I have fourteen reasons for believing there is a combination against me to take my life, and that Ambrose Dudley commands the party, and has employed Eliza Craig to deal with me.’ Elder Corbin called ‘ORDER!’ saving, ‘The matter before the Association is the complaint of Bryan’s against Town Fork.’ Mr. Creath paid no attention to the repeated calls to order. Elder Corbin finding that the Association did not sustain him in calling to order, left the seat, remarking, ‘You have no use for a moderator, as you pay no regard to order.’ Mr. Creath continued his speech for about two hours, at the end of which Ambrose Dudley arose and said: ‘As I have been publicly assailed I claim the privilege of replying, and as Elder Corbin has left the seat as moderator I suppose I

shall have to address the clerk.' He proceeded to vindicate himself against the charges made by Creath and spoke about two hours and twenty minutes. At the conclusion of his speech, Elder Corbin resumed the seat as moderator and said, 'I have two questions which I wish the Association to decide: 1. Is the Association in order?' An overwhelming majority voted 'SHE IS NOT.' 2. 'Will the Association now return to order?' A majority decided 'WE WILL NOT.' At the close of the session Elder Corbin proclaimed aloud, 'I will never meet the *majority* of this body again as the Elk Horn Association;' others concurred with him."

Is it not surprising that the condensed account given by the appointed historian should make these stirring events so concise as *just to say*, "This is the last Association over which Elder Ambrose Dudley ever presided as moderator!" This brief notice, together with many like it, only exhibits the weakness of the claims of those who have attempted to show that the Elk Horn Association is the original organization. It is out of this wreck that the Elk Horn Association of Missionary Baptist have arisen from the ashes of the old body, and with but few of the original features of the old Elk Horn Association.

This violent attack of Creath on such men as Ambrose Dudley and Eliza Craig threw the Association into the wildest disorders, resulting in the determination of such eminent men, able expounders of gospel truth and order as John Price, Joseph Redding, Lewis Corbin, Richard Thomas, John Conner, Bartlett Bennett, Absalom Bainbridge, and other Elders, together with a number of churches, never to meet in an associate capacity with such a riotous, filibustering majority, who paid no regard to order.

In 1809, the Creath party met at South Elk Horn Church as Elk Horn Association, some twelve or fourteen churches of the original body not being represented, either by letters or messengers. They appointed their next meeting in 1810 with the Church at Clear Creek, in Woodford County. And just here I feel that it is proper to copy an extract from a meeting held at the Bryan's Church in February of the same year, 1810:

"Received a letter signed by a number of our brethren, who have thought that it would be most to the glory of God, and for the peace and happiness of society under our present distresses, to call a meeting on the first Tuesday in March to meet at the Forks of Elk Horn in order to dissolve the Elk Horn Association; which was agreed to, and Brethren Ambrose Dudley and Leonard Young are chosen to attend the said meeting and let the brethren know we chose to meet at what they call the N. Elk Horn Association at Bryans."

Mr. S., in his history of the Baptist of Kentucky, copies this same minute, but adds two letters to the letter *N* and makes it read *New* Elk Horn Association. With the same latitude I might add and make it read *No* Association, or perhaps more correctly, *North* Elk Horn Association, as Bryans Church building was situated on

North Elk Horn, and Clear Creek Church on a tributary of *South* Elk Horn. But be that as it may, the two bodies met at their respective places of appointment on the second Saturday in August, 1810. Each body organized under the name of Elk Horn Association.

On Monday morning, a letter was received by the hands of messengers from the body at Clear Creek, sent to the body at Bryans, proposing terms of reconciliation, to which the body at Bryans replied: "We could by no means accede thereto, as they were in possession of our difficulties, and until they were removed we remained a distressed and grieved people."

The messengers from the Clear Creek body then proposed inasmuch as they had failed in the object of their mission [namely; to bring about a reconciliation,] that both parties or bodies should drop the name "Elk Horn," as it would cause confusion among corresponding associations. To this Elder Ambrose Dudley, who was moderator, replied: "I am not tenacious for names, and believing the name Elk Horn has become contaminated, I suggest that we take the name of LICKING." Elder Joseph Redding [my great-grandfather,] immediately arose to his feet and said: "I object to dropping the name Elk Horn, for if we do, this party will come back and charge that *we* have departed from the Constitution of the Association, for I have no more confidence in them, than I have in a band of Patiwattimie Indians."

This seemed to be very strong, harsh and rasping language coming from a minister of the gospel of peace, but it shows to what excess some of those old pioneer servants were driven in their loss of confidence in some with whom they had often taken sweet counsel and walked unto the house of God in company. The inspired apostle, who spake by the Holy Ghost, said, "For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, especially they of the circumcision; whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake. One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies. This witness is true. Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they be sound in the faith." Titus 1:10-13.

However, on motion and second, the name "Licking" was adopted and Elk Horn dropped, many believing the committee from Clear Creek would be true to their own proposition, and drop the name Elk Horn also, but the result was different. The words of Joseph Redding were prophetic, for the very next year a committee was sent from the Creath party [Elk Horn] charging that Licking Association had departed from the Constitution of the Elk Horn Association, and invited them back. Such actions are the efforts spoken of by some who have written on the subject, as the effort on the part of Elk Horn to reconcile the two factions.

It perhaps has been truly said, Joseph Redding was a prodigy among men. I

have frequently heard my grandmother, Susan Pratt, and her sister Annie Adair – his daughters; say, “he was a self-made and self-educated man, a natural grammarian; and that after they grew up old enough to know anything about their father, that his whole life was given to the work of the ministry, traveling often to Virginia through the dense forests on horseback, gone often for over a month at a time, returning home only to stay one night to enquire after the welfare of his family, leaving domestic affairs entirely to the management of his wife.” Elder T.P. Dudley has often said to me that his father, Ambrose Dudley, used to say of Redding, “that he was the most natural orator he ever met; that all he had to do was to throw back his head and open his mouth and it seemed filled with wisdom from on high.” He was the pastor of Great Crossing Church from 1793 to 1810, the year that Licking was organized, when he resigned and took charge of Dry Run Church, which went into the organization of Licking Association, but is now in Elk Horn. He preached the introductory at the time “Licking” was organized.

It is vain to charge that Licking was only a *faction* breaking off from the Elk Horn Association, when there were eleven churches with over eight hundred members that went into the organization without a “sufficient reason for dividing measures.” We have no doubt, as these old fathers in the gospel ministry pondered over the disorders so prevalent, their hearts were filled with dark forebodings as they beheld in the visions of God the captivity of many precious ones turned from the simplicity of the gospel. And as the hand [or power] of the Lord rested upon them, as it did upon Ezekiel, they beheld upon God’s delectable mountain, the frame of that city that was to be measured by Him [the Son of God,] “whose appearance was like the appearance of brass, with a line of flax [gospel order] in his hand, and a measuring reed [the word of God;] and he stood in the gate.” Ez.40:3. And we have no doubt they were now prepared to hear and take heed to the word of God spoken to that old prophet:

“Son of man, mark well, and behold with thine eyes, and hear with thine ears all that I say unto thee concerning all the ordinances of the house of the Lord, and all the laws thereof; and mark well the entering in of the house, with every going forth of the sanctuary. And thou shalt say to the rebellious, even to the house of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God; O ye house of Israel, let it suffice you of all your abominations, in that ye have brought into my sanctuary strangers, uncircumcised in heart, and uncircumcised in flesh, to be in my sanctuary, to pollute it, even my house, when ye offer my bread, the fat and the blood, and they have broken my covenant because of all your abominations. And ye have not kept the charge of mine holy things; but ye have set keepers of my charge in my sanctuary for yourselves.” Ez.44:5-8.

Language could not be more appropriate in portraying the state of the church from time to time in the going forth of His sanctuary, in His shaking, not only the

earth, but also the heavens in a manifestation of that “kingdom which cannot be moved,” a kingdom diverse from all others, a people who are commanded, “Thou shalt not sow thy vineyard with diverse seeds; lest the fruit of thy seed which thou hast sown, and the fruit of thy vineyard, be defiled.” Deut 22:9. Let even the cursory reader stop for one moment and think. Here is a kingdom peculiar to all others, “a chosen generation, a peculiar people,” “an incorruptible seed,” strangers to the world. But ye see your calling, brethren, “How that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called.” Then lift up your heads, poor trembling saints, though shorn of your own strength, poor and blind, weak and helpless, depleted in numbers [so far as the world sees and knows,] scattered and peeled; “troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed;” with the world, the flesh and the devil against you, the sweet promise is to you in the dark and cloudy day, the Ancient of days will come, and judgment shall be given unto you, a righteous judgment showing you the possessors of the kingdom.

Men may trace the biography of men, may record historical events concerning the origin and actions of ecclesiastical bodies with a view of showing its continued succession down through the cycles of revolving ages, but every effort that does not strictly conform to the word of God in delineating her features, fails to exhibit such as the “Bride, the Lamb’s Wife.” The soul-thrilling voice of the heavenly Groom speaks words of cheer and says: “My love, my dove, my undefiled is but one, the only one of her mother, the choice one of her that bare her. I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee.”

We have penned the foregoing pages with reference to the separation which took place in the Elk Horn Association, and the organization of Licking Association, to thus introduce our reader to that body of Baptist with which the late Thomas P. Dudley was so long identified; and we wish to observe that we have had no design of exciting the feelings of any living mortal, or of keeping alive issues long since forgotten, or perhaps never known by a large majority of the professors of religion; and if it should, we can only ask in the language of inspiration; “Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth? They zealously affect you [all who tell you anything than truth,] but not well; yea, they would exclude you that ye might affect them.”

“Here let the Son of David reign,
Let God’s anointed shine;
Justice and truth his court maintain,
With love and power divine.

Here let him hold a lasting throne,

And as his blessings flows,
Fresh honors shall adorn his crown,
And shame confound his foes.”

The genuine sincerity of those “old fathers,” as watchmen upon the walls, and as guardians of that most sacred heritage, “God’s eternal truth,” appears most forcibly in the following extract taken from the Circular letter of 1813:

As professors of religion, how great are the obligations we are under! God has committed to His Church as guardians, the divine truth. Shall we silently stand by and see them abused, and it be said by Jehovah, “there is none valiant for the truth?” Experimental doctrine and practical godliness is the essence of religion, and a departure from either of those grand and leading points ought to meet with our warmest opposition. We are happy in hearing of the peace, union and harmony that prevail among the churches of our union. Let us show by our love and regard for each other, and for all good and orderly Christians, that we are followers of the Lamb; and by withdrawing from all disorderly professors of religion, that we regard the direction of the great Head of the Church. The happiness of a Christian does not consist in an attachment to a jarring, divided, disorderly multitude. Let us prefer being a small, persecuted, abused, united, harmonious few, whose happiness it is to fear God and keep His commandments. Let our dwellings be the house of prayer. Our seats never empty in the house of God; a constant attendant on all His ordinances, committing soul and body and all we have to the disposal of Him that does all things well, and quietly wait the final issue.

Ambrose Dudley, Moderator.
John Price, Clerk. *Licking Minutes, 1813.*

Eighteen churches then composed the Licking Association, with 885 members. This is the *faction* of which we have heard so much from professed Baptist historians – a faction, as they say, that split off the Elk Horn Association. But in it all, even to the historical accounts given, we witness the display of that power that “rules in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth” in the preservation of the “remnant according to the election of grace,” the movement of that unerring power, fulfilling the prophecies going before, exhibiting along the pathway of time the comforting assurance and promise “I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee,” showing then, as also within the last few years, “that also of yourselves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them” [Acts 20:30,] and nowhere intimating that the elders, servants, or shepherds exercised any power, or had any part in the increase of the flock or body of Christ, for it “increaseth with the increase of God.” Col.2:19. Hence the command to Peter, “Feed my sheep;” and to the elders, “Feed the flock of God.”

The generic power which develops this family, this body, this flock, *still* resides, ever *has* and ever *will* abide in its *Generator*; hence the language: “That in blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies.”

Elder Thomas P. Dudley was appointed a messenger from Bryans Church to the Licking Association from the year 1822 to 1878, successfully, fifty-six years, and in all those years he missed attending only three sessions. He was chosen moderator forty-five years in succession, being first elected to preside in the year 1834. In the year 1823, he was made the clerk of the association, acting as such until the year 1827, and, according to the minutes of the association, he was first appointed to write a circular letter for the association in 1829 for 1830. This circular was adopted and published, and was a true index of his future career and usefulness, as one whom God had set forth for the defense of the gospel, and as one who believed *as we do* that our Heavenly Father in His infinite glory, wisdom and mercy circumscribed His Church within New Testament bounds, in which the great object of faith is continually set forth before us, while the doctrine and order which are made imperative upon us declare its inspiration and divinity. He saw that nothing short of a strict conformity to the laws of the King of Zion, and an adherence to the rule and practice of the apostles [the princes who rule in judgment,] could bring that unity and peace so much desired by all true lovers of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. We will here give an extract from the circular referred to, that those who were familiar with his latter writings and public ministry may see its harmony with that gospel that he ever preached. He says:

“It is a mistaken idea entertained by some that creeds and confessions of faith engender strife among the disciples of Jesus; it is a want of them, a want of the ‘unity of the spirit,’ and of His heavenly guidance which has produced so much strife and animosity in the professed Church of Christ, a giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils. Brethren, let us take the apostles admonition, ‘Hold fast the FORM of sound words; hold fast the heart-cheering doctrine of salvation by *unfrustratable* grace through the atoning blood and righteousness of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that blood applied through the immediate and irresistible operation of the Spirit of God. Deviate from this system and it is impossible that Jesus can be crowned Lord of all. We have seen, as yet, not a particle of evidence drawn from the oracles of God which opposes the views we entertain of the bible plan of saving sinners, and until we obtain that light, we shall be pardoned for still believing as we do.”

Here permit us to remark, dear brethren, that it has often been a matter of surprise to us that Christians, blessed as they are with the spirit of truth in their hearts, and the word of truth in their hands, should disagree in regard to the objects

to be secured by the advent of the Lord Jesus Christ. When we reflect that His humiliation, with His whole mediatorial work on behalf of sinners, was the result of Divine purpose, and to suppose that any contingency can frustrate that purpose, we must have very inadequate ideas of Him “who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will,” and who has said, “My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure.” We ask, Was not Moses confined in his prophetic office to national Israel? If Moses, in his mediatorial character, was confined to national Israel, and national Israel was typical of spiritual Israel, as will be conceded by all, the conclusion is irresistible that the Lord Jesus Christ, in His mediatorial character *is confined to spiritual Israel*; in other words, *that seed which shall serve Him*, and “*shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation.*”

We maintain that no other rational [not to say scriptural] ground can be consistently occupied, and refer you to Ephesians 5:25-27. “Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word; that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.” But why need we multiply proofs when the whole tenor of scripture upon the subject of redemption runs in the same channel? Were we compelled to make our election between those who hold universal atonement and special application and universalism, we believe, for consistency’s sake, we should embrace the latter, for it will be at once perceived, according to the first, that the object is to avert that soul-refreshing doctrine of particular and personal election and particular and efficacious redemption.

We cannot conceive by what sort of reasoning a tree devoid of root is to carry on the vegetating process to the growing, ripening and perfecting of fruit. That faith is essential to the rendering acceptable service unto God, will not, we presume, be controverted; and in the absence of that love, which is the fulfilling of the law, there is an absence of vital religion, will be conceded by all equally clear. What then is the testimony borne by the inspired writer on this subject? Listen: “But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith;” hence we discover that both love and faith are fruits of the Spirit.

The general tenor of the foregoing circular was to meet and refute the current heresy of general atonement and special application, a denial of a personal election in the chosen seed, making the elected the elector. The idea that the Father has appointed the Son to make a general atonement for Adam’s entire family, and that the Son has accomplished that work, and that the Holy Ghost refuses to make the application only to a part of the redeemed, is absurd. Such a position creates a schism in the Godhead. These were some of the heresies against which the *old fathers* had to contend, and was a line of demarcation between nominal and true Baptist before Elder Dudley became a Baptist, the outgrowth of Andrew Fuller’s

system. The Scriptures do not teach any such inharmonious disagreement in the Godhead. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God," and the same Spirit which inspired it must teach it: "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." I Cor.2:11. "And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth, for there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost." I John 5:6-7. Not more heretical, however, were the foregoing sentiments held by those who then departed from the faith and order of the gospel, than the sentiments of those who have more recently departed, claiming that the election is in Adam, the first, and by the operation of the Spirit on, or in the Adamic sinner, he is "born again," and thus he, the child of the flesh, becomes the holy seed or child of God.

Those old fathers of that early day experienced what it has fallen to our lot to experience in this day – that those who depart from the faith soon become the most bitter persecutors of those gospel ministers who "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." The true and faithful minister of the gospel will let none of these things move him, neither will he count his life dear unto himself, so that he may finish his course with joy, and the ministry he has received of the Lord Jesus to testify the gospel of the grace of God. Acts 20:24. Lovers of truth are firm and easy, whilst religious partisans are factious and busy, ever engaged by evasions, schemes and devious arts to pour contempt and heap odium on Old School Baptists as being disorderly and ungovernable. In doing this they are incorrect in conversation, preaching and publication, seeming to have no regard for principle or conscience, supposing one is led by the influence of another, and that a few preachers lead all the rest of the society, as was charged against Elders Ambrose Dudley, Joseph Redding, and others in the first split of the Baptist of Kentucky, and against Elder T.P. Dudley in the next split, when some went off on the heresy of the "regeneration of the soul," and more recently against Elders William M. Smoot, of Virginia; George Weaver, of Indiana; R.M. Thomas, of Missouri; John H. Biggs and L. Bavis, of Ohio; James H. Wallingford, J.M. Demaree and J. Taylor Moore, of Kentucky; by those who have gone off on the election in Adam and regeneration of or the "sinner born again;" but of this we will speak more at length in its proper place. Christians may err for want of clearer light and improper teaching, but a Christian's errors are no more to be sanctioned because they are the errors of a Christian than Peter's denying the Lord.

It is by sore experience that we poor fallible creatures learn that there can be no good government in church, association, state or family without good and honest principles. Whatever principles of a theological nature men may have not directed by the Spirit of the Lord, or His word, as the man of their counsel, will cease or change, as circumstances demand, not being implanted of the Lord, like seed to

produce fruit of the nature of the seed; hence, what we are sometimes led to regard as a departure from the faith is simply a want of it in the heart, which sooner or later develops in a reckless disregard for the “unity of the spirit in the bond of peace,” and a readiness to destroy the faith they once professed, and also to destroy those who continue steadfast in that faith. I am reminded just here of the many times I have heard Elder Dudley say, “That the sod would hardly be green over his remains before the vultures would be coming from every quarter of the compass to break up the peace and harmony of the Licking Association,” which he regarded as one of the most firm and harmonious body of Baptist of which he had any knowledge.

Brethren, are we not living witnesses of the fulfillment of this prophetic language? And well may those disorganizers tremble in view of the responsibility to which they will be held. But David describes such as having no fear of God before their eyes, and says of such: “He flattereth himself in his own eyes until his iniquity be found to be hateful, the words of his mouth are iniquity and deceit, he hath left off to be wise and to do good.” Such characters are generally found parading their zeal, boiling over with professed love to God, His cause, and for His people, making grand display of their piety for the prosperity of Zion, but Ahab-like, the first to charge the faithful servant of God as the one that troubleth Israel. I Kings 18:17. Such as the above could fraternize with almost anything that claimed to be Baptist in the earlier days of Elder Dudley’s public ministry; and the same class can, in later days, harmonize with almost anything claiming to be Old School Baptist. The question is often propounded, How shall unity be preserved? And to work men go to solve the problem, and write articles and terms of agreement, recommending their various cosmetics, while the servant of God sits silently by and realizes that where there is no unity, there is none to keep; but where we are of “one heart and one soul,” and not one merely on paper, we should “endeavor to keep the unity of the SPIRIT in the bond of peace.” It is frequently seen in the history of the church that multitudes who are not sound in doctrine, and can give no account of a work of grace, yet are often speaking of practical religion, piety and holiness, that no one can compare with them in this particular. It was against this Pharisaical sect that T.P. Dudley was made as a “defenced city, and an iron pillar, and brazen walls” that turned the shafts of his opponents with such rebounding force as to leave them in the ditch with the flimsy charge against him and his brethren of “arrogance;” and for such alleged arrogance, churches withdrew their professed fellowship and associations their correspondence. But such has ever been the case in the history of the church. When God shakes “not the earth only, but also heaven,” that those things which are shaken may be removed, and those things “which cannot be shaken may remain.” Heb.12:27.

CHAPTER III.

We have hinted in our last chapters that it was against a heterogeneous mass banded together by similar written agreements as those proposed by some only a few years ago among Old School Baptist. Even before Elder Dudley was ordained to the ministry, many Baptists were led into the delusive hope of promoting unity by entering in a compact called General Union, and of that General Union, Elder Taber, who was one of the presbytery who assisted in the ordination of the subject of this sketch, has this to say in a circular which he was appointed to write for the Licking Association, adopted in 1823:

“Party men are busy bodies, and will turn to any point of the compass to affect their objects without constitutions, covenants, terms of general union, or anything else; unless it be so loose and waxen that it may be slipped out from the doctrine of sovereign grace in the Bible, and in the confession of faith. These are the people, the charitable people, who wink at open communion and various irregularities, and would exclude for joining any particular Baptist church whose pastor would not fellowship all the heterogeneous matter mixed together within what is called the General Union in Kentucky. The terms of this union were never intended to operate against the constitution, sovereignty, and independence of churches, but now they are made to answer any and every purpose, and to supercede our constitution, and are termed “the great charters of our religious liberty.” If those who make this union everything had not thereby made the constitution nothing, and introduced doctrines and discipline contrary to it, to all that was ever intended by the terms of union, the state of society would now be different to what it is. We well know that for these causes the United Baptists, so termed, are very much disunited among themselves. Surely this warm, unbounded union, this “great charter of religious liberty,” has brought men to the zenith of frenzy. It would seem by the latitude they travel that there are no bounds fixed to which you may go and no further. We meet with very little persecution now but from the warmly united Baptists. A very late historian then ought to have reserved a part of his publication. [Taylor’s History; pg.184] He says: ‘Whatever other object *Particularism* may have in view, with some there is no doubt but that the destruction of the General Union of Baptist in Kentucky is its main object.’ He knows us better, although he gives this opinion of some whom he places between himself and the charge. This disingenuousness may be found in other parts of this author’s history, at least when

publishing what relates to the Particular Baptists. Where there is no union, there is none to keep, but where we are of one mind, have a union of souls, and not merely one on paper, we should endeavor to keep ‘the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace;’ that is, we must continue to be of one mind to enjoy cordial fellowship, striving against everything that would prevent it, and the principle and doctrine of bible truth should be laid down as our first principles and constitution and be agreed to. We are constituted on Bible principles, but it is necessary we should explain what our faith in the Bible is, which is our declaration or confession of faith, otherwise we should be indistinct.

We believe in PARTICULAR ELECTION, PARTICULAR REDEMPTION, PARTICULAR ATONEMENT, PARTICULAR CALLING, and all the doctrine of SPECIAL GRACE. Union is the delight of our hearts; that is what we have been after, what we have received, what we warmly enjoy and are sincerely thankful for. We pray that it may be enlarged. It is a union of faith, a union of sentiments, a union of feelings, a union of hearts and souls, a union with the Father, with the Son, with Bible truth, and of course with one another. People may unite to kill, to steal, and to destroy, but this is only agreeing on a plan without union; so compacts concerning religious matters may be agreed to on paper without union and without vital religion.”

In the foregoing extract from the circular of Licking association of 1823, it will not be hard for brethren to trace a similar course of those who have more recently severed their connection with us by their efforts to make the general correspondence between the associations anything and everything. One Eastern preacher publicly boasted that he was backed by five Eastern Associations, well knowing at the time that the sentiments he was then advocating was not in harmony with our views and convictions of truth; namely, the ETERNAL, UNCONDITIONAL and PERSONAL ELECTION of the CHURCH in CHRIST, the CHOSEN SEED, developing the GENERATION of Jesus Christ, “a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation.” And we would here make bold to assert that if the relation Christ bore to His people is only a fleshly relation, in that He took on Him the seed of Abraham, only that which resulted from his being made of a woman, made under the law, or after the law of a carnal commandment, and to redeem the sinners of Adam’s race, [which wise men above that which is written claim were chosen in Him,] His priestly office could have accomplished no more than that of Aaron’s; and this idea involves the unscriptural idea that His priestly office did not exist until His incarnation or birth of the Virgin Mary; an idea which they themselves have professed to oppose – it was an opposition to these gross heresies, and others of a kindred nature, to which the life of Elder T.P. Dudley and his contemporaries in the Gospel ministry in Licking Association were devoted, and be it said to the burning shame of some who professed great love and

fellowship for him and the doctrine he and his companions so ably maintained, that they bided their time for opposition till he and his older companions had gone to their reward before they raised their voices against the doctrine they preached, and with them rests the fearful responsibility of disturbing the peace of one of the most harmonious bodies of Christians that this world has ever known; namely, the Licking Association and those who are really and truly in fellowship with us.

We are admonished in the Scriptures: “Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they are of God, because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God; every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come [notice the language: *is come*] in the flesh, is of God. And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ *is come* in the flesh, is not of God. And this is that spirit of anti-christ whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.” I John 4:1-3. Whenever prophet, priest, preacher, or teacher undertakes to show that the generations of Adam – “the first man Adam,” is “the generation of Jesus Christ,” you may set him down as being of the world, a false prophet, and one who sooner or later will go out into the world, and though he may have a foothold or a name and standing in the visible organization – the Church – it is manifest that he is not of that “one body and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling.” Such characters will truckle to the superior abilities of men, whose powers of argument they cannot repel in their professed harmony, which sleeps like a smoking crater till the day of God’s reckoning, “for the Lord hath a controversy with his people.” Mic.6:2. And when that day comes, in the which he “shakes not only the earth but also heaven” [the Church,] they aspiring to become leaders and men of acknowledged ability are shaken and away they go to draw away disciples after them. But the admonition to us is, “Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear; for our God is a consuming fire.” It is thus we are made witnesses of those things which are shaken as of things that are made [by their removal,] that those things which cannot be shaken may remain. If we serve God acceptably “we must worship in spirit.” Hence said an apostle: “We are the circumcision, which worship God in the Spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.” Wicked spirits may serve God, but not in the spirit of the Gospel, for if God desires to have an Ahab persuaded he will permit a lying spirit to do it, but it is to Ahab’s destruction, “for the Lord is a great God, and a great King above all gods. In his hand are the deep places of the earth; the strength of the hills is his also; the sea is his and he made it; and his hands formed the dry land. O come, let us worship and bow down; let us kneel before the Lord our Maker; for he is our God, and we are the people of his pasture, and the sheep of his hand. Today if ye will hear his voice, harden not your heart, as in the provocation, and as in the day of temptation in the wilderness,

when your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my work.” Ps.95:3-8.

Are we not witnesses of the falling away of many, from that harmony of fellowship they professed *with* the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ to a manifest fellowship *for* Adam and his posterity? And that the reader of these pages may see who have kept in line with the fathers who continued steadfastly in the apostle’s doctrine and fellowship, we propose to give next some of the writings of Elder T.P. Dudley.

CIRCULAR ON THE CHRISTIAN WARFARE.

To the Churches composing the Licking Association of Particular Baptist; their Messengers wish grace, mercy and peace multiplied.

DEARLY BELOVED; It occurs to us that we could not select a more appropriate subject, because none possesses more intrinsic merit, for our present annual address, that the ORIGIN, NATURE, and EFFECTS of that warfare which so painfully disturbs the peace and quiet of the Children of the Regeneration.

It is confidently believed that much embarrassment and many doubts and fears with regard to their interest in a Saviour’s shed blood, have resulted from misconception of this important subject. How often does the troubled saint exclaim;

“If I love, why am I thus?
Why this dull and lifeless frame?
Hardly sure can they be worse,
Who have never heard his name.”

That the warfare, invariably follows being “born again,” is not, we believe, controverted by any experimental Christian. But whilst some of us maintain, that the warfare results from a conflict of elements within; others, and perhaps the larger number contend, that in the new birth, the man is changed from the love of sin to the love of holiness.

We inquire, by what power is the supposed change affected? The answer is, by the Spirit of God. Moses informs us, “He is the Rock, his work is perfect.” Deut.32:4. Now we ask, if indeed, in the new birth, the man is changed from the love of sin to the love of holiness, and this change is perfect, does it not necessarily follow, that he will be as wholly and entirely devoted to holiness subsequently, as he had been to sin antecedently to the new birth? If, as is contended by many, the enmity of the heart is slain in regeneration, whence arises opposition to the

dispensations of God's providence? Irreconciliation to his will? And whence the exclamation, "O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Rom.7:24. That the Christian is a compound being, is a truth so fully taught in his history; as given in the holy Scriptures, that we wonder it should be controverted by any who have tasted that "the LORD is gracious."

"But though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." II Cor.4:16. "For I delight in the law of God, after the inward man." Rom.7:22. "Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him." Col.3:9,10. "Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." II Cor.5:17. "For in Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." Gal.6:15.

Whence these various distinctions between the old and new man, if indeed there are not two men? If man is only changed in the new birth? If the language that "man is changed" were appropriate, there would be but one man; his feelings and affections having been changed; there would be no conflict and hence no warfare! We presume that none will contend that the old is the new man, or the new is the old man. This would be to confound language and make it unintelligible.

We affectionately ask brethren to consider that the matter of making christians, is no where, in the Scriptures represented as Reformation, but as a Creation. Hence it is said, "But be you glad and rejoice forever in that which I create; for, behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy. And I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people; and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying ... for they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them." Isaiah 65:18,19, 23. None, we presume, will deny, that the last quotation has exclusive reference to Gal.4:26 – "But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all."

"But now, thus saith the LORD that created thee, O Jacob, and he that formed thee, O Israel. Fear not; for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name; thou art mine ... Fear not; for I am with thee, I will bring thy seed from the east, and gather thee from the west; I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back; bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth; even everyone that is called by my name; for I have created him for my glory, I have formed him; yea, I have made him." Isaiah 43:1,5-7. "How long wilt thou go about, O thou backsliding daughter? For the Lord hath created a new thing in the earth; a woman shall compass a man." Jer.31:22. "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Eph.2:10. "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me." Ps.51:10.

But why need we multiply proofs on the point, when they are set forth so palpably in the Scriptures, and realized in the Christian experience?

The Bible furnishes the following history of the natural family. "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." Gen.1:27. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Gen.2:7. "Man and female created he them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created." Gen.5:2. Hence we learn that all "living souls," were created in, and simultaneously with their natural progenitor.

They all descend from him by ordinary or natural generation. They necessarily partake of his nature, and subsist upon the same elements upon which he subsisted. The breath of life communicated to man, whence he became a "living soul," constituted him a rational, intelligent, responsible being, the subject of law and of earthly enjoyments, capable of subsisting upon the products of the earth; but incapable of other and higher enjoyments.

Deprive him of the soul, mind, or rational faculties; and what would distinguish him from the brute? Deprive him of life, and he would be like other dead matter. In the absence of soul, or body, he would have been incapable of filling up his destiny upon earth.

It is said in the Scriptures, "And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden, to dress it, and to keep it. And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die. [The life which Adam had, could be forfeited by transgression.] And the Lord God said, it is not good that man should be alone; I will make him a help meet for him." "And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept; and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof. And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto him. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh." Gen.2:15-18, 21-24.

Now, we ask, if the woman had been different in nature and disposition, if she had been incapable of earthly enjoyments, of subsisting upon earthly productions, of breathing a natural atmosphere; in a word, had her susceptibilities been entirely different from Adam's, would she have been an "help meet" for Adam? But she was part of him, possessed the same nature, and was, consequently, an "help meet." Here too, we see the declaration, "male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam," carried out.

And unto Adam he said: “Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying: Thou shalt not eat of it; cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return. And Adam called his wife’s name Eve; because she was the mother of all living.” Gen.3:17-20. Did God address a rational, intelligent being in the foregoing quotation, and was he capable of realizing the curse pronounced? The characteristics of this family are strikingly marked in the Scriptures – “And Adam lived a hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his own image; and called his name Seth.” Gen.5:3. “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.” Ps.51:5. “The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies.” Ps.58:3. “Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” Rom.5:12.

From the preceding verses and arguments it is manifest that the family of the “first Adam” is not capable of rendering acceptable service to God, but the antagonist nature and principle of the two families [the natural and the spiritual,] out of which grows the warfare, are made still more manifest by the contrast introduced by an Apostle. And so it is written: “The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterwards that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.” I Cor.15:45-50.

Is it not evident then, that all “living souls” were created in and simultaneously with the “first man Adam,” that they all, being born of him, necessarily partake of his nature, “and he called their name Adam?” And that all “quickened spirits” were created in and simultaneously with the “last Adam” – that they all, being born of him, “born of God,” as necessarily partake of his nature? That all living souls no more necessarily descend from the first Adam than all quickened spirits necessarily descend from the last Adam; that the seed of the “first Adam” disclose his nature, and the seed of the “last Adam” make manifest his nature.

The children of the “first Adam” are born of the flesh and are earthly in all their feelings and affections; the children of the “last Adam” are born of the Spirit and are necessarily heavenly or spiritual in their feelings and affections. The children

of the first are born for earth; of the last Adam, are born for heaven. Those of the “first” are born of corruptible; those of the “last Adam” are of incorruptible seed. The first necessarily partake of human; the last, of the divine nature. The antagonistic principles attached to the two men necessarily result in the warfare. If all living souls were not vitally united to the first Adam, how could they be so directly and fatally effected by the first transgression? How could the original act of transgression be considered their act? “And so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” “There is none righteous, no not one.” Rom.3:10.

If all quickened spirits were not vitally united to the “last Adam,” how could his mediatorial work effect them in their deliverance from the wrath to come? “This is his name whereby he shall be called, The LORD our righteousness.” Jer.23:6. The transgression of the “first man Adam” involved all his family in guilt and ruin. The mediatorial work of the “last Adam” met all the claims of the law and satisfied divine justice in behalf of the chosen seed. But as the transgression of the “first Adam” did not disqualify his family for heaven, neither did the obedience and death of the “last Adam” impart to his chosen seed a qualification for the enjoyment of heaven.

The earth being the natural abode of the “first Adam’s” family, they are necessarily born of the flesh in order to its enjoyment; heaven being the ultimate abode of saints, they are as necessarily born of the Spirit in order to its enjoyments. “Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” John 3:5. Here we are presented with two distinct births of two distinct elements, which necessarily produce two distinct beings. The first, of the flesh, producing beings incapable; the second, of the Spirit, producing beings capable of entering into the kingdom of God. The first producing simple; the second compound beings. The first having but one; the second two natures. Of those born of the flesh, it is said, “Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.” Of those born of the Spirit, “But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now, if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.” Rom.8:7-9. “All men have not faith.” “But without faith it is impossible to please him.” Faith is a “fruit of the Spirit” – “the gift of God,” to the “new creature.”

The development of the natural family has been progressing for near six thousand years, and yet the last one born, like the first, gives proof, demonstrable proof of the source whence he sprang. The spiritual family has been developing with and since the days of Abel, and each one “born of the Spirit” gives evidence of the source whence he sprang. “I delight in the law of God after the inward man.” No contingency can prevent the entire development of each, the natural and

spiritual family; and we are warranted to believe that the last one who shall be developed of each shall be like the first of that family, whence he sprang.

The sturdy oak of the forest, with all its roots, its huge trunk, every limb, every twig, yea, and every leaf, which has been, is now being and shall be developed, were once enclosed in a small acorn, whence they all sprang, all are of the same nature, each a part of the whole. Had not the acorn been providentially committed to the ground whence it underwent decomposition and germination, there had been no development; so with the corn of wheat. “Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit. He that loveth his life [his natural life] shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world, shall keep it unto life eternal.” John 12:24,25. Adam the first, could no more produce a spiritual being, than the “thorn” could produce grapes; or the “thistle” figs.

We learn from the Scriptures that the husband [Christ] was composed of two whole and distinct natures; divine and human. The human composed no part of the divine; nor yet, did the divine compose any part of his human nature. Now examine the figure; if the bride is not composed of two whole and distinct natures, or if the human composes any part of the divine, or the divine composes any part of the human nature in her, can she be “an help meet for him?” Unless she partake of the same distinct natures, can she enjoy him, or he her, in this world; or in that which is to come? But we find the “two men” sustained upon radically different elements. The earth which is the mother of the “old” now, as formerly, feeds the “old man.” The “new” is fed upon that “bread which cometh down from heaven.”

“If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world ... Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.” John 6:51, 53.

The creation and development of those destined to inhabit both the natural and spiritual world, are distinct propositions. Hence the Psalmist, personating Christ, says: “My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth; thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them.” Ps.139:15, 16. “For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.” Eph.5:30.

Creation was instantaneous. Formation is progressive. Though we were created simultaneously with and lay dormant in the “first Adam,” for thousands of years, yet the time arrived, the purpose of God is carried out, and we were born of the flesh, elemented alone for a natural state of being, susceptible alone, of fleshly enjoyments, adapted to a natural world, capable alone of being sustained upon earthly food, and possessed alone of natural life; all of this family, “bear the image of the earthly Adam.” This includes Adam the first and all his natural seed. “And

he called their name Adam.” We should not forget that Adam the first, is said to be “the figure of him that was to come.”

What then, do we learn from the figure? That the bride, and all the spiritual children were created in and simultaneously with “the last Adam.” That, they are of the same nature with him, and being born “of the Spirit,” they are possessed of eternal life, which qualifies them for a knowledge of “the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.” John 17:3. Antecedently to this birth, and the imparting to them, this life [which it is the province of their spiritual Father to impart, John 17:2,] they are entirely ignorant of the “true God,” and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent. “The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God.” “No man can say that Jesus is Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.” I Cor.12:3.

Although all the spiritual seed were chosen in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world, and had “Grace given them in Christ Jesus before the world began,” and were “sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ,” though they were hidden in their spiritual father as the first Adam’s children, the time comes when they are born of the Spirit, when the “hidden ones,” are made known to each other. When their hearts being fashioned alike, the “Sun of Righteousness,” shines in their hearts, “to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.” II Cor.4:6.

As the light of the sun, the great luminary of day, shines upon the sons and daughters of the natural world, so the “sun of righteousness” affords light to the spiritual world. “I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, keep not back; bring my sons from afar, and my daughters from the ends of the Earth; even every one that is called by my name; for I have created him for my glory, I have formed him; yea, I have made him.” Isaiah 43:6,7. Here again, we see the figure carried out. All the family of the “first Adam,” created in him, are called by his name, “and called their name Adam,” all the spiritual family of the “last Adam,” are called by his name, “Even every one that is called by my name.”

Here we have two distinct families, propagated by two distinct heads; each deriving the nature of his progenitor, and each looking to his appropriate elements for sustenance. The first – mortal beings, sustained upon corrupted elements. The second – immortal, sustained upon uncorrupted elements. The first, earthly; the second, heavenly beings. We ask, is not the “old man” sustained upon the same identical elements, subsequently upon which he was fed and sustained, antecedently to the new birth? Can those elements sustain the “new man”? Do we not partake of earthly food, until our soul is satisfied, without imparting a particle of nourishment to the “new man”? Does not the “new man,” “setting under the droppings of the sanctuary,” feed sumptuously upon the provision of the gospel, without imparting a particle of food to the “old man”? “Feed the church of God,

which he hath purchased with his own blood.” Acts 20:28. “Feed my lambs, feed my sheep.”

Being “born of the flesh,” we are born into a natural state of consciousness, capable of investigating natural subjects, of participating in natural enjoyments, sustained upon natural elements, so long as we retain, and until we yield up that natural life, which we received in our natural head, “Adam the first.” Being “born of the Spirit,” “born of God,” we are made partakers of the divine nature, are susceptible of spiritual instruction, of investigating spiritual subjects, participating in spiritual enjoyments, sustained upon spiritual elements; nor can the being thus born, cease to be. “I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish.” John 10:28. “Because I live, ye shall live also.” John 14:19. “When Christ, who is our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory.” Col.3:4. Hence we see, that the death of the “old man,” cannot destroy the life of the “new man.”

The law was violated, and the curse incurred by man in the flesh. The law was magnified and made honorable, and the curse removed from his chosen seed [who sinned in their Adamic, or natural relation] by “God manifest in the flesh.” “For as much as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death; that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham.” Heb.2:14-16. The whole humanity of the Lord Jesus, both soul and body, was involved in that deliverance; because the whole “old man” both soul and body, was involved in transgression. “When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands.” Isaiah 53:10. “Now is my soul troubled.” “My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death.” “Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye are healed.” I Peter 2:24.

We have said, Christians are compound beings; by which we mean, there are “two men” – two whole and distinct natures, inhabiting the same tenement. The “old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts,” whose genealogy, we trace back to the “first Adam,” who “was made a living soul,” and who discloses the corrupt nature of the fountain from whence he sprang.

Adam “begat a son in his own likeness; after his image” – an enemy to holiness – a hater of God. The “new man,” which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness,” and who exemplifies the declaration; “If the root be holy, so are the branches.” “And they shall call them, the Holy People; the redeemed of the Lord; and thou shalt be called, Sought out, A city not forsaken.” Isaiah 62:12. “Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we

know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." I John 3:2.

Will he appear with two whole and distinct natures? If he shall so appear, shall we be like him, unless we too, have two whole and distinct natures? Hence it is seen, that the two men derive their nature and disposition, from two distinct sources. Each has a life peculiar to himself, yet common to his species. The first, natural – the second, spiritual life. The first is a corporeal – the second, an incorporeal being. The first, an earthly – the second, an heavenly being. "As is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly." "As he is, so are we in this world."

Nothing pure or holy, is attached to the "old man." "But even their mind and conscience is defiled." Titus 1:15. Nothing impure or unholy is attached to the "new man" – "Unto the pure, all things are pure." Titus 1:15. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Mt.5:8. It is contended by some, yea, many professors of religion, that the soul is regenerated. We confess we know but little about the soul. But we inquire, what is it, that renders man a rational, intelligent, responsible being? What is it, that exercises volition for the body? "When lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." James 1:15. "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart." Gen.6:5,6. If the soul were regenerated, would it not be as wholly devoted to God, subsequently, as it had been to sin, antecedently to the new birth? If it be the soul that exercises volition for the body, and that soul is "born of God," and consequently "cannot sin," how are we to account for the wicked actions of David, of Peter, and thousands of other christians, even down to the present day?

But, it is contended, that the same soul, exercises wicked volition for the "old," and holy volition for the "new man?" If so, is not the soul divided against itself? Others tell us, it is the mind which exercises volition for the body. We have heretofore proven that "their mind and conscience is defiled." But we are asked, when, and how, are the "old" and the "new man," to be united; and how will they appear hereafter? We answer, "Now we see through a glass darkly," but when we shall learn how the soul and body of the "Redeemer," "Husband," "Friend," now appears; and how they are gloriously united to his divinity, then, and not till then, may we undertake to say more in regard to the future state of the soul and body, and the "new man," composing the "Bride, the Lambs wife."

It is sufficient for the present, for her to know, that "when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." I John 3:2. Until which event shall roll on, the wise man describes her thus, "What will ye see in the Shulamite? As it were the company of two armies." Song.6:13. It is vain to tell us, that the flesh,

independently of an intelligent principle, call it soul, mind, or what you may; will rebel against God.

Some brethren, conclude that the warfare is to be explained, by “mind and matter.” Have they forgotten that it requires both, to constitute an intelligent responsible being? We have shown that “even their mind and conscience is defiled.” That “the carnal mind is enmity against God.” Matter would be incapable of vice or virtue, in the absence of mind!

Nor are those more successful, who attempt to explain the warfare, by the different colors blended in the rainbow. Have they forgotten that those colors harmonize, and that it is the entire want of harmony between the “old and new man” which necessarily produces the warfare? Have they forgotten the declaration, “For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world?” I John 2:16. If the “old man” is “born of God” he cannot sin, and there would be no warfare. But is this true? Let the christian experience answer: “For that which I do, I allow not; for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I.” Rom.7:15.

