

ON THE

# Plan of Salvation

BETWEEN

EDGAR E. FOLK, D.D.

EDITOR OF THE BAPTIST AND REFLECTOR, NASHVILLE, TENN.

AND

ELDER J. C. McQUIDDY

EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE, NASHVILLE, TENN.



NASHVILLE, TENN.

PRESS OF FOLK-KEELIN PRINTING COMPANY

1907

## Introduction.

The following discussion appeared originally in the columns of the Baptist and Reflector and the Gospel Advocate, both of Nashville, Tenn., of which Edgar E. Polk and J. C. McQuiddy are, respectively, editors. There was no thought at first of its publication in more permanent form; but yielding to numerous requests, the writers decided to put it in book form. The articles on both sides have been revised and considerably enlarged from the form in which they appeared in the papers, and we hope that they have been made more interesting and more valuable to our readers. There were several articles in each paper leading up to the discussion; but in preparing it for publication in book form, we have used only the articles which were published in both papers by agreement. All the points in these first articles are practically covered in the discussion.

The most momentous subject in the world is the plan of salvation. Upon it eternal destinies hang. It is a matter, therefore, of the utmost importance that people should know what is that plan of salvation. It would seem that if there is any subject in the world on which everybody would agree, it would be this one; but—alas!—if there is any subject on which everybody does not agree, it is this one.

Here, for instance, are two ministers of the gospel, editors of religious papers, holding and teaching different views as to what is the plan of salvation. Which is right? Let our readers decide; and may God help them to decide aright.

EDGAR E. FOLK.

J. C. MCQUIDDY.

NASHVILLE, TENN., September 2, 1907.

**Folk-McQuiddy Discussion**  
**on the**  
**Plan of Salvation.**

**ARTICLE I.**

**BY E. E. FOLK.**

The *Gospel Advocate* has made some reply to my questions. I must confess, however, to a feeling of disappointment that its reply should have been so brief, and at the same time so incomplete and unsatisfactory. It quotes the passages of scripture whose interpretation I asked it to give, but again studiously refrains from giving its interpretation of them. When the *Advocate* asked me to give my interpretation of some passages, I did so in a plain and straightforward way. I shall insist that the *Advocate* show the same courtesy to me. I again quote the passages of scripture:

"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John 3:16.) "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life: but the wrath of God abideth on him." (John 3:36.) "And brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." (Acts 16:30, 31.) "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. 5:1.) "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law

to do them." (Gal. 3:10.) "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." (Eph. 2:8, 9.) "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." (James 2:10.) "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (1 John 1:7.)

While the *Advocate* does not attempt to give the interpretation of a single one of these passages, it lumps them all together and says:

"These passages are relevant in this discussion only as they relate to faith and obedience. They mean what they say, but they do not say a man is saved by a dead faith, or that faith which does not lead to obedience justifies. 'The devils also believe, and tremble.' (James 2:19.) 'For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also.' (James 2:26.)"

Let me ask the *Advocate* several questions: Is a man saved by faith or by works? Where do you draw the line of salvation, at faith or at works? If at works, what works? Do you limit the works to one work, baptism? Must a man obey in only one respect to be saved, or must he obey in every respect? If he must obey in every respect, then who can be saved? Can the editor of the *Gospel Advocate* be saved? If a person must save himself by his works, then what use have you for Christ? Does not Paul say very expressly as quoted above: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any

man should boast?" (Eph. 2:8, 9.) What do you understand this passage to mean? Is not faith the root and works the fruit of salvation? Do the fruits make the tree? Do they not simply show the tree?

The *Advocate* adds:

"While the *Baptist and Reflector* quotes these passages to make it appear that obedience is unnecessary, yet this is inconsistent with the teaching by which he says he stands and which is the Bible teaching. Here is his position in his own words:

"'Can a man be saved who is fully informed as to the scriptural teachings upon the subject of baptism, and who knows his duty upon the subject, and yet deliberately and persistently refuses to be baptized?' Our reply to the question was that such a man could not be saved, not because he was not baptized, but because such a deliberate and persistent refusal upon his part, after having been thus fully informed as to his duty, would show that his heart was not right and that his conversion was not genuine."

I have called the attention of the *Advocate* to the fact that the question at issue between us is: Can a man be saved who is *not* fully informed as to the scriptural teachings on the subject of baptism, who does *not* know his duty upon the subject and does *not* deliberately and persistently refuse to be baptized, and yet is *not baptized*? I say that he will be saved if he has repented of his sins and trusted in Jesus Christ as his personal Savior, whether he has been baptized or not. What does the editor of the *Gospel*, *Advocate* say? What about the pious unimmersed? Will they be saved?