In conclusion, we submit to your serious and prayerful consideration, the foregoing pages, hoping that God may bless us with an understanding of the truth; and dispose us to reduce it into practice, that he may guide us with his counsel and afterwards receive us to glory, is our prayer for the Redeemer’s sake.

Thomas P. Dudley.

This Circular, on the origin, nature, and effects of the Christian Warfare, was written for the Licking Association in the year 1846, but the writer, Elder Dudley, learning that there would be some opposition to its teachings did not present it, but presented another which he had written.

In the year 1847, there was a Circular presented to the Association which failed to meet the views of the committee to whom it was referred. This letter, we suppose, was written by Elder M. Gossett, as he was appointed to prepare one for that year [Licking Minutes, 1846.] After considerable discussion on the report of the committee, the letter by Elder Gossett was rejected. Elder G. Beebe, who was present on the occasion, suggested that the letter on the Christian Warfare [which he had read,] be presented as a substitute. On its being presented and read to the Association, two or three members suggested their inability to concur in all its teachings, but said that if the association thought proper to adopt it they would go with the majority. Elder Dudley immediately arose and said, “I have no misgivings as to the truth taught in the Circular, but I would not intentionally be the means of embarrassing the minds of the brethren, and consequently I object to the letter being received.”

The reader will see how graciously he declined to become an instrument of discord among brethren in this faithful endeavor to “keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace,” but before another year had passed away restless, jealous, ambitious men, aspiring to leadership, began a conspiracy for the downfall of this eminent servant of God, whose praise was now “in the gospel throughout all the churches,” by the grossest kind of misrepresentations of the doctrinal views set forth in the “Circular on the Warfare.” It was these outrageous misrepresentations that led him in 1848 to publish one thousand copies of the Circular on his own responsibility, that brethren might examine for themselves and compare with scripture testimony.

From that time on garbled extracts of that document have been subjected to the severest attacks and criticisms, by a few who claimed to be Old School or Particular Baptist, and by many who would like to be called by that name only to take away their reproach. But few, very few, have had the temerity to make an open or public attack upon it as a whole. As late as 1873 he says in his writings: “I know of but one occasion on which its teachings have been directly and publicly attacked. In 1860, a learned D.D. of ____ Association attacked it in the presence of a church that he supplied, and continued his criticism at the next meeting. Hearing of the attack I applied for notes or the manuscript that he had used, as I intended to reply at a certain time and place, and gave a public invitation to him and his congregation to be present and hear what I had to say in reply. The Doctor, with some reluctance, gave a synopsis of his discourses on twenty-two closely-written pages, which was handed me the day before my reply.” Many now living in this section remember the occasion, and also remember that the Doctor was not present to hear the reply. Old Elder “Raccoon” Smith, a member of the so-called Christian church was present. He came to Elder Dudley after services were over and said: “Tom, you left him like a picked bird.”

Elder Dudley often told of an amusing incident that occurred on a certain occasion in Boone County, where he had been grossly misrepresented, from garbled extracts of the Circular, by a certain preacher. A large number of brethren wrote to him urging him to come to a certain Associational meeting, which he did, and when he was put upon the stand he had been preaching but a little while when an old sister, who was intimately acquainted with him, became so enthused at his able defense of the sentiments of the Circular which had been attacked that she cried out at the top of her voice, “Go it my Tom! Go it my Tom!” and several times during the discourse repeated it.

The rapidly growing sentiment in favor of the clear expose of Bible truth, set forth in the Circular on the Warfare, seemed only to intensify the vehement spirit of two or three preachers of Licking Association to relegate him to the rear in some way, or in any way that they might invent. So, to work they went, and on the 29th

of January, 1850, they succeeded in getting some of the members together of two churches [Stoney Point & Friendship,] and issuing a manifesto of the most disorganizing and revolutionary character, in which they set forth what they termed a grievance against three other churches, which they had never even notified that there was a grievance held against, but they exhibited the fact found in the Proverbs of Solomon, “He that sendeth a message by the hand of a fool cutteth off the feet ... the legs of lame are not equal,” their prime object being to rid themselves of Elder T.P. Dudley and his influence in Licking Association; hence, to rid themselves of three churches of his pastoral care was to rid themselves of him. We have seen the same spirit manifested recently, by those who have gone out from us, because they were not of us, and we suppose that same spirit will continue to persecute as long as our God has a faithful church on earth, who continues “steadfastly in the Apostles’ doctrine and fellowship.”

The issue that was raised by those two churches, was that they believed in the quickening and regeneration of the soul, “a never dying principle that will exist to all eternity, either in weal or woe.” It has been said from seven to ten members of Stoney Point Church, and not a much greater number of Friendship, perpetrated this high-minded and unchristian measure. Such a disorderly course on the part of this fractional membership of two churches was well calculated to fill the members composing the Mt. Carmel, Elizabeth, and Bryan’s Churches with astonishment, mortification, and sorrow. They immediately arranged to call a council of all the Churches of Licking Association, to take under consideration the charges preferred against them by Stoney Point and Friendship, who were also invited to send messengers.

The different churches of Licking [except the two making the charges,] representing a membership of over 600, sent messengers to the council. Inasmuch as these two churches had assumed the authority to dictate to and supervise the action of other sovereign churches, they dared not to meet in such a council. Too well, like others of our day, did they know something of Baptist order, and knew that their course could but be condemned before such a tribunal. But skulking behind their own self-assured supremacy they now turned all of their batteries on the object of their venom – Elder T.P. Dudley.

The Circular on the Warfare was read before this council of Churches, and on motion and second, they unanimously voted their approval of the sentiment maintained in the Circular as being in strict harmony with the word of God.

I have before me now the Minutes of that council, together with the names of messengers from the different churches, and as strange and inconsistent as it may appear, the only messenger to that council now living, who was one of the committee appointed to draft resolutions expressing the object of the meeting, in which they entered their solemn protest against the idea of the *quickenings* and

regeneration of the soul, election in Adam, sinner-born-again, and their kindred heresies, and in which they gave their hearty endorsement to the circular on the warfare – that man is now bewitched, and has turned back upon his own solemn action and declarations. But I have a letter before me, written by Elder Dudley, in which he states that, “I [Dudley] have various letters from John Clark, of Virginia, pledged to the belief of the doctrine I maintain, and in one or more of which he [Clark] uses the language, ‘I [Clark] have read the Circular on the Warfare and I see nothing in it, which should disturb the fellowship of brethren.’ ” But, alas! How many soon turned to be his most bitter enemies and persecutors. But the dagger’s point was turned by that word which said, “Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm.”

This same duplicity is found in those who have recently turned away from us, for while he lived they professed great love, harmony and fellowship for him and his writings. To make a fair show, they profess to contend for election, the absolute predestination of all things, controvert the idea of the quickening and regeneration of the soul or a part of the soul or a part of the man, and won’t have the word *born over*, forgetting that Elder Dudley, in his defense against the very same characters wrote: “How, then, can they contend that some part – for I have not met with one who contends that the entire Adamic man or the old man – is born of God?” And on another occasion, when asked by an aged Baptist minister why he did not tell the people that it was the Adam man that is born of the Spirit, his reply was: “My Bible don’t say so.”

Elder Dudley was a man who kept back nothing he thought profitable to his brethren and shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God. Unlike a prominent Eastern preacher of the present day, who in answer to a question by Elder Wallingford, publicly during the Licking Association at Drift Run. “Do you believe it is the Adam sinner that is born again; replied, Yes, but I don’t use that term.” And still another who believed that literal feet washing was an ordinance of God’s house, but did not preach it because he thought it would not be profitable in Kentucky.

Those who use such duplicity, even if they be such men as the eminent orator, Tertullus, find such as Elder Dudley and his compatriots pestilent fellows, movers of sedition throughout the world, and ringleaders “of the sect of the Nazarenes.” Their principal charge was that Elder Dudley denied the “new birth.”

We will take occasion to say here that we know not how the expression, *THE NEW BIRTH* originated, but we do know that Elder Dudley believed, preached, and defined *the spiritual birth*, and its product as the children of the one Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, “of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named,” and that these children are partakers of flesh and blood, but are “born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.”

His persecutions drove him, as it has many others, to a closer investigation of scripture testimony, and tended all the while to solidify Licking Association. But it has been clearly demonstrated since the death of Elders Dudley, Johnson, and Theobald, that there were only followers of men because of their reputation for ability, and were as ready after their decease to follow others, regardless of their former profession of fellowship. Elder Dudley says in his writings, "The violent denunciations of me, and of the faith I maintained, of course made me anxious to know if it could be successfully controverted."

CHAPTER IV.

Elder Dudley soon learned that there would be no lack of an attempt to overthrow the faith that he maintained, for correspondents now began to write to him from almost every state in the Union, and from Canada; some desiring further explanation on certain points contained in the Circular, others urging him to visit their section, others assuming to teach him the way more perfectly, while some others aspiring to greater and public notoriety, began an attack on garbled extracts from the Circular, through the different religious periodicals, to the greater number of which he replied in the most humble and Christian-like spirit.

I have frequently heard him speak of a visit to the Red River Association where he had been most outrageously misrepresented by a Dr. Fain, one of the editors of the *Baptist Watchman*. When Dudley was put upon the stand to preach he had been speaking but a little while when some man in the congregation cried out "If that man is a heretic so am I." He had proceeded but a little while when the same expression was used, and immediately it was taken up throughout the congregation. When the excitement had quieted, one of the preachers in the stand behind him, said, "Yes, we are all heretics." On Sunday Dr. Fain followed him in a very excited manner, and had progressed but a short while when he said, in a very excited way, "Yes, yes, a few years ago, you pronounced what you have just heard, the worst kind of heresy, and now you swallow it down greedily, greedily, greedily," reminding us very forcibly of what we have heard Elder Dudley say, about a Baptist coming to him in a certain section, where he had been libelously reported, and saying to him, "Brother Dudley, when I hear others tell what you believe, and preach I don't believe a word of your preaching, but when I hear *you* preach, I believe *every word* of it."

After the publication of the Circular he traveled far and wide and wherever he went the denunciation of heretic had proceeded him, but he has often said wherever he preached he found the so called heresy received by many as bible

truth, while others would give their pretended endorsement when with him, too cowardly or weak to oppose or refute it, and yet would lose no opportunity to secretly malign and charge him as an ambitious inventor of a new theory for the purpose of leadership among the Baptist.

He says in his writings, that one of the first objections he heard urged against the Circular on the Warfare was, that it taught that man had two souls. Then one Elder White, of Missouri, concluded that he taught in his writings that man had not even *one* soul; and one charge became proverbial among his antagonists; namely, “that he taught that in the atonement of Christ, there was nothing done for the sinner,” another, “that he denied the resurrection of the dead,” and still another, “that God had a family of spiritual children in heaven before time began, fully developed, who from time to time come down to earth, take up their abode in the Adamic man, engage in mortal combat, carry on the unequal strife, till man dies, and then returns to heaven without accomplishing anything else than opposition to man.” All of these charges with a multitude of others he met and refuted with that Christian-like spirit that characterized his whole public life.

In his reply to Elder White he says: “I put it to Elder White, was anything ever born of the flesh that had not an *antecedent life in the flesh*? What is a birth? The development of something that had an antecedent *seminal* existence. Does the birth change the nature of the thing born? What was man before his birth of the flesh? Was he not flesh? What is he after his birth of the flesh? Flesh. Then the birth does not change his nature. Now if this same man is born *over again*, of the Spirit, is he not *emphatically spirit*? The natural man is the product of a natural seed, his feelings, susceptibilities, hopes, desires and enjoyments are all together earthly. But is this true with regard to that other man whom the apostle designates, when he says, ‘The new man which after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness’? Whence his paternity, ‘Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.’ The first or natural life was given in creation to Adam and all his natural family, and is one life, and common to all that family. The second or spiritual life was given to the other, or spiritual family, in their oneness in and with Christ.” “This is the record that God hath given to us eternal life; and this life is in his Son.”

To the honest reader, I wish to say, that this is but a brief extract from Elder Dudley’s writings, and I have many of a like nature, and for which many withdrew their correspondence, fellowship, and Christian intercourse, from him, his churches and the Licking Association. This was in reply to a man who claimed that the soul is “born again,” “or a part of the Adamic man.” This turn was taken in order to avoid the idea, that the man is *born over again*. Elder Dudley reputed the idea that the Adamic man, or sinner in whole or in part, in order to constitute the child of God, is born of the Spirit. For he says, “I have ever conceived that the corn of

wheat, which falls into the ground and dies, contains within its germ everything, and nothing more than will spring up and grow out of it. Now I ask, was anything born of that incorruptible seed which was not in the germ? Was the natural seed deposited in Christ? I think brethren will answer each of these questions in the negative. How then can they contend that it is some part [for I have not met with one who contends that the entire Adamic man or the old man] is born of God." In view of such clear expressions, such a positive position, what must be thought by every honest, intelligent Christian of such men as Elder S.H. Durand, of Pennsylvania, and others, who claimed such harmony with Elder Dudley while living, to come among us after he is gone claiming that it *is* the sinner, that is born again, but in vain pretending they don't mean "born over;" don't mean that the Adamic man is changed. Who is the sinner? Is he not the Adamic man? I repeat what must be thought of such men who would come and sit in council with a church and disaffected members of other churches, and withdraw from correspondence and fellowship with us, because we would not endorse such sentiments, and dared to lift our voice against such heretical theories. Does it not mark them as the very characters that the Apostle warned against, saying, "mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them."

This, however, is but a repetition of what occurred in Elder Dudley's day, and has marked the onward march of the church in every age of her pilgrimage, and will through the annals of time. Says the Apostle: "Bonds and afflictions abide me." "And others had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonments, they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheep skins, and goat skins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented."

And it must be through a like fellowship of suffering that this sect every where "spoken against," of whom the world is not worthy, have to be brought, even in this day of boasted light and gospel liberty. But in vain may they "confederate," "associate themselves" and conspire against the "remnant according to the election of grace," the scriptures must be fulfilled, for of Israel it is written, "Thine enemies shall be found liars unto thee; and thou shalt tread upon their high places."

I have a private letter written by Elder Dudley in which he says, in speaking of the doctrinal sentiments of the Circular on the warfare, that he believed the time would come when that sentiment would be made a test of fellowship. The enemy of truth has made it so. "Behold, they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost; we are cut off for our parts."

Acting under an honest conviction and a deep sense of his duty to God as a faithful servant to his Master and an obedient child to his Father's command, regardless of the opinions of men, or the popularity so often sought after by men of

great endowments, Elder T.P. Dudley moved boldly onward in the “good old way,” blazed through the forest centuries of time from the first revelation of God to man to the setting up of his kingdom, which “shall not be left to other people,” and on down through what the world calls the “Christian Era” to the present day, reaching on through the coming ages to the climes of immortal bliss to every heaven-born heir of God’s spiritual family, blazing out with lustrous flame, emitting the “good will of him that dwelt in the bush,” and from whom came the voice to his chosen servant, “Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standeth is holy ground.”

With what awful solemnity must the servant of God [“Moses who was faithful in all his house,”] been filled when God spoke to him and said, “Come now therefore, and I will send thee unto Pharaoh,” informing him at the same time of the opposition with which he would meet, that the king of Egypt would not let his people go, and yet declaring that he would give this people favor in the sight of the Egyptians. No doubt that all who are called to the work of the ministry are filled with the same solemn doubts and fears of opposition, and yet some encouraging favored promises that, “Certainly I will be with thee.” Ex.3:12

Not only did Elder Dudley have Elder John Clark of Virginia, committed in writing of his hearty endorsement of the faith he maintained of the vital oneness of Christ and his people, but many others, among whom was Elder Wilson Thompson and his son, John A. Thompson, who said publicly on the stand at the Conn’s Creek Association in following Elder Dudley [who preached the introductory on that occasion at the request of Elder McQuary,] I [J.A.T.] have heard Brother Dudley once before, and then said, “If I ever heard the gospel preached Brother Dudley preached it,” and Elder Dudley writes: “He [Thompson] then endorsed most fully and feelingly on that occasion.” Elder D. says of the occasion: “When we went on the stand I determined within myself, ‘If I can find language plain enough to make myself understood, a future misrepresentation should be *willful*.’ I had been so often and so grossly misrepresented.” While discussing the question a brother in the congregation cried out aloud, “If that man is a heretic so am I.” He was responded to by another, and it was Elder Wilson Thompson, who proclaimed aloud from the stand, “Yes, brethren, if that is heresy, we are all heretics.” Of another occasion where he had met opposition, and had been misrepresented, he says, and it is in language too clear and plain for any who have recently claimed that they were in “perfect harmony” with him, and have withdrawn or gone out from us, “I expect for them to extort it into their view, that the sinner is born again.” Of the occasion, he says, speaking of the old or Adamic man: “I was unable then, as I have ever been, to conceive how such a mass of corrupt matter could have such an inbeing in the incorruptible Spirit as to be born again, ‘not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth

forever.' If the Adam man be born of the Spirit, he is spirit, and would be imperceptible to our natural sight, or of the touch or handling of our hands, as of the spirit of which he is said to be born."

While Elder Dudley lived the Licking Association, as composed of fifteen or sixteen churches, stood to a man [so far was known publicly] in line, *front face*, to every opposition to the above sentiment; but an alien ministry from east of the Allegheny Mountains under the leadership of one who had professed "perfect harmony" [I quote his own language] with Elders Dudley, Johnson, and Theobald, and this body of Baptist, came recently among us, and accomplished just what Elder Dudley so often told his brethren would be tried when he was taken from among us, alienating four churches and a few straggling members of two or three other churches, who, in a council held with Little Flock Church, in April, 1889, claimed to be Licking Association, but that they have gone back on their former profession is too palpable for discussion here, and they know it as well as we, that Licking Association proper, *and her ministry*, stand right where Elder Dudley, Johnson and Theobald left her.

The writer is just reminded [as many members of the churches which Elder Dudley served will be when they read this,] of his anxiety to know that his churches would be supplied with a sound ministry before his departure, and frequently urged them to call a pastor in his declining years, nor did he rest until he believed he saw what he desired accomplished. On one occasion, when urging some of the Bryans members to do this while he was yet living, for he was so endeared to all his churches they could hardly brook the idea of giving him up, one of them asked him, "Now, Brother Dudley, you want us to call a pastor, who will you recommend?" He spoke out immediately, "Either of three: Elders Theobald, Wallingford or Moore. I know them all; they are tried."

I write this for the comfort of my brother, James H. Wallingford, who only is left with me in the ministry of Licking Association, and I wish here to record for the benefit of history that I have frequently heard Elder Dudley say, "I wish we could induce Elder Smoot, of Virginia, to move to Kentucky and locate in the bounds of Licking Association," while on the other hand he would say of others that he feared trouble would ensue.

He was certainly accredited by all who knew him as a man of far-reaching discernment, and his declining years were filled with exhortations, admonitions, and warnings to his brethren, that as we look back over the last few years since his departure, it looks as if they were incited by the spirit of prophecy. I would not accord more to him than is due his memory, but he rose so far superior to so many that the world calls good and great, that as a servant of the churches he magnified his office.

On one occasion, when urged by political friends who were not members of his

churches, to become a candidate for Congress, his ability as a man being recognized, they knowing that he would not be an idle drone in the legislative halls of our country in a time of peril, when our liberties were threatened, his reply was, "I already hold an office that is higher than any in the gift of the people of the United States, and it would be a condescension for me to accept such a position." Contrast this with the graceless professors of religion aspiring to hold office under the civil government, to legislate in a way to make the people more religious, to recognize God in the Constitution and raise a higher standard of morality than the Master himself has set. But the King who reigns in Zion has already legislated all the laws for *Her* government, and none of them can be abolished, or any of them amended by fallen and depraved humanity; and a good citizen of that kingdom makes a good, orderly, meek, and quiet citizen of this or any other government.

Men may think it strange that they are not conformed to this world, but they are commanded not to be by one of the princes who rules in judgment on matters of this kind. This is but one of the peculiarities of that "peculiar people."

Reader, we have asked you to contrast the course of the subject of this sketch with that which the world calls good and great, and in connection with it called attention to God's calling and sending his servant Moses, who was not only a type of our spiritual Mediator, but in many respects a far-reaching, though, perhaps, a faint and indistinct shadow of all the called and sent servants of our God, with whom the angel of his presence goes to bear them up. But to make the particular application here, he was the adopted son of Pharaoh's daughter, learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, mighty in words and in deeds, made heir apparent to the throne of Egypt. Did he accept the offer? Did the glittering renown of worldly pomp and earthly glory entice or allure him as it spread out before him? Let the words of inspiration answer, not only for him, but for all of God's true and faithful ones. "By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt." Heb.11:24-26.

Let the servants of our God follow this noble example and they will never become a disturbing element to the church of God. It was such traits of character as shown above that made Elder Dudley a man among men, and one of the grandest of the age in which he lived.

The grandeur of this grand old patriarch became more pronounced as he gently passed down the declivity of life, a pilgrim sage, patiently journeying to the better country, where awaited him a mansion prepared by one "that buildeth his stories in the heavens and hath founded his troop in the earth ... The Lord is his name." Amos 9:6.

Possessed of a dignity that commanded respect, he attracted attention wherever

he went. He made a splendid personal appearance – calm, self-possessed, his face betokened that unconscious strength peculiar to himself, communicating its magnetic influence to others that was surprising to witness.

I remember an incident in traveling East with him some years ago. When our train stopped at Salamanca, quite a number of passengers boarded the train for New York. Among them was General Joe Hooker, familiarly known as “fighting Joe Hooker.” He had been seated but a few moments till he sent his companion back to me to enquire what “fine looking old gentleman it was traveling in company with me.” When I informed him who he was and he had communicated it to General Hooker, he immediately sent word back to me with the request that I should bring him forward, as he desired an introduction. When I gave the message to Elder Dudley the old gentleman straightened himself up in his seat and remarked, “If General Hooker desires an introduction to me he must come to me.” He paid servile flattery or adulation to no high sounding, man-made title, from the Rev. Doctor of Divinity on up to wherever flattering titles may go. The masses may think this expression reverses titles.

The writings of Elder Dudley show that there are few points in controversy between Baptist and *those claiming to be Baptist*, but what he had to meet in some way and from some source, and especially from those who objected to what they termed his “two-man theory.”

And the idea of having the old man, the Adamic man, and sin and lust or corruption, making three men, then boiling these three down into one sinner man, then throwing a little essence of spirit in, and by its operation, making all into one spiritual man, did not originate with one P.G. Lester, who a few years ago came amongst us, backed by an eastern syndicate, sizzling like a trembling crater, ready for an eruption for a number of years, for Elder Dudley had the same heretical notion to meet in a controversy with Elder John A. Thompson, of Lebanon, Ohio. In that controversy with Thompson, Elder Dudley says: “If I were as entirely confident of interest in the atoning blood and righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ, as I am that the earthly, fallen and depraved Adam, is the old man, I do not think I should entertain a doubt of reaching the heavenly glory.

I find no where in the Bible, the idea taught, of *three men*, in the disciple of Christ, and yet brother Thompson’s theory presents *three*. First, the first man Adam [who] is of the earth earthy; Second, the second man, is the Lord from heaven, and Thirdly, brother Thompson’s old man: “Sin and Lust.” He tells us “I have not wished to build my views upon inference, because to me inference proves nothing. Now I ask brother Thompson, in all candor, Does the Bible anywhere in its sacred pages say that sin and lust is the old man? What then is his assertion based upon but inference? But this is not the only objection I have to his theory; he would seem to represent the earthly Adam as a mere *myth*, and entirely to absolve

him from any participation in the christian warfare, and entirely irresponsible for all the opposition and rebellion against God, which is found in the old man, and to hold sin and lust, *his old man*, alone responsible. Will he be kind enough to inform us how he will have sin and lust punished, otherwise than in the living, conscious, responsible earthly Adam?

Was the law given to sin and lust, or to the *man* whom the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground, and into whom he breathed the breath of life, and man became a living soul? Was it to sin and lust the Lord said, "For in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die?" Or, "The soul that sinneth it shall die?" Sin and lust composed no part of the *man* to whom the law was given; it was brought forth in the original transgression, which brought death and all woes upon us. "When lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin, and sin when it is finished, bringeth death." "Lo this only have I found, that God made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions." Eccl.7:29. *Man* then is the guilty party, and sin and lust, that which exposed him to the curse of a violated law. "Sin is the transgression of the law." I cannot be mistaken in these views, and I think brother Thompson and all other intelligent christians, upon mature reflection, will say, they are in strict harmony with the record God has given.

Now if I understand the teachings of my Bible, sin is the cause, and death the effect of transgression, and by them *Man* procured the curse of the law.

My flesh is as incapable of violating the law independently of an intelligent principle, as my horse's flesh. An idiot, or insane person, is altogether incapable of violating the laws of the land, and incurring the penalty; because of the absence of mind, reason or sense, none of which are known to exist in brother Thompson's *old man*. When the Bible speaks of *man*, I do not understand a *myth* to be intended, but one who is possessed of mind, will, action and determination. Hence it is said, "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, was in the transgression." Adam, knowingly, wittingly and wilfully transgressed the law and incurred the penalty. It certainly cannot be necessary that I should labor this point further.

If however, brother Thompson desires more proof to sustain my position, I invite him to a close and critical examination of the following: "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Ye shall know them by their fruits. Even so every *good tree* bringeth forth *good fruit*, but a *corrupt tree* bringeth forth *evil fruit*. Make the *tree good*, and his *fruit* shall be good, or make the *tree corrupt* and his fruit shall *be corrupt*." Brother Thompson would make active principle, a corrupt fruit to exist, irrespective of a *corrupt tree which bears it*, and thus transposes the Bible order of things. We do not expect to make the tree better or worse by *tampering with the fruit*. If we desire good fruit, we go directly to work with the tree."

From the foregoing extract we see that modern disputers of Bible truth among Old School Baptist are only following a well-beaten path through the sands of time, but Elder Dudley, like some of the present time, stood as a mighty sentinel not only to sound the alarm at the approach of the enemy, but to dispute his entrance to the camps of Israel at every point.

While he ever wrote in the kindest spirit that language could command, yet his argument carried with it a withering rebuke that soon silenced the opposition of those who had the temerity and who expected notoriety by “downing Dudley.”

One man now living made an insidious attack on his views of “quicken spirits,” in the *Baptist Watchman*, a paper published in the South that never was regarded as sound in the old Baptist faith, and this man at the same time was professing great love, fellowship and “perfect harmony of sentiment,” but since the death of Elder Dudley the turpitude of the spirit by which he was acting then has been so clearly demonstrated, that we wonder how any can respect him for such baseness of character.

It is not pleasant to the writer of this “Biography” to have to refer to these things, but necessity demands it for the vindication of truth, for there is nothing more culpable in a professed Christian than a disingenuousness of character, a want of candor and frankness that carries confidence with it in all things in our dealings with each other. We are often made to cry out, O the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and that because we find so much of it in our own corrupt nature, and often fear that we do not bear with infirmities of brethren as we ought. If it were not for an ever-merciful God, brethren, what would any of us do, left to the leadings of our vile nature, where would we not go, or what would we not do? Truly, Elder Dudley was “an example to the flock.” None can ever charge him with the artful cunningness of those who tried to break him down or bring him into disrepute among his brethren. The open frankness and candor of his nature, the genuine child-like sympathy of his whole life, sparkle like gems in the memory of his brethren with whom he was so intimately associated. He was a man in whom was blended all of those higher qualities and tender, finer sentiments that spread like a halo, a benign influence on all around.

The doctrine of unity or oneness of Christ and his people as contended for by this “pilgrim sage” marks a sect everywhere “spoken against,” “a peculiar people,” “a chosen generation,” “a righteous seed,” “a holy nation,” unknown by the world, “a remnant according to the election of grace,” “dwelling in God,” “dwelling in safety alone,” standing out in bold relief and telling contrast in doctrine and order to every man invented theory of religion that has ever been or ever will be propagated on the earth. It is the only doctrine that sets an open door to the channel of mercy to flow to un-deserving and helpless sinners, and at the same time contemplates and provides for the maintenance of the perfections of God in a

complete and full obedience to his law, and satisfaction to his justice and truth, for in the absence of that relation we challenge the religious world to show the justice of God in the suffering of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, who was “holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners.”

This doctrine unseals the sacred volume of types and shadows, penetrates the gloom and darkness that hangs between us and the heaven of eternal glory foreshadowed by the veil of the Temple, the holy things of the Ark of the Covenant, and holy of holies, and demonstrates the exceeding riches of his grace and promises manifested in his love and mercy in giving his Son to die, the just for the unjust, in all its grand and discriminating beauty, to the praise of his own glory. Human tradition, priestcraft, or ecclesiastic invention has never yet harmonized the Scriptures with men made efforts to produce a spiritual, heavenly family of “the children of the flesh.” And though those efforts may come from those who wear the name of Baptist; yea, even “Old School Baptist,” they are no better, nor any more successful than though they sprung from the very hot bed of Catholicism, and are worthy of no respectful consideration by the church which is “the pillar and ground of the truth,” for it is a “Babylonish garment” of a like wool, of that with which Achan troubled Israel in the days of Joshua.

The idea of substituting a part of the generation of Adamic sinners as “the generation of Jesus Christ” is to subvert the whole general tenor of Bible truth. And this is just exactly what the learned John M. Watson did in his “Review of the Circular Letter of Licking Association of Particular Baptist;” namely, “the circular on the warfare,” and all others who war in like manner against the truth of God.

In a reply to this lengthy review of J.M. Watson, the venerable editor of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Elder Gilbert Beebe, says: “It is not our human existence that is born again. ‘That which is born of the flesh, is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.’ Elder Watson falls into the same error in confounding the two births that Nicodemus did, in supposing them both to be applied to us as merely human beings, whereas the new birth is a spiritual birth. But in what language shall we treat the conclusion arrived at by Elder Watson that, ‘if the children of God are born of him as a consequence of a previous existence in and union to him before they are born again, as in the case of Adam, then they must needs be born gods, and not merely saints or new creatures.’ This is a very extraordinary conclusion for a man of Watson’s superior understanding to draw from the premises. We think that it is clearly demonstrated in the Scriptures of truth that Christ is the life of his mystical body, that He *has been their dwelling place in all generations, even from everlasting*, and that upon this very principal they are *his seed* that shall serve him, and they shall be accounted to him for a generation. When dying for them on the cross he saw them as *his seed*, ‘a chosen generation, a royal priesthood,’ &c. And, ‘His name shall be called Wonderful,

Counselor, the Mighty God, *the Everlasting Father.*' If they are his seed then that seed was in him as their spiritual progenitor, or seminal head, and so long as he has sustained the relationship of everlasting Father, they have existed in the relationship of children. By virtue of this relationship they are born 'not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.' Does this birth, then, make them gods? By no means. Our pre-existence in, and lineal descent from Adam did not make us all *Adams*, or public federal heads of all the human family, but it made us manifest as the sons or children of Adam. So our relation to and previous existence in Christ, and our consequent descent from him by regeneration makes us manifest, not as gods, but as the sons or children of God. To change that, the doctrine of vital relationship and the pre-existence of a spiritual life in Christ, savors very much of Manicheism, falls harmlessly and powerlessly at our feet, so long as we find in support of that soul-cheering, God-honoring, and hell-defying doctrine, that cluster of direct Scripture testimony, which he [Watson] has copied from the Licking Circular immediately preceding this charge."

This lengthy extract from the pen of the late editor of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES was written and published, as he says, "without anticipating what the Licking Association might feel disposed to say in defense of the doctrine set forth in the Circular which has been reviewed by Elder Watson." "We claim the right," says Elder Beebe, "to attempt the defense of what we have held as the very foundation of the great, grand, and glorious system of salvation."

This was written in reply to an extract that we will now make from Elder Watson's review of the Circular, and to those who know something of Baptist history, it will be an easy matter for them to discover the ear marks of the same Chaldean spirit that has actuated some who claim to wear the name "Primitive" or "Old School Baptist" of the present day. Brethren, read *here* in connection the 1st chapter of Habakkuk. We will now give the extract from Elder Watson's review:

"We should note the qualifying adverb *again* in the declaration of the Savior that a man must 'be born *again*, before he can see the kingdom of God.' We shall then learn that human beings are born again, those who have already derived by a natural birth personal existence from Adam in such a manner that each one has become a distinct person, an *I, me, one's self*. The very *I, one's own self* must, says Christ, be 'born of the Spirit.' How? In consequence of an actual eternal existence in and union to the spirit? No, verily, for that would be downright Manicheism. The *I, me, or one's self* is brought into an actual union with Christ through the quickening, sanctifying, and transforming power of the Holy Spirit; thus this actual union has a beginning with the creature, and becomes one of life, the soul that is dead in trespasses and sins is quickened into spiritual life ... Hence to be born again does not imply a previous actual eternal existence in and union to the spirit."

Now I desire to ask in all candor, what better is the position of *Modern Old*

School Baptists who claim that it is “the sinner that is born again” of the Spirit, or from above, for their view of vital union is the same sporadic disease that affects every religious organization known on earth, that profess to believe in the operation of the Spirit? And all classes of Arminians can receive it as a weapon against the *chosen* generation of Jesus Christ.

As wonderful grammarians, the very wise of this world often play much upon the “laws of language” and especially upon the words “again,” and “that,” used in the language of the Savior, in John 3, “Except a man be born again,” &c. “That which is born,” &c. Now let them apply their law of language to the word “that” used by the Lord of glory in Luke 19:10; also Mt.18:11. “For the Son of man is come to seek and to save *that* which was lost.” What are their speculations worth? It does not take a great deal of grammar to overthrow the faith of some very zealous professors at times when they wish to carry their point, and unto such the Savior said: “Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess.” And so they reverse the scriptures, and have the old man, put off the old man, if it is only one man with two natures. On this subject Elder Dudley says: “I find no authority in my Bible for dividing the man. The old man is an entire old man, and the new man is an entire new man.”

What does it amount to for a man to say that he does not believe that it is the sinner that is born again, never did believe it, and has no fellowship for them who do believe it, and that he is in perfect harmony with Elder Dudley on the subject of the new birth, and then say, “This man who must be born again in order to see the kingdom of God is that *natural* man to whom he was speaking,” “and that this proves that this natural Adamic man, who is yet flesh and blood, is born from another direction, but is the same natural Adamic man.”

And because the churches which Elder Dudley served so long, and so faithfully, would not accept and wink at such duplicity, this man traveled several hundred miles to become an active party in an effort to put down those who maintain the same ground occupied by Dudley and others of the same faith and order; and in a council with disaffected ones who had professed to receive and believe the same doctrine of eternal vital oneness, but had become bewitched by men to “depart from the living God” for such men to aid in counsel and withdraw. We again repeat the question, What does it amount to? Should the church become discouraged? By no means! It is but an evidence, and a fulfillment of the scriptures. “Also of your own selves, shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them.” Elder Dudley took his churches and brethren to record like the inspired Apostle, and often told them that before the sod was green over his remains, grievous wolves would enter, “not sparing the flock,” but would disturb the equanimity, peace, harmony and fellowship of the Licking Association.

We can but regard his language as prophetic, and say, truly he was a man of God.

CHAPTER V.

As we wade through the dismal nights of sorrow and grief, who but the one “convinced of sin,” can say, “I know there is yet no change in this old man,” who can say: “I know that in me [that is, in my *flesh*,] dwelleth no good thing.” It is, then, when convinced of sin that we can look away from self and all creature help. Here is one that can say, “I delight in the law of God after the *inward* man.” Oh, how blessed is the man that standeth not in the way of sinners, that walketh not in the way of the ungodly, “nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful; but his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night.” “The ungodly are not so.” Where is the natural man that meditates on the law of the Lord day and night? Are his meditations never disturbed by the things of time and sense; yea, are they not wholly absorbed at times with the things of time and surrounding circumstances?

Elder Dudley says as late as 1874 – twelve years before his death: “What I have written will assure you that I repudiate the following heresies: First, “That all who were created in Adam were redeemed by Christ.” Second, “That Adam died a spiritual death.” Third, “That Christ died for spirits, and not men and women.” Fourth, “That the Divinity or Godhead of the Lord Jesus died.” Fifth, “That there will be no future resurrection of the just and the unjust.” The doctrine he maintained is the only doctrine which insures the resurrection of the dead, and sets forth. “Who is the only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords,” and who in His times will show that He only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, or can see; to whom be honor and power everlasting. Elder Dudley says, “Remember that Christ was ‘put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit.’ Was he quickened before his death in the flesh? Let the disputers of this world answer. I Pet.3:18.” And then answer if Adamic sinners who are dead in trespasses and sins are “quickened and born of God.” The Psalmist says, “Quicken me in thy righteousness.” Now apply the language of Paul: “Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit,” and see where are the advocates of “quickened sinners.” “Sinners born again.” “Sinners chosen in Christ before the world began.”

In the eighty-fifth year of his age, and the fifty-sixth year of his ministry, Elder Dudley wrote a condensed history of the correspondence of Licking Association in which he says: “Believing that I am in possession of some information which will

not be uninteresting to many members of your body and which in the near future will be found profitable in vindicating the truth of history, a part of which cannot be obtained from any other source, especially as the actors have mostly passed into another state of being, I feel it to be a duty incumbent on me, as I do not expect to remain with you long to communicate it to you. I am advised that the 'General Association of Baptist' have resolved to publish a history of the denomination in Kentucky, and for that purpose have appointed a committee to collect materials. I have been interviewed by several of that committee and conclude that the information I gave was rather distasteful, as they made no memorandum, nor asked of me the facts on paper. I am fully convinced that we need not look for a truthful history of our people from that quarter, especially if we consult 'Benedict's History,' or regard the slanders reported of us by some of their ministers. One reported in the northern part of the state that I was teaching a Bible-class every Sunday, another that I regretted that I had not organized Sabbath schools in each of the churches of my charge, and yet another that I was appointed one of the committee to examine candidates for the ministry by the board of trustees of Georgetown College. The latter report I publicly exposed from the pulpit in Georgetown. It is not difficult to understand their object, namely, to hold the Association responsible for the slanders reported of her ministry."

Toward the conclusion of this brief history he says: "It affords me none, not the least, pleasure to expose the disorders of those professing to be the people of God, many of whom I have loved in by-gone days sincerely in the truth, and as I believed, for the truth's sake. But they have raised the issue and require us to abandon the truth of God if we retain their fellowship. The price is more than we dare pay. We cannot consent to be false to our own convictions of the truth of God, or the obligation we owe our dear Savior, who has hitherto borne us up under all our trials, temptations and sorrows." This was perhaps the last public document that was written by Elder Dudley and published in the minutes of Licking Association. He served as its moderator for three succeeding sessions after this.

In July, 1880, he had a severe spell of sickness from which his physicians and most intimate friends thought he could not recover, owing to the infirmities of age, he being then in his eighty-eighth year. He, however, rallied and lived for six years, a blind and almost helpless invalid, but never recovered his physical ability enough to attend his churches any more except one occasion that I shall never forget. It was the Bryan's meeting held in Lexington. He sat in his chair, the ripened embodiment of the grand old patriarch that he was and preached, using the 2nd chapter of Titus as a text, repeating and commenting on every verse of the chapter. Though a physical wreck, he gave evidence of the activity of his mind in the things pertaining "to the doctrine of God our Savior," and the practical godliness set forth in that chapter, together with an unswerving devotion to the

great and glorious cause in which his life had been spent.

As stated above this was the last public meeting of his brethren that he ever attended, but the love of his brethren for him, the profound respect of his friends and acquaintances, his anxiety and care for their welfare, together with his inviting, generous, ever open hospitality, made him the object of their daily visits, until on the 10th day of June, 1886, he passed in triumph, as we confidently believe, to that better world into a full fruition of all that his faith and hope had grasped through a long and well-spent pilgrimage.

END OF BIOGRAPHY.

SELECT WRITINGS OF T. P. DUDLEY.

THE ADAMIC STATE.

Near Lexington, Ky., Feb.16, 1841.

MY DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - Although a controversy has been going on between the Old and New School Baptists in the west, for some years, in relation to *what Adam was antecedently to his transgressing the divine command*, yet I was not aware of a discrepancy in the views of “Old School” Baptists, on that point, until I read your editorial remarks in number 20, vol.8, of the SIGNS, in which your readers are informed that “a part of the Redstone Baptist Association, Pennsylvania,” take exception to the views contained in the circular of the Licking Association of 1839. I had hitherto supposed that association to be “built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the Chief Corner Stone,” and consequently that she recognized the Bible as the only infallible standard of faith and practice. I am very sure that no evidence can be had thence to sustain the opinion that *he was spiritual*; and I confess I was surprised to learn that such an idea was entertained even by a *part* of that body. The *New School* party in this country assume that he was a *spiritual being*; hence he was obliged to the performance of *spiritual duties*, such as *evangelical faith and repentance*, and liable to condemnation for non-compliance. I say *assume*, because it is assumption without proof; indeed the proof is altogether on the other side, and we have abundant cause of adoration to God that it is so – were it otherwise, the christian’s hope would be entirely prostrated.

God created this material globe to be inhabited by beings susceptible of its enjoyment. Those beings were susceptible of being maintained by material food; and that food is produced by the earth from whence those beings were taken, and to the products of which alone do they look for a perpetuation of that life imparted to them in creation. “And the Lord God *formed man of the dust of the ground*, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.” Thus we see the connection subsisting between man and the ground, and hence his susceptibility of being sustained by the food brought forth spontaneously by his *uncorrupted mother*, [the earth.] “And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and *there he put the man whom he had formed*. And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil. And the Lord God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it. And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” Gen.2:7-9, 15-17, compared with I Cor.15:46-50: “Howbeit that was not first which is *spiritual*, but that which is *natural*; and *afterwards that which is spiritual*. The *first man is of the earth, earthy*; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And *as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also*

bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.” The life communicated to the first Adam prepared him *alone* for an *earthly habitation*, and that life communicated to his offspring could not possibly prepare them for a higher abode. We should not forget that, although created upright and uncorrupted, he subsequently “sought out many inventions,” he became corrupt, as is manifest by his transgression, and imparted the same corrupt nature to all his offspring; yet did he not thereby forfeit heaven and immortal happiness; because he neither possessed, nor had title [in creation] to either. It is worthy of remark that his connection with the earth was such that in consequence of his transgression, corruption seized upon the ground whence he was taken, and it became thereby susceptible of producing food suited to *his vitiated nature*. The elements being corrupted, he could yet subsist upon them. “And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it, Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth unto thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground; for out of it thou wast taken; for dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return.” Gen.2:17-19. If, as is contended by some, the object of the second Adam was to restore the ruins of the first, why is the curse not removed from the ground? Why does it yet produce “thorns and thistles?” And why has man yet in the sweat of his face to eat his bread?

The truth is, had Adam remained as incorrupt, as pure and sinless as he was when his Creator pronounced him good, yea, very good, he never could have entered that heaven to which christians are destined. Man’s capability of earthly enjoyments was given in creation and in connection with his natural head who “is of the earth earthly.” His susceptibility of heavenly or spiritual enjoyments is given in the spiritual birth and in connection with his spiritual Head, “the Lord from heaven.” He is born to a *natural inheritance* – *born again* “to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away.” “Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God.” Why? Because the kingdom of God is a spiritual kingdom. “My kingdom is not of this world,” and man in his best estate was only a natural being. “That which is born of the flesh, is flesh,” and “flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.” That there are two births brought to view in the third chapter of John, and only two, I think must be obvious to all attentive readers, and that the Savior designed to show the ruler of the Jews, the necessity of the *natural birth*, in order to see, understand and participate the enjoyments of a natural kingdom, and that he urges thence the necessity of the spiritual birth as indispensable to see, understand and participate in the enjoyments

of the spiritual kingdom. “Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” We see two births brought to view in the foregoing quotation, and they are connected by the copulative conjunction *and*; they are in the plural number, and consequently cannot [as I conceive] refer alone to the spiritual birth. I have no hesitancy in believing that by the term *born of water*, is meant the *natural birth*, [the figure is appropriate;] and *of the Spirit*, the spiritual birth; by which [the latter birth] man is capacitated for spiritual actions. “Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house.” I understand the Savior to explain in the sixth verse what he means in the fifth, namely: “That which is born of the flesh is *flesh*, [the natural birth – ONE] and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit,” – TWO births, and both necessary to enter the visible church of Christ.

The idea that Adam was spiritual before he transgressed the command of God, would involve its advocates in a similar dilemma with that experienced by Nicodemus; he apprehended that the two births were of the same nature – [“How can a man be born when he is old?”] – both natural; they apprehend them to be of the same nature, – “both spiritual.” If either were correct in their apprehensions, I should be at a loss to account for the warfare experienced by all those who are “born of the Spirit.” “The old man is corrupt, with his deeds,” whilst the “new man, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness.” “The flesh [or old man] lusteth against the spirit [or new man,] and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things ye would.” “If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away, behold all things are become new.” I do not believe, brother Beebe, that God adopts the method in making christians which is *said to be* resorted to sometimes by hatters, namely; *to work over an old hat and apply some new fur to the exterior and sell it for a new one*. This indeed seems to be the New School idea, for they [or some of them] contend that all the new birth does is *to repair the faculties which became vitiated by sin*. If this theory be true, I want to know – *Whence the warfare?*

But to return; All the perceptions and powers bestowed upon man in his creation were purely of the natural kind; hence his feelings, his enjoyments and happiness are all earthly. “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” “Unto you [disciples] it is given to *know the mysteries* of the kingdom of God; but unto them that are without it is not given.” “I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, *because thou hast hid these things* [spiritual matters] from the wise and prudent and hast *revealed them unto babes*.” But why need I multiply proofs, since the whole chain of divine truth runs in the same channel?

The assumption that man was spiritual seems to be forced upon “New School Baptists” in their dilemma, in order to harmonize their views in reference to its

being the duty of mankind indiscriminately *to repent and believe the gospel evangelically, to the saving of the soul*, whilst they admit the gospel to be a spiritual system, and *referring their condemnation to its rejection*. They are not, however, agreed among themselves. Some of them avow their belief of the doctrine of infant purity, and hence say, "All they who die in infancy go to heaven." I would ask such persons to tell me how infants, if pure, can die, since the Bible informs us, "The wages of sin is death." Death is only an *effect*, and of necessity is preceded by its *cause*. I apprehend such as believe the doctrine of infant purity, have not considered that they are charging God with injustice in inflicting the penalty annexed to transgression upon innocent beings. Nor is this the only awful consequence attendant upon this theory. It effectually excludes from heaven all who have been born within the last eighteen hundred years. Let us not forget that Christ died upwards of eighteen hundred years ago; that he died for sinners, that "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin," that He is the Way, the Truth and the Life; no man cometh to the Father but by him, that he came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance, and withal, "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." All know that infants, as well as adults, possess flesh and blood, else could they not be subjects of death.

When a false theory is embraced, a perversion of truth to sustain it follows as a natural consequence; hence the shifts to which the advocates of the notion that Adam was spiritual in creation, are driven. If man did not sin as a natural being possessing flesh and blood, whence the propriety of the Apostle's reasoning, "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver *them*, who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham." It is manifest that in their natural or flesh and blood relation, they sinned against God; hence Christ's humanity paid the forfeit of his people's rebellion. If Adam sinned as a *spiritual being*, I cannot see how he could be redeemed, seeing "a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have," and Jesus "was put to *death in the flesh*, but quickened by the Spirit." A spirit has no blood to shed, and without the shedding of blood is no remission." But we have incontestable proof that Adam was *natural, not spiritual* in creation, in the fact that *his seed are natural*. "Every seed will produce his kind;" and Paul said of them, "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto them, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

Hence, it is seen, brother Beebe, that the young, as well as the old, "must be born again or never see the kingdom of God." "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the *first resurrection*; on such the second death hath no power." The first

death had power over *that life* bestowed upon man in creation, and which *he imparted to his natural seed*; but, blessed be God, “the second death hath no power over” those who have “part in the first resurrection,” because they derive their spiritual or eternal life *from Christ their spiritual Head*, “that He should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.” It is therefore manifest that man did not derive his spiritual or eternal life from Adam the first, who was “of the earth earthy.”

I have been more prolix than I intended when I commenced writing, and must desist for the present; but I may resume the subject hereafter when I have more leisure. In the mean time, those members of the Redstone association will do us a kindness by pointing out [through the SIGNS] the discrepancy, or rather *supposed discrepancy*, between the views contained in the Licking Circular and the Bible. I hold no principle too sacred to yield on conviction that it is errorness; and such I would hope to be the case with all Old School Baptists. Indeed I have no doubt but such is the fact with *real Old School Baptists*.

For the last six months I have been more actively engaged in preaching than ever before. I think I have averaged four discourses per week, and rejoice to tell you that the children of the promise, in the sections where I have traveled, [within a circle of some 80 or 100 miles] are manifesting a determination to take heed to the divine injunction; “Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins and that ye receive not of her plagues.”

By special invitation I attended the formation of two new associations last fall; the one in Henry, which I see noticed in the SIGNS, the other in Boon, composed of eight churches, five ordained and two licensed preachers. Six of the churches came out; one was a newly constituted church, and the eight was the orderly part of another body, the majority of which had left original ground.

Affectionately;

Thomas P. Dudley.

THE SOUL OF MAN.

Lexington, Ky., Aug. 15, 1849.

MY DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - From the moment I read your response to Elder Williams' queries in No. 12 of the SIGNS, I have had it in contemplation to write to you, and drop some suggestions for your consideration – knowing Elder Williams, and being satisfied that I know the motive which prompted him in

propounding the queries to you, I was prepared for his exultation at your admitting that the soul is regenerated. That brother Beebe, has committed himself in his reply to Elder Williams, I think will be manifest upon his re-examining the following positions taken in his reply.

“If what we have thus far written on this query be correct, then *nothing in the christian is a new creature, but what was actually in Christ.*” A little lower down on the same page you say, “And this quickening is the communication of *new life to the soul*, which was dead, by the which *that soul is made alive, and becomes a new creature.*”

Now, I ask brother Beebe, was the soul actually in Christ? If not, and I think on reflection, brother Beebe will admit it was not, are you not found in conflict with yourself? “And so it is written the first man Adam, was made a *living soul.*” “And he called their name Adam.” “The last Adam was made a *quickening spirit.*” “As is the *earthy, such are they that are earthy*; and as is the *heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly.*”

I submit several questions, a solution of which may rid the subject of some obscurity. 1. What do you understand *the soul to be*? 2. Did the soul compose any part of the Adamic man? 3. Were living souls created in the first or the last Adam? 4. Does anything descend from within the first or the last Adam, which was not created in him? 5. Is it not the soul which distinguishes man from the rest of creation, and renders him a *rational, intelligent, responsible being*? 6. Was man capable of vice or virtue until the Lord God “breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and *man became a living soul*? 7. What is it that exercises volition for the body, and prompts it to action? 8. Is it the *act* or the intention to commit the act, which constitutes crime? 9. Can any other than an intelligent being commit crime and draw down the curse of God upon him? 10. Is any thing ever developed from seed, which was not in the germ? 11. Does Jehovah take any part of the Adamic man, out of which to form the “new man?” 12. If the soul is regenerated, or more properly, remodeled, and by this remodeling *becomes the new man*, is it not a reformation? 13. Is it not an abuse of terms, to call the *soul* the “new man,” when in truth, the soul existed prior to the new birth; and would it not be rather the *old man* dressed up in *new livery*? 14. If the soul is born again, and it is that which exercises volition for the body, would not every act of the body, and its members, be conformed to the strictest principles of holiness; seeing that “whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin because he is born of God?” 15. If the soul is the intelligent part of man, which renders him responsible, and that soul being regenerated, cannot prompt the members of the body to sin, how are we to understand the Apostle John. “If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us.” “If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all

unrighteousness.” 16. Would God chastise beings entirely devoid of intelligence? 17. Could the flesh and blood of David, Peter, or any other child of God rebel against the divine throne and bring down the rod upon him, if that part which rebelled, was destitute of an intelligent principle? 18. Was Jesus Christ [the husband] composed of two whole and distinct natures, the divine and the human – did either compose a part of the other nature? If christians [the bride – the Lamb’s wife] be composed not of two whole and distinct natures, or if either, composed part of the other nature in her, can we realize what the Apostle said, “But we know that when he shall appear, we shall be *like him*, for we shall see him as he is?” 19. Are there indeed two men in the christian; “the old man, which is corrupt, according to the deceitful lusts;” and “the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him?” Is the “new man after God, created in righteousness and true holiness?” 20. Are not the two men in, or composing the christian as developed, here upon earth, fed upon radically different elements, and possessed of radically different lives?

I rose up from an attentive perusal of Doctor Watson’s review of the Licking circular, with this strong conviction of mind, the most appropriate answer Licking could give the Doctor is, “What I have written, I have written.” That is, what we have written is true, and the Doctor’s sophistry cannot overturn it. I was much pleased with, and most cordially adopted your reply to the Doctor. I was also much pleased with your reply to Elder Williams’ queries with the exception I have taken in the early part of this communication. From the time you left us, I was strongly urged by many brethren to publish the circular on the “origin, nature and effects of the christian warfare,” but declined until the extensive and palpable misrepresentations of that letter and of my views, seemed to render it necessary to my own vindication. I forwarded copies to you immediately after its publication, and have been led to conjecture, that if you received them, you were deterred from its publication, by the consideration that it would produce controversy. Those in this country, or some of them, who have made war upon that circular are beginning to see the inconsistency of advocating the doctrine of eternal union and opposing the circular, hence they are denying union, except in *purpose*.

I submit it to you, whether as the circular has been referred to by more than one of your correspondents, justice to all parties, does not require its publication?

Most truly and affectionately your brother,

Thomas P. Dudley.

ONE MEDIATOR.

Lexington, Ky., Dec.10, 1854.

DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - In looking over the SIGNS of the 15th of last month, which came to hand but a few days since, I find over the signature, John A. Hudnut, a request for my views of that part of the word of God, which will be found in the gospel recorded by John 6:48-58 inclusive; especially the latter clause of the 51st verse, which reads, "And the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."

The subject, or rather subjects presented, are very copious; and had I capacity, a full discussion of them in their bearings on other points in the system of salvation, would require more time and space than I have at command; and certainly, more space than you ought to allow any one of your correspondents.

I might invite the attention of your correspondent, to the nature of that *uncorrupted, natural life*, which was imparted to man in his original organization, and to the *uncorrupted, natural elements*, which were destined to sustain, feed and nourish that life. To the *corruption and forfeiture* of that life, and subsequent adaptation of the elements destined to sustain it. I might show the contrast between this life, and the elements appointed to sustain it; and that *incorruptible, spiritual life*, which is imparted in the heavenly birth, with the *incorruptible, spiritual elements*, appointed to nourish and sustain it. This being done, would afford a general answer to the request, with the exception of the clause to which special reference is had, and an answer is desired.

The Passover, peculiarly a Jewish rite, is introduced in the early part of this chapter. The multitude present, are presumed to have understood the nature and end, for which that rite was instituted. That none participated in it, but only the congregation of Israel. The uncircumcised were expressly forbidden to eat of it.

The *manna*, the *typical bread*, which was given the typical people in the wilderness, is also referred to in the chapter. The multitude admitted this bread, to have been given them; but ascribed it to Moses. The miracles wrought by the Lord Jesus, impressed them with the belief that he was "that prophet which should come," and hence they were disposed to "take him and make him a King."

The vast multitude, which were so miraculously fed with the five barley loaves, and two small fishes, combined with the manna, given them to eat in the desert, did not satisfy them with regard to his character and object in coming into the world. They wanted some other sign. "Then Jesus said unto them; Verily, verily I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is he which cometh down from

heaven, and giveth life unto the world. Then said they unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread. And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst. But I said unto you, That ye also have seen me, and believe not.” John 6:32-36. Wherein it is manifest that they understood him not. They knew that eating the manna could not prevent death; hence, without understanding the expression, *the bread of God*, that he is emphatically, “he that cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world,” and supposing it to be, the perpetuation of their natural life, “they said unto him, Lord evermore give us this bread.” He had already said unto them, “Ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled.” verse 26.

Our Lord declared to them the object of his mission into the world; and astounded them by declaring that *he was from heaven*. “For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the Father’s will which sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.” verse 38,39. The Jews were disposed to reject the idea of his coming down from heaven. They say, “Is not this Jesus the Son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How is it then that he saith, I came down from heaven?” Being ignorant of the work assigned, they were consequently ignorant of his vital, mediatorial existence, antecedently to the original transgression of his people in their *Adamic or natural head*. That the right of property which he held in them, antecedently to their going astray, gave him the right of redemption. We may purchase that to which we had no antecedent title; but a man can never redeem that to which he had no previous right. Hence the advent of Messiah had immediate and special reference to the gift of the Father to him. “All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.” Isa.53:6. “For the transgression of my people was he stricken.” “Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see *his seed*, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied; by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.” Isa.53:8,10,11.

We should not forget that the justice of God, which is as immutable as his nature, is concerned in the salvation of his chosen people. Hence the psalmist said, “Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne; mercy and truth shall go before thy face.” Psa.80:14, and the apostle, “To declare I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and *the justifier* of him, which believeth in Jesus.” Rom.3:26.

In view of the fact, that the bride of the Lord Jesus, had gone into transgression; that the claims of the law must be *legally* met; and the demands of divine justice must be satisfied; the momentous question presents itself; who shall, *legally* meet those claims; and who shall legally satisfy those demands? All christians will admit that the mediator of the new covenant was alone capable of meeting those claims. But upon what is that capability predicated? A man may have ample means of relieving another, who is confined in jail for debt; but where is the law which will demand of him payment, in the absence of *legal* liability? The legal oneness existing between husband and wife; between shepherd and sheep; or between head and members; will answer the question. But suppose no such legal relation to exist, and we again ask, Where is the propriety of demanding payment of him?

But to make the case still stronger; suppose *your member, or members*, to have committed the crime of murder, whence the propriety of demanding *my life*, as the forfeit? It is sometimes said a man may voluntarily offer his life, a sacrifice for the guilty culprit. But we ask, would this voluntary offer, and the execution of this volunteer, meet the demands of immutable justice?

For illustration, suppose A to have murdered B. A is arrested, tried, convicted and condemned; and is waiting in the dungeon, the day of execution. Suppose when the day of execution arrives, C presents himself, and says, I volunteer to suffer the extreme penalty of the law in the room of A. C is executed, and A is set at liberty. Will not every one say that C is deliberately murdered; that the ends of justice have been perverted; and the officer, or officers, concerned in this nefarious business deserve to suffer the extreme penalty of the law themselves? Hence it is seen that one sustaining no legal relation, cannot be held liable for the offences of another. If the legal relation or oneness of Christ and his church, be controverted; we desire to know how divine justice is made to harmonize with the penalty of the law inflicted on the Lord Jesus, “who did no sin; neither was guile found in his mouth?” “Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him.” Allow me to say that the Godhead or divine nature of the Lord Jesus Christ, did not, and could not suffer. His manhood could, and did suffer, when he “poured out his soul unto death,” when “being in an agony, he sweat as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.”

Now, the first account we have of the man Christ Jesus in the new testament, is in connection with his people. “And she shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save *his people* from their sins.” Mt.1:21. “Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.” Rom.4:25. “For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” II Cor.5:20. And yet we hear the Lord say, “He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both *are* an abomination to the Lord.” Prov.17:15. Would there be any more propriety in

denying that we had any existence, antecedently to our natural birth; than in denying the existence of the *manhood* of our glorious Mediator, antecedently to his being brought forth of the virgin?

Jesus said, "I came down from heaven." Was it the Godhead or the *man* that came down from heaven? As God, "Heaven is his throne; and the earth his footstool." This is a very deep matter, and I dare not go beyond what is revealed. "Revealed things belong to us and to our children." The world existed at least four thousand years before the incarnation of the WORD, was the world, in existence, these four thousand years without a Mediator? Who is the Mediator as known in the Bible? If we shall be told that Jesus Christ in his Godhead, or divine nature, was the Mediator during these four thousand years, we shall reply, is Christ not in his Godhead, or divine nature, essentially God? Is not God one? "Now a mediator *is not a mediator* of one; but God is one." Gal.3:20. The question recurs, Who was the mediator during those years? The bible reply is, "the same yesterday, and today, and forever." But who is he? "For *there is* one God, and one mediator between God and men, the MAN Christ Jesus." I Tim.2:5. Now, if this mediator, this man, Christ Jesus, did not exist during that period, through what medium did Abel, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, with many others, approach a mercy seat? What has become of the millions and myriads, who lived and died in these four thousand years?

When we resort to the "more sure word of prophecy," we there learn, "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the *Son of man* which is in heaven." John 3:13. Again, "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?" John 6:62. Again, "Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things." Eph.4:9,10.

There are those who cannot, it seems contemplate the existence of the man Christ Jesus, except in communion with the body. Indeed, who deny his existence as man, antecedently to his being brought forth of the virgin. I would ask such, did you, or did you not exist, anterior to your development from your earthly parents? Is the one mystery more incomprehensible than the other? If we admit the first proposition, why reject the second; supported as it is by many unmistakable proofs? "For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices; wherefore it is of necessity that *this man* have somewhat also to offer." Heb.8:3. "For such an high priest became us, *who is* holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens." Heb.7:26. What had this man to offer? Let him answer, "Wherefore when he cometh into the world he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body has thou prepared me." "Then said he, Lo I come to do thy will O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By

the which will, we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once *for all*.” Heb.10:5,9,10. Under the law dispensation, we have the priest, the gift, victim, or sacrifice, and the altar. The priest did not offer himself, nor yet the altar; *but the victim*; what are we to learn thence? The high priest of our profession, offered “that sacrifice which was prepared for him,” upon the altar of his divinity. He did not offer himself as high priest. Hence an apostle said, “But this *man*, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.” Heb.7:24,25. While on the subject of the priesthood, allow me to say, when the priest under the law appeared in the holiest of holies, to make atonement, he was required to wear the priestly robe, and “on his breastplate, and two shoulder pieces,” to have the names of the *twelve tribes of Israel*, for whom, and *for whom alone*, collectively and individually, he was authorized to make atonement. See Exod.12:1-14 & 43-48, & Exod.28:29-30, Lev.4:21, 10:10, 16:21,22 & 34. Whence it will be seen that all the offerings under the law, were made specially and exclusively for the congregation of Israel, individually and collectively; and that they subserved the purposes for which they were made in behalf of the typical people. The high priest of our profession [“And having an high priest over the house of God.” Heb.10:21,] was as emphatically, and as exclusively confined in his offering, and in making atonement to the anti-typical people, the house of God, his sheep, his bride, his body; “the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.”

None we presume, who pretend to believe the scriptures, will deny that the atonement of Christ was as efficacious, in behalf of those for whom it was made at least, as the atonements under the law. The word *atonement* in its prime signification, means reconciliation, a ransom, satisfaction made for sin. “For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.” Rom.5:10. “The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness sake; he will magnify the law and make it honorable.” Isa.42:21. The term *propitiation*, is also used with reference to the work of Christ. The meaning of which word, in theology, is “the atonement; or atoning sacrifice, which removed the obstacle to man’s salvation.” Rom.3:25, I John 2:2, 4:10. “Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered.” Ps.32:1. By which we are not to understand, simply the throwing a cloth or some other substance over them. But an equivalent offered. For example, you present an account against me, composed of many items, the gross amount of which is one hundred guineas – I lay down one hundred guineas to you; they cover the account, cancel, pay; yea, fully discharge the debt. Redemption is also ascribed to Christ as our high priest. The meaning of the word *redemption*, is the buying back, or re-purchasing captured goods or prisoners. Wherever the word redemption

occurs, with reference to the work of Christ, it will be found to be special, definite, and efficacious. Hence, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed *his people*." Luke 1:68. The apostle shows the super-excellency of Christ's sacrifice in behalf of his chosen people. "But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own *blood*, he entered in *once* into the holy place, having obtained *eternal redemption for us*. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God; purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God? And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions *that were* under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree. That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." Gal.3:13,14. If the question be asked, for whom is this eternal redemption obtained? I answer, "I am the good shepherd, and know my *sheep*, and am known of mine. As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father; and I lay down my life for the sheep. And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." John 10:14-16. But who are these "other sheep?" I answer the Lord's people; his redeemed among the Gentiles, who had not yet been brought to believe on him. "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church; and he is the Savior of the body. Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing. Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish. So ought men to love their wives, even as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife, loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord, the church. For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and *they shall be one flesh*. This is a great mystery; but I speak concerning Christ and the church." Eph.5:23-32.

It will be seen that the oneness sustained by Christ with the church, is that which gave sanction to his work in her behalf, as mediator, and I hold that the church was as capable of meeting the claims of the law, and satisfying its penalty,

in her oneness with Christ, as the family of the earthly Adam, were capable of receiving the law, violating its precepts, and incurring its penalty in their oneness with him. I may be asked, is not redemption co-extensive with the earthly family, who violated the law? If it can be proven that the earthly family comprise the bride, the Lamb's wife, that they all are the sheep of Christ, that they compose the body of Christ, that they are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones, then it follows that universalism is true, that it is the doctrine of the Bible. But what said an apostle on the subject? "And they sung a new song saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and *hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto God kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth.*" Rev.5:9.

Food, whether natural or spiritual, is designed for the living. Nor are the living susceptible of its enjoyment, antecedently to birth. The children of the first Adam, are born of the flesh, because of antecedent vital existence in him. He could impart to them none other nature or life than that possessed by him. "This is the book of the generation of Adam; in the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; male and female created he them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created. And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth." Gen.5:1-3. The offspring of the first Adam, were capable of being sustained on the same earthly elements which sustained him. The last Adam has a generation also; hence it is said, "He was taken from prison and from judgment, and who shall declare his generation? For he was cut off out of the land of the living; for the transgression of my people was he stricken." Isa.53:8. This generation had an antecedent, vital, seminal existence in the last Adam; and hence their development as the "heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." Partaking of his nature; and spiritual food being adapted to the nourishing and sustaining of that nature; they eat "that bread of God which came down from heaven." The apostle treating of the doctrine of the resurrection, has given us the character, not only of the *two heads*, but of their respective families; hence he says, "And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit, that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have born the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." I Cor.15:45-49.

The last Adam, is not only a quickening or life giving spirit; but he is also a life sustaining, and life perpetuating spirit. "As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him; and this is

life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.” John 17:2,3. A knowledge of the only true God, and of Jesus Christ, is inseparable from eternal life; and hence those, and those only, who have that knowledge, recognize his “flesh as meat indeed, and his blood, as drink indeed.” “And this is the record, that God has given to us eternal life; and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son, *hath life*; and he that hath not the Son of God, *hath not life*.” I John 5:11,12. Whence it is abundantly manifest, that those who have this life, and those only, are believers on him; and to such he is indeed, “the bread of life.” “I am the living bread which came down from heaven, if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.”

As I have already said, the Savior was talking to the Jews, who entertained the opinion that the Gentiles were entirely excluded from participation in his mediation. The meaning of the term *world*, as used in the text, is evidently God’s chosen people among the Gentiles. Hence the apostle Paul said, “For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead.” Rom.11:15. The apostle John had to contend with the prejudices of the Jews against the Gentiles, when he said, “And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.” I John 2:2. John was a Jew, hence he includes himself with his Jewish brethren, for our sins; we Jews; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world; that is for our *Gentile brethren*, as well as we. “And when James, Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.” Gal.2:9.

The distinction formerly was, God’s chosen people the circumcision, and the world; the gospel distinction is, the church and the world. All who do not belong to the church are considered as belonging to the world. The apostle Peter, who was a Jew said, “But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we [Jews,] shall be saved, even as they [Gentiles.]” Acts 15:11. And Paul when writing to the Gentiles said, “Wherefore remember that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh who are called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made by hands. That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world. But now, in Christ Jesus, ye, who sometimes were far off, were made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace.” Eph.2:11-15. “Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted

repentance unto life.” Acts 11:18. “And how he had opened the door of faith to the Gentiles.” 14:27. “Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name.” Acts 15:14. “From henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles.” 18:6. “Be it known therefore unto you, that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and that they will hear it.” Acts 28:28. “Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also.” Rom.3:29. I feel confident it is not necessary to labor this point further, as without redemption, none, whether Jew or Gentile, can be saved; and the elect among the Gentiles [the world,] share in common with the Jews, the benefits of the atonement of Christ. From all which, it is manifest, that the immortal sons of an immortal sire; being born of the spirit. Born of God, made partakers of the divine nature, are they, and only they, who “eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood,” and thus make it manifest that they are in possession of eternal life. It is quite evident, the Jews, the multitude to whom the Savior was speaking, did not, and could not understand the doctrine he taught. “And he said unto them, Unto you [disciples] it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God; but unto them that are without, all these things are done in parables.” Mark 4:11. “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man.” I Cor.2:14,15. It is far the more manifest that the absence of faith, was the reason why the multitude could not eat of this bread. “This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he has sent.”

To the new man, the inner man, the spiritual existence within, “that which is born of the spirit [and] is spirit,” this bread is nourishing, strengthening, sustaining, enlivening, and invigorating. “Eat, O friends, yea drink abundantly, O beloved.” “He brought me to his banqueting house; his banner over me was love.” “The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want; He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; he leadeth me beside still waters.” To the poor laboring and heavy laden soul – the soul sick of sin – thirsting for the waters of salvation – hungering for the bread of life; whose language is, “O! that I knew where I might find him; that I might come even to his seat; I would order my cause before him.” He reveals himself to such, whence they cry, “his mouth is most sweet, yea he is altogether lovely,” – “the chiefest among ten thousand.”

“Wealth and honors, I disdain,
Earthly comforts, Lord are vain,
These can never satisfy,
Give me Christ, or else I die.”

“Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies; thou anoinest my head with oil, my cup runneth over. Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.” This rich, never failing, spiritual food, will he give his beloved. “I will abundantly bless her provision; I will satisfy her poor with bread. I will also clothe her priests with salvation, and her saints shall shout aloud for joy.” Ps.132:15,16.

The interminable nature of the life communicated to his spiritual seed, and the interminable nature of that bread which was given to sustain that life, amply secure the promise, “And the bread that I will give, is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.” The whole elect family composed of Jews and Gentiles. “And I will give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father which gave them me is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father’s hand.” John 10:28,29. “Because I live, ye shall live also.” John 14:19.

“Though hell may rage and vent her spite,
Yet Christ will save his heart’s delight.”

“For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us unto God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit.” I Pet.3:18. “For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through suffering. For both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee. And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given me. Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver *them*, who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham, wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren; that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted.” Heb.2:10-18. “I am he that liveth and was dead; and behold, I am alive forevermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death.” Rev.1:18. May not the saints then sing,

“I’m rich, the Lord has made me so,
Nor greater riches would I know.”

Well might the spouse sing, "I sat down under his shadow with great delight, and his fruit was sweet to my taste." Songs 2:3.

"None but Jesus, none but Jesus,
Can do helpless sinners good."

Every member of the family of the Lord Jesus, when brought to a discovery of the holy character of that God who claims his obedience, the nature and extent of the claims of God's righteous law, the heinous nature, and dire consequences of sin, his own guilty, helpless and justly condemned situation; to loathe sin and himself, on account thereof; to "delight in the law of God, after the inward man," is made to cry, "Lord save, we perish." "In me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing." When he is led by faith to a view of the Lord Jesus as the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth, is made rejoicingly to cry,

"This is the way I long have sought,
And mourned because I found it not."

Christ is his meat and his drink – his all, and he is prepared to exclaim, "Whom have I in heaven but thee, and there is none upon earth I desire beside thee."

I have been much more lengthy brother Beebe, than I intended, when I commenced writing; and I fear much too lengthy to tax your columns with the publication. I therefore conclude to send on this response just as it is, written by *piecemeals*, as it has been; with the request that you will dispose of it as your judgment may dictate. Perhaps it will be better just to send the manuscript to your correspondent, for whose approbation or disapprobation it has been written.

Most sincerely and affectionately your brother, and companion in tribulation,
Thomas P. Dudley.

REV. 2:2-6.

Near Lexington, Ky., Feb.1, 1859.

DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - In the 23rd number of the last volume of the SIGNS, I find a request from sister Sarah H. Izor, of Indiana, for my views on Rev.2:2-6, inclusive.

I might have answered the request sooner but for a combination of circumstances, embracing the following: 1st. My time is a good deal occupied in attending four churches, several of which are at some distance from me. 2nd. My health has not been as good during the winter as usual. 3rd. There seems to be no lack of interesting matter to fill your columns, and I feel more inclined to learn than to attempt to instruct others. 4th. It is only occasionally I feel inclined to write, especially when it requires time, labor and reflection to make myself intelligible on subjects submitted to my pen; and, withal, I am somewhat of a Quaker, at least in one particular: I am, perhaps, too prone to wait till the "Spirit moves me."

Sister Izor will allow me to premise, first, that the circumstances attendant upon the communication made to John were somewhat peculiar. "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet." Second, the substance of the communications made pertained to the present and future state of the churches addressed. "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches." Third, that John, though an apostle of the Lamb, and "in the Spirit on the Lord's day," nevertheless required one to interpret the mysteries declared by his divine Master, "I, Jesus, have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches." They were too profoundly mysterious for his comprehension; hence an explanation is declared by "mine angel." "The mystery of the seven stars which thou sawest in my right hand, and the seven golden candlesticks. The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches; and the seven golden candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches." One more remark, introductory to the subject. Under the typical dispensation, God communicated his law to his typical people through the prophets. Under this gospel dispensation, he communicated his mind to his spiritual family, first through his Son, and subsequently through his servants, divinely commissioned to publish the "glad-tidings of salvation." "God, who, at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." The Son of God commissioned the twelve apostles, and assigned their work, after telling them that "all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

Paul, to the Elders of the Church of Ephesus, said, "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost made you overseers, to feed the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood." Acts 20:28. The figure employed is entirely appropriate. The overseer receives his instructions from his Lord, and communicates them to the *operatives*. The subject to which my attention is immediately called is introduced thus: "Unto the angel of

the Church of Ephesus write.” The term *angel*, as used in the scriptures, is frequently, if not most generally, applied to the ministry. “And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.” Mt.24:31. Again, “Of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire.” And again, “Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them, who shall be heirs of salvation.” Heb.1:7,14.

“These things saith he that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand.” The writer has given the interpretation of the “seven stars,” in the preceding chapter. “The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches.” The term “star,” as applied to the ministry, seems to me to be peculiarly appropriate. First, because the stars are only reflectors, they only reflect the light they receive from the sun. Secondly, they are obscured by the greater light of the sun. Thirdly, they reflect a greater or lesser amount of light, as in the heavens literally seen; all of which aptly apply to the ministry. By the term “right hand,” I understand the Sovereign Power which guards and defends the ministry. “Touch not mine anointed – do my prophets no harm.” “Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen.” “And they that be wise, shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the *stars* for ever and ever.” Dan.12:3. I presume it will not be controverted that all the *spiritual* light the ministry, whether prophets, apostles, or those who subsequently minister in holy things, have, they receive immediately from the “Sun of Righteousness.” “We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us.” “I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase.” “That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.” John 1:9. As the sun, literally, gives light to the natural world, so the Sun of Righteousness is the great luminary of the spiritual world. Hence it is said, “He [that is, John,] was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that light.” John 1:8. “Who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks.” The interpretation of this term, not less appropriate than the term *stars to the ministry*, has also been given in the preceding chapter. “The seven golden candlesticks are the seven churches.” The figure is quite familiar; the candlestick is designed to bear up the candle. It would seem the apostle so understood the matter when he said, “That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the *pillar and ground* of the truth.” Gold is the most precious of metals, and very aptly represents the preciousness of the churches of the saints to their gracious Lord. “The precious sons of Zion comparable to fine gold.” Lam.4:2. “If any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones.” I Cor.3:12.

“I know thy works, and thy labor, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil.” The good works of saints, as well as their evil works, are

known to God; and in his reckoning with them will be made manifest, as we shall presently see – their “works of faith and labors of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ.” Works, the legitimate effect of “the faith of the operation of God.” Works, by which faith is made perfect, or demonstrably proven – their close adherence to the doctrine taught by their divine Master, and steady maintenance of the principles of revealed truth – doctrinally, experimentally and practically – “holding fast the form of sound words,” and “contending earnestly for the faith once revealed to the saints” – their opposing and exposing the assaults made on the Citadel of Truth. “But I labored more abundantly than they all; yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me.” He regarded their patience, under persecution, the steadfastness of their faith in afflictions and trials, the perils they had to encounter in defense of truth. This church seems to be realizing the prediction of the apostle, “For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock; also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.” Acts 20:29.

“And how thou canst not bear them which are evil.” They turned with loathing and disgust from the perversions of sacred truth, which were manifestly aimed at the subversion of the way of salvation; would not recognize the propagators of these false notions as brethren, nor “receive them into their houses [of worship,] nor bid them God-speed.” “And how thou hast tried them which say they are apostles and are not, and hast found them liars.” The standard given by which to try the claims of those assuming to be apostles of Christ, is the infallible word of God. “To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” Their system, if it deserves the name, brings Christ in conflict with himself in his precious word; its tendency is to divide the crown with the Savior, to exalt the works of sinners, and count the blood of the Covenant an unholy thing; in a word, to stultify the declaration, “Salvation is of the Lord.” “Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to whom be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.” Rev.1:5,6. By bringing them to the test, you have learned unmistakably that they are “false apostles – deceitful workers” – that they have nothing in common with the apostles of Christ. Their’s is “another gospel, which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.” “They prophecy lies in my name,” and “the prophets of the deceit of their own hearts.” The church of Ephesus acted consistently with her high calling in bringing their teachings to the standard of truth, in opposing and exposing their hypocritical cant.

“And hast borne, and hast patience, and for my name’s sake hast labored, and hast not fainted.” He reiterates approvingly the steadfastness of their faith and patience in vindicating the “faith once delivered to the saints,” thereby illustrating

their love for truth and its illustrious author. Their trials indeed were heavy and their conflicts almost insupportable, yet “have they not given place to those deceitful workers – no, not for an hour.”

“Nevertheless, I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love.” However much there was to approve in what precedes, yet the smallest delinquency in the discharge of duty is not passed by unnoticed. Contrast, as though he had said, your present condition with that you enjoyed on your first being led to a knowledge of salvation by Christ – the peace and joy you then realized – yea, “a joy unspeakable and full of glory.” Then you could join the poet, and sing:

“Soon as the morn the light revealed,
His praises turned my tongue;
And when the evening shades prevailed,
His love was all my song.”

“My Beloved is mine, and I am his.” “His mouth is most sweet – yea, he is altogether lovely.” Then you delighted to “speak of the glory of his kingdom, and talk of his power” – to tell the saints what his love has done. “He brought me to the banqueting house, his banner over me was love.” Then, “you sat down under his shadow,” and his fruit was sweet to your taste.

“Then to his saints I often spoke,
Of what his love had done,
But now my heart is almost broke,
For all my joys are gone.”

How sad the contrast! Then the mind was filled with heavenly contemplations – Jesus and his love swelled my bosom.

“His grace its riches did display,
And made my griefs remove.”

Wherever his image appeared, the warmest affections of my heart were drawn out. I recognized the image as developing a son or daughter of Zion, a friend of the dear Savior, a trophy of his divine grace, an heir “to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away.” Then could you join the inspired Psalmist, and say, “O come, let us sing unto the Lord; let us make a joyful noise to the Rock of our salvation. Let us come before his presence with thanksgiving, and make a joyful noise unto him with psalms. For the Lord is a great God, and a great

King above all gods.” “O come, let us worship and bow down; let us kneel before the Lord our Maker. For he is our God; and we are the people of his pasture, and the sheep of his hand.” Ps.95:1-3,6&7.

“Remember, therefore, from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent.” This church seems to have forgotten that she was “purged from her former sins,” that she owed ceaseless obedience to her divine Lord. She seems unmoved by the joys of heaven, or torments of the damned. Paul describes her as asleep. “Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light. See then that ye walk circumspectly; not as fools, but as wise; redeeming the time, because the days are evil.” Eph.5:14-16. Not fallen from *grace*, but from a lively discharge of christian duty. “But your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you, that he will not hear.” Is.59:2. “Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call upon him while he is near. Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.” Isa.55:6,7. When Israel observed the command to repent, God turned away his threatened judgments from her; but when she disregarded the command, he visited the penalty. When God’s spiritual Israel “confess their sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” I John 1:9. Awhile ago she could say with the Psalmist, “For a day in thy courts is better than a thousand. I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God than to dwell in the tents of wickedness.” But how is it with her now? Is she oppressed with her ingratitude, her darkness and slothfulness? Let her cry with the prophet, “O Lord, I am oppressed; undertake for me.” “Turn us again, O Lord, and cause thy face to shine upon us, and we shall be healed.” But she seems entirely unmindful of her best interests, to have fallen into a state of insensibility of the things that make for her peace, hence the appropriateness of the exhortation, or warning. “If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; If they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments; Then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless my loving-kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail.” Ps.89:30-33. “Or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent.” Every consideration of interest and duty, of spiritual peace, love and real enjoyment is presented to stimulate her to return to duty. Let her “weep between the porch and the altar, saying, Spare thy people, O Lord, and give not thine heritage to reproach.” Let her lift her hands with her heart to God for help. I have heretofore said that the interpretation of the term *candlesticks* is churches. The conclusion is then, “except ye repent,” I will remove

your *visibility* as a church. You shall not be known and numbered by the saints as a church of the living God.

My mind is irresistibly drawn to several localities in this country where there existed some forty or fifty years ago, sound and consistent gospel churches, where truth was maintained, and where it seemed to be received joyfully, and where any departure seemed to arrest the attention of the church immediately. The doctrine and practice gave, as it was thought, unmistakable evidence that the favor of heaven's King rested upon them; but the scene is changed. A laxity of discipline, departure in doctrine, and the introduction of *new measures*, hitherto unknown among those churches, gave full proof of the saying of the Lord by the prophet, "For among my people are found wicked men; they lay wait as he that setteth snares; they set a trap, they catch men." Jer.5:26. They seem to have been but too successful in "drawing away disciples after them." Now, the truth is scoffed at by the members at those localities, and its advocates denounced as Antinomians, "old fogies," &c., &c. So that, were you to visit their meetings, hear the slang they belch out, and witness their efforts at proselyting, you would rather conclude you had entered a "synagogue of Satan," than a church of God. But I have yet another verse to answer, in order to fulfill the request of sister Izor.

"But this thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate." The church of Ephesus, fallen as she was, from the original steadfastness of the living God, and from her promptness in controverting for the rights of Zion; yet she had not fallen so low as to tolerate those grosser and more palpable breaches of the law of Christ. Some suppose the deeds of the Nicolaitans to have consisted in repudiating the institution of marriage, that they were "socialists," had their wives in common. Whether this be true or not, one thing is certain, their deeds were offensive to God, opposed to his divine government, and were also hateful to his church.

In conclusion, should not the present cold and languid state of Zion, amid the lo's here, and the lo's there, admonish her sons and daughters to a close and prayerful examination of the subject, to ascertain whether there is or is not, some analogy between the case of the church of Ephesus and the churches of our day? That they may take the warning. "Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls." Jer.6:16.

I have hurriedly answered the request of sister Izor, though very imperfectly. The answer may or may not be satisfactory. The text, however, remains untarnished, and some other brother may be induced to give a more satisfactory solution.

As ever, your brother, in hope of eternal life,

Thomas P. Dudley.

BAPTISM: IT'S MODE & SUBJECTS.

Lexington, Ky., Aug.30, 1859.

MY DEAR BROTHER: - We were much gratified to receive your letter of the 17th., which came to hand last evening; from which we learn that you and your family were enjoying that greatest of earthly blessings, health – without which we are unprepared to appreciate other earthly blessings.

We also learn, thence, the verification, with you as with us, of that ancient promise of our beneficent Creator, that: “While the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and Summer and Winter, and day and night, shall not cease,” with their concomitant “fruitful seasons,” &c. That the laborer is fully rewarded for his toil – the earth aboundeth with, not only the necessities, but the luxuries of this life; all of which call for the grateful emotions of *renewed hearts*. But there are other and higher blessings, which pertain to another and higher being; and which cease not with our earthly existence, but endure through the countless ages of eternity – the base of those unceasing praises, which the Redeemed of the Lord will continue to render to “God and the Lamb.” These latter blessings are not “earned by works, nor bought with gold,” but of that sovereign grace of God, which was disclosed in the gift of his Son, “who was delivered up for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.”

The case to which you allude, of the “Baptist preacher, who favored open communion,” and which gave rise to “great excitement in your city,” is one, in the adjudication of which, *tradition*, whether ancient or modern, is not the test, but whose solution scripturally, can be governed, exclusively, by the unerring Word of God; should be approached with a sense of the deep responsibilities devolved upon the church, by the Law-giver to Zion. I should say, that, so long as Mr. _____ taught and enforced the *doctrine and order of the church*, whether that doctrine and order be consonant with God or not, she was left without cause of action against him; the delinquency being referable to her *declaration of faith and practice*, to the support of which, *alone*, he was pledged. He acted consistently when he resigned the charge, as Pastor, on finding disaffection for his ministry on the part of the members – and the church stultified herself, in taking up a complaint against him, for holding as *private property*, sentiments, the avowal of which, on the part of candidates for membership, had presented no obstacle to their reception as members of her body. If his teachings, whether public or private, were

antagonistic to her faith and practice, *made known in her public confession of faith*, then it was her privilege and her duty, to call him to account. I maintain that the church has no claim on me whatever for my *private opinions*. They are emphatically *private property*, over which she cannot legitimately exert her authority; but to publish the teachings of the unerring word of God. I should, consequently, deny her right of action against me, whilst I confine myself to the observance of the rule I have indicated.

But whether “open communion” is consistent with the theology of the Bible is entirely a different question, and does not depend for its solution, upon the action or non-action of the church or churches. It exists as truth or error, independently of the profession or practice of churches. In the investigation of the question, you may consider, as others have said, I am too rigid, and do not allow sufficient latitude of opinion. But you will remember that I am directly responsible to God for what I teach as Bible truth; and that it is your prerogative to test, not by *ancient or modern tradition*, but by the infallible word of truth, the doctrine I maintain. “To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.”

Allow me to say, there can be no authority drawn from the Bible for inviting those to the Lord’s Supper who are not divinely qualified for the ordinance and that the Master himself, has unmistakably defined those qualifications.

The late Robert Hall, of England, a prominent minister of the denomination to which he belonged, has said: “Open communion arises from a *new state of things*.” May I add, from the *perversion* of the gospel!

Baptism and the Lord’s Supper are ordinances belonging *exclusively* to the Church of God, and are destined to continue during her militant state, and the former is indispensably necessary to give right to the latter. No divinely accredited authority can be found for inviting *un-baptized* persons to the Lord’s Supper.

You quote from the language of Mr. _____, as follows: “But he [Mr. _____] thought the table of the Lord, belonged to all that loved our Savior, and were members in good standing in *other evangelical churches*.” I frequently come across the expression *evangelical churches* in certain quarters, without being entirely certain as to the precise meaning the writer intends to convey by the term *Evangelical*. Now, a denomination may claim to be *evangelical*, simply because she has protested against some of the grosser corruptions of the Church of Rome, and approximates nearer the standard of the Evangelists, while at the same time they retain some of those corruptions. I cannot recognize them as evangelical, so long as *any* of these corruptions cleave to their skirts. Indeed, I am not authorized to hold any community as an *evangelical church* which has not been built after the model of the Apostolic Churches – for example, the church at Jerusalem, the churches at Antioch, Ephesus, &c. God has given but one *model*, according to

which all evangelical churches are reared up – they must be organized according to this *model*, or I am bound to dispute their claim. “My dove, my undefiled is but *one*; she is the *only one* of her mother, she is the choice one of her that bare her.” Song.6:9 “There is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, *one baptism*.” Eph.4:4-5. “Now ye are the *body* of Christ, and members in particular.” I Cor.12:27. What denomination is it, whether Catholic or Protestant, that does not claim to be *the* Church of God?