Why does the *Advocate* studiously ignore these questions? I insist upon an answer to them.

The *Advocate* closed its editorial of June 22 with the following remark: "There is not a case on record where God has ever blessed a man who refused to obey him. A refusal to obey God shows that the heart is not right, the faith is wrong, and the conversion is not genuine."

I then asked the editor of the *Advocate* these questions: Is the obedience which he claims is essential to salvation limited to baptism? Is the command to be baptized the only one which a person must obey in order to be saved? If obedience to one command *is* essential to salvation, is not obedience to all commands essential to salvation? Will the editor of the *Advocate* please draw the line of salvation and tell us just when and where a person is saved? If he must obey in one respect in order to be saved, must he not then obey in every respect? Who does that? Who then can be saved? Can the editor of the *Advocate* be saved? This suggests another question. Paul said: "For if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." (Gal. 2:21.) If salvation is a matter of obedience to the law, if we have to obey the law to be saved, then there was no need for Christ to have died. Will the editor of the *Advocate* tell us what use he has for Christ?

The *Advocate* studiously refrains from answering or even quoting these questions or from referring to them in any way. I insist upon an answer to them.

The *Advocate* complains, however, that I did not publish all of its articles. The articles in question were over two pages in length and it would have

taken a great deal of space to publish all. I did publish, however, all of the essential portions of them, as much as is customary in discussion between papers, and, as a matter of fact, published as much from the *Advocate* as the *Advocate* has published from the *Baptist and Reflector*. I will, however, make the *Advocate* two propositions: (1) I will publish the articles of the *Advocate* if the *Advocate* will agree to publish my replies to them. (2) Or if the *Advocate* will not agree to do that, I will make this proposition: I will discuss with it the question, "What must I do to be saved?" in any number of articles the *Advocate* may designate, say from six to twelve, each paper to have equal space and each to publish the other's articles. Each may have the privilege of a final reply in its own columns. I await the answer of the *Advocate* to the above questions and also to these propositions.

**REPLY I. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.**

In a former issue of the *Baptist and Reflector* the editor affirms: "Salvation is necessary to baptism." It is significant that not a word of scripture is offered in support of this statement. It is undoubted Baptist doctrine, but it is certainly in contrast with the teaching of Christ and of the Holy Spirit through the apostles on the relation of baptism to salvation. There is no saving efficacy in baptism itself. It is simply one of the conditions on which pardon is promised in the New Testament to the believer. Here is an expressive contrast:

## BAPTIST AND REFLECTOR.

## NEW TESTAMENT.

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16:16.) "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Acts 2:38.) "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3:5.) "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." (Acts 22:16.) "Know ye not, that so 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." (Rom. 6:4, 5.) "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." (1 Cor. 12:13.) "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." (Gal. 3:26, 27.) '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." (Eph. 5:25, 26.) "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.) "Baptism doth also now save us." (1 Pet. 3:21.)

"Salvation is necessary to baptism."

I shall be deeply interested in the effort he makes to harmonize these scriptures with his own position that "salvation is necessary to baptism." I am anxious for all Baptists to see how fruitless are his efforts to obscure the scripture teaching, the baptism of a penitent believer is unto the remission of sins.

It is wholly unnecessary for him to quote by way of rebuttal any of the passages that ascribe salvation to faith, for I accept all these in their obvious meaning as readily as he, for not one of the passages quoted by him denies that "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." In fact, it could not with-



out making the Bible contradict itself. I can see no reason for quoting these scriptures unless it is to make the Bible contradictory. He quotes a number of scriptures — John 3:16, 36; Acts 16:30, 31; Rom. 5:1; Gal. 3:10; Eph. 2:8,9; James 2:10; 1 John 1:7 — not one of which says a man is saved by faith alone, or that "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" is not true. As already stated, I accept these scriptures as readily in their obvious meaning as the *Baptist and Reflector*, the difference being that I harmonize scripture with scripture. "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? . . . Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." (James 2:21-24.)

He cannot break the force of the scriptures I have quoted until he finds a scripture that teaches we are saved by faith alone and that there is no element of faith connected with baptism. This he cannot do.