The Catholic Church claims that high distinction, and avers that the Episcopal, the Lutheran, the Presbyterian, and indeed, that all other Protestant denominations, are *schismatics*, that they have apostatized from her communion. Allow me to enquire: Whence did Episcopalians, Lutherans, Presbyterians and Methodists, together with all other Protestant denominations, properly so called, obtain their baptism? Whence the ordination of their ministry? I apprehend they cannot successfully controvert the answer to this question – *From the Catholic Church!* That the Bishops of the Episcopal Church – Martin Luther and John Calvin, John and Charles Wesley, together with all Protestant ministers, properly so-called, received their baptism and their ordination – if, indeed they have been *baptized* or ordained at all – from the Church of Rome, is potent truth, cannot, we are sure, be denied. And yet, each of those denominations claim to be *the* Church of God. Who is to decide on those claims? We respond, the unerring, the infallible word of God.

We do not claim, and we cannot imagine how the Church of Rome can, with any degree of consistency, place *us* in the same category with the denominations above alluded to, seeing we have been the objects of her bitter persecutions. The Catholic Church is quite too *young* to be the mother of the “Old School Baptist Church,” unless we admit the *daughter* to be several centuries *older* than the *mother*. We claim to have descended from the Apostolic Churches, to maintain the same faith and practice with them, to be built on the same foundation. “Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.”

Let us inquire: Were the churches at Jerusalem, Antioch, Galatia, Ephesus, &c., separate, independent bodies, subject to the government and control of none but the great Law-giver to Zion? Is it so with the churches I have named? Are not the various congregations of Episcopalians controlled by the “Court of Bishops?” Does it not require the whole, to constitute the Episcopal Church? Is not the same true with regard to the Lutheran? Is not the Presbyterian Church composed of the many congregations of that order? Is it not true of the various *societies*, [“Our Societies,” as John Wesley called them] to constitute the Methodist Church? Are not appeals from the inferior to the superior judicatures allowable in those denominations, including the Church of Rome? Are not all of those denominations part and parcel with State establishments, except the Methodist? The Catholic, of France, Spain, and some of the smaller States. The Episcopal, of England. The

Lutheran, of Germany, and several other States. The Presbyterian, of Scotland. The “Evangelical,” of Prussia, &c. Is there not in this an acknowledgement of another *head* than Christ. Finally, are not these facts conclusive against the claim of all and each, to being the Church of God? “My kingdom [said the Redeemer] is *not* of this world.” “The kingdom of God is righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.”

“The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are termed benefactors. But with you it shall not be so; let him that is greatest among you, be as the younger, and he that is chief, as he that doth serve.” Luke 22:25,26. Again; “Be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth; for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters; for one is your Master, even Christ.” Matt.23:8-10.

The “Old School Baptists,” in contradistinction to all these denominations, claim the Church of Christ to be the *highest* ecclesiastical authority on earth; from her decisions there is no appeal. “And if he neglect to hear them, tell it to *the Church*; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto them as a heathen man and a publican.” “Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” Matt.18:17-18. Whence the authority, in cases of dealing for offences, to go to the inferior judicatories, and travel up to the Pope, with the Catholic Church? To the inferior and travel up to the “Court of Bishops,” if, indeed, you stop short of Queen Victoria, who is the “head of the Episcopal Church, and defender of the faith?” Whence your authority to go before the “Session,” the “Synod,” thence up to the “General Assembly” of the Presbyterian Church? To go to the “Class Leader,” the “Circuit Rider,” the “Presiding Elder,” the Bishop, and up to the “Methodist Conference,” in the Methodist Church? Is not the decision of the Pope final in the Catholic – the decision of the “Court of Bishops” final in the Episcopal Church? The decision of the General Assembly final in the Presbyterian Church? The decision of the General Conference of the Methodist Church final with Methodists? If not, why those appeals? Do not those various denominations “make void the law of God by their traditions?” Is there not in all this, a radical departure from the order Christ has established in his Church?

That the Catholic Church has been a persecutor from her very existence, we think no one will deny, who has acquainted himself with her history, either *sacred* or *profane*. In this, her example has had its influence with some of her *protestant daughters*.

But whom did she persecute within the first fifteen centuries? Not Episcopalians, because they had no visible existence on earth until the year 1536, when Henry the VIII, by an act of Parliament, separated England from the Pope’s

dominion and authority, and assumed to be the head of that church and defender of that faith. Not the Lutherans, because they were not known until the rise of Martin Luther, the Reformer, in the sixteenth century. Not the Presbyterians, because they were utterly unknown until the rise of John Calvin, at Geneva, in 1539. Not the Methodists, because they were alike unknown until the rise of John and Charles Wesley, at Oxford College, in the year 1729. But whom did she persecute? We answer; Non-conformists; Baptists, who adhered to apostolic doctrine and order; “Novationists,” who maintained the same doctrine and order now maintained by “Old School Baptists,” – that salvation is wholly of Grace, abounding to the chief of sinners, through the rich atoning blood of the Lord Jesus, applied to the redeemed by the irresistible operation of the Holy Spirit, to the *production* of “repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ” – that the legitimate subjects of Baptism are *believers only* – the mode, dipping, immersing, overwhelming. “Therefore we are *buried* with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead, by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.” Rom.6:4. The administrator, a Baptist Minister, regularly called of God to the work, in union and fellowship with the Baptist Church.

“Donatists,” in the 4th century, who held substantially the same principles with the Ephesians of the 1st and the Novationists of the 3rd century, became the objects of the most bitter persecutions because they would not receive into their churches persons coming from the Catholic Church, without their giving “a reason of the hope within them,” and submitting to the ordinance of Baptism from a properly authorized minister. Hence they were charged with re-baptizing. “Paulicians,” in the 7th century; “Vaudois,” in the 8th century; “Gundulphians,” in the 10th century; “Berengarians,” in the 11th century; “Petrobrussians,” in the year 1110; “Henricians,” in the year 1135; “Arnoldists,” in the year 1140; “Waldensians and Albigenses,” in the year 1150; “Waldo and his followers,” in the year 1176; “Hussites,” in 1420; “Pichards or Waldensians” in the year 1450.

I ask, who persecuted John Wickliff and had John Huss and Jerome of Prague burned to death, for the testimony they bore to the truth? Answer: Roman Catholics. Who caused Lewis and Joseph Craig, John Waller, James Ireland, Jeremiah Moore, John Shackelford, and many others, to be imprisoned in Virginia, for preaching Christ, and him crucified? Answer: Episcopalians. Who had Muncer put to death, for his advocacy of Bible truth and civil and religious liberty? Answer: Martin Luther. “All men condemned Luther for these murdering proposals, but in order to relieve himself, he made the devoted people the scape goats, while he and his colleagues imputed the crimes of the Empire to the Anabaptists, and so escaped.” Orch.Ch.History pg.356. But what was Muncer’s crime, for which Luther urged his death? “The doctrine of liberty had been advocated by

all the Reformers, while pointing out the usurped claims of the Pope; but none understood or carried out this liberty into practice but the *Baptists*, consequently all eyes were directed to Muncer, who now drew up a memorial expressive of their grievances, and which was presented to their lords, and dispersed all over Germany. It consists of twelve articles on civil and religious liberty. It is allowed to be a master-piece of the kind.” Orch.Ch.History pg.355. Who caused the putting to death of Servetus? Answer: John Calvin, the Presbyterian. “The truth is and it ought to be avowed, that the conduct of Calvin admits of no apology.” Jones’ Ch.Hist., pg.424.

It will be observed that each, Doct. Mosheim, Jones and Orchard, in their histories of the Christian Church, accord to the people who have maintained “Old School Baptist” sentiments since the apostles’ day, and whom I have designated by the NAMES given them, mostly, by their enemies, purity of life and conversation, and almost rigidity in the sacrifices they should make, rather than swerve from the faith.

Noble examples of suffering and death, for the cause of their Divine Master, are given in the cases of Perpetua and Felicitas, two females, whose circumstances were peculiar – each having an infant at her breast, and who were entreated by their nearest and dearest earthly friends to “renounce their faith,” and save their lives. The former, while in prison, and just before her being thrown to wild beasts for destruction, was permitted to suckle her infant. “In this situation [says Jones] she comforted her mother, and encouraged her brother, entrusting to him the care of her infant son; and was, according to her own expression, as happy as if she had been in a palace.” Jones’ Ch.Hist., pg.146. But what is the testimony concerning Felicitas? “Three days before the exhibition, however, she was delivered; and, being in great pain, those who were about her, asked how she would be able to endure the being exposed to wild beasts, when she was much affected with the pains of child-birth. She replied, that in this case she was left to herself, but that in her other sufferings, she would have another to support her, even Him for whom she suffered.” Jones’ Ch.Hist., pg.144.

What shall we say of the firmness and resignation of John Wickliff, in bearing reproaches for the cause of Christ? John Huss and Jerome of Prague sealed their testimony with their blood – the former was burned to death, 7th July, 1415, the latter on the 20th May, 1416. After this digression, I return to the subject immediately before me.

We find the most palpable discord between the “Mother of Harlots” and her Protestant daughters – while she charges those daughters with apostasy, they charge her with being the *Apocalyptic Beast*. All would be left in doubt, but for “the more sure word of prophecy.” No wonder that the *Old Mother* forbids to her children *the use of our Bible*. The wonder is, rather, that her protestant daughters

submit, with so much seeming patience, to the *grand-children*, having recourse to the “King James translation of the Holy Scriptures.”

But the impression is attempted to be made that all Protestant denominations are but so *many branches* of the Church of God. We, as “Old School Baptists,” have no disposition to interfere with the *family quarrel*; wholly disclaiming descent from, or anything in common with the Old Mother or her daughters. The exhortation is, “Let there be no schism in the body.” What would the amalgamation of materials so inharmonious present? Not the body of Christ. Because that body, although composed of “many members,” recognizes but *one life*, and Christ is that life. The members sympathize with each other – their interest is one – all are interested in the well-being, health and growth of each. “If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; and if one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it.” Is this applicable to the so-called “evangelical churches?” Have they care and anxious solicitude for the advancement of the interests of “Old School Baptists?” If they have, they have undergone a wonderful change within the present century. Have we forgotten that Paedo-baptists persecuted Baptists and Quakers in Massachusetts within the present century? Look at the “blue light laws” of Connecticut. Have Baptists of the Old School, ever sought power from the secular arm? Have they not all the while, since the Independence of the United States was achieved, asked of “the powers that be,” *only to be let alone?*

But you claim for these various denominations the title “evangelical churches.” If you claim that they are churches, according to the standard of churches recorded by the Evangelists of our Lord, then you will allow that it is our privilege to test the claim by that standard.

In this particular, we claim to be the *only* evangelical churches known to the word of God, and we accord to you the right to test our claim by that standard. Allow me to say that evangelical churches knew nothing of *baby sprinkling* – *baby membership*. This is a new order, which dates several centuries subsequently to the apostolic day and is utterly unknown to the Bible, and directly antagonistic to its teachings.

Immersion or dipping was the universal mode of baptism for a long series of years after the organization of the Gospel Church on earth. Towards the close of the fourth century, the idea prevailed that none could be saved unless they were baptized. Hence sprinkling was allowed by Emperors [without the slightest authority from the word of God] in cases where it was supposed the immersion of the whole body would endanger the life of the individual. “In the year 370 Galetes, the dying son of Valens, was baptized by order of the Emperor, who swore he would not be contradicted.” Time progressed, and dipping was still observed as the manner of administering the ordinance of baptism, until the rise of John Calvin,

who said, “Howbeit, the very word *baptizing* signifieth to *dip*, and it is *certain* that the manner of *dipping* was used of the Old Church.” Institutes, Book 4, chap.15.

I may startle you, somewhat, when I say, and shall prove from the standard of truth, the Bible, that *believers* are the only Bible subjects – dipping or immersion the *only Bible mode* – and *Baptist Preachers*, “called of God, as was Aaron,” the *only Bible administrators* of the ordinance of baptism. If however, the word of God does not sustain me, the assertion is not worth the paper on which it is made.

The Divine Redeemer said, “See that ye make *all things* according to the *pattern* showed thee in the Mount.” May I not say, without fear of successful contradiction, that a church not *built after that pattern is not the Church of Christ!* That no authority has been given by the King of Zion to alter the pattern. And that it is the highest presumption and impiety in the Pope or any other earthly tribunal, to attempt to change the ordinances, or extend them to others than those whose characters are most clearly and unmistakably defined by the *only Law-giver to Zion?*

I now proceed to give the Bible testimony concerning the building, the materials, their preparation, and the rearing the *spiritual* superstructure. “Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.” Ps.127:1. “And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” Matt.16:18. “Therefore, thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion, for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious stone, a sure foundation; he that *believeth* shall not make haste.” Isa.28:16. “For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.” I Cor.3:11

The commission given by the Lord Jesus to his called and qualified apostles, reads thus: “Go ye, therefore, and *teach* all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; *Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever* I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen.” Matt.28:19-20. Allow us to inquire; Are not *the taught* the only subjects of baptism known in the commission? “He that *believeth*, and is baptized, shall be saved.” Mark 16:16. “Then, they that gladly *received his word* were baptized.” Acts 2:41. “And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.” Acts 2:47. “But when they *believed* Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, *they* were baptized, both men and women.” Acts 7:12. Allow me to inquire, If, as our adversaries contend, “baptism came in the room of circumcision,” whence their authority for extending the ordinance to females? Circumcision, under the law, was confined to Abraham’s male descendants, and those servants [male] bought with his money. Whence were Timothy and Titus, who had been previously baptized, compelled to be circumcised, if baptism superceded circumcision? I proceed; “Can any man

forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost, as well as we.” Acts 10:47. “For with the *heart* man *believeth* unto righteousness; and with the *mouth confession is made unto salvation.*” Rom.10:10. “And Philip said, If thou *believest with all thine heart*, thou mayest. And he answered and said, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.* And he commanded the chariot stand still; and they went *down into the water*, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him. And when they were *come up out of the water,*” &c. Acts 8:37-39. Need I multiply proofs that *believers* are the *only* Bible subjects of baptism?

We come next to the mode of baptism; “And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he suffered him. And Jesus when he was baptized, *went up straightway out of the water.*” Matt.3:15,16. “Thus” – in this way – after this mode – agreeably to the example I give. What was that example? “Know ye not that as many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are *BURIED with him by BAPTISM into death*; that like as Christ was *raised up* from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been *planted* together in *the likeness of his death*, we shall be also in *the likeness of his resurrection*; knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin. Now, if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him; Knowing that Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.” Rom.6:3-11. “*BURIED with him in baptism*, wherein also ye are *risen with him* through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.” Col.2:12.

Suppose you employ a laborer to *bury* a dead corpse. He takes it away, and after a time applies to you for payment. You ask, Have you complied with your agreement, and where did you bury it? He conducts you to the place – you find the corpse propped up on its feet, with a few particles of dust thrown on the face and head. Would you pay him for *burying the corpse*? Would you not conclude he was trifling with you? In vain might he urge your *practice* in the observance of the ordinance of *baptism*. “A word to the wise is sufficient.”

But I proceed to the third proposition – the administrator of the ordinance.

John was named of the Angel, before his birth. For what purpose did the Holy Ghost add “THE BAPTIST,” but to set forth his *official character*? “In those days came *John the Baptist* preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” Matt.3:1,2. Not that it is a continuation of

the old Jewish congregation “is at hand” – not already set up, *visibly*, in the world – nor does the right of admission to its ordinances result from being *literally*, the children of Abraham; with whom the covenant of circumcision was made. No, no. “That is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.” Rom.9:8.

Nor was “the Baptist preacher” sent *to prepare*, but “to make ready a people *prepared* for the Lord.” Luke 1:17. How make them ready? To open up the prophecies which had gone before to “the people *prepared*,” and show their fulfillment in the person of the Messiah – to extend the holy ordinance of Baptism to those who “confessed their sins.” Thus, the Baptist not only clearly shows us that *believers* are the legitimate subject of baptism, but also *denies* the ordinance to all who did not “bring forth fruit meet for repentance;” telling them, “And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.” Matt.3:9.

What are the so-called “evangelical churches” doing when they extend the ordinance of baptism to babies of believing parent, or parents, and thus *force* them into the church? Do they observe the pattern? With what face, then, can they claim to be the Church of God? If baptism is efficacious in saving babies, where one of the parents is a believer, why not where both are unbelievers? You should no more censure the “new order,” which was *newly sprung up*, for contending they are not authorized to say that any can go to heaven who are not baptized. You lay quite as much stress on baptism as they do.

But I resume; The *volition* of all those who are the subjects of Gospel Baptism, is indispensable. “But first gave their own selves to the Lord, and unto us by the will of God.” II Cor.8:5. But I have said the administrator must be a Baptist Minister, regularly called of God, ordained to the work, and in good standing with the Baptist Church. Let us not forget the Savior said, “Follow me.” “Be ye therefore followers of God as dear children; and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savor.” Eph.5:1,2.

Now, if Jesus went to a “Baptist Preacher” for baptism, and received the ordinance at his hands, saying, “*Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness*,” I submit, whether it is Christ’s ordinance, or whether we “fulfill all righteousness,” if we receive the ordinance from a baptized or unbaptized Catholic, Episcopalian, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Methodist, or indeed, any other but a Baptist Minister?

I might fatigue you with reading proofs drawn from our adversaries, with regard to the practice, or rather in support of the practice of “Old School Baptists.” A few may suffice for the present. Doct. Mosheim says: “The rites instituted by Christ himself, were only two in number, and these designed to continue to the end of the *Church* here below. These rites were Baptism and the Holy Supper.” Mos.Ch.Hist.,

vol.1, ch.4. The same writer says: “The sacrament of Baptism was administered in this [the 1st] century, without the public assemblies, in places prepared for that purpose, and was performed by *immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font.*” Mos.Ch.Hist., vol.1.

John Calvin said: “Howbeit, the very word of baptizing signifieth to DIP, and it is *certain* that the manner of *dipping* was used of the Old Church.” Institutes, Book 4, chap.15. The same writer admits fully, in his Institutes, that believers are the primitive subjects, and *dipping*, or *immersion*, the primitive mode of baptism.” Institutes, Book 4, chap.15 &c.

Pardon me for introducing the testimony of a highly learned Paedo-baptist minister of our own country. He was approached by a Baptist Minister, who remarked, “You are aware that I am utterly unacquainted with the Greek language – I do not know one letter in the Greek alphabet. Please inform me what is the literal translation of the Greek verb *baptiso* or *baptidso*?” The Paedo replied, “To dip; to plunge; to immerse the whole body.” The Baptist Minister, supposing the other disposed to jeer him, remarked, “You can play off on my ignorance – you know that I know not.” To which the Paedo rejoined, “No man, who is entitled to reputation as a Greek scholar, dare deny that I have given you the literal translation of the word.” Then, said the Baptist, “with your knowledge on the subject, how could you practice sprinkling, and call it Baptism?” The Paedo replied, “Hut, tut, man; you can’t imagine what an effect three or four hundred guineas will have upon a man.” I need scarcely tell you, because I apprehend you have not forgotten, that the late Elder Joseph Redding was the Baptist preacher, and Parson Stubbs the Paedo.

Another learned teacher among Paedo-baptists said, in presence of a large assembly, “No minister, who understands the Greek language, will be so silly as to controvert the subject of Baptism with a Baptist, allowing the *New Testament* to be the guide. For that knows no one as a proper subject, and no other as a New Testament mode, but *believers*, and *dipping* or *immersion.*” A Professor of Greek Literature, in one of our most celebrated Colleges, says: “There is no doubt but that *believers* were the apostolic subjects, and *immersion* or *dipping* the apostolic mode of Baptism.” That Professor is now President of a Paedo-baptist college. With all the foregoing testimony before us, how can we doubt?

Doct. Mosheim, Milner, Baxter, Doct. Wall, and other Paedo-baptist ministers, who sought earnestly and laboriously for authority for Infant Baptism and Infant Church Membership, are all constrained to admit that no higher authority has been found than “ancient tradition,” – “the ancient practice of the Church.” Doct. Baxter has, indeed, resorted to the “Scriptural Almanac,” as proof; but by whom calculated, or when published, he does not inform us. Dare we recognize any

authority paramount to God's Holy Word? But I love consistency, and have forbearance with a man who is consistently wrong.

How is it that Paedo-baptist claim that *babies* are the subjects of baptism, extend the ordinance to them, and yet deny to them the Lord's Supper? If they are the rightful subjects of the first, they certainly are of the other ordinance – why do they not bring them to the Lord's Table? It may be replied, To do so, would be mocking a holy ordinance. I ask, what more sense is there in baptizing them? They have about as correct conceptions of the one ordinance as of the other – and grant either of them, is to grant a *spiritual* ordinance to a *natural* subject, contrary to the divine teachings of God's Holy Word.

You inquire for my practice, and especially for my invitation to the Lord's Supper. It is, and has been, uniform, since my earliest ministry, thirty odd years ago, that “Brethren and sisters, of *sister churches*, who are in *good standing* at home, and have fellowship with us and *the doctrines* we hold, are invited to take seats and partake with us.”

You seem to conclude that my invitation will cover the ground occupied by Mr. _____. Let us see: “But he thought the table of the Lord belonged to all who loved our Savior, and were members in good standing in *other* evangelical churches.” 1st. I cannot recognize any communities as evangelical churches, which have not been built after the apostolic *model*. 2nd. I do not recognize any as “sister churches,” built after a different *model* – hence, my invitation will not embrace such. 3rd. “Fellowship for us and the doctrine we hold.” Now, my Bible teaches. “There is *one* body and *one* spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; *One* Lord, *one* faith, *one* baptism; *one* God and Father of *all*, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.” Eph.4:4-6. The Spirit of God is infallible – therefore he does not teach one that *babies* are the subjects, *sprinkling* the mode; and another that *believers* are the subjects, and *dipping* the mode of *Baptism*. Need I repeat, I cannot recognize any as the proper subjects of the Lord's Supper, but those who with the “heart believe unto righteousness; and with the mouth, make [voluntarily] confession unto salvation,” – and are legally baptized.

I took occasion, some months since, to utter, in a public discourse, the following: Our Paedo-baptist friends complain that we do not invite them to *our* communion table; and in the next breath take care to inform us, that it is not *our* table, but the Lord's.” We cheerfully grant that it is not our table. If it were ours we could exercise some discretion; but, as it is “the Lord's,” no discretion is left us. We must be content to invite such as our Divine Master called to his table. But we ask, will you invite *unbaptized* persons to the Lord's table? We presume you will answer, unhesitatingly, No. Then we ask, How much more charitable [according to the *abuse* of the term charity,] are you than we? Now, we do not consider the sprinkling of a baby or adult, by an authorized or unauthorized administrator, as

baptism; and for this very reason we dare not invite to the Lord's Supper an individual who has given the most satisfactory evidence that he or she is "born again," has "passed from death into life," until they have submitted to *Gospel Baptism*.

The *piety* of Paedo-baptists, or of those who *assent* to *immersion*, as the gospel mode of baptism, is not now the subject in controversy. Though they give us the most conclusive evidence, so far as words go, that they are the subjects of divine teaching, as many have done, yet their submission to gospel baptism is a *sina quanon* to their invitation to the Lord's table. They must not only believe as the Church does, but practice as she does, to entitle them to seats at the communion table.

I am aware that our sympathies have much, too much influence with us, many times. Our children enlist the warmest sympathies of our hearts. It is natural that it should be so; but we should be cautious that those sympathies should not *blind us* to their and our best interests.

Suppose we were to embrace the popular system, that salvation is *offered* to mankind universally, on the *condition* that they "repent and believe the gospel." Are infants, babies, competent to comply with the conditions? But it is contended, in some quarters, that they are not sinners until they come to the year of accountability. At what age do they become accountable? How happens it that they frequently die before they arrive at that year? How can death justly seize upon them in the absence of sin? "The wages of sin is death." "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." But have we forgotten that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." And, "Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." Is superior power indispensable to change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body, and can inferior power prepare the *spirit* for celestial glory?

I am not wholly unapprised of the effects *now*, and from time immemorial, being made to play upon the sympathies of parents and friends, against God's method of saving sinners. What plan have they to propose, which gives promise of greater success?

I commend to the most serious consideration of Paedo-baptists, the following occurrence, which took place not one hundred miles from Lexington, as an illustration of the folly of extending an holy ordinance belonging to the *spiritual subjects* of Christ's spiritual kingdom, to those whose minds are "enmity against God, not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be; so then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." Is not the destruction of an holy ordinance, rebellion against the authority of God? Are not the parties to such desecration *participus*

crimius? A very respectable widow lady had four children, two of them [the older two,] professed hope in Christ, and the convictions of their own judgment led them to seek membership with a *Baptist Church*, where they could receive baptism according to the *pattern* given, and the example laid by the head of the church himself. The mother, being a Paedo-baptist, desired that the two younger children should have their membership with her. For this purpose she exercised her maternal authority. A meeting was appointed at her house for the purpose of having the children baptized. The authority of the mother, procured quiet compliance on the part of the little girl; but when the boy was called for he had attempted to evade baptism by hiding himself. Threats of the application of the rod forced compliance on his part. When the minister had pronounced the ceremony, he dipped his fingers in a bowl of water, and sprinkled it in the face of the youth. The latter immediately jumped back, clenched his hand, drew it back, and said to the minister, “G--d d--m your soul, if you do that again I will knock you down.” What is this but a desecration of an ordinance whose rites all its legitimate subjects are *inwardly* taught to respect?

Allow me to give another example, in which want of confidence on the part of the actors in the teachings which they recognize is most clearly manifested. “But without faith it is impossible to please God.” One or two congregations sent up to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, [New School] at Buffalo, N.Y., in the year 1855, two queries, which are substantially as follows: 1st. “Is Roman Catholic Baptism valid Baptism?” 2nd. “Is Roman Catholic Ordination valid Ordination?” The subject was referred to a committee, who reported adversely. When the subject was taken up for discussion on the report of the committee there were those who unhesitatingly pronounced against the validity of the baptism and ordination of the Catholic Church. Others who, perhaps, understood themselves and the position they occupied towards the “Old Mother,” better attempted and succeeded in arresting the attention of the young *spouts*. They maintained that, “if you determine that Roman Catholic Baptism is *not* valid Baptism, *then are we not baptized*. That Calvin and Luther received their baptism in the Catholic Church. That if you decide that Roman Catholic ordination is not valid ordination, by that decision you *un-church* us. Forasmuch as Calvin and Luther were ordained in the Catholic Church.” The result was the indefinite post-ponement of the subject, with directions to the Secretary to erase from their minutes the proceedings had on the subject.

Now, I ask, if the General Assembly felt that she could sustain herself by the unerring word of God, why did she decline a decision of the queries presented for her solution? Why did she not yield to the earnest solicitations of those whom it is fair to presume, were honestly searching for truth? Again; If those congregations

did not feel that they were bound to submit to the decision of the great “Sanhedrim,” why did they refer the queries to them?

But, I ask emphatically, is not the decision of the Pope on matters of faith and practice, *Law*, in the Catholic Church? Is not the decision of the “Court of Bishops,” with perhaps the sanction of Queen Victoria, the head of that Church, and defender of that Faith, *Law*, in the Episcopal Church? Is not the decision of the highest judicature in the Lutheran Church, [by what name soever that judicature may be called] *Law*, in the Lutheran Church? Is not the decision of the “Presbyterian General Assembly” *Law*, in the Presbyterian Church? Is not the decision of the Methodist General Conference, although the body itself is not one hundred years old, *Law*, in the Methodist Church? Have these denominations forgotten the teachings of the inspired Apostle? Let us see: “Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in the old time by *the will of man*, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.” II Pet.1:20,21. Do they claim divine inspiration? Let us see their *chart*.

Will they give us a bible example for taking a case on appeal from the decision of the “Church” to a higher “Court of Appeals”? You may possibly refer to the case recorded in the 15th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, supposing that to be analogous to the cases put. But, I ask, Is there not a radical difference between the tribunals, whose province it is to decide? The twelve apostles are the ordained *Princes* which shall rule in judgment, divinely qualified for the purpose. Now will you claim equal dignity for those *uninspired* men? Allow me again to refer you to the commission delivered to the Apostles: “Teaching them to observe *all things whatsoever I have commanded you*.” The Canon of Scripture is filled up, it is complete. We should be cautious that we neither “add to, or take from the words of this prophecy,” lest we experience “the plagues that are written in this book.” See Rev.22:18,19. In the above case something was taught which Christ had not commanded his Apostles. And as he had commanded to teach all the lessons necessary to faith and godliness, it was eminently proper that they should decide the matters committed to them, being *divinely appointed* to that end.

I desire again in this connection, to call your attention specially to a subject insisted on by the Paedo-baptists, namely; “That Baptism, supercedes, having come in the room of circumcision.” You will allow an inspired Apostle to decide in this matter. “Him [Timothy] would Paul have to go forth with him, and took and *circumcised* him, because of the Jews which were in those quarters; for they knew all that his father was a Greek.” Acts 16:3. Again; “But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised, and that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage.” Gal.2:3,4.

Now, if Paul considered Baptism to have come in the room, or to have superceded circumcision, why did he circumcise Timothy, and allow Titus to be circumcised, each of whom had been *baptized*?

But there is yet another matter to which I invite your attention. Circumcision, under the Old Testament dispensation, was a *sign*, an external sign, which those who received it bore wherever they went, and by which they conveyed unmistakable evidence to the sons of Abraham [to whom the rite belonged] that they belonged to the same family, and consequently had right to the privileges and immunities belonging to the Abrahamic covenant of circumcision. Now will you inform me what trace the water leaves on the baptized? Or what sign by which others who have been baptized, may know them? You are aware it always requires a *substance* to cast a shadow. Such a thing as a shadow casting a shadow has never been known. The Bible informs us that circumcision is a *sign*, or shadow. Baptism is also a *figure* or *shadow*, hence it is impossible that circumcision prefigured baptism.

You inquire, what then, was circumcision a figure, or representative of? I answer, or rather let the Holy Ghost answer, “For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh. But he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.” Rom.2:28,29. Now the *sign* of circumcision, or circumcision “in the flesh,” was an external *sign*, by which the beneficiaries of the covenant of circumcision were distinguished from all others. The *circumcision of the heart*, more indelibly made, because to last as long as eternity itself, is an unmistakable evidence that the Lord has taken up his dwelling there. And hence Old School Baptists require of candidates for the holy ordinances “a reason of the hope that is within you.” God has no *still born* children. If he has wrought the work of circumcision within, the subject can give such evidence of it, which will secure *gospel fellowship*, without which the ordinances and admission to church membership should always be denied. “Let there be no schism in the body.”

Suppose a circumcised Jew from London met a circumcised Jew from Paris, in the city of Lexington, and suppose one thousand of the most respectable citizens of Lexington would offer their combined testimony to the man from Paris that the man from London belonged to the circumcised family of Abraham. What influence suppose ye, their testimony would exert on the mind of the Pharisee? Not a particle – no more than the whistling of a bird. And why? The man from Paris would naturally inquire, What do you know of the *sign*? He would say, If the man from London, is a member of the family, he bears along with him unmistakable evidence of the fact. Each exhibits the “sign of circumcision,” and each is irresistibly convinced that the other is a *veritable* circumcised Jew. Now, suppose one who is

circumcised in heart, from Moscow, meets another circumcised in heart, from Madrid, at London; and suppose one hundred thousand of the most respectable *unregenerate* persons of that Metropolis, should say to the man from Moscow, that the man from Madrid is a christian, would this suffice to give fellowship? Not at all. The man from Moscow would reply, Let the man from Madrid give me the evidence, which he bears with him, if indeed he is “born again.” They each give “the reason of the hope that is in him.” The result is, the hand of fellowship follows the heart that is circumcised to the heart of the circumcised; each is satisfied that the other is “an heir of God and a joint-heir with the Lord Jesus Christ.”

We should not forget the one is “the circumcised in the flesh, made by hands;” the other “the circumcision of the heart, *in the Spirit*.” Well might the Psalmist proclaim, “The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him; and he will shew them his covenant.” And Paul, “But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of man, save the spirit of man, which is in him? Even so the things of God, knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God; which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man. For who hath known the mind of the Lord that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ.” I Cor.2:10-16. Hence it is seen that Paul and his brethren had “the mind of Christ.” They received his ordinances understandingly. Will this apply to unconscious babes? Shall we consider it a small matter to attempt to “instruct” Christ? Has not Calvin and others attempted to do so? What else is the substitution of sprinkling for baptism? Extending the right to unconscious babes? Their attempting or pretending to “bring them into covenant with God?”

I love babies, but my Lord alone can “save them with an everlasting salvation.” I rejoice that the salvation of his people whether adults or infants, is secured in his *tried hands*; that it is “not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior.”

Suppose salvation were conditional, and none could be saved but those who complied with the conditions; what rational hope could we indulge of their salvation? Remember the seeds of death are sown in them as well as in adults, that all are sinners. “Ye must be born again,” must be “*born of the Spirit*,” or we cannot

see, or enter into the kingdom of God. What agency had we in bringing about our first birth? Can we rationally suppose that we can be more active in bringing about our spiritual birth? But remember infants have flesh and blood, and that “flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.” And the argument of the apostle, “For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality; then shall be brought to pass the saying, Death is swallowed up in victory; O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ.” Again, “So also is the resurrection of the dead. It [the body] is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body.” I Cor.15:42-44,53-57. But who performs this mysterious and glorious change? “Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.” Phil.3:21. If it require Almighty power to prepare our *bodies* for eternal bliss, do you feel willing to entrust the preparation of our *souls* to inferior power? Our children twine about our hearts, but I rejoice to know they are in the hands of the Judge of the whole earth, who will do right.

Modern Arminians seem to consider the mission of the church to be the “evangelization” of the world. Hence they are forming societies, raising money, and sending out missionaries for the purpose avowedly, as some of them say, of making christians, adding to the Redeemer’s kingdom, saving souls from hell, &c. Possibly this is the interpretation intended to be given of the term “Evangelical Churches.”

I am forcibly reminded of two of eleven queries put to the prayerful consideration of the churches in Kentucky, some years since, by “the Publishing Committee of the Kentucky Baptist Convention.” 9th. “Suppose all Missionary and Bible Societies were now to stay their efforts and leave the matter to others, how would they go about it? And how many hundreds of centuries would pass before the gospel could be preached or the Bible could be read in one hundred of the three thousand languages, and how many thousands even in our own country might perish for the lack of knowledge?” 11th. “If the church shall fail to contribute to the extent of her resources, to furnish the millions, yet in Pagan darkness with the scriptures, may not their blood be found at her door, when their voices shall rise against her in judgment?”

And yet these very people [modern missionaries] charge Catholics with being awfully *impious*, because Catholics, as they say, contend that the priest can pray souls out of [the half-way house] purgatory. It is but justice to Catholics to say,

they charge this to be misrepresentation. Their position is, the priest is a righteous man, and “the effectual, fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.” Therefore, the prayers of priests should be secured in behalf of those who are gone to purgatory.

Modern missionaries are industriously engaged to raise a fund to save “the millions yet in pagan darkness.” Now what is the difference? Catholics beg or demand money to pay for praying souls out of purgatory, and Protestants beg money to prevent, as they say, souls from going to [the lower house] hell? In point of fact the course of those Protestants is as impious as that of the Catholics.

Some years since I was in Frankfort, where I met one of the great luminaries of the Missionary Society [Elder Alfred Bennett], who after hearing me preach, came to me and said, “I was glad to hear you make one remark this morning.” “What was that?” said I. He replied, “You said if you were in error, you would be glad to be convinced of it.” “Yes,” said I, “I wish to be right; and he who convinces me of error, will shew himself to be my friend.” Said he, “Where will I see you in the morning?” I replied, “At S_____.” “Until what hour – until nine o’clock?” said he. “Yes,” I replied, “I will wait for you until ten.”

We separated; I waited for him until eleven o’clock the following morning, and hearing nothing from him supposed he had declined his *mission to convert me*. However, about two o’clock in the afternoon I received a message that he was at the house of brother S_____ and wished to see me. I went immediately in company with two or three brethren. When we reached the house, we found several of his missionary friends, whom I supposed he had collected to witness my conversion. He commenced asking me questions with regard to sundry points of the christian religion. I promptly and most frankly answered his questions. After proceeding for about one hour, during which time he had not controverted one position I had taken, he remarked, “You are not to conclude I coincide in opinion with you, because I do not controvert your position.” Several friends present remarked, “Yes we will.” He seemed to become irritated, and said quite quickly, “No, you are not.”

He resumed, and I, to answer his questions. Immediately after answering the first of the second series of questions, he said, “I dissent from you.” Here several of the bystanders remarked, “Well, now give us your reasons for dissenting.” “No,” said he, “I shall do no such thing; I only wanted him [me] to answer some questions for my own satisfaction.” “But,” said the bystanders, “each of you profess to be teachers; we want instruction, and if brother Dudley is wrong, you should tell us wherein.” “No,” said he, “I shall do no such thing.”

He progressed with his questions and I with my answers for, I think, about another hour. After he concluded, I remarked, “Mr.B., I wish now, to ask you a few questions. Do you believe man to be *dead* in trespasses and sin, as the Bible declares him to be?” “Most assuredly,” said he, “I do.” “Do you believe the gospel

to be a *spiritual system*, and that without *divine influence* man is totally incapable of believing or obeying it?" "Most certainly I do," said he. "Have you any guarantee that God will send his Spirit where you send the Gospel?" "No," said he, "why do you ask that question?" I replied, "Because I desire to know your precise position." I continued, "What proportion of the heathen, to whom you send the Gospel, will believe and obey it?" "I do not know," said he. I inquired, "Do you suppose that all will receive and obey it?" He promptly answered, "No." I continued, "Will one-half believe and obey it?" He replied, "No." "Will one in ten?" He answered, "I suppose one in ten may believe and obey the Gospel." I asked, "What will be the *cause* of the damnation of those who are damned?" He quickly replied, "The *rejection of the Gospel.*" "And I suppose," said I, "that, according to your views, the acceptance or belief of the Gospel is the cause of the salvation of those who are saved." "Yes," said he. I then remarked, "You have come out just where I supposed you to be." I continued, "Where is your philanthropy? Why will you send *damnation* to a people who, according to your theory, would not be damned if the Gospel were kept from them, and only one in ten, at best, could be saved?" He seemed to become quite incensed at me. May I add, Mr. B. or Elder B. [he had D.D. appended to his name] that these are some of the marks of the "Beast." Can you wonder that I have no fellowship for him or for his mark?

Now, I take it, that the Book of God is a book of positive institutes; and that no *power* resides anywhere, not even in "His Holiness, the Pope," "The Court of Bishops," "The Lutheran Combined Council," "The Presbyterian General Assembly," "The Methodist General Conference," "Baptist Conventions," "Councils," or "Associations," to modify or, in any particular, to change the doctrine, discipline or ordinances established by the King for the government of his Zion. To do so, would be open rebellion against Him who has said, "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." Hear the language of inspiration: "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds." II John 10.

I am a Baptist, because my experience and the Word of God will not allow me to be anything else. Yet I censure not others because they cannot see as I see.

My wife joins me in kindest and warmest regards to you, and every member of your family. God bless you all, and if consistent with His will, make you all the happy subjects of his great salvation. Our friends are enjoying their accustomed health, so far as I am advised. As ever, most truly and affectionately,

Your friend and brother,

Thomas P. Dudley.

P.S. – You will allow me to add an important and interesting piece of history of a people whose successors we are: “On another occasion, the same writer [Theodore Beza, the contemporary and colleague of Calvin] remarks, that, the Waldenses, time out of mind, have opposed the abuses of the Church of Rome, and have been persecuted after such a manner, not by the sword of the word of God, but by every species of cruelty, added to the millions of calumnies and false accusations, that they have been compelled to disperse themselves wherever they could, wandering through the deserts like wild beasts. The Lord, nevertheless, has so preserved the residue of them that, notwithstanding the rage of the whole world, they still inhabit three countries, at a great distance from each other, namely: Calabria, Bohemia and Piedmont, and the countries adjoining, where they dispersed themselves from the quarters of Province about two hundred and seventy years ago. And as to their religion, they never adhered to Papal superstition; for which reason they have been continually harassed by the bishops and inquisitors abusing the arm of secular justice, so that their continuance to the present time is evidently miraculous.”

Again; Bullinger, in his preface to his sermons on the book of Revelation [1530] write thus concerning the Waldenses: “What shall we say that for four hundred years and more, in France, Italy, Germany, Poland, Bohemia, and other countries throughout the world, the Waldenses have sustained their profession of the Gospel of Christ, and in several of their writings, as well as by continual preaching, they have accused the Pope as the real anti-christ foretold by the Apostle John, and whom, therefore, we ought to avoid. These people have undergone divers and cruel torments, yet have they constantly and openly given testimony to their faith by glorious martyrdoms, and still do so even to this day. Although it has often been attempted, by the most powerful kings and princes, instigated by the Pope, it hath been found impossible to extirpate them, for God hath frustrated their efforts.” [“If God be for us, who can be against us?”]

And yet again; Monsieur De Vignauce, who was forty years pastor of one of the Churches of the Waldenses, in the valley of Piedmont, and died at the advanced age of eighty, wrote a treatise concerning their life, manners and religion, in which he says, “We live in peace and harmony one with another, have intercourse and dealings chiefly among ourselves, having never mingled ourselves with members of the Church of Rome, by marrying our sons to their daughters, nor our daughters to their sons. Yet they are so pleased with our manners and customs, that Catholics, both lords and others, would rather have men and maid servants from among us, than from those of their own religion, and they actually come from distant parts to seek nurses among us for their children, finding, as they say, more fidelity among our people than their own.” Jones Hist.Chris.Church, pg.343,344.

Do you not see in this people called Waldenses many traits which find their parallel no where in modern times, but among “Old School Baptist?” Can you wonder, my dear brother, that we are tenacious of our principles! Adieu for the present.

Thomas P. Dudley.

ONE BODY.

Near Lexington, Ky., April 9, 1868.

MY DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - I have read with interest the communication of Brother W.J. Purington, and, with your permission, propose subjoining some remarks on a subject immediately connected with the closing part of his communication.

That the “Old School Baptist Church” is “The Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth,” to the exclusion of all other organizations, claiming that high and honorable distinction, I have not one doubt.

“My dove, my undefiled, *is but one*; she is the only one of her mother, the choice one of her that bear her.” “There is one body, and one spirit; even as ye are called in one hope of your calling.” “Ye are *the body* of Christ, and members in particular.” “As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that body being many, are one body; so also is Christ.” “Come hither and I will shew thee the *bride*, the Lamb’s wife.” “And I beheld the Holy City, the New Jerusalem descending from God out of heaven adorned as a *bride* prepared for her husband.” “Thy Maker is thy Husband, the Lord of Hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel, the God of the whole earth shall he be called.”

I am aware that there are those who claim so much charity, as to acknowledge that we are a “gospel church,” but say they, we are a gospel church too; while there is no more fellowship between them and us, than between “righteousness and unrighteousness, no more agreement than between the temple of God and idols.” “No more concord than between Christ and Belial.” What would be thought of a man who is found using one member of the body, to wound other members; and to mutilate, yea, to destroy the body? Guilty of suicide? What has been the course of the *Old Mother* “clothed in scarlet,” and of all her protestant daughters and grand-daughters, towards Old School Baptists, but to employ themselves in persecuting and putting to death, yea, exterminating them, wherever they had the power; and yet they seek union and correspondence with us? “Like their *relatives* of old. “Let

us build with you, we seek your God, even as ye do.”

I am forcibly reminded of an occurrence which took place not many miles from my residence a few years since. A certain D.D. claiming to be a “United Baptist,” delivered to *his flock* a series of lectures on the doctrine of Predestination and election, which were listened to by several intelligent Old School Baptists, one of whom remarked to a member of *his flock*, “If your preacher will continue to maintain the doctrine he has been preaching in these discourses, we shall claim him for an Old School Baptist.” The member replied, “Wait a little and he will show you where he is.” At perhaps the very next meeting, the D.D. remarked in substance, “I have been preaching a series on the sovereignty of God – the doctrine of Predestination and Election, *which is true*. But another system of salvation is taught in the Bible *which is true also*,” and preached directly in opposition to what he had been preaching. He took up the “Circular on the Origin, Nature, and Effects of the Christian Warfare,” and fought, not it, but a man of straw, he manufactured, and most violently. One of our brethren, who had been listening to him attentively, remarked to the D.D. that he had most grossly misrepresented brother Dudley, and that I would reply to his attack. Our brother informed me of the attack made on me, when I requested him to call on the D.D., and inform him that I would answer his attack on a certain given day, and that I specially invited him and his congregation to be present and hear the reply; and further, that I asked of him the notes or manuscript he used on the occasion, as an act of justice to me, as he had attacked me behind my back. On the day before I had appointed to reply, I received a paper of some twenty-two pages manuscript, purporting to be a synopsis of his two discourses, making the attack. A grosser perversion of truth I believe I never saw.

The time to reply arrived, when I met a very large audience, composed of members of the various denominations, including a large number belonging to the same order of Baptists with the D.D., with very many non-professors, when I proceeded to take up his faith as disclosed in the synopsis, his perversions and misrepresentations, and to answer them as fully as the time I consumed [about three hours] and my strength would allow.

I called special attention to his assertion, that “no man ought to be allowed to occupy the pulpit who is not a theological scholar.” I proceeded to remark, that the scriptures of the Old Testament were written or printed, originally, in the Hebrew language; those of the New Testament in the Greek language, neither of which languages do I understand. But let us test the Doctor’s theory. Go to Millersburg, where there is a college, whose professors and teachers tell you that they understand those languages. What is taught there? Methodist theology. Come to Georgetown, where we have another college, whose professors and teachers say they understand the original languages in which the scriptures were written. What do you get there? Fullerite Baptist theology. Go to Danville, where we have

another college, whose professors and teachers tell you that they also understand those languages. What do you hear there? Old School Presbyterian theology. Go about ten miles North, to Harrodsburg, where we have another college, whose professors and teachers, like the others, tell you that they understand the languages, and what do you hear? Modern reform theology. Go a few miles West, where we have still another college, whose professors and teachers insist that they understand those languages. What is taught there? Roman Catholic theology. Go still a little farther West, to Princeton, where there is another college, whose professors and teachers say the same thing. What do they teach? Cumberland Presbyterian theology. Come up the Ohio river to Louisville, to Bishop Smith's college, who claim to be *the church*, and to understand those languages. What do they teach? Episcopalian theology. Here we have seven different churches, so called, whose leaders assure you that they understand the original Hebrew and Greek languages, in which the scriptures were written, take the same Bible and give you seven different interpretations of the same text. I asked, is not this confusion worse confounded? I maintained the Bible is its own best expositor, and recommended its teaching rather than theological schools. The occurrence reminded me of the prophet Isaiah, and I thought I saw the prophesy fulfilled. "And in that day seven woman shall take hold of one man, saying, We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel; only let us be called by thy name to take away our reproach." Isa. 4:1. Yet am I censured because I am unwilling to profess union, communion and correspondence with such people! If they feel safe in their own boat, I do not desire to interfere with them. Having no misgivings that the Old School Baptist church is, legitimately, the church of God, and that all others claiming that prerogative are spurious. We, the Old School Baptist, being built after the Bible model, I am exceedingly desirous that our people shall "walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all loveliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love, endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Let us, dear brethren, heed the holy admonitions with which his word abounds.

Brother Purington, and some other brethren, have dwelt, as I trust, profitably, on the duties devolving on God's ministers, to "preach the word," "preach the gospel," "to be in season, out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine." To "feed my lambs, feed my sheep;" to "feed the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood." To "let the dead bury their dead, but go thou and preach the gospel." "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." "Give thyself wholly to the work."

Has it not occurred to you, dear brethren, that a compliance with the duty

devolved on the ministry, and which is made imperative, that time, labor and toil are indispensable, to “make full proof of their ministry?” That they are men of like passions with other men? That they have needs which must be supplied; that they watch for your souls, that they must give account to God, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief? And are there not corresponding obligations devolved on the church towards those *watchers*?

The duty to minister to the poor saints is plainly laid down in the Bible, but is it more plain than the duty to minister to the Lord’s watchmen of our carnal things? Listen to the teaching of the inspired word of God. “Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charge? Who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? Or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock? Say I these things as a man? Or saith not the law the same also? For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen? Or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written; that he that ploweth should plow in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope. If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things? If others be partakers of this power over you, are not we rather? Nevertheless we have not used this power; but suffer all things, lest we should hinder the gospel of Christ. Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? And they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel. But I have used none of these things; neither have I written these things, that it should be so done unto me; for it were better for me to die, than that any man should make my glorying void. For though I preach the gospel, I have nothing to glory of; for necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel! For if I do this thing willingly, I have a reward; but if against my will, a dispensation of the gospel is committed unto me.” I Cor. 9:7-18. On another occasion the apostle, alluding to the same subject, observes: “Not that I desire a gift, but fruit that may abound to your account.” The inspired volume tells us, “If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.”

While I bear cheerful testimony to the observance of the duties enjoined, including the above, on the part of many members, yet I fear that others have not this fruit, which may abound to their account; that they have been unmindful of their interest and duty in this behalf.

I recollect, many years since, hearing the remark made in reference to a minister: “We will keep him poor; the Lord make him humble.” I am glad they were not Old Baptists. Let us not, dear brethren, demonstrate that we are of that class who “muzzle the ox.” I have known some cases within the last forty-eight years where the neglect of churches caused a minister, or perhaps ministers, who

had families to care for, feeling it to be their duty to leave the churches they supplied, and seek a new field, where they could meet the temporal wants of their families, and minister to the spiritual wants of brethren.

While I loathe and abhor the practice which prevails so generally, except among Old School Baptists, of professed ministers *auctioning* themselves off to the highest bidder, and thus assuming the character of “hirelings,” I nevertheless am freely persuaded that when the church fails or neglects her duty in this matter, the ministration of God’s servants fails to afford that comfort, instruction and encouragement they would otherwise derive from their labors. In such cases the ministry becomes to such as “dry breasts.” Let us bring the matter home to ourselves, and ask, Would we be willing to leave the little comfort we enjoy in the bosom of our family, our domestic concerns at home, by which a competency is secured for those committed to our charge, and labor, and toil for the encouragement of others, while we are pained to witness how indifferent they are to our comfort, and the comfort of those near and dear to us?

Brother Beebe, I have regretted to find some of our brethren in the ministry so *tender-footed*, [as they say in the West,] on this subject.

Brother Beebe, let us try to imitate an inspired apostle, who said, “I have not kept back anything that was profitable unto you.” Again, “I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.” Let us clear our skirts, whether others hear or forbear.

The remark may be repeated, “Ah brother Dudley is scolding again.” I have this consolation, if they complain, it is a sign of guilt, and that they are not quite dead, or as Paul said, “Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.” God grant that each and all of us may come home, and revive our own hearts, in the light of the “candle of the Lord,” and ask, Am I delinquent in duties? And pray that in the future we may be enabled to walk more as “the children of light.”

God bless you, my dear brother, and all the household of faith.

Thomas P. Dudley.

BORN OF GOD.

Near Lexington, Ky., April 20, 1868.

MY DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - I have read with deep and abiding interest, and decided approval, your very kind and brotherly reply to both Elder Vanmeter of Illinois, and Elder Wright of Indiana, and feel disposed, with your permission to

subjoin some thoughts on the interesting topics you have discussed in those replies.

The word of God teaches, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." I take it for granted that the Savior has fully conveyed the doctrine that everything, whether body, soul, spirit, feelings, affections, susceptibilities, appetites, hungering, thirsting, rejoicing, or mourning, pain or pleasure, that is "born of the flesh, is flesh." Hence the exhortation, "Mortify the deeds of the body." "Crucify the flesh, with the affections and lusts." "I keep under my body and bring it into subjection." "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin, but yield yourselves unto God, as those who are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God. For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace." All the reproofs, admonitions and exhortations, with which the gospel is so richly stored, and which are addressed to the churches, or to individual members of the body of Christ, are predicated upon the acknowledged fact that she and they are yet "in the body" – that she has not yet reached her "perfect state," where they would be inappropriate. Where "the Lord God and the Lamb are the light of the city." Where the "candle" will not be necessary to her furtherance in the divine life.

The disciples are here composed of the "old man, which is corrupt, with his deeds," and a "new man, which is after God, created in righteousness and true holiness;" between whom there exists direct antagonism of life, of nature, of instincts, of hopes, desires, appetites, enjoyments, pleasures and pains, which are entirely irreconcilable. "The carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be; so that they that are in the flesh cannot please God." "To be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace." Some contend that the corrupt feelings, affections and lusts are the "old man." But the apostle seems not to have adopted this view, or why did he say the "old man is corrupt, with his deeds"? Acts pertain to agents, hence he concludes the corrupt actions illustrate the corrupt nature of the agent from whom they proceed. I am unable to perceive what they gain by their assumption. Do they intend to assert that man is born over again, and that all belonging to him has become spiritual by the new birth? That the "new man" is not only the subject of holy desires, spiritual enjoyments, and strictly of the christian walk and conversation, and yet that the same man belongs to the same category with those for whom the law was made? "The law was not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for the unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers, and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine." Or do they mean to convey an idea

that the disciples of Christ do no wrong? If the latter be their teaching, then Peter did no wrong when he “denied his Lord, and cursed, and swore he knew not the man.” Is this what they design teaching? If it is, why, when his Savior looked upon him, did Peter go out and weep bitterly?

Now, if all that a man was, and was possessed of, was born over again, then indeed could he not sin. “Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, because his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.” The unerring testimony does not contradict itself. There we learn, “If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us; if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just, to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” Let me ask, in all sincerity, Does the word of the Lord anywhere say, Except a man’s soul, *or any other part of man*, be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God? Why is the soul, in contradistinction to the other parts of man, selected as that which is said to be born again? Paul considered the soul as likely to contract blame as the body, or the spirit; hence he said, “And I pray God that your whole soul, body and spirit be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.” If the soul be born again, why pray that it be preserved blameless, when the apostle knew full well that it could not contract blame, if indeed it be born again? Allow me to enquire, Did not man sustain that name *before* the Lord God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul? Did not the man exist, according to the divine testimony, *antecedently* to being born of the flesh? Now of what elements was man originally born? The answer is, of the flesh. “Adam begat a son, in his own likeness, after his own image, and called his name Seth.” Was there anything born of the flesh that had not a previous seminal existence in the flesh? If not, the figure is a perfect one. The elements of the sinner are found wholly in the flesh, as emanating from the “first man, who is of the earth earthy.” The elements of saints are found wholly in the divine nature, imparted to him by the “last Adam,” “the Lord from heaven,” “born of God.” The natural progenitor could impart to his offspring none other than the nature he possessed. “As is the earthy, such also are they that are earthy.” The heavenly progenitor could impart none other nature to his offspring than that he possessed. “And as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly.” Paul said, “As he is, even so are we in this world.” He was here with two whole and distinct natures – the human and the divine. His children, “born of God,” are possessed of two whole and distinct natures, neither nature contributing anything essentially to the existence of the other. A part of the divine did not compose “the man Christ Jesus,” neither does a part of our human compose any part of the divine nature, of which “we are made partakers.” The paternity of each, the old and the new man, is radically different as holiness and sin. The old man is “born of the flesh, and is flesh,” the new man is “born of the Spirit, and is spirit.” “A spirit hath not flesh

and bones, as ye see me have,” said Jesus. I have ever conceived that “the corn of wheat, which falls into the ground and dies,” contained within its germ everything, and nothing more, that will spring up and grow out of it. The idea that the soul of the natural man, or any other part of him, is born of the Spirit, in the absence of proof that *that* soul or part existed seminally in the Spirit, is a reversal of the doctrine taught in the Bible, that “every seed will produce his kind.” We do not look for a crop of onions from the potatoes we plant. My flesh, simply considered, without an intelligent principle, is as incapable of sinning as my horse’s flesh. It is true my flesh has life, so has my horse’s flesh life. It is *mind*, or intelligence, which distinguishes beings capable of violating the law from those incapable of contracting guilt from that source. “Sin is the transgression of the law.” “By the law is the knowledge of sin.” “I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.” The disciples of Christ are “not without law to God, but under law to Christ.” Their comfort is, “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.” Yet being under law to their King, what do we hear them exclaim? “I find a law in my members, [are those members devoid of an intelligent principle?] warring against the law of my mind, [what mind? Certainly not the carnal mind, but “the mind of Christ,” which they have,] and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin, which is in my members. O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?” If our carnal mind is “born of God,” worked over, or by any other process made spiritual, how is it that “their mind and conscience is defiled?” If man be “born over again,” by which intelligence assumes altogether a spiritual type, and has cast off the natural, whence the complaints of sinful, wicked, vile and presumptuous thoughts, of which christians so universally complain?

The Bible nowhere teaches that the new birth obliterates or changes the natural birth – that imparting spiritual life destroys the animal life previously had, or that the creating holy desires, imparting appetite for the “bread of life,” or a thirst for the “waters of salvation,” destroys sinful pleasures, proneness to sin, and a thirst for the natural elements which sustain our dying natures, but everywhere teaches the “putting off the old man, which is corrupt according to its deceitful lusts,” practically. “Let your conversation be as becometh the gospel of Christ” – “putting away lying, let every man speak truth with his neighbor.” “Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God.” “This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God, be careful to maintain good works; these things are good and profitable unto men.” But the new man is said to be “born not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.” Now, I ask, was anything born of that incorruptible seed which was not in the germ? Was

the natural seed deposited in Christ? I think brethren will answer each of these questions in the negative. How then can they contend that some part [for I have not met with one who contends that the *entire* Adamic man,] of the old man is born of God? The natural intelligence of man is not changed by the birth of the Spirit. He subsequently, as antecedently to the new birth, investigates natural subjects, arrives at natural conclusions from natural facts disclosed, partakes of natural food and drinks, partakes of the pleasures and pains attendant on our mortal state, and is subject to all the ills to which flesh is heir.

We are told that the views we propagate are too deep and mysterious, if indeed they are true, to be published. I reply, Are they sustained by the record God has given? Is it more inconsistent with the Bible to contend that the “holy seed” had seminal existence in their spiritual Head “from everlasting, or ever the earth was,” than that the natural seed existed seminally in their natural head from his very creation? Is the one proposition more unreasonable or anti-scriptural than the other? Shall we reject either because we cannot fully comprehend it? Let us remember, “Great is the mystery of godliness: God manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory;” and “canst thou by searching find out God?” Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? “Therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not.” Is not the implication irresistible, that if the world had known him, it would have known his brethren? “We have known Jesus Christ after the flesh, but now henceforth know we him no more.” How was the Son of God manifested on earth? As we have just seen, “God was manifest in the flesh.” How are his children made manifest to each other in this world? “They are born of God.” They “show the work of the Spirit, written in their hearts.” They “deny ungodliness, and worldly lusts, and live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world.” “The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him; he will show them his covenant.”

I grant the subject is profoundly mysterious, how two whole and distinct natures dwell in the people of God. Yet it is not more mysterious than how two whole and distinct natures dwelt in their “Elder Brother.” I rejoice to know that there is a great and infallible expounder of the sacred testimony. “But God has revealed them now to us by his spirit, for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God.” “He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you.”

Bother Beebe, I have read my Bible to little profit for the last fifty years, if in the divine economy our God has ordained that a spiritual stock shall grow out of a natural seed or root – that the product shall be essentially different from the seed which produces it, or that beings should spring from the germ of immortality, who had no seminal existence in that germ or immortality.

My views on this important and interesting subject are the result of much reflection and anxiety to have a solution of the mystery within me. After many long months, struggling and toiling to obtain a righteousness in which I could be accepted of God, and finding myself helpless, and almost hopeless of obtaining the divine favor, realizing that “in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing; for to will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good, I find not,” and fully assured that,

“The law’s demand I can’t fulfill,
For I have nought to pay.”

At a time, unexpected to me, I was led to a discovery of the Lord Jesus as “the end of the law for righteousness unto every one that believeth.” For a short space I “rejoiced with joy unspeakable, and full of glory,” and adopted the language,

“All over glorious is my Lord,
Must be beloved and yet adored;
His worth, if all the nations knew,
Sure the whole earth would love him too.”

My joy did not continue long, until I found the “Canaanite is yet in the land.” I soon found I still had a wicked heart and wandering mind, which led me to fear I was deceived. I found too, that vain, foolish and wicked thoughts were still bubbling up within me – was tempted to go to the church and tell them they were deceived in me; that no christian had so wicked and rebellious a nature as mine. And to add to my distress, I occasionally heard from the pulpit that “the new birth changed the soul from the love of sin to the love of holiness.” The sentiment seemed like a dagger to my heart. I felt, if that be true, I am not the subject of the christian religion. But this was not all. I heard it proclaimed from the pulpit, “Regeneration, or the new birth, *slays the enmity of the heart.*” I asked myself, Is the enmity of your heart slain? If so, whence the rebellion you feel at your domestic affliction? I was dumb, concluding the preachers are good men, speaking advisedly, and felt like resigning all hope. My great distress, however, induced me to go to my Bible, and try to pray to God, that I might understand its teachings. After a severe conflict, which lasted some time I read, “When I would do good, evil is present with me.” Who is the speaker? The apostle Paul. Was Paul a christian? O, yes; but you should not take comfort from this. Paul was not so rebellious, so irreconcilable as you. I read on, when I came to this other expression of the same apostle: “The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things

that ye would.” This is Paul’s experience. He is right and the preachers wrong, responded my poor hitherto distressed heart. The more I searched the divine record, the stronger were my convictions that the preachers, who taught the change of heart, by the new or spiritual birth – that the enmity of the heart is slain by that gracious work, were in error. I knew if they were right I was wrong. Strong as was my confidence in their piety, and call to the work of the ministry, I was nevertheless fully convinced they were wrong in this matter. The Bible nowhere, as I read it, taught that the man – the soul, the heart, the mind, the affections, the instincts of the natural man – are changed; but rather that “a new heart and a right spirit;” an entirely new and higher order of life was given, the result of which was new views, new desires, new breathings, new appetites, new employments, new aspirations, of a spiritual, higher and holier character than those belonging to the natural man. That his elder, or old man, “shall serve the younger,” or new man. Now are the saints desirous to “walk in the spirit,” as a result of that holy implantation, to “keep under the body, and bring it into subjection,” to “mortify the deeds of the body,” to “crucify the flesh with the affections and lusts.” I said, forty odd years ago, in trying to preach, “The Lord does not make christians as the hatter sometimes makes hats; namely, take an old hat, work it over, and put a little napping on it, and call it a new hat. That is, God does not take the old sinner, and work him over, and put a little dressing on him, that he may be a new saint.”

Bother Beebe, I have not in forty-eight years found any other system that will, in my judgment, meet my needs. If it be heresy, as charged, I pray God to deliver me from the heresy; but if truth, God grant that we be enabled to proclaim it, though “our names may be cast out as evil.”

I blame not any for differing with us on this subject. If they can enjoy more peace and happiness in contemplating a different theory. God forbid we should endeavor to disturb that peace, further than to proclaim, “The Lord saith,” and be sure that we teach nothing as truth which our God has not sanctioned in his divine word. The conclusion is, then, that instead of any part of the Adamic man being “born of the Spirit,” “a new man created in righteousness and true holiness,” is developed. A spiritual man, “born of the Spirit,” possessed of eternal life, with new or spiritual powers, perceptions and susceptibilities, who is expected to bring the old man into subjection, to control him, keep him under, and thus produce a change of practice, and thus, as a “branch in the true vine,” to “bring forth fruit unto holiness.” “Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit, so shall ye be my disciples.” “Show me your faith without your works, and I will show you my faith by my works.” “As the body without the spirit is dead, even so faith without works is dead also.”

I have thrown together some of my reflections on the subject, which if you think will subserve the cause of truth, and tend to a further consideration of the

doctrine involved, you are at liberty to publish, otherwise throw this communication aside.

As ever, most truly and affectionately your friend and brother in hope of eternal life,

Thomas P. Dudley.

TRYING THE SPIRITS.

Near Lexington, Ky., Dec.19, 1870.

MY DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - The inquiry is frequently made of me, Why do you not write more for the SIGNS OF THE TIMES? I can most truly say, It is not because I feel less interest in its success than formerly. My correspondence has been, and still is pretty extensive, and as I grow older I find my wounded shoulder gives me much more pain from writing than formerly. Hence it is becoming more of a task to write than in my younger days. In addition to which, the correspondents of the SIGNS are becoming more numerous, and I prefer giving way to them, thinking the patrons of the SIGNS may probably be more edified by their communications than from anything I may write. I regret much to see a spirit of intolerance abroad in the land, which tends rather to anything else than to godly edifying. The Bereans of old left an example for modern saints worthy of imitation. "These were nobler than they of Thessalonica, because they searched the scriptures daily, to see whether these things are so."

The church has not yet arrived at her perfect state. "Now we see only in part." Controversy, when guided by the spirit of the gospel, tends to the elucidation of truth. It is not allowable while in the present state of things, that we should engage in factious opposition, or should become piqued, because another has avowed sentiments that we cannot, at the present, comprehend the doctrine taught. We wrong ourselves and others when this spirit is manifested. No prophecy of scripture is subject to any private interpretation. Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. While we dare not claim divine inspiration, yet it is our privilege and duty to "try the spirits, whether they be of God." I have no idea that any member of Christ's mystical body on earth understands the entire volume of God's holy word, and there seems some presumption on the part of Doctor Gill, Henry, Clark, and others, in attempting to give an exposition of the whole. While I am not sure but the church, in the persons of her members, combined, do not comprehend that portion which is "revealed to us and to our children," according to the record given. I think I may say truly that in the last fifty years I have had

dark and mysterious portions opened up to my understanding by God's ministers, and private members of the flock of God.

The apology sometimes offered for objecting to new expositions of the sacred text, that our fathers and Elders, under whose ministry we have feasted on fat things, "marrow and fatness, wine upon the lees, well refined," never advanced such ideas, is wholly inadmissible, unless we are prepared to take the ground that those fathers were divinely inspired. In the latter case we could see no propriety in the caution, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they be of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world." Again, "To the law, and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them." If, indeed, we many times feel that "we need one to teach us which be the first principles of the oracles of God," we should rather be thankful to God that he gave apostles, and prophets, and evangelists, and pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the fulness of the stature of Christ." I reckon our brethren will hardly contend that we have already arrived at that perfect state. If not, do we desire an increase of knowledge of divine things? Where a temperate and christian attempt to elucidate a part of divine truth is made by our brethren, would it not be more consistent with the christian character to "search the scriptures to see if these things be so," rather than become impatient, and disposed to charge an attempt to propagate new things, without satisfying ourselves that the supposed new things are, or are not *true things*? A minister of Christ should be especially cautious that he propagate nothing to the flock that he is not willing should be criticized, and tested by the infallible standard of truth. Unwillingness to submit to such criticism betrays a disposition to be wise above that which is written, or to assume that which we cannot now accord to mortals – infallibility. I have now been a professed teacher in the church of God for more than fifty years, and I think I can say most conscientiously, that I have not desired the church to receive anything from me as gospel, which is not clearly sustained by the word of God. I am fully satisfied that no teaching can profit the church which is in conflict with the testimony borne by the Savior, his prophets and apostles.

May not the restiveness and impatience occasionally manifested by correspondents, have driven from the list some of the ablest writers for the SIGNS? Is not the church likely to suffer in her increase of knowledge from this source?

Whilst we all admit that we are imperfect, what better plan suggests itself to correct our errors in theory or practice, than a free interchange of views on the various points in the christian system? The contrast between truth and error,

whence the exhortation, “That ye should *earnestly contend* for the faith which was once delivered to the saints.”

From our surroundings, I am not authorized to believe that saints on earth are free from the influence of judaizing teachers, or that they are all sound in the faith; and yet we occasionally hear them say, rather impatiently, O, go on and preach, and let other people alone. Is this the spirit of the gospel? Hear an apostle: “Rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith.” Again, “Reprove, rebuke and exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine.” And yet again, “My brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him, let him know that he that converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and hide a multitude of sins.” Shall we heed the importunities of brethren whose sympathies are enlisted in behalf of *weak brethren*, lest they be offended, or obey our Master?

Brother Beebe, you are fully aware of the controversies I have been party to, on the doctrine of justification; the indissoluble union of Christ and the church; and the circular on the “Origin, nature, and effects of the christian warfare,” with several other topics, and yet have I not desired that my views should *prevail*, unless they should be found in strict harmony with the word of God, and I think I can say most sincerely, that so far from being unwilling that those views should be criticized, and brought directly to the Bible and christian experience, which is in harmony with the teachings of the word of God, I have been most anxious that they should be fully tested by the standard, and if found unharmonious therewith, that I might be convinced of the error. Yet, I must say, each and all those papers have met the closest scrutiny, and sometimes seemingly ill-natured comments, and denunciations, I have yet to be convinced that in them, the doctrine which is according to godliness, has not been taught.

You will not have forgotten, brother Beebe, how reluctant I was to publishing the circular on the christian warfare, when I found the pre-conceived views of some of the brethren to be antagonistic to its teachings. I do not now regret its publication, being, as I have no doubt it is, not only my own experience, but the experience of those who have gone before, and who “spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,” as I find on record in the Bible. The unkind throws, the misrepresentations, the perversions, and censures cast upon it, have done their office, in causing the word of God to be read, and as was said on another occasion, “I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.” I most ardently desire its teachings to be tested by the scriptures. To tell me, as many have, Our old preachers, whom we loved, did not preach the doctrine, is no substantial argument against it. Did Paul, and Peter, and James, and the Master, preach it? If so, the doctrine cannot be overturned, and to oppose it is to oppose what every christian finds in his or her own experience.

The Licking Association, composed of fifteen or sixteen churches, scattered over a large territory, are, so far as I know or believe, a *unit* with regard to those points of doctrine, and have expressed not only a willingness, but a desire that those who differ, try them by the standard of faith and practice, and if not true expose them.

But what have our brethren to offer in substitution of those truths expressed in the doctrine taught, and which have so often warmed our hearts and strengthened our hope in a Savior's blood and righteousness? Assured we are that when any shall disprove by the word of God the antagonism existing in every christian's bosom, between the "old man which is corrupt with his deeds," and the "new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness," out of which grows the warfare, we shall not only be prepared to surrender all hope of salvation, but to surrender the Bible as the word of God. If our brethren really think our views so easily confuted, and theirs so easily maintained by the holy oracles of God, are they not remiss in duty by not making the attempt? But, brother Beebe, I occasionally meet brethren who talk very much to the point when they speak of the *effects* which result from being born again; the fightings and strivings which so disturb the peace of God's children; but when enquired of regarding the sources of that antagonism, seem to be entirely in the dark. They insist that some *part* of the old or earthly man is by some process, which they cannot explain, transformed into the "new man," one of the contending parties. I tell them, I have not so learned Christ. I conclude the old man is an entire old man, composed of soul, body and spirit, and bears the image and likeness of his natural father; and the new man is an entire new man, bearing the exact image of his spiritual Father. The old man, being born of the flesh, is flesh. No change in *his nature* by the birth; and the new man, born of the Spirit, is spirit; the birth causing no change in *his nature*.

It would be quite as inconsistent for men to expect to gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles, or that part of the thorn was transformed into the thistle, as that any part of the Adamic man was a component part of the new man. The first man is of the earth, earthy, [soul, body and spirit.] The second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. This doctrine is fully taught by the Savior in the declaration, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit." Let us consider, that according to the laws of nature, nothing will ever be developed from that corn of wheat that has not a *life existence* in the *germ* before it fell into the ground. Hence it is said of the product, First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. The law of nature is carried out, and the seed produces his kind. It is quite as irrational to suppose that Adam could produce, or contribute to the production of a spiritual substance, as to suppose that men will gather a crop of tobacco from corn planted in the spring of the year, or

that a buckeye planted will produce an oak or apple tree. It was quite as necessary that Christ should assume, not “the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham,” that he should be “made like unto his brethren,” “partake of flesh and blood,” “fall into the ground,” that is, be “made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law;” fall into the “body which thou hast prepared me,” which is represented by the ground, and die the just for the unjust, as that he “should ever live to make intercession for us.”

We know that the rough exterior of the grain of corn must necessarily become decomposed or *die*, else the *tender germ* could never *burst through it*. Why all this? Because the adopted children, born of the flesh, were involved in sin and transgression, the law and justice of God holding claims against them, which must be fully met and canceled, or they could not be saved. Hence his whole work, sufferings and death, was for and on behalf of *his people*, who had gone into transgression. Those who have charged us with holding that nothing has been done for the sinner, should be ashamed of their calumny. Hence it is seen that just so long as the *germ* held oneness with the *corn of wheat*, in the figure, after the similitude, just as long as *Christ* has existed, *his people had a living existence* in him.

Brother Beebe, as the weather is too inclement to be out, I thought I would sit down and write you of matters and things in general, with some matters which are very special with christians, on which their hope of everlasting happiness is suspended. The older I grow, and the more I see and hear of the errors, delusions and false ways which are so industriously propagated by men professing to be ministers of Christ, to the subverting and leading astray from the simplicity of the truth, the more I feel like “spending and being spent” in its defense. I cannot perceive that age [although now more than seventy eight years] has at all cooled my ardor in maintaining the truth. With all my weakness, I feel that truth, gospel truth, is a *jewel* worth fighting for.

I learn from a distant brother, with whom I have no personal acquaintance, that a minister, who visited us some years since, when the controversy on the union of Christ and his church, and the circular on the warfare, were being canvassed more than at any other period I have known, and who, at that time, as is well remembered by many brethren, *professed* to be *cordially with us* in sentiment, now is so hostile to me that, learning the brother held correspondence with me, became so incensed that he would not speak to, but “treaded him with silent contempt.” I do not envy him his peace of mind in harboring his enmity against me.

Brother Beebe, a great deal of the preaching we have in these days of darkness and delusion, reminds me of a circumstance which occurred many years since. One of our old and tried sisters said to Elder Corbin, I heard Elder _____ preach the other day. Well, how did you like him, sister? said Elder Corbin. I did not like him

at all, said the sister. But, said Elder C., did he not preach some good things? She replied, He quoted some scripture – that was good. But, said she, brother Corbin, I love *milk*, and if I were to see a *mote*, I could remove it and drink the milk; but if I found a *rat drowned in it*, I could drink none. It was a somewhat homely comparison, but I think a very forcible one. Such, indeed, is the most of the preaching had in our day, it is fouled with a *dead rat*, or something quite as loathsome.

Dispose of this long letter as you think most for the interest of Zion.

Most truly and affectionately your friend and brother,

Thomas P. Dudley.

OLD SCHOOL DISTINCTIVES.

Lexington, Ky., Jan.19, 1871.

MY DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - Strange as it will appear to attentive observers of passing events, some of the opposition to the views of Particular or Old School Baptists are laboring under the hallucination that we have left the ground we have all the while maintained with regard to the great and fundamental truths of the christian religion, and have come over to their views. Whence these dreamless visions, which caused them to lay the flattering unction to their souls, I confess is beyond my comprehension. I am, I presume, as conversant with the views of Old School Baptists as anyone of that order, except yourself, and am utterly at a loss to conjecture how any *sane man* can have imbibed that opinion. Our views are known east and west, north and south, and I have yet to learn that one individual Old School Baptist, who *is one indeed*, or has been recognized as one in our ranks, has gone over to the *opposition*. If we have not written or dwelt as much on the distinguishing traits of character which have distinguished Old School Baptists from the new theories, it is not because we have any misgivings with regard to the truth of the doctrine, but because none of the *puerile* attempts to successfully controvert it have presented any scriptural argument to controvert the doctrine. Have they found one who denies the unity in the Godhead; the personal relation of the “three that bear record in heaven?” The eternal, underived, unbegotten, essential deity of the Lord Jesus Christ? His incarnation and assumption of the nature of his chosen people, in order to their redemption and deliverance from the curse of the violated law? The actual union between Christ and his chosen people, which gives sanction and validity to his work in their

behalf, as Shepherd for his sheep, as Husband for his bride, as Head for the members of his body, the church? Nor yet have I heard of an Old School Baptist who denies the necessity of the new or spiritual birth, in order to see the kingdom of God, or that “that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.”

It is true that we deny that any part of the Adamic or natural man is made spiritual by the new birth; but that the old man is controlled in his life and conversation by the inward or spiritual man. Nor have we contented that nothing has been done for the old or Adamic man. On the contrary, we maintain that what the Lord Jesus did, by his life, sufferings and death, was for and on the behalf of the old man, the sinner, and that these vile bodies shall be changed and fashioned like unto his glorious body, and that every member of his mystical body shall be brought to participate in the heavenly glory.

Moreover, we maintain that every member of each, the natural and the spiritual family, shall be developed, wearing the image or likeness of his progenitor. We maintain that the entire natural family, who were created in the earthly Adam, will be developed by natural generation, or being born of the flesh; and the entire spiritual family, created in the last Adam, will be developed by the new or spiritual birth, as “heirs of God, and joint heirs with the Lord Jesus Christ.”

In what then, have we changed or gone over to their ground? The charge then, that we have gone over to their ground is a strange hallucination of the brain. If then, they who have formerly been numbered with Old School Baptists have seen their error, and are prepared to confess their fault, and return from their wandering, I know of no reason why we should not restore to fellowship; but until this is done, I am entirely certain that nothing can be gained to the cause of truth and godliness by *professed* union and fellowship. We have nothing to surrender, no compromise to make with error. Better remain as we are, than bring in the uncircumcised or *bewitched* into the congregation of the Lord. We now enjoy sweet peace, union and fellowship; let us be content to abide alone and suffer the reproach, rather than to dishonor the Lord. Let us admit none to our communion who fail to give evidence that they are fully with us.

As ever, most truly and affectionately, your friend and brother in hope of eternal life,

Thomas P. Dudley.

THE IMAGE OF GOD.

Lexington, Ky., March 24, 1871.

MY DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - The sixth number of the current volume of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES came to hand a day or two since, in which I have read attentively a communication from Elder John A. Thompson, of Lebanon, Ohio, offering a criticism on some things contained in my letter published in the number for the first of February. I take no exception whatever to the *spirit* of that letter, however much we may be found to differ on the points criticized. I fully accord to brother Thompson, and to all other brethren, the right to criticize anything I may have written, or may write for the *eye* of my brethren, on the subject of the religion of Christ. I desire however that they shall show wherein I have *misinterpreted* or *misapplied* any portion of the divine record. The circular on the Christian Warfare has now been the subject of criticism, sometimes severe, since its publication, more than twenty years, and more than three thousand copies have been printed and circulated among the brethren. I should be gratified that those who attempt to criticize its teachings would specify what in it is antagonistical to the doctrine of the Bible. I am fully conscious of my own imperfections, and liability to err, and am anxious, if in error, to learn the *better way*. I am now too old, and it would require too much labor to re-write all that I have written on that, to me, deeply interesting and, as I conceive, important subject.

Brother Thompson has not now to learn that the first Adam was composed of *soul, body* and *spirit*, and that the *soul* is generally conceded to be the seat of intelligence, which distinguishes man from the rest of the creation, possessed of *animal life*, and that it is this intelligence which renders man the subject of law, and responsible to God.

“And God said, Let us make man *in our own image*, after our likeness.” Brother Thompson and I shall not differ in opinion that the likeness spoken of is the likeness of “God manifest in the flesh.” Nor yet shall we differ in regard to what is said of the creature man. “In the likeness of God made he him; *male and female created he them*, and blessed them, and called *their name* Adam, in the day when they were created.” Gen.5:2,3. Nor yet shall we disagree in regard to the declaration, “And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.” Christ, the anti-type of Adam, was possessed of *soul and body*. Hence it is said, “When thou shalt make his *soul* an offering for sin.” My *soul* is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.” Again, “Who his own self bare our sins in his own *body* on the tree.” With regard to the earthly or old man, it is said, “For the redemption of their *soul* is precious, and it ceaseth forever.” Psalm 49:8. “For the word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of *soul* and *spirit*, and of the *joints* and *marrow*, and is a discerner of the

thoughts and intents of the heart.” Heb.4:12. With regard to the spirit of man, Paul said, “For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the *spirit of man* which is in him?” I Cor.2:11. Brother Thompson will not require more proof that the earthly Adam was composed of soul, body and spirit. If however he desires more, please read the following: “Abstain from all appearance of evil, and the very God of peace *sanctify you wholly*; and I pray God your whole *spirit, and soul and body* be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will do it.” I Thes.5:23,24. From the last quotation we learn, first, that Paul’s brethren to whom he wrote were partakers, or composed of body, soul and spirit; and secondly that neither their spirit, soul or body was born of God. Each was liable to contract blame, which the apostle John will not allow *as possible*. “Whosoever is born of God *doth not commit sin*; for his seed remaineth in him; and *he cannot sin, because he is born of God*.” I John 3:9.

Allow me to call brother Thompson’s attention to the text, “And Adam lived one hundred and thirty years, and *begat a son in his own likeness, after his own image, and called his name Seth*.” Gen.5:3. Brother Thompson will excuse me for my obtuseness in comprehending how “our corrupt lusts or sinful propensities” could *beget the old man*, or from whence the old man derived his being, if not from the earthly Adam. But the apostle abundantly sustains my declaration, to which brother Thompson objects, and which he concludes is indefensible, the Bible being the guide, namely: “I conclude the old man is an entire old man, composed of soul, body, and spirit, and bears the image of his natural father.” He adds, “Brother Dudley, will you be so kind as to tell us why you conclude thus?” It gives me pleasure to inform brother Thompson how my mind is irresistibly brought to the conclusion. First, I have already quoted that Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image, and I now offer additional and, as I think, irrefragable proof. “And so it is written, The first man Adam *was made* a living soul; the last Adam *was made* a quickening Spirit. How be it, that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man *is* of the earth, *earthy*; the second man is the Lord from heaven. AS IS THE EARTHY, SUCH ARE THEY ALSO THAT ARE EARTHY. And *as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly*. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.” I Cor.15:45-49. Could language be more emphatic to establish the character of the children of each, the first and last Adam? Brother Thompson has wholly misapprehended my meaning in regard to the *buckeye*. It was designed, in part, as illustrating the text, “Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit.” Brother T. will not deny, I apprehend, that everything that will spring from or grow out of the corn of wheat had a life existence in the germ, or that every seed will, according to the word of God, produce its kind. If I comprehend brother

Thompson, he denies that the old man is the son of the first Adam. He seems to make him a sort of non-descript, or automation, destitute of mind, will, or anything pertaining to a living intelligent being. And yet we see the old man living, moving, eating, drinking, trading, &c. If the old man is not a living, conscious, intelligent being; whence do we find so many warnings and cautions against him? Although the old man, who so much annoys, harasses and distresses the christian, or new man, is “dead to the law by the body of Christ,” yet will he not cease to war until he shall fall a prey to death *temporal*.

Brother Beebe, I have wondered that brethren seem so much *excited* when we speak of the “old man” and the “new man,” as the antagonistic parties to the christian warfare. I have been told, “If you will call them *two principles*, we will not object. But we will not have your *two men*.” I tell them, I only characterize them as the apostle did. He tells us, “The *old man is corrupt* with his deeds.” “The old man is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts.” He furthermore tells us, “The new man, after God, is *created* in righteousness and true holiness.” Again, “I delight in the law of God after the *inward man*.” And yet again, “But though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day.”

Let us, dear brethren, ask ourselves, Is it more mysterious that two men should dwell in our earthly tabernacle, than that two nations should be in Rebekah’s womb, and that two manner of people should be separated from her bowels, and that one people should be stronger than the other people, and the elder shall serve the younger? See Gen.25:23. Or that Solomon should see in the Shulamite as it were a company of TWO ARMIES? And remember that “As then, he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now.” Gal.4:29.

We said in a document published more than twenty years since, “Where brethren agree that salvation is of the Lord, and wholly of grace, and that the warfare follows being born again, our fellowship for them has not been interrupted though they use a different mode of expressing themselves; and we think it rather uncharitable *in them* to withdraw fellowship from us because of our manner of illustrating the subject.”

Brother Beebe, we are told that history repeats itself. As part of the current history of the times, I propose introducing a piece of that history, which I do not suppose brother Thompson will fail to remember. Many years since, and after the Circular on the Warfare, in which is necessarily involved the doctrine of union of Christ and the church, had been printed, and extensively circulated, I received a letter from the late Elder McQuary, of Indiana, than whom I do not think I have ever known a truer friend, or more faithful minister of Christ, informing me that I had been greatly misrepresented, and the author of the mis-representations had found an *endorser*, who had weight of character, or influence among the Baptists,

and that several Old Baptists who had heard me preach, and said if they had ever heard the truth preached, they heard it from me, but from what was reported of me they felt embarrassed. Now, said brother McQuary, brother Dudley, I very much desire that you shall attend the approaching session of Conn's Creek Association, which is to meet, I think he said, with Conn's Creek Church, in his immediate neighborhood, and that he would meet me at Edinburg, Ind., with conveyance. I responded that I would, unless providentially hindered, be at Edinburg on the certain day named, on the morning train. Brother McQuary met and conveyed me to his house, where I remained from Wednesday afternoon until Friday morning following, during which time not one word passed between us on the subject of his letter. On Friday morning we went to the association, and while standing in company with Elders Wilson Thompson, John F. Johnson, Nay, Jackson, who had not then been ordained, John A. Thompson, with several other ministers, whose names I do not now remember. Brother McQuary passed and touched me on the shoulder, saying, Brother Dudley, you have got to preach the introductory. I turned my head and replied, Go and preach your own introductory. Brother Wilson Thompson said in his familiar way, When old Mack gives an order he intends being obeyed. We went on the stand, and I determined within myself, if I can find language plain enough to make myself understood, a future misrepresentation should be *willful*. I took up my subject, embracing the points about which I had been so often and so grossly misrepresented, and after discussing the subject for perhaps from forty minutes to an hour, a brother in the congregation cried out aloud, If that man is a heretic, so am I. He was responded to by another in a different part of the congregation, So am I. Yes, said brother Wilson Thompson, brethren, if that is heresy, we are all heretics. As you may suppose, those exclamations produced considerable excitement in the congregation. The introductory being concluded, Elder John A. Thompson was requested to occupy the stand, who in his introductory remarks was understood to say, I heard brother Dudley once before, and then said, If I ever heard the gospel preached, brother Dudley preached it. Since then I took a pretty extensive tour in Kentucky, when I heard many things said against brother Dudley, but it was among his *enemies*. He then endorsed most fully and feelingly what I preached on that occasion.

When it is remembered that I had been reported far and near as guilty of the "worst kind of heresy," and fellowship publicly withdrawn from me in various quarters, you will not wonder that being *endorsed* by so large and intelligent an assembly of brethren made an impression on my mind not easily to be erased.

Brother John A. Thompson may have misapprehended me, or he may have had different reasons since to change his opinion. In either case I attach no blame to him.

In the year 1852 I visited the Scioto and Muskingom Associations, and there found that the charge of heresy had preceded me. The brethren of each association, at each of which I preached several times, were very kind, and I had the satisfaction to know that, *heretic* as I had been charged with being, the body of each association cordially received what I preached, and invited me to visit them again.

In the year 1860 I had a long tour in Missouri, extending from St. Joseph down the Missouri River to St. Charles, preaching some twenty times, to large congregations, with every evidence I could ask that the doctrine was cordially received generally, although I had been published as a heretic in several places I visited. I also attended the White Water and Lebanon Associations, in Indiana, and Okaw, in Illinois, and at each I preached several times, and had assurances that the doctrine was received. Less than four years ago I attended Red River Association, in Tennessee, which had discontinued correspondence with us many years since, because of my *reported* heresy; but upon hearing me for themselves, assured me that the doctrine I preached was what they believed, and their belief that I had been slandered. In addition to all these cases, two associations in this state, which had discontinued correspondence for the same assured cause, came back with full acknowledgments, and were cordially received into correspondence again.

Taking into view the foregoing facts, combined with the additional one that I had been preaching the same doctrine for more than twenty years before I wrote the circular, without hearing the first exception taken to the doctrine, and you, brother Beebe, will perceive how fully you are sustained in the following remarks in the last number of the SIGNS: “And we firmly believe that much mischief and mystification have already resulted from the attempts of some overmuch wise and confident expositors attempting to interpret his meaning.” Nor are you more mistaken in saying, “And if we have not altogether failed to understand him, it is the consciousness of the depravity of his own fleshly nature that has led him to express his views upon this very subject of the conflicting elements which are found in all the children of God while here in the flesh.”

Brother Beebe, since I commenced writing, the PRIMITIVE BAPTIST came to my address, in which I find my letter copied from the SIGNS of the 1st of February last, with a number of comments by the editor. The spirit of those remarks comes kind and brotherly as one could ask. Elder Temple asks me to tell him what the soul of man is. I was asked the same question more than twenty years since, by those who denounced me as an heretic, because I could not conscientiously say I believed that the *soul literally* was regenerated and born again, and *resurrected and become the new man*. I then answered, as I now answer Elder Temple, I most frankly confess that I am so ignorant that I am utterly incapable of defining that mysterious indefinable something, called the soul; but if they, or he, will tell me

what the soul is, as they certainly ought to do, since they insist that it is regenerated and born again, I will then tell them whether or not I think it is born again.

Elder Temple has given me a new idea, however. He tells me, "The dust of the ground fashioned into a man, and the breath of life, as it was afterwards breathed into his nostrils, is the new man." If I comprehend him, I confess the idea is too obtuse for my comprehension, and he must excuse my ignorance. Especially as I have all the while contended that neither soul nor body of the redeemed can go to hell, but are destined to undergo a mysterious and glorious change, by which they will be assimilated into the likeness of the soul and body of the Lord Jesus, and reign in eternal bliss. Very soon after I entertained a hope in Christ, and was received into the fellowship of the church, I was thrown into the deepest distress on hearing a minister declare from the pulpit that in the new birth, "the soul, or the man, is changed from the love of sin to the love of holiness." I asked myself the question, If there be nothing in you which loves sin, why are you so full of it? Why do you see daily in yourself so much of it? It is true that I hated it, but still vain, foolish and presumptuous thoughts would rise up within me. Again, I asked myself, Is the enmity of your heart slain? If so, whence all that rebellion and rising up against your domestic affliction, to such an extent that, had you the power, you would roll it back? I felt as though I was ready to surrender all hope, when Paul's experience came to my relief; "When I would do good, evil is present with me." And, "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." I felt that my nature was no better, and that such was Paul's case. But there was something in me that did not proceed from nature, which could be satisfied with nothing short of perfect holiness. The flesh, or fleshly man, [for really I could not conceive how my *flesh*, independently of a *living, acting* principle, would rebel against God] was yet sinful. I could not believe it was at all improved, or was any better than when I expected to be banished from the presence of God. I trust that I felt within me another intelligent somebody, who delighted in the law of God, and rejoiced to hear the brethren talk of the goodness of God and glory of Christ. My conclusion was, If the man is changed from the love of sin to the love of holiness, he would be as entirely devoted to holiness after, as he had been to sin before, especially as the change was wrought by God; and the Bible declares, "He is the Rock; his work is perfect."

Brother Beebe, I have rested satisfied with the theory I then embraced, for over fifty years, and nothing I have yet heard has shaken that confidence. If I am in error in the premises, I pray God to deliver me from the error.

I sincerely hope I may not again feel called upon to publicly investigate this subject. If what I have already written has failed to satisfy brethren, I despair doing so.

In conclusion, if it will afford any comfort to the brethren, I will close in the language of Paul, “But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets.”

Affectionately, your friend and brother,

Thomas P. Dudley.

OLD MAN – NEW MAN.

Lexington, Ky., May 25, 1871.

MY DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - I have read attentively the kind and affectionate letter of Elder John A. Thompson, of Lebanon, Ohio, published in number eleven of the current volume of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, and brother Thompson will pardon my obtuseness in not perceiving wherein he has shaken the position taken in my answer to his former communication, in which I represent the earthly Adam as the old man to whom Paul alludes as one of the antagonist parties of the christian warfare.

If I were as entirely confident of interest in the atoning blood and righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ, as I am that the earthly, fallen and depraved Adam, is the old man, I do not think I should entertain a doubt of reaching the heavenly glory.

I find no where in the Bible, the idea taught, of *three men*, in the disciple of Christ, and yet brother Thompson’s theory presents *three*. First, the first man Adam [who] is of the earth earthy; Second, the second man, is the Lord from heaven, and Thirdly, brother Thompson’s old man: “Sin and Lust.” He tells us “I have not wished to build my views upon inference, because to me inference proves nothing. Now I ask brother Thompson, in all candor, Does the Bible anywhere in its sacred pages say that sin and lust is the old man? What then is his assertion based upon but inference? But this is not the only objection I have to his theory; he would seem to represent the earthly Adam as a mere *myth*, and entirely to absolve him from any participation in the christian warfare, and entirely irresponsible for all the opposition and rebellion against God, which is found in the old man, and to hold sin and lust, *his old man*, alone responsible. Will he be kind enough to inform us how he will have sin and lust punished, otherwise than in the living, conscious, responsible earthly Adam?

Was the law given to sin and lust, or to the *man* whom the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground, and into whom he breathed the breath of life, and man

became a living soul? Was it to sin and lust the Lord said, "For in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die?" Or, "The soul that sinneth it shall die?" Sin and lust composed no part of the *man* to whom the law was given; it was brought forth in the original transgression, which brought death and all woes upon us. "When lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin, and sin when it is finished, bringeth death." "Lo this only have I found, that God made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions." Eccl.7:29. *Man* then is the guilty party, and sin and lust, that which exposed him to the curse of a violated law. "Sin is the transgression of the law." I cannot be mistaken in these views, and I think brother Thompson and all other intelligent christians, upon mature reflection, will say, they are in strict harmony with the record God has given.

Now if I understand the teachings of my Bible, sin is the cause, and death the effect of transgression, and by them *Man* procured the curse of the law.

My flesh is as incapable of violating the law independently of an intelligent principle, as my horse's flesh. An idiot, or insane person, is altogether incapable of violating the laws of the land, and incurring the penalty; because of the absence of mind, reason or sense, none of which are known to exist in brother Thompson's *old man*. When the Bible speaks of *man*, I do not understand a *myth* to be intended, but one who is possessed of mind, will, action and determination. Hence it is said, "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, was in the transgression." Adam, knowingly, wittingly and wilfully transgressed the law and incurred the penalty. It certainly cannot be necessary that I should labor this point further.

If however, brother Thompson desires more proof to sustain my position, I invite him to a close and critical examination of the following: "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Ye shall know them by their fruits. Even so every *good tree* bringeth forth *good fruit*, but a *corrupt tree* bringeth forth *evil fruit*. Make the *tree good*, and his *fruit* shall be good, or make the *tree corrupt* and his fruit shall *be corrupt*." Brother Thompson would make active principle, a corrupt fruit to exist, irrespective of a *corrupt tree which bears it*, and thus transposes the Bible order of things. We do not expect to make the tree better or worse by *tampering with the fruit*. If we desire good fruit, we go directly to work with the tree. Again the Savior says: "A *good man*, out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth *good things*, and an *evil man*, out of the evil treasure bringeth forth *evil things*." The *evil man* is the guilty party, and his guilt is established by the evil things; his sin, lust, &c., which he brings forth, or discloses. The law was given to rational, intelligent beings, as a test of their obedience. The gospel is addressed to the subjects of Christ's spiritual reign, to whom it is said appropriately: "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him." Col.2:6. Again: "The night is far spent, and the day is at hand; let us

therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light. Let us walk honestly as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness; not in chambering and wantonness; not in strife and envying, but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the flesh to fulfill the lusts thereof." Rom.13:12-14. Again: "For as many as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." Gal.3:27. Now I feel confident brother Thompson on reflection will admit this putting on, and putting off, is not literal, but figurative. As ye have put on Christ by profession, you should engage practically in the performance of those duties which exemplifies your high calling; namely, that "Ye should be followers of God as dear children, and walk in love, even as Christ hath also loved us, and given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savor." Prove your faith by your works.

If I am right in the foregoing exposition of putting off, and putting on, as I am confident I am, then those other passages to which brother Thompson has referred, are susceptible of easy, natural and scriptural solution. Now after the same manner, we are exhorted to put off the old man, we are commanded to put on the new man. "That ye put off concerning the former conversation, the old man, which is corrupt, according to the deceitful lusts, and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbor, for we are members one of another. Be ye angry and sin not; let not the sun go down upon your wrath; neither give place to the devil. Let him that stole, steal no more; but rather let him labour; working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth."

We see the apostle draws the distinction between the old man and his deeds, while brother Thompson confounds them; the evil deeds the work of an evil agent. Paul said, "Knowing this that our old man is crucified, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that hence forth we should not serve sin." The apostle does not say our sins and lusts are crucified, but our old man. It would seem superfluous to prosecute this subject further. It does seem to me so plain that I am not exhorted to *put off my natural body, or man, literally*, but the erroneous, or sinful practices, affections, passions and propensities; which proceed from the old man, and are the fruits of the flesh, or fleshly man; and exhorted to put on, practically, that new man, and to exhibit the fruits of the Spirit, which are "love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, meekness, faith, temperance, against such there is no law;" and that we are exhorted to add to our faith, "virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity; for if these things be in you and abound, they make you that you shall be neither barren nor

unfruitful in the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ,” that I feel some surprise that any should doubt.

I cannot suppose that brother Thompson anticipates that his old man, sin and lust, will be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God; and yet I look forward with pleasing anticipations to a period when “this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality.” When I shall see Jesus and be like him, for [I hope] to see him as he is.

But brother Thompson quotes from my former letter: “You say brother Dudley, that the old man, harasses the saint; I say so too, but brother, do you want to loose your body.” I answer that I most ardently desire to “keep under my body, and to bring it into subjection.” – to cast off the works of darkness; the works of the old corrupt Adamic man, with whom I have so often to grapple, and over whom the Lord Jesus will ere long give me the victory.

Brother Beebe, I should perhaps offer an apology for drawing so largely upon your columns, but I felt that brother Thompson’s letter called for a response at my hands, and I desired to make it so full and explicit, that no further explanation shall be needed.

I am as ever, most truly and affectionately your friend and brother in hope of the life which now is, and of that which is to come,

Thomas P. Dudley.

THE MEDIATORIAL WORK OF CHRIST.

Lexington, Ky., Feb. 29, 1872.

DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - I have reflected much on the *crude* and *undigested notions* of almost, if not altogether, the religious world, so-called, excepting Particular, or Old School Baptists, with regard to the mediatorial work of the Lord Jesus Christ, and am constrained to acknowledge, that, if those notions comport with the teachings of Christ, and his apostles, and prophets, I have wholly mistaken them.

It will be conceded that all laws, whether human or divine, are quite as much designed to *protect the innocent as to punish the guilty*, we learn from the divine word that Christ was “holy, harmless and undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens.” Heb.7:26. Again, “Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.” I Pet.2:22. We furthermore learn that, “He that *justifieth*

the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination to the Lord.” Prov.17:15.

Having regard to the character of Christ, and the immutable justice of God, a momentous question is presented for our solution, where is the justice, and what the propriety of the following declaration: “Who was delivered for our offences; and was raised again for *our* justification?” Rom.4:25. Again, “Who his own self bare *our* sins in his own body on the tree, that *we*, being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes *ye are healed?*” I Pet.2:24. I know of no provision of law whereby an innocent person can be made to suffer the penalty annexed to transgression, though he will do it willingly, and the guilty party, is exempt from punishment. And why is it so? Because the law imposes the penalty on the *transgressor*, and *not on the innocent party*. “Sin is the transgression of the law.” I John 3:4. Now we know that what things the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.” Rom.3:19. “For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.” Rom.3:23. If it be asked, when and where all have sinned; allow the apostle Paul to answer, “Wherefore, as by one man, sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” Rom.5:12. Hence we learn that the violation of the law by one man, was *fatal to all* who sustained vital oneness to and with him. Having shown that all those who were *vitally* united to the earthly Adam, were directly and fatally effected by the original transgression, which brought death and all our woes upon us; and he, the earthly Adam, being “the figure of him that was to come,” that he, the first Adam, was the embodiment of all of his natural family. I now propose showing that the Lord Jesus was the embodiment of *all his spiritual family*, and that by virtue of his union or oneness with his family *they*, and *they only*, derive the blessings resulting from his mediation on their behalf. The Psalmist informs us that, “He that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty.” Psalm 91:1. Again, “Lord, thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth, and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting thou art God.” Psalm 90:1,2. And yet again, “For *we* are his workmanship, *created in Christ Jesus* unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.” Eph.2:10. Once more, “Who hath saved *us* and called us with a holy calling, *not according to our works*, but according to *his own purpose and grace*, which was given *us in Christ Jesus before the world began.*” II Tim.1:9.

I presume it will not be denied, that *imputation invariably follows relation*. There could be no justice in imputing the transgression of *Tom to Gilbert*, and holding the latter responsible in the absence of legal union, or relation.

If I mistake not, the record God has given is that; Christ sustained relation to his church, *as shepherd, husband, and head*, “ere sin was born, or Adam’s dust was fashioned to a man.” Now, when a flock of sheep commit a trespass, by which damages are incurred, I have never heard of a case in our jurisprudence where the sheep have appeared in court as *defendants* in action for trespass. The action is maintained against the shepherd. Hence we hear it said, “Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts; smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered, and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones,” Zech.13:7; again, “I am the good shepherd, and know my *sheep*, and am known of *mine*. As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father; and *I lay down my life for the sheep*,” John 10:14-15; and yet again, “And *other sheep* I have which are not of this fold; them also I *must bring*, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd.” John 10:16.

We know that an action for debt brought against a wife in her own name cannot be maintained, while she has a living husband. But if brought against the husband, although he may not, in his own person, have contracted a farthing of the debt, yet, if the claim be just, is he holden responsible for payment. The prophets said, “For thy maker is thy husband; the Lord of hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; the God of the whole earth shall he be called.” Isa.54:5. The relation of husband *invests* him with the right of redemption. Again, “Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word. That he might present *it* to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without a blemish. So ought men to love their wives, as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife, loveth himself. For no man ever hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church. For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery; but I speak concerning Christ and the church.” Eph.5:25-32.

I will present one more bible figure, and am done with this part of the subject. We know that the life of the sheep is not forfeited by transgression or trespass, although the shepherd has to pay damages, and that the life of the wife is not forfeited by negotiating a civil contract, but the husband is held for payment; but the life of the body is forfeited by the commission of a *capital offence*. “Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.” I Cor.12:27. Again, “Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh, for *his body’s sake, which is the church*.” Col.1:24. Now for the Headship of Christ: “And gave him to *be the head over all things* to the church, which is *his body*, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.” Eph.1:22,23. “And he is

the *head of the body*, the church; who is the beginning, the first born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence.” Col.1:18. Sustaining the relation of *head* to his people, when they violated the divine law, it demanded his life as the forfeiture. Hence it is recorded of him, “For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit.” I Pet.3:18. Again, “Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver *them*, who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham, wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren; that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted.” Heb.2:14-18. Thus it is seen that not only *legal*, but *vital* union, or oneness, is indispensable to make the work of the Lord Jesus, available on behalf of his chosen people.

In the year 1852 I attended the Scioto Association, Ohio, and by request, preached the introductory discourse. I was also chosen to preach the first discourse on the following day. Just before I arose, a ministering brother said, “Do you know that _____ has been endeavoring to make the impression on the congregation, that you had said the *eternal life of the church died, when Christ died on Calvary*, and that you had furthermore said, *the children of God existed in flesh, and blood, and bones, before the foundation of the world?*” I replied, I had not heard any such thing of such charges before. After opening worship, I called the attention of the congregation to the charges, the preacher who made them being present. I asked what greater absurdity could be presented to the mind of intelligent persons than that eternal life died? The earthly Adam was not possessed of eternal life when the law was given; and consequently could not forfeit that of which he was not possessed, and proceeded to say, if you will tell me what life man had when the law was given him; I will tell you assuredly what life it was that died because of transgression. We should not forget that “God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul.” Eternal life is given in quite another Head. “And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.” I John 5:11. I maintained that the second charge was alike preposterous. That according to the charge, we should have the children partakers of flesh and blood four thousand years before their father. I, however, maintained that the children of God had a *seminal* existence in the Lord Jesus as a *seed* before the world began. I had the satisfaction of believing, from the demonstrations made, that the

congregation generally understood me and received the doctrine. The preacher who misrepresented me neither offered any explanation or apology.

Brother Beebe, the foregoing pages are submitted to your judgment and discretion. As ever, most truly and affectionately, your friend and brother in hope of life eternal,

Thomas P. Dudley.

P.S. – Brother Beebe, I have endeavored, and I think, proven conclusively, that oneness or union gave validity to Christ’s offering as shepherd for his sheep; as husband for his bride, and as head for the body, and all the members. I may be allowed to say, hateful as the doctrine of eternal union or oneness of Christ and his church seems to be to a large majority of professors of the religion of Christ, destroy this *main pillar* in the Christian system, and I am left entirely without hope of the “better resurrection.”

T.P.D.

MISSIONISM.

Lexington, Ky., March 27, 1873.

To the Editor of the Western Recorder:

My attention has been called to a series of articles over the signature of “Old Flint,” published in your paper, the first, of date Feb.1st, the second, Feb.22nd, and the third, March 1st, in all of which he labors hard to establish his claims to the title of Old School Baptist. He is not possibly aware that the old flint lock was found unreliable in warlike contests; that it has been very generally superceded by the percussion cap. He may yet learn that it is equally unreliable in contests of a different character, especially when brought in contact with that harder material which is announced on very high authority; “Is not my word like as a fire, saith the Lord, and like a hammer that breaketh a rock in pieces.” Jer.33:29. I have shown in a former communication that the commission given by the Lord Jesus is silent as death on the subject of Missionary, Bible, Tract and Temperance societies, and Sunday Schools, with all the modern inventions originated by men as aids in

evangelizing the world; and that the teachings of his inspired apostles are equally silent; furthermore, that the London and Philadelphia Baptist Confessions of Faith urge no duty on the church to rear and sustain those inventions. So far from it, the Confession of Faith assumes and insists that the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the word of God, and the only certain and infallible rule of faith and practice; that they contain “everything for us to know, believe, or do in the service of God.” Is he prepared to ignore the preaching of Christ and his apostles? If not, why seek to make additions? He has set out with false assumptions and seems determined to adhere to them. Has he read in the divine record that, “everything that a man hath will be given for his life, skin for skin?” Whether he has read it or not, he seems determined to carry out the principle. He reminds me forcibly of the witness who shored the horse was seventeen feet high.” The counsel attempted to correct him by saying seventeen hands. The witness replied, “Did I say feet?” “Yes,” said the counsel. “Then,” said the witness, “I stick to it.”

“Old Flint” insists that the pioneers to the dark and bloody ground were missionaries. I have already shown in a former communication that the only attempt to introduce missions and missionary societies in the Elkhorn Association, previous to the year 1808, when the Association split, fell still born. I will now show the action taken by Licking Association, of which were members the following pioneers who did not wait to contract with a missionary board for a stipulated salary, but labored faithfully in the gospel of Christ, and were as eminently useful as the best of the “Old Flint’s” missionaries, with their stated salaries, namely; Ambrose Dudley, Corbin, Redding, Price, Bainbridge, and perhaps Barrow. Here is an extract from the Licking Association in 1814: “Monday, 5b – Letter from Elder Luther Rice, respecting missionary business, called for and read. Agreed to send brother Rice a friendly letter and return to him the money for the pamphlet that he sent us; but we do not join in the missionary business in its present form.” Who are we to believe, “Old Flint,” or the messengers from eighteen churches composing the Licking Association? Assuredly the latter. He seems to belong to that class of whom the apostle speaks: “Desiring to be teachers of the law, understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.” He seems to be very shy of the “hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces.” Hence you do not hear him speak of Jesus, Peter, John, Paul, Jude, Timothy or Titus, as missionaries advocating the modern inventions of men for the purpose of evangelizing the world; but rather of those “pioneers” who did not profess apostolic inspiration. Suppose for argument that those pioneers advanced what we believe to be error, would he have subsequent ministers to follow in the propagation of such error? He seems to have become desperate in the fear that he will be unable to rob the name of “Old School” from those to whom it legitimately belongs, and from his hiding place makes personal attacks on Elder Johnson and

myself. He would seem to belong to that tribe of whom we read in the Bible, who said, "We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel, only let us be called by thy name to take away our reproach." We shall presently learn his success. The charge that I deny the doctrine of the Regeneration and the New Birth, will be pronounced by thousands of honest, truthful Baptists, in and out of Kentucky, who are acquainted with my religious views, an unmitigated slander; in that number I include many intelligent Baptists of Elkhorn Association. What, suppose you, the churches at Elizabeth, at Bryans, Bourbon county, at Mount Carmel, Clark county, and at Georgetown, Scott county, where I have preached regularly for the last fifty-two years, will say to the charge? They will at once say that the charge proceeded from a disordered intellect, or else from a calumniator.

His endeavor to make the impression that the doctrine we maintain now is not that which was taught in 1786 and instances the doctrine of the eternal union of Christ and his church as taught by Elder J.F. Johnson and myself. He, with all his hosts, cannot successfully controvert that or any other doctrine we maintain. Let it be remembered that in the purer and better days of Elkhorn, and before Elder Luther Rice and others *drugged to intoxication* that association with the poison of missionism, she adopted and printed in her minutes of 1796, a circular written by the late Elder John Gano, [one of the pioneers,] on the "unity of Christ and his church," in which he maintained substantially the doctrine we maintain. The Confession of Faith maintains it; and above all, it is the doctrine of the Bible.

But he says, "those claiming to be" Old School Baptists, deny the universality of the gospel; or that the gospel should be preached to all men. I know not what he means. If he means that we do not preach the gospel to the comprehension of the unregenerate, I plead guilty. My Bible teaches me it is the gospel of the kingdom; that it is hid from the wise and prudent, and revealed unto babes; "that it is to the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, it is the power of God and the wisdom of God." I give the practice of the Savior, whom I desire to follow, "For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified, are all of one, for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, I will declare their name unto my brethren; in the midst of the church will I sing praises unto thee; again, I will put my trust in him; and again, behold I and the children thou hast given me." Heb.2:11,12. I will dismiss "Old Flint's" third number, notice of which is not appropriate just now.

"Old Flint" invites attention to the history of Licking association, showing her decline in numbers rather exultingly, and would seem to indicate, as the cause of that decline, her opposition to missionary societies and their kindred institutions. That decline is owing to several causes. Death has removed very many in half of century, removal from the vicinity of a number more, want of ministerial aid, perhaps some others. The candle stick has been removed from several localities.

But thank God, those who remain are of one heart and one judgment, as is confidently believed, having sweet union, love and christian fellowship. If there is one dissenter I do not know it. Such union, harmony and sweet fellowship as many who are not of our body, in our own and other States, who have visited our associational meetings, proclaim they have never seen in any other body of the same size. It is most true that we do not boast of what we have done, are now doing, and intend doing for the Lord. We leave those who seem not so poor, helpless and dependent on sovereign, rich and reigning grace as we feel; but rather “speak of the glory of his kingdom,” and talk of his power, to save to the uttermost those who come unto God by him, being drawn by his irresistible power. Had we been presumptuous enough to suppose, or claim to be “co-workers with God himself, in laboring for the eternal salvation of our apostate world,” and resorted to exciting meetings, telling sympathetic tales, whispering persons into the church, who gave no evidence of obtaining fellowship for them, we know not to what extent we might have reported our numbers. But believing that “salvation is of the Lord,” it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy; that our God cannot be hastened, and glory to his name, he cannot be hindered in developing the heirs of glory in his own good time. Having no desire to see our churches crowded with a brood of persecuting Ishmaelites, who do not with the heart believe unto righteousness, and with the mouth make confession unto salvation, “whether brought from Sunday Schools,” which some esteem “the pillow to the church,” much as we desire a refreshing from the presence of the Lord, we have to await God’s time. We are not so presumptuous as to suppose that we can change God’s purposes; that we can make ourselves or others “heirs of God, and joint heirs with the Lord Jesus Christ.” Mine own arm, said Jesus, hath brought salvation, and of the people there were none to help. Some are curious to know what amount of capital missionary and other kindred institutions contribute to the firm of “their God & Co.,” in laboring for the salvation of our apostate world. Our God tells that he is the “author and finisher of our faith,” but their god would appear to require aid in carrying out his system of proselytism. Hence it is evident that “their rock is not as our Rock, our enemies themselves being judges,” and yet they would be called by thy [our] name to take away our reproach.

I am now done with “Old Flint,” at least until I shall deem it necessary in the defense of truth, which I sincerely hope may not be the case. I bear him no ill will, but should be much gratified to have better evidence than I yet have had that he is “born of God.” In conclusion, I have to say that I have many times publicly declared that I would as soon expect to get to heaven without redemption as without regeneration and the new birth. I had no desire, if it were possible, to get there in the absence of either.

Respectfully,

Thomas P. Dudley.

P.S. - Experience and observation of more than fifty years, have satisfied me that where Andrew Fuller's system, in which he attempted to harmonize the sovereignty of God in the salvation of sinners, with what they call "free moral agency;" or that the atonement is infinite or indefinite, and the application is special or particular, thus attempting to harmonize that which the apostles taught was wholly irreconcilable; namely, "If it be of grace, it is no more of works, otherwise, grace is no more grace; and if it be of works it is no more of grace otherwise, work is no more work," - prevails, it has only widened the flood gates of error, and furnished an apology for the introduction of means, or instrumentality of the preacher, for the living word in giving life to the sinner, dead in trespasses and sins, and thereby producing the New Birth, without which none can "see the Kingdom of God." They seem to say, the preacher is the instrument, and the preached gospel the means, of the eternal salvation of our apostate world? I however, have not so learned Christ. I hold that it is not less possible for God to change, than for the blood of Christ to secure the eternal deliverance of all for whom it was shed. "He, by one offering hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." "He entered in once into the holy place having obtained eternal redemption for us." Fuller's system, as I understand, would "tread under foot the Son of God; and count the blood of the covenant an unholy thing."

T.P.D.

THE PARDON OF SIN.

Lexington, Ky., Jan.3, 1874.

MY DEARLY BELOVED BROTHER BEEBE: - Although my natural vision is so much impaired that I can read or write but little, without suffering more or less, yet my thoughts are more busy on the things of the kingdom of our dear Lord, I think, than when less embarrassed, and I sometimes hope my spiritual vision has not been obscured by bodily infirmity.

There are two problems which the wisdom of this world has failed to solve, and a solution of which "The Faithful and True Witness, the Beginning of the creation of God," has prevailed to disclose to the understanding of his spiritual children, to

their comfort and delight.

The first problem is; How can God be *just*, and save a sinner? The second; Reconcile the justice of God with inflicting the penalty of the law upon him “who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.”

I am your senior in years, but you are my senior in the public service to our gracious King. I therefore propose submitting some of the convictions of my judgment to you, with the hope that if wrong you will act the part of Aquilla and Priscilla, and teach me the way of God more perfectly. The text I propose investigating is found in Romans 5:14 – “Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression, who is the *figure* of him that was to come.”

I remember that in my early ministry the question was asked; Who were they that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression? The answer generally given was, “They are infants.” I have been unable to see the propriety of this connection, and cannot restrict the expression to infants, because within the long series of years which intervened, death was not confined to either young or old, but was common to both. I find no authority in my Bible that warrants the belief that God has made another man in his image, after his likeness, combining in him a vast posterity, and pronounced, with the rest of God’s creatures, very good, and to whom a law, permissive and prohibitory, was given, threatening death, as the result of transgression, and who, transgressing the law, has conveyed to that posterity all the ills to which flesh is heir. I cannot therefore concur in opinion with Doctor Gill, and others, that infants, to the exclusion of all others, were they “who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression.” Now with regard to the *figure*, I believe it is generally, if not universally, conceded that the expression, “Him who was to come,” Christ, the second Adam, is intended. Now if the first Adam be the embodiment, the head and representative of all his natural family, [“And he called their name Adam”] is not the figure lost, if the last Adam be not the embodiment, the head and representative of all his spiritual family, “even every one that is called by my name.” “For this cause I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named.”

Could the first Adam convey to those not *vitally* united to him all the ills resulting from transgression? If the last Adam be not *vitally* united to his spiritual family, could he convey all the spiritual blessings to that family? The decree had gone forth, “The soul that sinneth, it shall die.” “The wicked shall be turned into hell, with all the nations that forget God.” This sentence pertains alike to head and body. “And He is the Head of the body, the church.” “For His body’s sake, which is the church.” “Ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.” “For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.” “As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that body being many are one body, so also

is Christ.” Now the law and justice of God spent their whole force on head and body, when Christ said, “It is finished.” “For if we be dead with him, we believe that we shall also live with him.” For the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him that died for them, and rose again.” Hence Paul said, “I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.” Now we know that the law and justice of God only pursues the offender to the suffering of the penalty. Henceforth “ye are not under the law, but under grace.” In this arrangement, seeing that Christ “was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification,” have we not a full and complete solution of our two problems?

I might have added, “As the husband is the head of the wife, even so is Christ the Head of the church; and He is the Savior of the body.” Again, “For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall be joined to his wife, and they two shall be *one flesh*. This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the church.”

Based on the foregoing considerations, Paul says, “Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness, that he *might be just*, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.” “Who was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification.”

Regarding what has been previously said, we see how God can be just, and save a sinner, and can reconcile the justice of God with inflicting the penalty of the law on the Mediator of the new and better covenant. Where, then, is the justice in charging us with contending that nothing is done for the old man, or sinner? Especially when we maintain that all that Christ did and suffered on earth was for and on behalf of the sinner. But, brother Beebe, this indispensable work of the Mediator did not prepare men to “serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear.” “Ye must be born again,” or ye cannot enter into or *see* the kingdom of God. A higher order of life, even eternal life, must be had, to “know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent.” Or to believe the record that God has given of his Son. “But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them which believed on his name; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” Without this birth we should be unprepared for the heavenly glory.

Brother Beebe, we cannot too highly appreciate the pardon of sin. But though

the chief pardon the guilty culprit, and he goes free from suffering the penalty his crime deserves, yet it does not remove his guilt. I desire more than pardon. I want to be clothed in "fine linen, which is the righteousness of saints." This will enable us to hold up our heads, being justified from all things from which we could not be justified by the law of Moses.

If Christ did not exist from the beginning in another nature than his eternal, underived, unbegotten, unproduced Godhead, what Mediator had the Old Testament saints? Could any approach God but through a Mediator? Now Paul said, "There is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the *Man* Christ Jesus." And Jesus said, "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." "I am the way, the truth and the life." "For no man can come unto me, except the Father which *sent me* draw him, and I will raise him up at the last day."

"He saves, and none beside him can;
Come, sinners, come, behold the man."

Brother Beebe, I have not written the foregoing pages for publication, as they may provoke controversy, and injure the pecuniary interests of the "Signs," but with a hope that you may find a leisure moment to reply. Really, I feel some hesitancy in taxing you so far as to read it, with the assurance that I will at no time intentionally embarrass you.

As ever, most faithfully and affectionately your friend and brother,

Thomas P. Dudley.

THE TRANSGRESSION OF THE LAW.

Campbell, Coles Co., Ill., July 21, 1874.

BROTHER BEEBE: - By permission, please publish the enclosed letter, written by Elder Thomas P. Dudley.

Isaac Taylor.

Lexington, Ky., June 25, 1874.

DEAR BROTHER TAYLOR: - Your very kind and brotherly letter of the 10th instant came duly to hand, and has been attentively considered. It is matter of some

surprise that after my views of bible truth have been so fully and unmistakably expressed, from the pulpit, the press, and in an extensive private correspondence, and so severely stigmatized and criticized, and I flatter myself have been so fully vindicated by the divine record, that there should be those who yet do not understand them, or who willfully pervert them to some unholy end. I have never attempted to make my faith a *standard* for others, although of its truth I am as firmly convinced as I can be; yet I have invariably urged brethren to try that faith by the infallible standard, the word of God. If not sustained by that word, reject it. Unfortunately for the good of society, others have undertaken to speak for me. I protest against this injustice, and have frequently said, I am willing to be held responsible for what I have delivered, since my earliest ministry, but protest against being held responsible for what others *say* I have preached.

I have ever protested against the *heresy* that “all who were created in the earthly Adam were redeemed by Christ,” as necessarily resulting in Universalism, or denying the responsibility of the larger portion of the human family to God – either of which doctrines I consider no better than open infidelity. I have, moreover, controverted the notion that “Adam, by transgression, died a spiritual death,” for the conclusive reason that in his original creation he was not possessed of spiritual life, and he could not lose that which he had not. “Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven.”

Hence we see the beauty and harmony of the divine record. “There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.” The law was given to, and was violated by, and the curse incurred, by the universality of mankind, in their oneness with their earthly head. “In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” “The wages of sin is death.” “Sin is the transgression of the law.” “Where there is no law there is no transgression.” “Without the shedding of blood is no remission.” Do our adversaries mean to contend there were no transgressors but those who were redeemed by Christ? I presume they will not dare content that Cain, Ishmael and Esau were redeemed! If the law did not bind Cain, where was his offence in killing his brother Abel? How could “sin lie at his door,” if the law did not bind him? And if he was not one of his creatures, and the subject of law, how can we reconcile the justice of God with pronouncing the curse upon him?

If the law was not given to, and transgressed by *spirits*, what need of Christ dying for spirits?

Men, as I have shown, were the subjects of law, and transgressors; therefore the man Christ Jesus “was made sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” Let Paul explain: “Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that

through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, [disembodied spirits] but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore it behooved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." Remember that Christ was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit;" that "he bare our sins in his own body on the tree;" that "he died for our sins, according to the scriptures, was buried, and rose again, according to the scriptures." What more monstrous heresy than that the Godhead died, was buried, and rose again!

Although modern Hymenaeus'es and Philetus'es do greatly err in saying the resurrection is past already, let us attend to the more sure word of prophecy. "If the dead rise not, then is not Christ risen; and if Christ be not risen, then is your faith vain; ye are yet in your sins." "But now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept." "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." "But we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." When? "When this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality."

No doctrine in the Bible is more conclusively established by divine testimony than the future resurrection of the bodies of all the heirs of promise.

What I have written will assure you that I repudiate the following heresies: First, "That all who were created in Adam were redeemed by Christ." Second, "That Adam died a spiritual death." Third, "That Christ died for spirits, and not men and women." Fourth, "That the Divinity or Godhead of the Lord Jesus died." Fifth, "That there will be no future resurrection of the just and the unjust."

I have not written the foregoing without considerable inconvenience, resulting from the loss of sight of one eye, and impaired vision of the other.

I am entirely confident that those who have been personally acquainted with me from my earliest ministry, now reaching through a period of fifty-three years, in all my published articles on the subject of religion, together with my private correspondence, will bear me witness that I have constantly and invariably maintained the same system of truth, and will unhesitatingly say the charge of change on my part is untrue.

I should be gratified to visit your section, but when I consider my advanced age of infirmity, together with the distance, I hesitate to give a promise. Kind regards to the brethren and sisters who may care to hear from me.

Your brother in hope,

Thomas P. Dudley.

THE CALL TO THE GOSPEL MINISTRY.

Lexington, Ky., Nov.24, 1874.

MY DEARLY BELOVED BROTHER BEEBE: - A short time since I received a letter from a brother in a distant state, asking me to write for publication in the "Signs," my views on the call to the gospel ministry. I can only give the exercises of my own mind on this important subject.

Very soon after I became seriously and lastingly impressed with a sense of my exposed condition as a sinner against God, I resorted to the attentive perusal of my Bible, with the hope that I might find therein some way of escaping the wrath of God, which was justly due me as a sinner. Instead of finding the relief I had hoped for, I realized a deeper sense of my own wretchedness, guilt and condemnation. It seemed that almost every sentence I read, made my just condemnation more clear and conclusive. I found many passages which seemed to afford encouragement to those who were not so polluted and vile as I felt myself to be. I felt as the poet expressed;

"I hoped that in some favored hour,
At once he'd answer my request;
And by his love's constraining power,
Subdue my sins and give me rest.

Instead of this he made me feel,
The hidden evils of my heart;
Let all the angry powers of hell,
Assault my soul in every part."

My distress and anguish of heart became more pungent when I bowed to ask the forgiveness of my sins, because of the insincerity of my heart and wanderings of my thoughts. In the course of time, I learned a man was to preach in the town where I lived, who spoke much of the terrors of hell, and the torments of the damned. I immediately resolved to hear him. I found truly that the burden of his preaching was of that character. I left the house more deeply distressed than ever, with the reflection, How hardened you must be when the terrors of hell and torments of the damned make no impression on you. I considered my case, if possible, more hopeless than ever. Soon after I learned that an Old Baptist preacher had an appointment in town, and I went to hear him. His theme was, God's love to

sinner, and before he had proceeded far with his discourse I felt the tears trickling down my face, but I could not believe I was of the number God loved. On going home and meditating on the subject of the discourse I had heard, I was more perplexed than ever. I now hope I understand the apostle's language, "Not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance."

Shortly after this and in the month of September, 1819, while lying on my bed, about 11 o'clock at night, and bemoaning my lost and undone condition, the wicked and presumptuous thought intruded itself on my mind that perhaps I should have at some day to preach the gospel. I was greatly alarmed, and concluded this was an omen of my swift and speedy destruction. I concluded if I had committed no other sin, this wicked thought was enough to justify God in my condemnation. The thought,

"I who am all defiled with sin,
A rebel all forlorn,
A foe, a traitor to my God,
And of a traitor born,"

filled me with horror; and as often as the unwelcome intruder was felt, anguish of heart was the result. I still strove to get better, but found I was growing worse, until the 3rd Sunday in February, 1820, when it seemed bitter despair was about to seize upon me. I went to preaching sad and almost hopeless, when the preacher, [the late Elder Trott,] took for his text Isa.28:16 – "Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold I lay in Zion, for a foundation stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation, he that believeth on him shall not make haste." Immediately the darkness of my poor soul, which was so thick as to be *felt*, was dispersed, and the precious cornerstone, the sure foundation, the Lord Jesus Christ was revealed to me [as I hope,] as the way whereby poor sinners could be saved. Tears of joy and gladness now flowed freely, and Doctor Watts' language became mine:

"All over glorious is our Lord,
Must be beloved, and yet adored;
His worth, if all the nations knew,
Sure the whole world would love him too."

I yet feel that it is only necessary to know, and that knowledge will cause love to him. It was but a very short time when the unwelcome intruder [the thought that I should be required to preach,] returned with more force, anxiety and opposition, if possible, than ever. I plead youth and ignorance and utter unfitness for so great a work, and determined to keep my thoughts on this subject to myself. Some three

months subsequently an intelligent sister asked me after hearing some good preaching, How did you like that preaching? I replied that I was delighted. She continued, You will have to do so, to which I quickly replied, No, I won't. She said, I think you will; I responded, You have no right to think so, to which she said, Pray sir, can you help your thoughts? I answered, No; but you ought to help or control yours better than indulge such. I now began to be afraid that others might have such thoughts, and thereby increase my embarrassment. Very soon another and yet another of the brethren approached me with the inquiry, Has not your mind been impressed with the duty of preaching the gospel? I endeavored to keep dark, under the impression that if I were called to the work, so long as the church were silent, I should escape chastisement. It was not long, however, until this *prop* was taken away. An old and highly esteemed brother and "pioneer to the dark and bloody ground," observed to the church that he believed the Lord had blessed them with a gift, and moved that liberty be granted me to exercise my gift in singing, prayer and exhortation, within the bounds of the members. I immediately responded, I have as much liberty as I want – that of being a member of the body. But little time elapsed when I was called to another trial. Another old and beloved "pioneer," moved that written license be given me to preach wherever the Lord might cast my lot, and that I be requested to go into the pulpit and preach, as well when the pastor was present as absent. I begged the brethren to forbear, but in vain. Time wore on, I was distressed when I refused, and distressed with my feeble efforts when I consented to try. A circumstance bore heavily on my mind and embarrassed me greatly, of which they were not advised. I heard ministers whom I loved, declare from the pulpit, that in regeneration the man was *changed from the love of sin to the love of holiness*. I concluded, if this be true, I am no christian.

Again, They preached that in regeneration the enmity of the heart is slain. I felt within me if that is true, I am where I ought not to be. My distress drove me to my Bible; on this subject I earnestly desired to know the truth of the matter, and after painful experience I found relief in reading Paul's experience when he said, "When I would do good evil is present with me." Again, "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things ye would." I was confirmed in my opinion that those brethren were wrong. But a hard struggle rose up immediately. How could I, a poor, weak and imperfect being, rise up and controvert the truth of the doctrine preached by those older and more experienced, and in whose christianity and call to the ministry I had more confidence than in my own!

The severe domestic affliction under which I had been laboring for many months, and which had disclosed the native enmity of my poor, sinful heart, proving the truth of the apostle's declaration, "The old man is corrupt with his deeds," led me almost to despair reaching the heavenly glory. The poet has well

expressed my agony of soul when he cried:

“Lord, why is this, I trembling cried,
Wilt thou pursue thy worm to death?”

But my mind was led on to the further declaration of the same apostle, “The new man after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.” I then saw the antagonism of the *two natures* possessed by every one born of the Spirit, out of which grows that warfare which so pains the heart of the christian. Now to withhold the convictions of my own judgment on this subject would be dishonest and criminal; while to avow the difference would manifest a desire to follow an apostle who said, “I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.” I seemed indeed to be “chastened as a bullock unaccustomed to the yoke.” I was, however, greatly encouraged when I found my brethren receive so cordially the views I held on the subject. I however passed along between hope and fear for a short time, until another of the dear old pioneers proposed, in the church, my ordination. I instantly plead in bar my youth as a professor, my ignorance, inexperience, and total lack of scriptural qualifications for the ministry; but all in vain. I believed the mind of the Lord was in his church, and submitted. The work of ordination was proceeded, and a presbytery composed of four of the “old pioneers,” with five or six other ministers, who examined me on my christian experience, call to the ministry, and doctrinal views, proceeded to set me apart to the work. Very soon after my ordination I was brought to confront the doctrine of Fullerism, or general atonement and special application; and in a short time, the doctrine of the Reformation, as it is called, promulgated by the late Alexander Campbell, both of which I felt were at war with the doctrine of the Bible; consequently I felt bound to oppose and expose. Very soon afterward, the almost universally popular inventions of man for evangelizing the world, were strongly and persistently urged on the churches as a *christian duty*. I was approached and urged to join them; but give me, said I, Bible authority for them, or I cannot join. The reply was, See how much good we are accomplishing by them. Well, said they, if you cannot, or will not, join us, don’t say anything against them. I asked, What is the duty of the watchman but to warn the church on the approach of the enemy? The next step was to intimidate, by saying, You have fearful odds against you; the wisest and most learned men among us are members, and you are comparatively alone. My reply has been, If it is the truth I am contending for, God will maintain his own truth; but if it is error, the sooner it is put down the better. Those departures from the simplicity of the truth began to shew themselves in letters from corresponding associations, to which we promptly replied, protesting against these errors, which soon produced the dropping of the correspondence. But

we were destined to a sorer trial when brought to realize the warning of the apostle, “Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.” The doctrine of the Circular on the Christian Warfare had been preached among us without offense, so far as I know, for very many years, but was ultimately made the occasion on the part of some of our body for the denunciation against us of “the worst kind of heresy,” and “a declaration of non-fellowship against us.” Several churches withheld correspondence with us, together with a suspension of correspondence by several associations through their misrepresentation of us. Two of those associations, on being better informed, returned, and with acknowledgements, asked a renewal of the correspondence. One of the party who had left us approached me, saying the old fashioned Baptists were few in number, and asking on what terms they could have union and correspondence with us; I replied, You have publicly denounced us guilty of the worst kind of heresy, and declared non-fellowship for us; you ought not to ask correspondence with heretics, and those for whom you have declared non-fellowship – a public acknowledgement is indispensable, on your part, to union with us. I am advised of no such acknowledgement; hence no union can be had with us. I am fully satisfied that no substantial good can result, as we have hitherto learned, from correspondence with those who are not agreed on the fundamental principles of our holy religion, and I am entirely satisfied that churches and associations wrong themselves and compromise their own peace and religious welfare by receiving [into their correspondence] to doubtful disputation, those not in faith and practice with them. Licking Association now, and for more than twenty years, has enjoyed uninterrupted peace, union and sweet fellowship. If what I have been called to suffer, and to bear, in the last fifty-four years, has contributed to the comforting, building up and establishing the children of God in the truth, I feel that I ought therein to rejoice, rather than regret what it has cost in doing so.

If the sympathy of my heart has been more warmly enlisted in behalf of one class of christians than another, it has been in behalf of those called of God, and put in trust with the ministry of the word; but I would remind such that they serve a good and gracious Sovereign – one who knows these trials, temptations, and discouragements; and although they cannot at all times *feel* his presence, yet he has most truly said, “Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” They will find brethren faithful and true, [as I have] so long as they are faithful to their calling.

As ever, faithfully your brother in hope of the better resurrection,

Thomas P. Dudley.

P.S. – Although I have never had the heart satisfying evidence that I have been called to the work of the ministry I have desired, yet I may be allowed to say that I

have no misgivings with regard to the truth of the doctrine I have preached.

T.P.D.

REPLY TO “OLD SCHOOL.”
From the *Western Recorder*.

Lexington, Ky., 1875.

Four numbers have recently been published in your columns over the signature “Old School,” which are so unjust and perverse of truth, that I feel called on to respond.

Your correspondent may be, for aught I know, a disciple of the old “school of one Tyrannus,” with whom Saul disputed in his day. See Acts 19:9. His readiness at perversion, or falsifying, is worthy of him. He quotes from the Circular on the Christian Warfare, as follows: “The new man needed no redemption, never having transgressed the law;” and charges Old School Baptists with denying the doctrine of regeneration and the new birth. Can he have read in the divine record, “The new man, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness.” Again, “For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works.” Or the testimony of the Psalmist, “Lord, thou hast been our [Head, body and members] dwelling place in all generations; before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth or the world; even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God.” Or yet the following: “According as he hath chosen us in him, before the foundation of the world.” “But according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Jesus before the world began.” The law had not then been given, and of course sin, which is the transgression of the law, had not been committed. What need was there for the redemption of the new man? But our God has said. “I have not beheld iniquity in Jacob; neither have I seen perverseness in Israel.” Will your correspondent contend that he spoke of Jacob or Israel according to the flesh, as the descendants of the earthy Adam? Or not rather, typically, as the spiritual family of the Lord Jesus, the second Adam? “The Lord’s portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance.” “Israel shall be saved in the Lord, with an everlasting salvation.”

The whole mediatorial work of the Lord Jesus was directed to the redemption and salvation of his chosen seed, who sinned in their relation to, and by virtue of their oneness in nature with the earthy Adam. In this nature they were “the children of wrath, even as others.” Hence the Redeemer said, “Forasmuch as the children

are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham." "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Will your correspondent affirm that the Mediator did not exist until his birth of the virgin? If then he so existed, the children also existed. The Head, having assumed flesh and blood, with the children, met the claims of a violated law, and bore the curse due to transgression; hence an apostle said, "For the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, [all the children] then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him that died for them and rose again." Hence it is said, "If we be dead with him, we shall also live with him; if we suffer, we shall also reign with him." "Ye also are become dead to the law, by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him that is raised from the dead, that ye should bring forth fruit unto God." Again: "And he is the head of the body, the church, the first born from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence." Suppose you the head exists without the body, or the body without the head?

Hence we learn that the warfare exists in every christian, between the antagonistic parties, the "old man, which is corrupt with his deeds," and the "new man, which after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness." If your correspondent be a subject of the new birth, he is not a stranger to that warfare.

We should not forget that the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. That "*seed* which shall serve him, and shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation."

I do not object to fair criticism of anything I propagate with my pen or tongue; but when the critic shall garble, by taking detached sentences, and supplying explanations, as your correspondent has done, he betrays conscious weakness and incapacity to meet, either by argument, or proof drawn from the divine record, to successfully controvert the doctrine he assails. If he had been searching for truth, he would have learned from the Circular from which he quotes, that the doctrine of regeneration and the birth were not only taught, but that the warfare which invariably follows being born again, was explained as existing between the "old man" and "new man." I am entirely satisfied that he cannot find an intelligent, unprejudiced christian in the land, acquainted with the ministry of the Old School Baptists, or Elders Beebe, Durand, Johnson, or myself, who will believe his assertion that we deny regeneration and the new birth. I very much doubt whether he himself believes his assertion.

I find no authority in my Bible for dividing the man. The old man is an entire

old man, and the new man is an entire new man.

Your correspondent professes to quote from Elder Vanmeter, and assumes that he holds that some part of the old man is the subject of regeneration and the new birth, and that Elder Beebe does not dissent from the idea. I am fully satisfied that he does Elder Beebe injustice in this assumption.

Your correspondent assumes that some part of the Adamic man is the subject of regeneration and the new birth. If he shall refer this to the soul, the learned tell us, "The soul is the seat of intelligence; that the thoughts emanate thence;" and the Bible tells us, "The thought of foolishness is sin." If christians have vain, wicked and foolish thoughts, then is their soul not born again. The apostle tells us, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." If he shall refer to the heart, the word of God informs us that, "from within, out of the heart, proceedeth evil thoughts." "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it?" Again, the Lord saith, "I will give them a new heart to know me." If they could know him with the old arminian heart, whence the necessity of giving them a new heart? If he shall refer to the mind, an apostle informs us. "The carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." If he refers to the body, why is it said, "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body?"

But why has your correspondent so recently become enamored with the name "Old School?" Is it because he cannot so readily impose on those who do not take the trouble to inform themselves with regard to their new moneyed inventions for evangelizing the world, under their former cherished name, "United Baptists?" Or the more ancient names, Regular Baptists, Separate Baptists, General Baptists or Missionary Baptists, as Old School? A solution of this inquiry may be found in the public declaration of a prominent elder of his order, "If we do not go back to Old Baptist ground, we will lose many members." Is not this an acknowledgement that they had left Old Baptist ground?

Your correspondent may know that the name, "Particular Baptists," is two hundred years older than "Old School," and that it is older by several years even in this country. The Licking Association having adopted the name at her session in the year 1820, not to remove her from original faith, but as more expressive of that faith, and to distinguish her from other bodies of Baptists.

Your correspondent presumes to assert that the "Signs of the Times" is the exponent of the faith of the Particular Baptists. The editor does not claim that distinction, nor is it accorded to that paper, or any other human production. He, with sound Baptists everywhere recognizes no other standard of faith than the unerring word of the eternal God.

I very much doubt whether your correspondent, or any who fraternize with him, would willingly meet any one of the elders whom he has assailed before a company of intelligent christians; and discuss the points at issue with them, agreeing, of course, that the word of God shall decide.

If your correspondent had read the Bible more attentively, if indeed he be capable of understanding its spiritual import, and relied less on fables, Sunday School tracts, and reports of missionary boards, he might have saved himself this exposure. The intolerant spirit manifested by your correspondent, like his brethren of old, would seem to say, “None shall be allowed to buy or sell,” [proclaim the truth of God] but such as have “the mark of the beast in the forehead or in their right hand.” Especially would he seem to proscribe Particular Baptists, and all others who demand bible authority for the brood of inventions recently reared up as means to “evangelize the world.” Not so with Particular Baptists; they advocate the largest toleration of religion, only asking that truth be left free to combat error.

I assert, without fear of successful contradiction, that no evidence can be found in the word of God to sustain the notion that all, or any part of the Adamic man, is changed from natural to spiritual by the new birth, or will be so changed until Jesus “shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body,” or until “this corruptible shall put on incorruption; and this mortal shall put on immortality.” Then will the heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ “see this Savior and be like him, for they will see him as he is.”

In conclusion, I have to say that professedly sound Baptists have incorporated with their confessions of faith, the following: “We believe the scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the word of God, and the only certain and infallible rule of faith and practice, containing everything necessary for us to know, believe or do in the service of God.” Particular Baptists are entirely satisfied to observe that rule, and to be judged according to its teachings. If your correspondent is satisfied with what is taught therein, whence the new inventions they have reared up in the last few years? If what I have written on the foregoing pages be heresy, “let him make the most of it.”

I have quoted from memory, not being disposed to impose on my eye by testing the accuracy of the quotations by the scriptures; but am satisfied that I have given the substance of each text quoted.

Respectfully,

Thomas P. Dudley.

P.S. – I here reaffirm the unfaltering belief that, “Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God;” and this birth is “not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.” Moreover that this birth, developing eternal life, is indispensable to the belief of the record

God has given of his Son; “which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” I suspect your correspondent feels that “his craft is in danger,” hence his gross misrepresentations of the Old School Baptists.

T.P.D.

MODERN RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS.

Lexington, Ky., Feb.7, 1875.

MY DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - I have reflected much, and more recently, on the ancient, compared with the modern systems of religion. In the days of Christ and his apostles, “the wisdom of this world is [declared to be] foolishness with God;” that “He taketh the wise in their own craftiness.”

I am thoroughly convinced, from experience and observation, that all the schools, from that of one “Tyrannus,” the “Alexandrian,” and all subsequent schools gotten up for the avowed purpose of teaching the religion of Christ, have grown out of ignorance of the true nature of Bible religion, and the pride of the human heart. It seems the lessons taught by Christ and his apostles have been entirely lost on modern divines, who teach the necessity of human science in order to explain and unfold the divine mystery. Christ said, “I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes; even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight.” And Paul taught, “The preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but to us who are saved, it is the power of God.” How does this agree with the teaching of modern professors, in theological schools, who tell us it is as easy to believe as to turn your hand over? The Savior said to the Jews, “Why do ye not believe my speech? Even because ye *cannot* hear my word.” “They have eyes, and see not, ears, and hear not; a heart, and understand not.” How ridiculously absurd the idea of bringing the blind, the deaf, aye, the dead, into their divinity schools, to be taught, and to teach others, the religion of Christ! Are they not emphatically blind leaders of the blind? And should we wonder that both fall into the ditch? I had, a short time since, a pretty fair specimen of school divinity, in a graduate of a theological school, who is called to the pastorate of a Missionary Baptist Church. He asked me if I did not believe the design in preaching the gospel was to save unregenerate sinners. Not a bit of it, said I. He then quoted, “It pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe.” I replied, Do you not

understand plain language better than that? The apostle says, “to save *them that believe*,” not unbelievers. He looked astonished, and quoted, “It is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.” I asked, Does the apostle say *unbelievers*? He looked more astonished, and asked. How does the gospel save believers? I replied, saves them, when they listen and heed its teaching, from the errors, delusions and false ways you teach. I wanted to know of him whether he supposed the preaching of poor, finite and imperfect mortals is to have more influence on the carnal mind, enmity against God, than the preaching of the Savior, when he was upon earth? I further remarked that it is declared to be “the gospel of the kingdom.” It is given to a spiritual kingdom, composed of spiritual subjects, and they only understand its mysteries as the Spirit unfolds them. He wished to know if I did not believe that sinners are condemned for not believing it. I replied, Neither in whole or in part. They were condemned before the gospel was preached on earth; that sin is the transgression of the *law*; that where no law is, there is no transgression. And I have found no precept in the *law* requiring men to believe the gospel. It is “good tidings of great joy; for unto *you* is born this day, in the city of David, a Savior, which is Christ the Lord.” Those born of God.

The doctrine of missionaries and arminians generally, if I understand them, and I believe I do, is that, God requires evangelical faith and evangelical repentance of mankind universally, and damns them where they are not found. In this assumption, they slander the Righteous Judge. Let us see. “By grace are ye saved, through *faith*, and that not of yourselves, it is the *gift of God*.” Hence we learn that “faith is the gift of God.” Now with regard to repentance. “Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Savior, for to give repentance *unto Israel* and the forgiveness of sins.” How does the matter stand? Let us see. According to their theory, God withholds faith, and Jesus withholds repentance; and Jesus, as Judge, pronounces the sentence against them! Christian, is this the just God and Savior, through whom you hope to inherit eternal blessedness? No, say you, they would dishonor my Lord, and impeach his justice. I well recollect hearing the late Elder Jonathan Going, one of the early apostles of Missionism, sent to the west, some forty or more years since, in preaching to a large assembly, at an association, say in substance, that the best time to convert and bring into the church the fallen sons and daughters of Adam, is from eight to twelve years, and that it was certain that more Sunday School scholars were the subjects of salvation than others. I suppose he entertained the same opinion with an *author* professing to believe in the sovereignty of God, “When men become old and hardened in sin, it is almost impossible for the Lord to convert them.” Such is the extravagance, wickedness and folly of those who “desire to be teachers of the law, understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.” And here I am reminded of another preacher, and *author*, who, after hearing me preach, asked, What objection have

you to our missionary operations? I replied, You have asked me a question, and I shall of course, answer candidly. In the first place, I find no authority in my Bible for your missionary operations. In the second place, I have to say, I have never heard one of your missionary preachers, whom I could lay my hand on my heart and say, I believed, is called of God to the work of the gospel ministry. This brought the exclamation from another preacher of the same stripe. "O, brother Dudley! Brother Dudley! That is too uncharitable." I replied, I have answered candidly. Another objection I have is, that they have the condemnation of sinners to result from the disbelief of the gospel, when you acknowledge they cannot believe it without the direct operation of the Spirit of God. They then said, The disbelief *enhances* their condemnation. I replied, That is about as bad. If they, or either, be living, they will remember this. Another of their preachers asked me, some five and forty years since, "Brother Tommy, where did you get the idea that natural duties pertain to natural men, and spiritual duties to spiritual men?" and added, "I have read a great deal, and heard many of the ablest preachers, in this country, and have never heard the sentiment only from you." I replied, When God formed man of the dust of the ground, did he say, Come man, I formed you, now animate your body? You will say, No. I continued, Did he require action of him until he had breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul – a living, intelligent, conscious being? Nor does he require of sinners, dead in trespasses and sins, living spiritual action. It just occurs that some have objected to my remark, that "natural duties pertain to natural men," and to sustain their objection, quote the apostle Paul, "Wherefore the law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under sin." But will they remember that every law, whether human or divine, has its spirit, or meaning, as well as its letter. The letter looks to the *act*, the spirit to the *intention*. For example, A determines to take the life of B, and adopts the most certain means of accomplishing his aim; but the providence of God intervenes to defeat his intention. A is a murderer in his heart, although he has failed to commit the murder, according to the spirit of the law. Another example: An *idiot*, or demented person, takes the life of a dozen sane men. Why is he not adjudged guilty of a crime, and subject to the penalty? Because malice afore thought, or previous intention to commit the act, cannot be predicated of him. He is not conscious of the crime. But, says the objector, man has a spirit. I reply, The horse has a spirit too. Suppose the horse shall kick to death a man, is he amenable to the law? Why not? Because of the lack of intelligence.

But to the contrast between then and now. The Savior called and sent forth twelve apostles, only one of whom, so far as the Bible informs us, was learned in the sciences of this world, being "brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, a doctor of the law." What is the testimony he bears? "And I brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech, or of wisdom, declaring unto you the

testimony of God; for I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified.” Where do you find this example followed, outside of the Particular, Primitive, or real Old School Baptists? Again, “And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man’s wisdom, but in demonstration of the spirit, and of power; that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God. Howbeit, we speak wisdom among them that are *perfect*; yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that cometh to naught; but we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery; even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory; which none of the princes of this world knew, for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him; but God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.” I again ask, Where do you find this example imitated, but by our people? Where do the workmongers of our day find authority for the *machinery* put in operation for evangelizing the world? If truth be said, it originated in the disordered brains of their priests, who would make merchandize of the gospel; and brought these measures into being, in their conventions, general associations, missionary boards, &c. And yet they have the effrontery to claim to be Primitive, and Old School Baptists!!! In my judgment, they are ignorantly offering a direct insult to the Author of our holy religion, and virtually saying, the “means he has devised, that his banished be not expelled from him,” are inadequate, and we will supply the deficiency with our *moneyed inventions*.

That they have bewitched many of the Lord’s children, by their *sorceries*, or something quite as deleterious to spiritual health, I believe; and regarding the divine caution, “If I speak evil concerning Israel, and thou warn them not, they shall die, but their blood will I require at thy hand; but if thou warn them, they shall die, but thou shalt save thy soul.” God grant that his bewitched children may take warning.

Let us examine the contrast between then and now, further. While all the denominations, outside of the church of God, so far as I am advised, must have learned preachers, vainly supposing that the sciences of this world, which are based on natural principles, will enable them to unfold the mystery of godliness, and several of them profess to believe in the call of God to the work, they seem to have overlooked the fact that “the husbandman that laboreth must first be partaker of the fruits.” They are evidently not willing to entrust their education in the school of Christ; that school will not allow the inventions of graceless men a place in quickening the dead, opening the eyes of the blind, and raising up the bowed down,

but attributes this indispensable work alone to him who has said, "I will work, and who shall let it?" "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure."

I wonder whether these theological preachers have ever thought of what the Lord says, by the prophet, "Behold I am against the prophet that steals my word, every man from his neighbor!" Again, "They are the prophets of the deceit of their own hearts, prophesying lies in my name, saying, I have dreamed, I have dreamed. The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; but he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully; what is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord."

Brother Beebe, it would be an endless job to attempt to follow the errorists of our day in all their windings and twistings, their means and instrumentalities, their assumption of names wholly inconsistent, with the practice of those who legitimately bear them. They remind me of the saying attributed to the late Lorenzo Dow, "You can, and you can't; you will, and you wont; you'll be damned if you do, and you'll be damned if you don't." They are very bitter against those they call Campbellites, and the assertion in the "Western Recorder," over the signature of "Old School," which charges that "extremes have met, that the Particulars and Campbellites both deny regeneration and the new birth," reminds me of what the apostle Paul said, "Thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal?" I know of no denomination more inconsistent than those claiming extra benevolence, who conclude the furnishing them the money, for from "twenty-five to fifty cents per head, they can evangelize the world," thus claiming to do that which our God has given us no warrant to believe he intends shall be done. They have manifested a bitterness and unrelenting spirit of persecution of those who, in the absence of divine authority to sustain their moneyed schemes, oppose them, which, it would seem, ought to open the eyes of those they have duped.

It may be thought by some that I have been too severe in some things I have written. I would invite such to examine the sacred text, the word of the living God, and the injunction of the apostle, "Reprove, rebuke, and exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine." "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." Has not that time come? Why do their scribblers hide behind some covering when they assail personally those whom they dare not meet in argument in open day? The reason may be found in the text, "He that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds be reprov'd." They claim the name Baptist, but have left the practice of *real* Baptists, both ancient and modern, in bringing the uncircumcised into the congregation of the Lord, then setting at naught the divine command. It is true, they *immerse*, but I very much doubt whether the administrator or the subject be such as the gospel recognizes. The truth is, brother Beebe, Universalists are more consistent than they. Their frequent

change of name – first Regular Baptists, next United Baptists, then Missionary, and lastly Old School – should arouse suspicion.

Our adversaries have charged that we are opposed to education, because we will not consent that the literature and science of this world, however extended it may be, can qualify the men of this world to comprehend the mystery of the kingdom of God. But have they considered that “the world by wisdom knew not God,” or that the “natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; *neither can he know them*, because they are spiritually discerned?” We esteem learning highly valuable to the inhabitants of this world, preparing them to understand and appreciate the blessings of civil, social and political rights and immunities. In this latter sense we are, and have been, the decided advocates of learning.

It is more than forty years since we first met and exchanged salutations with, if I am not mistaken, between twenty and thirty ministers, all of whom have passed away, but you and myself. I desire to thank God that the affection and christian fellowship and confidence formed then has remained unbroken on my part. That there may have been a difference of opinion between us on some points, is possible, but never that interrupted the cordial relations between us.

The quotations I have made in the foregoing communications, are from memory; it would tax my eye too heavily to compare them with the word of God, to test their correctness; I feel confident I have given the substance.

Faithfully your brother and companion in tribulation, and defense of the truth,

Thomas P. Dudley.

THE CREATION OF GOD.

Lexington, Ky., Dec.30, 1876.

MY DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - I have been able to read or write but little, in consequence of the condition of my eyes, for many months. I have heard read your reply to a correspondent asking your understanding of the expression found in the Circular on the *Christian Warfare* – “All living souls were created in, and simultaneously with the first Adam; all quickened spirits were created in, and simultaneously with the last Adam.” You remark, “A brother should not be held an offender for a word.” I certainly did not intend to offend against the generation of his children, but was looking to the contrast of the two Adams, and not to the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ. If I have rightly understood the scriptures, the terms, “was made” and “created,” are frequently used synonymously, or interchangeably, as in the following: “In the image of God *made* he him, male and

female *created* he them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were *created*.” With reference to the family of the last Adam, we read, “Bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth, even every one that is called by my name; for I have *created* him for my glory, I have formed him, yea, I have *made* him.” When we read of the family of the earthly Adam, they are brought forth through many generations, because of very many intermediate fathers. Of the family of the Lord Jesus, there is but one generation, they being all born of God, and consequently no intermediate fathers. Of him all the family in heaven and on earth is named. Let us now examine the contrast, as introduced by an apostle. “The first man Adam was *made* a living soul; the last Adam was *made* a quickening Spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.” The Bible informs us that the old man is corrupt, with his deeds; but the new man, after God, is *created* in righteousness and true holiness. Again, “We are his workmanship, *created* in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.” From what we have said, it will be seen that the body of Christ is a created body, and of this body, Christ is declared to be the head. “And gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.” Now, it is said of Christ, as the Mediatorial Head of the church, “These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true Witness, the *beginning of the creation of God*.” “Who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature.” According to our vocabulary, whenever we speak of creature, a creator or creation is necessarily implied. The term, “was made,” as in the following quotations: “The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.” “Was made sin for us.” “Was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death.” May not the foregoing expressions be susceptible of a deeper and more profound meaning than finite minds, such as ours, can comprehend, and a part of that mystery of godliness which God hath not made known to the sons of men? How far Adam, with his generations, is a figure of Christ, with his generation, we may not be fully informed. An apostle informs us, “Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.” We are assured that there existed a vital oneness between the first Adam and the entire natural family, else would not the apostle have said, “Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have

sinned.” We have before proved that both Jews and Gentiles are all under sin. We are equally well assured that there eternally existed between the Lord Jesus Christ and his spiritual seed, who sinned in their relation to the first Adam, a vital oneness; else would not his life and death, resurrection and ascension, have delivered them from the curse of a violated law, obtained eternal redemption for them, and by one offering perfected them that are sanctified.

Brother Beebe, your reply to a brother, to which I have alluded, meets the question at issue, nor do I recollect anything that you have said with which I do not concur. I heard your reply read but once, and immediately the paper was misplaced, and I have not yet been able to find it; consequently I may have repeated what has been better said in that reply.

How any one who has read the Circular on the Warfare should conceive that I denied the eternal, underived, unbegotten, unproduced Godhead of the Lord Jesus Christ, I cannot see. I have affirmed and re-affirmed, perhaps more than a thousand times, my unshaken belief of that precious truth. But while I believe this, I as firmly believe that the man Christ Jesus existed, not as a *myth* or *shadow*, “Ere sin was born, or Adam’s dust was fashioned to a man.” If this be not true, what became of the patriarchs and prophets who died before Christ was born of the virgin? They were lost without remedy. As we learn from divine testimony, “There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.” And this Man said, “I am the *way*, and the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me.” Again, “No man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven.”

This has not been written to provoke controversy, but simply to make myself understood. If you see anything in this calculated to subserve the cause of truth, you can publish it; otherwise, throw it aside.

Most truly and affectionately your brother,

Thomas P. Dudley.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

Lexington, Ky., Jan.11, 1877.

MY DEAR BROTHER IN CHRIST: - If you knew my anxiety to hear from

you, the interest I take in your temporal and spiritual welfare, I think you would have written before this time. I have not heard anything directly or indirectly from you since we parted in Louisville. My health has been unexceptionably good since my return, and I feel that I ought to be infinitely more thankful to the giver of all good than I am, especially when I consider my advanced age. I have spent many hours alone since I saw you; and yet not entirely alone. I trust the blessed Comforter has brought many things to my remembrance which had been spoken by the Lord Jesus for the comfort of his afflicted and poor people, such as, "Fear not, thou worm Jacob." "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." "Because I live, ye shall live also." "As thy days, so shall thy strength be." Does it not seem presumptuous for such a polluted worm as I to appropriate them, with a thousand other exceeding great and precious promises, to myself?

"I, who am all defiled with sin,
A rebel all forlorn;
A foe, a traitor to my God,
And of a traitor born."

It does seem, if I were what I profess to be, I should be more conformed to him whose I hope I am. But,

"I am so vile, so prone to sin,
I fear that I'm not born again."

And yet I take courage when I read, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God. And every one that loveth him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of him." Now, if my poor, wretched heart does not deceive me, I do believe that "Jesus is the Christ;" and I am equally confident that I love those whom I believe are begotten and born of God. I will not deny that I take comfort when I read that "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief."

"My language is, Let me, my God,
On sovereign grace rely,
And own 'tis free, because bestowed,
On one so vile as I."

In the multitude of thoughts, death has been a prominent one. What is it? A separation from life; the close of our mortal career on earth; an enemy to our poor, cowardly, fleshly nature, but a friend in *disguise* to the christian.

“Death is the gate to endless joy,
And yet we dread to enter there.”

But there is something that will brighten up the scene;

“O! If my Lord would come and meet,
My soul would stretch her wings in haste;
Fly fearless through death’s iron gate,
Nor feel the terror as she passed.

Jesus can make a dying bed,
Feel as downy pillows are;
While on his breast I lean my head,
And breathe my life out sweetly there.”

But we have the solemn announcement from on high, “Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.” We are sensible that we have flesh and blood, and deeply sensible that we are corruption itself. The prospect of happiness, to such creatures as we, is gloomy indeed, when we look to “man, whose breath is in his nostrils.” But when we look to Christ, who “was made sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him,” when “the Sun of Righteousness shall arise with healing in his wings,” the cloud is dispersed, and we say, “My Beloved is mine, and I am his.” The mind soars aloft, and we sing with exceeding joy,

“Jesus is worthy to receive,
Honor and power divine;
And blessings more than we can give,
Be, Lord, forever thine.”

Our Surety met every demand that law or justice had against his chosen bride, “Being put to death in the flesh, and quickened by the Spirit.” And yet this did not impart to her a qualification to appreciate his glorious work. Still it thunders in her ears, “Ye must be born again.” “Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.” And with the prophet we cry, “All our righteousness are as filthy rags.” With the poor woman we cry, “Lord, help me.”

“Empty and bare, I come to thee,

For righteousness divine;
O may thy matchless merits be,
By imputation mine.”

“Our earthly house of this tabernacle,” although now the tenantry of the old and the new man, is destined to be dissolved; “the dust to return to its dust as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it.” Yet hath he ordained that the “new man” be clothed upon with his house which is from heaven.” In view of this, my dear brother Theobald will be heard to sing,

“O to grace how great a debtor,
Daily I’m constrained to be;
Let that grace, Lord, like a fetter,
Bind my wandering heart to thee.”

But of the means to consummate this heavenly state, hear an apostle: “Some man will say, How are the dead raised up? And, With what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body which shall be, but bare grain; it may chance of wheat, or some other grain; but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body.” Now, we know that the *hull*, or rough exterior of the grain, is given to protect the tender germ, and that this hull possesses no germinating propriety, and must be decomposed, die, and return to its dust, in order that the living germ produce, “first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear.” The foregoing illustration so far comports with the divine record. “There are bodies celestial, and bodies terrestrial; but the glory of the celestial is one glory, and the glory of the terrestrial is another glory. There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown *a natural body*, it is raised *a spiritual body*.” “Behold I shew you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up of victory;” and then will you sing loudly, “O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law; but thanks be to God who

giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.” Then, O then, my dear brother, shall we see Jesus, and be like him, for we shall see him as he is.

Pardon this long, imperfect, and may be uninteresting scroll, which has been written in loneliness – the absence of the dear family of our God – “To speak of the glory of his kingdom and talk of his power.” I have endeavored to solve the mystery of how God can be just and save poor sinners, of whom it is said, “Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.” How far I have succeeded, you will determine.

I need not say we desire much to see and hear you discourse of the good things of the kingdom of our God, and earnestly hope it may not be long before this desire is gratified. Do let me hear from you soon. Kindest regards to all the dear ones with you.

Truly and affectionately as ever, your brother in hope,

Thomas P. Dudley.

QUICKENED SPIRITS.

Lexington, Ky., Jan.25, 1877.

MY DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - My attention has been recently called to an expression which occurs in the Circular on the Warfare – “quicken spirits.” I remember the expression was severely criticized immediately after the Circular was first printed. Recently it has been called up by a brother, who seems to conclude the expression is inappropriate. The term *quicken* is susceptible of several meanings, as we learn from several of our lexicons, as Brown’s Dictionary of the Bible, Buck’s Theological Dictionary, and Webster’s Dictionary. There is more than one of those meanings which in my judgment justifies the use I have made of the term – to give life; to hasten; to accelerate. To quicken is ascribed to each Father, Son and Spirit. Hence, “As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.” “It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing.” Again, “If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your *mortal body* by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.” It was said, on another occasion, “That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die.” This expression is applicable in a two-fold sense: “dead in trespasses and sins,” and corporeally dead. First, “Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ.” “If we be dead with Christ we believe we shall also live with him.” “For in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth

unto God. Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof.” “The last Adam was made a quickening Spirit.” Whence the term quickening Spirit, if he does not *quicken somebody*? Another suggestion, before I proceed with the exposition. There is a recognized difference between *the man* and *the body*, or *temple*, or *house*, he dwells in. “If this earthly house of our tabernacle were dissolved.” If crime be committed; it is not charged against the house, but against the man that dwells in it. “And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground.” Here is the body, house, or dwelling place of man. “And breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.” Paul conceived the idea that man could live in the body and out of the body. And the man Christ Jesus said. “A body hast thou prepared me.”

I now proceed with the matter directly in issue. “And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins.” We do not suppose he meant to say or intimate that their fleshly nature or mortal body was then quickened, but that the seed or germ of eternal life was implanted in them. Allow me to say, I understand that quickening necessarily antecedes birth, whether we apply it to the natural or the spiritual birth. “But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ.” As I have said, we cannot suppose, rationally, that he meant that their mortal body or fleshly nature was then quickened with Christ; nor yet can we rationally suppose that when the apostle further says, “And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ,” he meant that the Adamic nature had been so highly blessed. What then? That the *germ* had been quickened, “born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” And this “new man” sat in heavenly places in Christ. “The old man” was not created in Christ, and consequently could not descend from, or be born of him.

The Bible informs us that “God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.” Paul asks the question, “What man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.” “If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.” From what I have said, it is demonstrated that those, and only those, who are quickened and born of the Spirit, can worship God aright; and they often complaining of slothfulness, coldness, and want of zeal in the cause of God and truth. Indeed, they are represented as asleep; yea, as dead. Hence we hear the exhortation, “Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.” They cry, Quicken us, and we will call on thee; draw us, and we will run after thee. Now, if Christ quickens them, “gives grace to the humble,” so that they “offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable unto God by Jesus Christ,” I ask, What are they but “quickened spirits?” No petition is intelligently raised to the divine throne to quicken my fleshly nature, that I may worship God aright. How

common is the cry of the distressed in Israel, "I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing; for to will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not." "We are the circumcision which worship God in the spirit, rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." Who are these but "quicken spirits?" Our God has so ordered that the "new man, after God created in righteousness," and the "old man, corrupt according to the deceitful lusts," shall here inhabit the same house or tabernacle, antagonists as they are in nature, whence arises strifes, contentions, wars, wrestlings and runnings; that the new man is constrained to often cry, Lord, save! Lord, help! Lord, deliver! And is only consoled for the time by the hope that ere long he will put off this his tabernacle, and be clothed upon with his house which is from heaven. It is this continued strife which incites to prayer and supplication. We find very many appeals to Christ for help and deliverance. The psalmist cried, "O that my ways were directed to keep thy statutes." "Quicken me according to thy word." "Turn my eyes away from vanity, and quicken me in thy way." "Behold, I have longed after thy precepts; quicken me in thy righteousness." "This is my comfort in my affliction; for thy word hath quickened me." "I am afflicted very much; quicken me, O Lord, according to thy word." I might add many more such supplications, but consider it unnecessary. In none of those cries for help and deliverance have they proceeded from an unsanctified heart; all, all addressed to "him who is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him." The members of the spiritual family, who have here no abiding city. But the comfort, O! The consolation, in the assurance that "though our earthly house of this tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens;" and the remembrance that our God has provided *celestial bodies* for all his family; that our body, though sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; though sown in weakness, it is raised in power; though sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; though sown a *natural body*, it is raised a *spiritual body*. Hence an apostle says, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is."

I sincerely hope, brother Beebe, that I may not be called on again for an explanation of what I have written. I am as ever, most truly and faithfully your friend and brother in hope of the better resurrection,

Thomas P. Dudley.

THE TWO NATURES.

Lexington, Ky., Oct.3, 1877.

MY DEAR SISTER IN CHRIST: - I am gratified to learn you reached home in safety on Thursday evening after leaving us. I retain a very vivid recollection of the delightful season we enjoyed with the brethren and sisters from the north, south, east and west, at my house, the association, and with the dear saints in that vicinity. A moment's sadness came over me at the thought that perhaps from my advanced age, no such season is held in reservation for me during my sojourn in this careworn world. Immediately, however, the scene brightens, with the reflection that soon our Father will call, "Child, your Father calls, come home." Then parting will be no more. When we remember the decree has gone forth from on high. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption," and that the source of all the ills we encounter on our pilgrimage is found in the antagonism of flesh and spirit, and that no power below the heavens can "change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body," we begin to cast around for the source of deliverance. That deliverance is found alone in the life and death, the resurrection, ascension and intercession, which is the crowning glory of the Son of God.

"Whose work was great, 'twas to redeem,
And bring to glory all,
The chosen seed, beloved in him,
Selected ere the fall."

The law must be maintained; justice must be satisfied.

"And who but the Redeemer, say,
Was able to endure,
The weight of sin that on him lay,
And make salvation sure."

"Wherefore it was needful that this man should have somewhat to offer." "And gave him to be the Head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers

of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject unto bondage." All that he did and suffered was for "his body's sake, which is the church." Did he accomplish his undertaking? When the Head met the claims of the law, the members, in their oneness with the Head, met those claims. When the Head suffered, the members suffered. When the Head died, the members died. When the Head rose, the members rose. And thus was the law magnified and made honorable, and justice fully maintained. "If we be dead with Christ, we shall also live with him, if we suffer, we shall also reign with him."

"He for the sins of all the elect,
Hath a complete atonement made;
And justice never can demand,
That the same debt should twice be paid."

Hence Paul said, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather that is risen again, who also maketh intercession for us." He pleads for the members of his body, and says, he knows his Father always hears him. "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory." "By one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified," set apart to a holy use.

"I'm rich, my Lord hath made me so,
Nor greater riches would I know."

I conceive it impossible to reconcile the justice of God with inflicting the penalty of the law on his Son, "who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth," if you shall separate him from those members of his body that had gone into transgression; and equally impossible to justify the withholding of the blessings of redemption from those for whom Christ has obtained "eternal redemption;" and yet equally impossible to account, scripturally, for the continued conflict or war in which the christian is engaged, if we deny that he is composed of antagonistic natures, which the apostle characterizes thus: "The old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts," and "the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." "The flesh [or fleshly man] lusteth against the spirit, [or spiritual man] and the spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." "No man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it." Consequently

the warfare is peculiar to those only who are possessed of two natures. Whence do they derive these two natures? The one is born of the flesh, and is flesh; the other is born of the Spirit, and is spirit. The one is mortal and defiled, the other is immortal, holy and pure. Hence we see that a new tenant coming into the house, tenement, or tabernacle, so directly opposite in every particular, the strife or war begins, and is continued until "mortality is swallowed up of life."

In my younger days I contemplated with great delight the plan ordained of God for the deliverance of poor, rebellious sinners from the curse of the violated law, and their translation into the kingdom of God's dear Son. Now, having grown old, and as I near the end of my mortal career, I feel deeper interest in looking to the future of that existence, and knowing indeed that I have an old man, utterly unprepared for the enjoyment of the saints in light, how consoling to remember there is One "who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body;" that these poor bodies of ours, though sown in corruption, shall be raised in incorruption; though sown in dishonor, will be raised in glory; though sown in weakness, will be raised in power; though sown natural bodies, will be raised spiritual bodies. Then indeed will be brought to pass the saying, "Death is swallowed up in victory." And then will you see Jesus, and be like him, for you will see him as he is. That will be enough.

I trust you may not be as much fatigued in reading as I have been in writing this scroll. My niece, Virginia, will forward you my photograph as requested, and one for sister Purington. A line from you at your leisure will be very acceptable.

Your brother in hope of the better resurrection,

Thomas P. Dudley.

PASSED FROM DEATH UNTO LIFE.

Lexington, Ky., Nov.7, 1877.

MY DEAR BROTHER IN CHRIST: - You and I have been permitted to live and labor long, as we have presumed to hope, in the cause of our divine Savior, and have witnessed many defections from the faith of the gospel, among those who professed to "walk with us to the house of God in company;" and why is it that we

have not been “turned away from the truth, and been turned unto fables?” What anguish has that question stirred. “Will ye also go away?” I feel the language to be appropriate to me.

“Dear Lord, with such a heart as mine,
Unless thou hold me fast;
I feel I must, I shall decline,
And prove like them at last.

But thou alone hast power, I know,
To save a wretch like me;
To whom, or whither shall I go,
If I should fly from thee?

The help of man and angels joined,
Could never reach my case,
Nor can I hope relief to find,
But in thy boundless grace.

That blood which thou hast spilt,
That grace which is thine own,
Can cleanse the vilest sinner’s guilt,
And soften hearts of stone.”

On the grace, and that alone, can you and I rely for the future, as for the past. As we near the end of our mortal career, I feel that we can say in truth, “We have not been moved from the hope of the gospel.” In view of the future of our existence, [and we trust it may be a blessed future] we can say with another poet.

“Should worlds conspire to drive me thence,
Moveless and firm this heart should lie;
Resolved, for that’s my last defense,
If I must perish, here to die.

But speak, my Lord, and calm my fear;
Am I not safe beneath thy shade?
Thy vengeance will not strike me here,
Nor Satan dare my soul invade.”

From my greatly advanced age, it is not reasonable to suppose the days allotted

me on earth are yet many, and I cannot feel their number to be a matter of much concern; infinitely more am I concerned to live to the glory of God, than I am about dying. Death, what is it? A separation from God? A change of state? Instead of a separation from, I indulge hope that I shall be ushered into his immediate presence; not, however, in the “earthly house of this tabernacle,” but being “clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life.” Death, to the christian, is but a shadow, the substance having been destroyed by our High Priest. Yet we have been often, on our pilgrimage, alarmed at shadows. No wonder the christian feels alarmed, when contrasting his pollution, guilt and shame, with the holiness of God; but when he can realize that his sins are, like the Egyptians drowned in the Red Sea, only dead corpses, buried, and no more to rise against him, he sees the folly of his fear.

“O could we make our doubts remove,
These gloomy doubts that rise,
And see the blessed home we love,
With unclouded eyes,”

how would it brighten up the scene, and cause him to exclaim, “Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly;” especially could he realize that death is but a change from a sinful to a sinless state, a mortal for an immortal, and earth for heaven. It will be seen that we are not of those who believe and teach that man dies like the beast of the field, and there is no more of him; but that both saint and sinner will exist in a future state, the former in unmolested bliss, the latter in interminable woe.

“O, if my Lord would come and meet,
My soul would stretch her wings in haste,
Fly fearless through death’s iron gate,
Nor feel the terror as she passed.

Jesus can make the dying bed,
Feel soft as downy pillows are,
While on his breast I lean my head.
And breathe my life out sweetly there.”

There will the heirs of promise rest secure, nor one faint murmur rise. A change from this, to a state of bliss, will bring with it interminable blessedness; but to the wicked, interminable woe. The apostle spake thus to the Thessalonians, to soothe their sorrows; “But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are *asleep*, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we

believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which *sleep* in Jesus will God bring with him.” “And the dead in Christ shall rise first.” Hence it is seen that the terms *sleep* and *dead* are used interchangeably, with regard to the saints. Again, “Behold, I shew you a mystery; we shall not all *sleep*, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the *dead* shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.” Could the people of God contemplate the close of our mortal existence as going to sleep, it would rob death of its gloom.

The psalmist tells us, “Though I walk through the valley of the *shadow of death*, I will fear no evil; for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me.” Could we appropriate these precious promises to our selves, how would they ease our burdened minds. Who rightfully claim them? Let an apostle answer. “Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God; and every one that loveth him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of him.” “We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren.” “Unto you that believe, he is precious.” But to the ungodly, “He is a root out of dry ground, having no form nor comeliness. There is no beauty in him, when they see him, that they should desire him.” Can you not say truly, The gold of Ophir is but dross, compared with my Beloved? “He is the chief among ten thousand, and altogether lovely.”

The mixture of joy and sorrows I daily encounter, cause the anxious inquiry, Are christians built up and cast down thus? Time was with me, as most aptly described by the poet,

“Soon as the morn the light revealed,
His praises turned my tongue,
And when the evening shades prevailed,
His love was all my song.

Then to his saints I often spoke,
Of what his love had done;
But now my heart is almost broke,
For all my joys are gone.

Now when the evening shade prevails,
My soul in darkness mourns;
And when the morn the light reveals,
No light to me returns.”

Let us see whether the unerring word of truth, with regard to the bride of Christ,

does not solve the doubt. "By night on my bed I sought him whom my soul loveth; I sought him, but I found him not." How often, when the busy scenes of the outer world are superseded by this mantle of darkness, and we retire to bed for rest, do our thoughts trouble us greatly. We mourn our forgetfulness of the dear Savior, and lament that the trifles of this poor little world should occupy our minds, to the neglect of his sparing mercy and long-forbearance. We seek him in our meditations and prayer, but find him not. We become restless and disquieted; the bed affords no rest. Hence she says, "Now will I arise and go into the city," [the church] in the streets and broad ways thereof. She wants the *bread of life*, and goes into market street. She thirsts for the water of life, and visits water street; but she fails to meet him whom her soul loves. She is found by the watchmen, [ministers of the gospel] who publish the dealings of the Lord with his children; but they fail to relieve her anxious heart. "It was but a little I passed them, till I found him whom my soul loveth. I held him, and would not let him go." She realizes the truth of the declaration, "We have this treasure [gospel food] in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us." "Until I bring him into my mother's house." [Jerusalem which is above, is free, which is the mother of us all.] But why did she bring him into her mother's house, but that its inmates should rejoice with her in her happy deliverances, as they are they of whom the psalmist speaks, "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him, and he will shew unto them his covenant." What joy do the children of God feel when their Lord brings them into his banqueting house, and his banner over them is love!

When it is remembered that Christ "hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel," and, "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." In confirmation of all these promises, we learn from the divine word that "neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." For our further consolation we are told that, "Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him." "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." "Jesus saith unto her, I am the Resurrection and the Life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die." Gospel faith, or the faith of Christ, is conclusive evidence that its possessor is the subject of everlasting life, "and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." And love to the brethren assures the heirs of promise of their inheritance with all the sanctified in Christ Jesus.

As ever, yours in hope of eternal life,

Thomas P. Dudley.

P.S. – I sat alone, and thought I would employ a few moments in dropping you this scroll.

I baptized a lady, on profession of her faith in Christ, at Elizabeth, at our October meeting. I felt somewhat timid, when I thought of my greatly advanced age; but I had no more difficulty in administering the ordinance, than forty years ago.

T.P.D.

THE ADOPTION OF SONS.

Lexington, Ky., Dec.12, 1878.

MY DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - While sitting alone and meditating on the teachings of the word of God, and especially the many “exceeding great and precious promises” contained therein, my mind was suddenly arrested by the teaching of the apostle Paul, in his fourth chapter to the churches of Galatia, first to fifth verse inclusive, which was opened up to my mind with more comfort and encouragement than ever before. The distinction he makes between the lawful heirs of one’s body, and those who become heirs by adoption, is so manifest and plain as to commend itself to the especial attention of those who desire an understanding of the “more sure word of prophecy.” He said, “Now I say, the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all, but is under tutors and governors, until the time appointed of the father.” We know that the father is responsible for his children while they are minors, and that the children are legally subject to the government and control of their fathers during their minority, although they, when they arrive at their majority, are lords of, or come in possession of the entire estate. Do not forget, this right or prerogative belongs alone to the lawful heir, and his interest in the estate is not advanced one picayune by *adoption*. Not so with the stranger or foreigner; he has no legal right to the estate, nor any part thereof. Hence the apostle continues, “Even so we, when we were children, [of the flesh] were in bondage under the elements of the world; [under the law and under its curse] but when the fullness of the time was come,

God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the *adoption* of sons.” The law interposed a barrier to their receiving the adoption of sons; hence the law must be met in all its jots and tittles, and the curse removed, before they could legally receive the adoption of sons, and the curse removed by one who is legally bound for their transgressions. Hence it is said, “For the transgressions of my people was he stricken.” Again, “For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” Again, “Having predestinated us [the sinful sons and daughters of the earthly Adam] to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, [the sons and daughters of the earthly Adam] according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the Beloved. In whom we [the sons and daughters of the earthly Adam] have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins.” Once more, “Forasmuch then as the children [of God] are partakers of flesh and blood, he [Christ] also himself likewise *took part* of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and deliver them [the same children] who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject unto bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham.” “And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.”

“His work was great, ‘twas to redeem,
and bring to glory all,
The chosen seed, beloved in him,
Selected ere the fall.

And who but the Redeemer, say,
Was able to endure,
The weight of sin that on him lay,
And make salvation sure?

Yet this redeeming Angel came,
So vile a worm to bless;
He took with gladness all my blame,
And gave his righteousness.”

Thus we see that, according to the covenant engagement of Christ, “He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.” And, “By one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.” And he sends his Spirit to seek his sheep and search them out. I now ask our adversaries, Has Christ

done nothing for the “old man?” Not one groan, not one pang, not one sorrow, pressed his holy soul, but for the old man, the sinner. “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.”

“Christ hath fulfilled the law,
Obtained my peace with God;
Hence doth my soul her comfort draw,
And leave her heavy load.”

Paul said to his brethren at Rome, who were quickened and born of the Spirit, “Ye have not received the spirit of bondage, again to fear, but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.” The born heir of God calls God his Father, and the adopted son claims the same relationship. I again ask, Is there nothing done for the “old man?” The apostle did not say to his brethren, Ye have received adoption, but, “the spirit of adoption.” Adoption is in the future; hence he said, “waiting for the adoption, to wit, *the redemption of our body*. For we are saved by hope; but hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for it? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it.” The apostle had in anticipation the cheering truth that Christ “shall change our *vile body*, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body;” that although his body “is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption;” though “sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory;” though “sown in weakness, it is raised in power;” though “sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body.” “For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law; but thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.” Again, I ask, If the adopted sons and daughters share in all these spiritual blessings, is there nothing done for the “old man,” or sinner?

As ever, most kindly and affectionately your friend and brother, in hope of eternal life,

Thomas P. Dudley.

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP.

Lexington, Ky., Jan.8, 1879.

MY DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - Sitting and reflecting this morning, I remember this day is the anniversary of what was called the great battle of New Orleans, fought on the 8th of January, 1815; and I was led, not for the first time, to ascribe the victory achieved by the American arms on that memorable day to the God who rules in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of earth. The victory was so astounding to all parties, when the result came to be known, I commenced a letter to my father as follows: "The Lord has blessed us with the most extraordinary victory on record." But how little I then knew of the power, providence and grace of our God. I had not then read that Saul shall slay his thousands, but David his tens of thousands; nor the declaration of Moses, "O that they [Israel] were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end! How should one chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight, except their Rock had sold them?" Deut.32:29,30. Nor yet the victory achieved by Gideon and his little army of three hundred men, over the innumerable hosts of his enemies. When the battle was over, the victory won by the American arms, it was reported, two thousand, six hundred and fifty of the enemy killed, wounded and prisoners, while the American army had lost but six killed and eight wounded! You will not wonder that I should have written to my father as I did. The contrast between the loss of the contending armies was so great as to almost bewilder.

Our God made a covenant with Abraham and his seed, which ran thus: "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; [not go to heaven for your obedience] but if ye refuse, and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword; for the Lord hath spoken it." According to the statute, God required a mark to be placed on his covenanted people, which should distinguish them in all time from the other nations of the earth. Hence he commanded him to circumcise *his son Isaac*; not to constitute or make him his son. The command reached all the *male* descendants of Abraham, and those *males* bought with his money. This sign of circumcision was intended to distinguish this people from all other people; hence the Lord said unto them, on a certain occasion, "You only have I known of all the nations of the earth; *therefore* will I punish you for your iniquities." A statute of Israel forbade the giving of their sons or daughters in marriage to the heathen nations by whom they were surrounded, that the *seed* might not be corrupted. Few of the violations of the statute to keep the seed holy was more severely punished than the foregoing. "Thou shalt not bring the uncircumcised into the congregation of the Lord." The uncircumcised were positively forbidden to eat of the Passover. And yet we hear a prophet say, "In those days saw I Jews that had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab; and their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews' language, but according to the language of each

people.” If there was nothing in the statutes given to Israel forbidding those unlawful marriages, why does the prophet bring them up, as showing the divine displeasure, in that the offspring could speak neither the language of father or mother, but a confounded language that neither father nor mother could understand? We learn from the divine word that, “Whatsoever was written aforetime was written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.” Israel in her corporate capacity was a type of spiritual Israel, or the church of the living God. The vessels of the sanctuary were committed to the priests under the law, and they were held responsible for safe keeping and proper use.

I now come to the matter I had in contemplation, when I commenced this letter. Allow me to say at the outset, that our God did not command any to *see*, whose eyes of the understanding he had not opened to see “wondrous things out of thy law,” or whose ears he had not circumcised, or opened to hear the holy messages he was about to deliver to them. It is but too manifest that the professed Baptist ministry of our day, like those other denominations, have turned their backs on the teaching of the divine word, listening to fables, desiring to be teachers of the law, understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm; worshiping the idols of men’s hands, bible, missionary and tract societies, theological and Sabbath Schools, by which they “worship and serve the creature more than the Creator, who is over all God blessed for evermore.” The Lord by the prophet Jeremiah said, “Among my people are wicked men; they lay snares, they set traps, they catch men.” Again, “The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule, and my people love to have it so; and what shall be in the end thereof.” And yet again, “O my people, they that lead thee cause thee to err.”

The first temple was demolished, raised to its foundation, because of violation of the statutes and judgments given to govern Israel. With regard to the building of the second, we are told, “When the *adversaries* of Judah and Benjamin heard that the children of the captivity were about to build to the Lord God of Israel, they said, Let us build with you; we worship your God, even as ye do.” But Zerubbabel and Jeshua, and the rest of the chief of the fathers of Israel said, “Ye have nothing to do with us; we ourselves together will build to the Lord God of Israel, according to the decree of king Cyrus, king of Persia.” These very pious adversaries set about immediately to obstruct the building, throwing obstacles in the way, so that the builders, before the work was consummated, had to hold their weapons for defense in one hand, and rear the building with the other. And seeing their hypocrisy, shall we, dare we, enter into partnership or make a compromise with such men? Now let us hear the solemn warning of our God, in the prophecy of Ezekiel, 44:5-9 – “And the Lord said unto me, Son of man.” [I do not recollect that the expression, *son of man*, is ever applied to any but this prophet, and to the Lord Jesus, in the

scriptures. “No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven.” Again, “What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?” Ezekiel is addressed in that way in the 37th chapter of his prophecy. “Son of man, can these dry bones live? O Lord God, thou knowest.” Again, in the 43rd chapter, “Son of man, shew the house to the house of Israel, that they may be ashamed of their iniquities; and let them measure the pattern.”] “Mark well, [give the most earnest attention] and behold with thine eyes, and hear with thine ears all that I say unto thee concerning all the ordinances of the house of the Lord, and all the laws thereof; and mark well the entering in of the house, with every going forth of the sanctuary.” I know of only two ordinances pertaining to the anti-type, the gospel church: Baptism and the Lord’s Supper.

But the prophet was commanded to mark well the entering in of the house, with every going forth of the sanctuary, as well as “the laws thereof.” The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, and the law of sin and death, together with all the laws pertaining to the government of the house, or church of God. “And thou shalt say to the *rebellious*, even to the house of Israel, O ye house of Israel, let it suffice you of your abominations, in that ye have brought into my sanctuary strangers uncircumcised in heart and in flesh, to pollute it, even my house, when ye offer my bread, the fat and the blood, and they have broken my covenant because of your abominations.”

I remember, when I was a soldier in the war of 1812-15, and was posted on picket guard, I forfeited my life if I suffered a stranger to enter the camp who did not give the watchword. And are we less criminal, as the servants of our God, if we allow persons to enter the sanctuary of our God who are unable to pronounce *Shibboleth*, the pass-word of safety? And are we not guilty of causing them to break the covenant? I remember to have heard a minister ask the question, many years since, “Ought not great allowance to be made for ignorant or illiterate persons, in telling their experience to churches?” He replied, “O yes; but if they have sense enough to tell when the pigs get into the corn field, they can tell a christian experience if they have one.”

Allow a short digression. I have heard some contend that baptism is the anti-type of circumcision. Now, the latter was an external sign by which the circumcised identified themselves as the children of Abraham, and bore with them in all countries whithersoever they went, that they belonged to the family of Abraham. Now, what evidence does the sprinkling of a few drops of water on the face carry with it that they belong to the family of our God? Or what evidence do they give to others that they so belonged? Are not both the sign and substance lost in the operation? Again, as circumcision pertained alone to the *male* descendants of Abraham, and those *males* bought with his money, where do you get your authority

for baptizing *females*? The whole system is anti-christian – utterly without divine warrant. Circumcision in the flesh, made by hands, is typical of the circumcision of the heart; hence an apostle said, “He is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God.” Hence we hear it said: “He fashioneth their hearts alike.” And, “As face answereth to face in water, so the heart of man to man.” Again, “The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him, and he will shew them his covenant.” And yet again, “We are the circumcision which worship God in the spirit, rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.” Hence the exhortation of the apostle Peter, “But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts, and be ready to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you.” This is indispensable, as the only means of obtaining gospel fellowship, without which a seat in the gospel church has no charms for me. Christ said, “I am the door; by me if any man enter in he shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture.” A double wrong is committed in receiving persons into the church who fail to give evidence that their heart has been circumcised by the Spirit of God. They must realize their utter helplessness, their just condemnation as violators of the divine law, and be brought to rely alone on the atoning blood of Christ to cleanse from sin, and his righteousness to clothe and present them faultless before the divine throne, and have been baptized by immersion, by an administrator called of God, as was Aaron, and in fellowship with the church, or they have no right to membership in the church. If brought in otherwise, they eat the bread and drink the wine unworthily, not discerning the Lord’s body, and the church is justly chargeable with the wrong.

“And ye have not kept the charge of my holy things, but have set keepers of my charge in my sanctuary for yourselves.” They have employed men as professed ministers, whom the Lord has not called to the work, “desiring to be teachers of the law, understanding neither what they say nor whereof they affirm.” They lack an important qualification; namely that, “the husbandman that laboreth must be first partaker of the fruits.” “Therefore thus saith the Lord, No stranger uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh shall enter into my sanctuary, [dwelling place] of any stranger that is among the children of Israel.” Remember the Lord said, “They are prophets of the deceit of their own hearts, prophesying lies in my name.” But our adversaries tell us, “All these warnings, admonitions and exhortations were well enough in that dark and cloudy day, under the legal dispensation; but we live in a day of light and liberty, the gospel day, and they are inappropriate when applied to us.” Let us see. But do we remember it is said, “The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done, is that which shall be done?” The Savior said, “Beware of false prophets that come to you in sheep’s clothing,

but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits” – the doctrine they preach. And the apostle Paul says, “I know that after my departure shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.” Again, “For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they *heap* to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.” Where do the denominations of that order look for teachers, but to the theological schools? One of which boasts of having graduated more than four hundred. How many have other schools graduated, I know not, but presume the aggregate very far exceeds the number of Baal’s prophets. The apostle Peter tells us, “There were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false prophets among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and shall bring upon themselves swift destruction.” And the apostle John says, “And hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars.” The King of Zion has given a rule by which to try them. “To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” I well remember when the Baptists of this state were pretty much one people; but how is it now, when Fullerism, Arminianism, Campbellism, Two-seedism, Non-resurrectionism, Missionism, with its kindred heresies, are made tests of orthodoxy? Divided and subdivided. God grant that we may take warning, dear brethren, and may we be found contending for the faith which was once delivered to the saints, remembering the chief Shepherd has said, “Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life that fadeth not away.”

Brother Beebe, you will pardon this long letter when you remember I spend much of my time alone, and that I can neither read a sentence in print or manuscript, and am utterly unable to read what I have written. There may be mistakes, especially in quotations, but I am unable to correct them. Truth is omnipotent, and enlightened public justice certain. If you see anything in this letter that will compensate you for reading, and your compositor for setting the type, it is at your disposal.

As ever, with warm affection, your brother, I hope, in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ,

Thomas P. Dudley.

ONE OFFERING.

Lexington, Ky., Jan., 1879.

DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - I cannot suppose that any of the people of our God are so bewitched as to conclude that the blood of the lamb of the passover, sprinkling the lintel and side-posts of the door of the houses occupied by the children of Israel in Egypt, was more efficacious in protecting the inmates from the sword of the destroying angel, than the blood of Jesus Christ is in protecting his redeemed from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us. The law of sacrifices for atonement was made with Abraham and his seed, and was continued in their generations, until the "bringing in of a better hope." Hence it is said, when one of the congregation of Israel had sinned against God, "Aaron [the high priest] shall make atonement for his sin, and it shall be forgiven him." Again, when the whole congregation of Israel had sinned against God, Aaron the high priest shall take from the congregation of Israel two goats, one for the Lord, and the other for the scapegoat." "And Aaron shall lay both his hands on the *head* of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness." And it is expressly said that the scapegoat *bore away* all the transgressions of all the children of Israel. Hence it is seen that the priests under the law were confined to national Israel, in all the atonements made. As the High Priest of our profession is, in making atonement, alone for the children of God. Paul says, "But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, that is to say, not of this building, neither by the blood of bulls and of goats, but by his own blood he entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Again, "By one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified."

"Christ, for the sins of all his elect,
Hath a complete atonement made;
And justice never can expect,
That the same debt shall twice be paid."

Of what avail then is all the appliances which Arminians rear up for the purpose of evangelizing the world, combining protracted meetings, pathetic tales to work on the passions, anxious-benches, and proselyting to their false systems, when brought in contact with the announcement from on high, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption?" "Who then can be saved?" "With men it is impossible; but with God all things are

possible.” We know, as rational beings, that we have flesh and blood, and that we are corrupt, or we could not die, and that all the agencies under heaven cannot transform our flesh and blood into spirit, nor remove our corruption. Hence we are compelled to acknowledge the sovereignty of God in the salvation of his people.

As ever yours,

Thomas P. Dudley.

MEMBERS OF HIS BODY.

Lexington, Ky., Jan., 1879.

MY DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - I have been fully satisfied for more than fifty years, that the difficulty with the people of God in explaining the warfare which so distressingly annoys and perplexes them, results from want of understanding the relations they sustain to the Lord Jesus Christ, and their complex character as the sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty. They have not considered the complex character of the Husband, that he was composed of two whole and distinct natures, the divine and the earthly; and the bride must partake alike of the same, or they could not enjoy each other's society. She sustained the relation to him originally, as "created in righteousness and true holiness;" but according to the divine arrangement, she must partake of flesh and blood, and in thus partaking she transgressed the divine law and became exposed to its curse. Hence it is said, "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise [after the same manner] took part of the same," &c. He was the Christ of God before, and they were the children of God before partaking of the same. Under the Jewish law, when a Jew became indebted beyond his means of payment, he was sold into bondage, and the nearest of kin possessed the right of redemption; but if he declined, the statute required that he should take off his shoe and cast it to the next nearest of kin, and thus transfer his right to redeem. But, thank God, Jesus, our nearest of kin, did not transfer his right. "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." It is admitted on all hands that the entire family of the earthly Adam were created in and with him. Is the mystery, that the spiritual family should have been created in their spiritual Head before the foundation of the world, less true? Of the earthly family it is said, "And called their name Adam." What is more common than to call children after the name of their father? Hence, all born of the flesh are nothing more than Adam multiplied. But Paul tells us of another family: "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of

whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named.” And we hear Christ say, by the prophet, “I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back; bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth, even every one that is called by my name. For I have created him for my glory, I have formed him; yea, I have made him.” Very soon after I became a member of the church, I heard a minister say from the pulpit, “In the new birth the soul, or man, is changed from the love of sin to the love of holiness.” This plunged me into deep distress, finding this was not my case, that I was continually sinning. I ventured to inquire, Who changed him? The reply was, God. I remember that Moses said, “He is the Rock; his work is perfect.” My reason told me that if that change were wrought in me, I would be as wholly devoted to holiness after, as I had been to sin before the change. This increased my agony. This was not all; he said, “In the new birth the enmity of the heart is slain.” I knew well, if this were true, I was no christian. Such was my distress, laboring under a heavy domestic affliction, I went to the church, and told them I was satisfied I was no christian; if they could see into my heart, they would have as much fellowship for the devil as for me. My distress seemed to be almost unbearable. I found myself murmuring at the providence of God, and could not suppress it. Go where I would, by day or by night, I felt rebellion rise in my heart; and on the third Saturday evening in 1820, riding alone, mourning over the rebellion of my poor heart, the text occurred, “When I would do good, evil is present with me.” Again, “The good I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do.” This was Paul’s experience, but he was not as rebellious as I. I had gone but a short distance when another declaration of Paul occurred to my mind, “The flesh [or fleshly man] lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary, the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.” This startled me. This is Paul’s experience; is it not yours? I could doubt no more on the subject. So strong was the impression on my mind, that while riding along I spoke aloud, Paul is right, and those who differ from him are wrong. The correctness of this conclusion was so irresistible, that from my earliest ministry I maintained the doctrine that “the old man is corrupt, according to the deceitful lusts;” but “the new man, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness.” And these are the antagonistic parties in the people of God, which cause the wrestling, striving and fighting which so disturb their peace. I preached the doctrine for five and twenty years, without its being called in question, so far as I know and believe. At the session of our association in 1845, I was appointed to prepare a Circular Letter for the following year. I wrote the Circular on the “origin, nature, and effects of the spiritual warfare.” On my way to our association the next year, and calling at the house of a dear ministering brother, whose wife had been confined to her bed two or three years, the brother remarked, “Brother Dudley, I remember you were appointed to write the Circular; have you written it?” I replied,

“I have written two.” He said, “My wife has been confined to her bed for two or more years, and could not get out to preaching; have you any objection to reading them?” I replied, “No; I have no secrets from my brethren.” While reading the Circular, tears ran freely down her face, and when through, she exclaimed, “O, brother Dudley, that is the letter,” placing her hand on her breast; “I have it here.” I left to attend other appointments, and on the morning the association met, the brother to whom I have alluded came to me, and said, “I spent last night with two of our ministers, who will object to the adoption of the letter.” Then said I, “I will not offer it, as I will not intentionally cause difficulty.”

The next year the committee declined to recommend the adoption of a Circular which had been written, and were about to adjourn, when a brother, who had seen the Circular on the Warfare, [contrary to my wish] brought it to the attention of the committee, who offered it as a substitute for the one which had been written. Two members said, “The letter contains some things too deep for our understanding, but we will go with the association if they wish to adopt it.” I immediately objected, saying, “I have no misgiving as to the truth of the doctrine taught in the letter, but I will not burden my brethren.” Many misrepresentations of the contents of the letter were made, and in February, 1849, I had one thousand copies printed, the association had three thousand more printed, and twelve thousand or more were published in the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, which caused, or rather was made a pretext for, two small churches to withdraw from the association. Recently the war on the Circular has been renewed in certain quarters, and it has been denounced as the worst kind of heresy. Strange as it may appear, while so many hard things have been said against its teachings, there has not been one man found in the ranks of the opposition who has had the courage to bring it to the test on its merits or demerits, as the case may be, and show a want of harmony with the divine word. Truth is omnipotent. It is gratifying to believe there is not a dissenting person in our connection from the doctrine of the warfare, as illustrated in the foregoing illustration.

As ever, your brother in hope of eternal life,

Thomas P. Dudley.

DEFENSE OF VIEWS.

Lexington, Ky., April 18, 1879.

ELDER G. BEEBE & SON: - I had thought I would not ask you to publish my reply to Elder Joel Hume's communication published in the *Baptist Watchman* of the 4th of January last, in which he has given what he calls a conversation he had with me nearly thirty years since, out of which he seems to think he can make capital to my prejudice at this late day. I chose rather to ask of the editor of the *Watchman*, in whose columns Elder Hume's letter was published, the liberty of replying through the same medium. I wrote to Elder Stevens three or four weeks since on the subject, and hearing nothing from him since, I take it for granted he does not intend opening his columns to my reply. From the reluctance he has heretofore shown to correct misrepresentations wantonly made of my brethren and myself, when he had been furnished with a refutation of those misrepresentations, I doubted whether he would publish my reply to Elder Hume. Nearly two years since he published three letters over the signature of R.B. Gunn, Egypt, Miss, in which were gross misrepresentations of the late Elders Trott and Leachman, and Elders Beebe, Johnson and myself. I wrote a reply, which did not appear in his columns for near three months. Some twelve months since, he published a communication from Big Harpeth Church, Wilson County, Tenn., making an unprovoked attack on Elders Beebe, Patman, Licking Association and myself, to which I transmitted a reply, dated the 12th of July last, and that reply appeared in his issue of Nov. 2nd – nearly four months after, with the date and a supplemental note suppressed.

Elder Hume's memory has been so much at fault, and his imagination so fruitful, that I feel it due to the cause of truth and myself to ask the insertion of the enclosed in the SIGNS. As ever, most truly your friend and brother,

Thomas P. Dudley.

P.S. – In my letter to Doctor Stevens, editor of the *Watchman*, I reminded him, as a practicing physician and surgeon of the necessity to the safety of the patient, where poison is thrown into the system, the antidote should follow as speedily as possible. In the delay he has shown in publishing refutations of the defamatory articles against the brethren, he has given reason to conclude that he intended the poison should do its full work before the antidote was applied in arrest.

T.P.D.

Lexington, Ky., March 24, 1879.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BAPTIST WATCHMAN: - I received from a friend, a few days since, a part of your issue of the 4th of January last, who called

my attention to a communication, a letter over the signature of Joel Hume, the inaccuracies of which I feel it due to myself and the subject to correct.

I have a distinct recollection of the topic on the last night he spent at our house, but not the slightest recollection that on that night, nor on any other occasion, the words passed between us on the subject of the christian warfare; and I am very confident I should have had no difficulty in explaining the two texts he tells us he put to me, and pretty strongly insinuates I could not explain in perfect harmony with the views I entertain. I will here inform him that I explained these texts thirty years since, *in print*, where they are now to be seen. But he seems to assume that, if my views are correct, he knows nothing savingly of the christian religion. In this conclusion I sincerely hope he is mistaken.

I propose to present dates and facts, which will show clearly the improbability, if not impossibility, of his statement being correct. My wife and myself were married on the 24th of October, 1848, and removed to my farm the last of November, or first of December, 1849. The circular on the Warfare was printed in the month of February, 1849, in pamphlet form, and one thousand copies immediately circulated. The stronger impression on my mind is that a copy was forwarded to Elder Hume, and I do not think I ever saw the manuscript after the proof was examined. Yet, Elder Hume says I read the manuscript to him at my house the last night he spent with me, and that I asked what he thought of it. Further, as my recollection serves me, Elders Hume and Conrad had an appointment and preached in this city on Wednesday preceding the fourth Sunday in November 1849, and accompanied my brother James to his house. On Thursday they preached at Bryans, where Elder Hume attempted to disabuse himself of the charge of two-seedism, which had been made in some quarters. From Bryans they accompanied my wife, myself, and I think, a brother of the church at Bryans home. Here I remark that Elder Conrad, who accompanied Elder Hume to our house, was fully and publicly committed to the belief of the doctrine taught in the circular on the Warfare. The topic of conversation at our house I think Elder Hume will remember, on his memory being refreshed, was the split in the church at Sardis, in Boone County. At the session of our association in September 1848, two letters were presented, each claiming to be from the church at Sardis. At the proper time the letters were referred to a committee, on whose report the association rejected both letters, declaring the church was in disorder. Notwithstanding this decision, Elder Conrad, who was a member of our association, and Elder William Hume, for whom I entertained warm christian regard, had an appointment for [I think] a three days meeting with one of the disorderly parties, towards the close of which they administered the Lord's Supper to them. I pronounced this gross disorder on the part of the Elders engaged. This led to a long conversation, in which Elders Joel Hume and Conrad attempted to justify, and I to condemn the disorder. After a great

deal being said, I recollect distinctly that Elder Joel Hume asked, "If my uncle were to visit you, as you think he is in disorder, would you invite him into your pulpit to preach?" To which I replied. "If I did, I should partake of his disorder." What influence this plainness on my part had in causing Elder Conrad's subsequent opposition to the circular on the Warfare, I know not, or what influence, if any, it had in causing him subsequently to be opposed to the circular, I know not. I am confident I had no knowledge of his opposition until subsequent to that night's conversation. On the following morning I accompanied those Elders to their appointment at my nephew's, Elder S. Dudley. On taking leave of them that afternoon, Elder Hume gave a pressing invitation to visit the churches to which he had been preaching, and preach for them. The next I heard from Elders Hume and Conrad was the day after we separated, the fourth Saturday of November, 1849. They attended the meeting at Stoney Point, and are believed to have participated in bringing out that extraordinary and mischievous document purporting to be "a joint manifesto of the churches of Stoney Point on Friendship," in which they denounce the circular on the Warfare as "the worst kind of heresy," without regard to the divine admonition, "An heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject," and declared non-fellowship for three sister churches, without giving either of them, the slightest information that they had anything against them, in disregard of the divine direction.

The next we hear of Elder Hume is contained in a letter from Elder B.B. Piper to me. Elders Hume and Piper attended an appointment in Boone County, at which Hume severely denounced someone for preaching terrible heresies, and warned the brethren against the heresies. They were invited and accompanied brother E.H. Parrish home, and I here give Elder Piper's account of what passed: "Parrish asked Hume, Who did you allude to in your discourse today as preaching such terrible heresies? Hume replied, I alluded to Thomas P. Dudley. Parrish said, Are you certain that brother Dudley holds and preaches those heresies? Hume replied, Yes sir, I am certain he does. Parrish said, Be certain that you are right. Hume said, I am certain I am right, and if I had his Circular on the Warfare I would prove that I am right. Parrish said, Are you certain that you could prove that Dudley holds and preaches these heresies, by the circular on the Warfare? Hume replied, Yes sir. I am certain I could. Parrish absented himself from the room a short time, and returned with the Circular, which he handed to me [Piper] to read. When I had read it carefully through. Parrish asked Hume, Now where is the proof? Hume seemed, and evidently was confounded. After a considerable pause, Hume said, I got it from him in private conversation." On my first interview with Parrish subsequently, he confirmed in every essential particular Piper's letter to me. The veracity of no man in the communities in which he had lived was less questioned than that of Edmund H. Parrish.

Elder Hume seemed to conclude that if the Circular on the Warfare was published, it would play havoc in splitting, dividing, and disturbing the peace of churches. But what does the sequel prove? Where will he find a parallel? Fifteen churches scattered over an area eighty or more miles north and south, and about the same east and west, which have enjoyed uninterrupted peace, union, harmony and warm christian fellowship for eight or nine and twenty years, which has been the good fortune of Licking and her eleven corresponding sister associations? But this is not all. The Salem Association, of which Elder Hume was a member in troublesome times, and whose members he warned against my heresy, being misinformed by one of her ministers, telling a majority of them [as I was informed] that Licking Association was in disorder, [which was not true] induced them to put in their letters a request to suspend correspondence with Licking. When the subject came up in Salem Association, and the suspension was warmly opposed, the same minister interposed, saying, "The churches are sovereign, and a majority have in their letters suspended. We must obey the churches." Thus the suspension was brought about. In a very short time these churches being informed of the error practiced on them, came back with acknowledgements and asked a renewal of the correspondence with Licking, which was agreed to. Substantially the same may be said of Mount Pleasant Association. Licking dropped from her correspondence Ketocton Association, because of her opening correspondence with a people for whom we had no fellowship. Tates Creek took some steps toward renewing the correspondence, but Licking declined. The only remaining association which from false information suspended was Red River. I visited and preached several times at that association, many of whose members did not hesitate to say I had been slandered; that the doctrine I preached was what they believed.

With regard to the churches of our association which withheld correspondence, with or without cause. Elder Hume may understand that several of them have since become extinct, the candlestick being removed, and among the churches to which the Moderator of the meeting which issued and published that mischievous document, the "joint manifesto," I take sincere pleasure in saying that I paid him a visit, shortly, before his death, and he made such atonement as I cheerfully received.

I now submit to the readers of this response to determine whether the quotation made by Elder Hume, and which he would have applied to me; namely, "Mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine ye have received, and avoid them," applies with stronger force to him, the accuser and defamer of the brethren, or I, who in all the controversies to which I have been a party, always acting on the defensive, but never the aggressor.

Respectfully,

Thomas P. Dudley.

I propose now to give what I understand to be the true exposition of the texts which Elder Hume seemed to conclude I could not reconcile with my views as published in the Circular on the Christian Warfare. If he will consult his lexicon, he will find the prime import of the word “quicken” is to “give or impart life.” In no case is it used to *change the life had*. The words *quicken* and *impart life*, are used interchangeably or synonymously in the book of God. For example, “And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins.” Again, “And hath quickened us together with Christ.” “I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish.” Again, “That he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given them. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.” I presume Elder Hume will not deny the necessity of possessing eternal life, as indispensable to a knowledge of God and the discharge of any spiritual or gospel duty. “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; *neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.*” Now, it was the possession of this eternal life which enabled Paul’s brethren at Ephesus to sit together in heavenly places in Christ. But allow me to remind you that this eternal life given them did not *change or destroy* their Adamic or natural life.

The terms *soul* and *man*, or *men*, in the scriptures is to be interpreted man or men, as the eight souls saved in the ark, and the three thousand souls added unto them on the day of Pentecost.

Now, concerning the other text, Elder Hume quoted, “Confirming the souls of the disciples,” &c. Can Elder Hume suppose the apostles expected or intended to confirm the souls, *literally*, when they elsewhere so abundantly show the incapacity of men in nature to understand the things of the Spirit of God? What then is the meaning of the text? Undoubtedly, confirming the “new man, after God created in righteousness and true holiness;” the man born of the Spirit. But enough. I sincerely hope Elder Hume may be led to understand the fitness of things in accordance with the divine word.

Thomas P. Dudley.

ADOPTION.

Lexington, Ky., Nov.29, 1879.

ELDER G. BEEBE & SON – DEAR BRETHREN IN CHRIST: - I wrote an article on the doctrine of adoption, which appeared in one of the earlier numbers of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES of the present year. I now propose with your permission to offer some additional thoughts on that important subject. Important as I consider it to be in the christian system, I have never seen it incorporated with any formula of faith, either printed or written.

I am aware that the doctrines of election and predestination are most generally confounded by professors of religion in our day. I however conclude that they are radically different in their import, election being a sovereign act of the Creator as already consummated; predestination looks to the future for its consummation. The Bible presents us with two families: The earthly and the heavenly, each family having its respective head or progenitor. The offspring of each is necessarily one with its progenitive head in nature. Those two heads are the earthy Adam and the Lord from heaven, as described by the apostle. “And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening Spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.” The law of God was given to the earthly Adam, which is obligatory upon him and all his seed; hence it is said, “The law was not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient.” Again, “Sin is the transgression of the law.” Again, it is said, “All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.” “All flesh hath corrupted his way before the Lord.” Hence we see that the whole earthly family are guilty before God, having violated his law. The apostle tells us, “Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” Now with regard to the heavenly family, it is said, “According as he hath chosen us in him [Christ] before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love.” Again, “According to his [God’s] own purpose and grace, which was given *us* in Christ Jesus before the world began.” Again, “Lord, thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations; before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth or the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou God.” [Ps.90:1,2] The offspring of our spiritual Progenitor “are born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.” The psalmist tells us, “A seed shall serve him, it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation; they shall come, and shall declare his

righteousness unto a people that shall be born, that he hath done it.” Isaiah calls them the “holy seed;” again, he calls them “the seed of the blessed.” Hence it appears the law never was given to Christ as the spiritual Head, nor to his spiritual seed; consequently they never went into transgression, and needed no redemption. It is moreover said of them, “which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” Here we have the direct antagonism between the children of the flesh and the children of the Spirit, out of which grows the christian warfare. The apostle tells us, “The old man [or child of the flesh] is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; but the new man after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.” Again, “But though our outward man perish, the inward man is renewed day by day.”

There are those who contend that the election of God was in the earthly Adam. I cannot concur with this idea, because there is no authority in the Bible for it. The election of grace I have already shown to be anterior “to the creation of the heavens and the earth and the sea, and all that are therein,” and necessarily was antecedent to the creation of Adam and his earthly family. Moreover, it is said of Christ, the Head of his spiritual seed, “who is holy, harmless, undefiled, *separate from sinners*, and higher than the heavens.” Again, “Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.” Of the spiritual seed it is said, “Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.”

Now with regard to adoption, which looks to the future for its consummation, it is said, “having predestinated [foreordained or pre-appointed] us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, wherein he hath made us accepted in the Beloved.” Thus it is seen that a portion of the earthly Adam’s family are predestinated to the adoption of children, in which the distinction is plainly drawn between the heirs of one’s body and strangers that might be adopted. The heir of the body looks alone to the will of the testator for title to enjoy the inheritance, his name being written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. The adopted has to resort to the records of the court to establish his claim to participate in the inheritance. The apostle tells us, “Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he [Christ] also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham.” “Unto Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ.” Again, “Neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children; but in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the

promise are counted for the seed.” Hence it appears that the children were children before they partook of flesh and blood, even as Christ was the Christ of God before he partook of flesh and blood; therefore it is seen that the part of which he took was the predestinated to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ.

To deny the existence of the two families would be to ignore the mediation of Christ, for it is said, “A mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one.” It would also ignore the doctrine of adoption. There is perfect oneness between the progenitor of each family and the offspring of that family, hence the term mediator would be unmeaning. But when we remember that the earthly family are bound by law to their Creator, and that all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God, we see a propriety in the Mediatorial work of Christ. Hence the apostle said, “There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all [the adopted,] to be testified in due time.” An apostle says, “Even so we, when we were children [of the flesh,] were in bondage under the elements of the world; but when the fullness of the time was come God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.” Owing allegiance to the law, we could not receive the adoption of sons until its claims were fully met. The apostle says, “For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.” Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us. It is written, “Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.” Christ says, “Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee; as thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.” “And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.” This eternal life, or the new man after God, created in righteousness and true holiness, becomes a tenant in the house or body with the old man, who is corrupt, according to the deceitful lusts. The antagonism between those two men is very soon made manifest, the war commencing between the flesh and spirit, and will be continued till the old man falls a prey to death. We conclude that the resurrection of the dead is the crowning glory, so to speak, of the Mediatorial work of the Lord Jesus Christ. The apostle says, “As in Adam all die [that are in Adam,] even so in Christ shall all [that are in Christ,] be made alive. But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ’s at his coming.” “But some man will say, How are the dead raised up; and with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain; but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own

body.” I Cor.15:35-38. “There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial; but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another. There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body.” It is said of Christ, “Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his own glorious body.” “For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory.” The adopted in the new birth only received the spirit of adoption; they now receive that for which they have been waiting, to wit, the redemption of the body. Hence an apostle said, “Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.”

Now of the things herein written this is the sum: The election of grace was in Christ before the foundation of the world; the holy seed is the substance thereof; the Lord has been their dwelling place in all generations, before the mountains were brought forth; their sonship is in the only begotten Son of God; they are born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible; they cannot sin, because they are born of God, and therefore have no need of redemption, their names are written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world; their title to the inheritance of the saints in light is found in the will of the testator; they are begotten again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for them who are kept by the power of God unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time. Predestination is accomplished in the adoption of a definite number of the family of the earthly Adam, who were by nature the children of wrath, even as others; hence it is said, “But Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the most holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.”

“And who but the Redeemer, say, was able to endure,
The weight of guilt which on him lay, and make salvation sure?
Yet this redeeming Angel came so vile a worm to bless,
He took with gladness all my shame, and gave his righteousness.”

I delight to do thy will, O my God; thy law is within my heart. The spirit of adoption is received in the new birth, and the eyes of the understanding are opened. They discover wondrous things out of God's law. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the law to do them." The sinner is made to cry,

"Darkness and shame and grief oppressed my gloomy mind,
I looked around for relief, but no relief could find,
At length to God I cried, he heard my plaintive sigh,
And instantly he sent salvation from on high.

My drooping head he raised, my bleeding wounds he healed,
Pardoned my sins, and with a smile the gracious pardon sealed.
O may I ne'er forget the mercy of my God,
Nor ever want a tongue to spread his loudest praise abroad."

How transporting the thought, that "when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is."

With warm affection, your brother in hope of the better resurrection,

Thomas P. Dudley.

BORN OF THE SPIRIT.

Lexington, Ky., March, 1880.

ELDER G. BEEBE & SON – DEAR BRETHREN: - For more than sixty years I have esteemed the Bible as among the unappreciable blessings that our God has bestowed upon his church, containing everything needful for us to know, believe and do in his service; but what solid comfort or instruction could it afford us in the absence of that other inestimable blessing, the holy interpreter, of whom it is said, "He shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you?" Especially shall we remember, "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." In my younger days, when blessed with sight, I read its holy pages occasionally with some pleasure, I trust, not without some profit; but then, as now, clouds obscured my path, and doubts and fears arose with regard to the salvation it teaches. I was made to adopt the language of the poet,

“But when, great God, thy light divine,
Had shone in this dark soul of mine,
Then I beheld with trembling awe,
The terrors of thy holy law.

How dreadful now my guilt appears,
In childhood, youth and growing years;
Before thy pure, discerning eye,
Lord, what a filthy wretch am I!”

Nor did I find peace or rest until the blessed Comforter turned my mind to the declaration, “For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit.” Since then I have not varied in my conclusion that “there is salvation in none other; for there is none other name under heaven given amongst men whereby we must be saved,” but the name of Jesus Christ. Therefore I can most cordially adopt the language of the poet,

“None but Jesus, none but Jesus,
Can do helpless sinners good.”

If there were no other medium of comfort or consolation while on our pilgrimage through this world than that which is derived from reading the written word, how sad would be my condition; but I rejoice to know that our God is able to speak comfort to the poor distressed heart, independently of the written word. I know not if at any period of my life I have had more comfort in meditating on the divine word than since I have been deprived of the privilege of reading. This brings me to contrast faith and sight. Our God is not a corporeal being, but a spirit, invisible to natural sight, but believed on by faith. Man is a corporeal being, and can be felt of; and so of God manifest in the flesh. God was invisible to sense. The man Christ Jesus was seen and heard when he tabernacled among men on the earth. Hence he said, “Handle me; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.” Thus we see he was possessed of two whole and distinct natures – the divine and the fleshly. Not like the earthly, created man, who was created with only one nature. While the man Christ Jesus was on earth, those who lived in that day saw him with their natural eyes, and the miracles which he performed; yet they did not perceive the Godhead bodily that dwelt in him. The Bible tells us, “No man

hath seen God at any time.” And the Savior says, “No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.” I suppose that no intelligent person will fail to perceive the difference between matter and spirit. Matter is something seen by the natural eye, and is tangible. On the other hand, the spirit is only seen by the eye of the understanding being enlightened, and is intangible. I presume that no intelligent christian will question the appropriateness of the illustration given by the Savior of the new birth, “The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit.” He also said, “That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.” I shall be allowed to suggest a few thoughts in relation to the birth of the Spirit, in connection with a circumstance which occurred in Boone County, Kentucky, nearly thirty years ago. Elder Wilson Thompson and I preached there, and as we entered the pulpit an aged Baptist minister said to me, “Tell the people what man it is that is born of the Spirit.” After preaching, the same minister said, “Why did you not tell the people it was the Adam man that is born of the Spirit?” I replied, “My Bible don’t say so.” I suppose that is the idea of those who differ from us on the subject of the new birth. But who, and of what is the Adam man composed? He is of that family of which the Bible tells us, “All flesh hath corrupted his way before God.” He is composed of flesh, blood and bones, or soul, body and spirit. I was unable then, as I have ever been, to conceive how such a mass of corrupt matter could have such an inbeing in the incorruptible Spirit as to be “born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.” If the Adam man be born of the Spirit, he is spirit, and would be imperceptible to our natural sight, or of the touch or handling of our hands, as of the Spirit of which he is said to be born. We see the destruction of life and property by the wind, yet we cannot see the wind. To illustrate, a man was seen yesterday rolling sin under his tongue as a sweet morsel, drinking down iniquity as the ox drinketh water, and was heard to boast of his good heart, his approved conscience, and of the bright prospect before him. Today the same man is seen with his head bowed down as a bulrush, loathing himself on account of the abominations of his heart, and exclaiming, “God, be merciful to me, a sinner.” With haggard looks and downcast eyes, as if despair had seized on him, under a sense of his just condemnation he says,

“If my soul were sent to hell,
Thy righteous law approves it well.”

By-and-by his countenance brightens up, he is filled with peace and joy, and exclaims, “Jesus is revealed to me as the way whereby God can be just and save a

poor sinner.” Now we have seen with our natural eyes his varied countenance, and heard his exclamations, but the power of the divine spirit of our God by which the varied countenance and language is heard is as impervious to our natural sight as to the wind that blows; and “so is every one that is born of the Spirit.” There are some who contend that the soul is born of the Spirit, and is spirit. The Bible says that the man, soul, body and spirit is born of the flesh; and are equally liable to contract blame. This could not be the case if the soul was born of the Spirit; for an apostle has said, “Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.” Intelligent persons concur in the belief that the soul is the intelligent part of man, that it exercises for the body and its members, and that they act and move at its bidding. If the soul is born of the Spirit, the body and its members will be incapable of sinning. Believer, have you no vain and foolish thoughts, nor unclean desires? Have you ceased to realize “that when I would do good, evil is present with me,” or, “the good that I would, I do not, but the evil that I would not, that do I?” Have you ceased to feel a war within? If you have no internal conflict, and can serve God as you wish, you have had a much more comfortable life than I have had for more than sixty years. Paul said, “I know that in me [that is, in my flesh] dwelleth no good thing.” The soul is located somewhere within the man that is born of the flesh; and Christ said, “I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things [spiritual things] from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight.” I have known Gilbert Beebe after the flesh, as I have known other men, composed of soul, body and spirit, for nearly forty-six years, and have distinguished him from other men by his natural physiognomy; but this afforded me no evidence that he was born of the Spirit. Paul says, “He is not a Jew [christian] which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew [christian] which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.” The apostle Peter said, “Sanctify the Lord God in your hearts, and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear.” The apostles concluded that true and vital religion pertained to the “hidden man of the heart,” and is made known by the heart that believeth unto righteousness, and by the mouth that maketh confession unto salvation, and is utterly intangible and impervious to the natural sight or touch. But I sincerely hope that I have known brother Beebe for this number of years by his knowledge of those spiritual truths which none but those who are born of the Spirit and taught in the school of Christ can comprehend. Thus has the warm fellowship of my heart been drawn out to him as a servant of God called to the work of the ministry, as was Aaron of old, and proving his faith by his works. “By their fruits ye shall know them.”

Allow me to sum up. The elder Brother, the Lord Jesus, is partaker of two whole and distinct natures. He is both God and man. "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." The younger brethren partake of two whole and distinct natures. The old man is corrupt with his deeds; the new man, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness. Now we see the old man with our natural eyes; but the time is coming when we will no longer know him after the flesh. Hence an apostle said, "As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall [in the future] also bear the image of the heavenly." But when? When death shall have done his office with the body, and Christ shall have changed our vile body, and fashioned it like unto his glorious body; when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality. Hence John said, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is."

Brother Beebe, my mind has been exercised with many thoughts. I have been utterly unable to place them on paper. I am dependent on friends to do all my writing. If you shall, in perusing this long letter, conclude that there is anything to throw light on the subject, and to comfort the pilgrims to Zion's city bound, as they journey through life, you may publish it; otherwise throw it aside. With warm affection your companion and brother in the afflictions and consolations of the gospel,

Thomas P. Dudley.

THE END.