Every effort he makes, he seems to sink deeper into the darkness. In one breath he would make the impression a man is saved by faith alone, and then in the next he shows us man is saved by grace and by the blood of Christ. Much of his effort is wholly gratuitous and unnecessary. No one has intimated that righteousness came by the law of Moses (Gal. 2:21) or that baptism was the only work of obedience. Faith is a work of God. "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." (John 6:29.) It is the work of God that men repent. (Acts 17:30.) It 'is the work of God that penitent believers be baptized. (Mark 16:16.) God saves "when we obey. (Heb. 5:9.) We are saved by grace.

(Eph. 2:8-10.) We are justified by his blood (Rom. 5:9), by faith (Rom. 5:1), by baptism (1 Pet. 3:21), by works (James 2:24.) Who has a right to strike out all save any one of these, saying we are justified by it alone? Who is authorized to strike out even one? In the case of some people he cuts out baptism, and in the case of others he says they will be lost if not baptized, because the heart is not right and the conversion is not genuine. I ask for authority for such teaching. He says the man who does not know his duty on the subject of baptism and is not baptized will be saved. Here is Paul in contrast: "And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." (2 Thess. 1:7-9.) It is dangerous to be wise above "what is written."

He writes of the pious unimmersed (until one would say they are good enough to commune with him, as they are good enough for heaven) and shows he is confused and weary of his own position by seeking to change the issue. He says he has reminded me several times the "issue between us is: Can a man be saved who is *not* fully informed as to the scriptural teachings on the subject of baptism, who does *not* know his duty upon the subject and does *not* deliberately and persistently refuse to be baptized, and yet is *not baptised*? He slips in the little word "not" and italicizes it. Here is the position by which he says he stands:

"Can a man be saved who is fully informed as to the scriptural teachings upon the subject of baptism and who knows his duty upon the subject, and yet deliberately and persistently refuses to be baptized?' Our reply to the question was that such a man could not be saved, not because he was not baptized, but because such a deliberate and persistent refusal upon his part, after having been thus fully informed as to his duty, would show that his heart was not right and that his conversion was not genuine."

In the garden of Eden, to deceive Eve, the devil added "not," and thus brought death to the human family. He should profit by the experience. As the "pious unimmersed" are informed on the subject of baptism, they will be lost, teaches the *Baptist and Reflector*, not because not baptized, but because their neglect or refusal to be baptized shows the heart is not right and the conversion not genuine.

It is abundantly established by both the Bible and the *Baptist and Reflector* that baptism to scripturally informed, penitent believers is unto the remission of sins.

He goes on to say that the man who does not know it to be his duty to be baptized and is not baptized, if he has trusted in Jesus and repented of his sins, will be saved. Such a case never occurred in the days of the apostles. Men who believed and repented were always baptized, and sometimes even "the same hour of the night." Believers were never commanded to put off baptism. Believers in apostolic times always learned they should be baptized, and never learned they should put it off for a year, as do the Baptists. If preachers do their duty now, all believers will be

taught the Scriptures as to their duty to be baptized. If not, why not? If the man will be lost who is fully informed as to the scriptural teachings upon the subject of baptism, if in neglecting or refusing to be baptized he shows his heart is not right and his conversion not genuine, what will become of the preacher who refuses or neglects to teach the Scriptures on the subject of baptism? Will he not be lost because his heart is not right and his conversion not genuine? If not, why not? "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." (Gal. 1:8.) Will he tell us what bearing the scriptures he quotes have on this subject, if he does not quote them to prove that a man is saved by faith alone without obedience to the law of Christ? If this is true, is not his position wrong that the man who understands the scriptural teachings on the subject of baptism and yet refuses to be baptized will be lost—not because he is not baptized, but because his heart is not right and his conversion is not genuine? Thus we have Folk against Folk.

The principle involved is a test of a right heart and genuine conversion. If the preacher does his duty, no man can believe on Christ without being "fully informed as to the scriptural teachings upon the subject of baptism." The duty of every believer to be baptized is made perfectly clear in the New Testament. The Bible teaching on the subject of baptism is that which makes it one's duty to be baptized. It is, therefore, one's duty to be baptized soon as he understands that teaching. Any delay to be baptized after he believes on the Lord Jesus Christ and understands

the scriptural teaching on the subject of baptism is a deliberate and persistent refusal to do the duty God plainly requires. For this reason no one should ever tell any one that his heart is right and his conversion is genuine till he does that present duty.

If I get his point, the man who is fully taught the Scriptures on the subject of baptism cannot be saved unless he is baptized. This is equivalent to saying that baptism is unto the remission of sins to the man who is fully instructed as to the scriptural teachings on the subject of baptism. All believers in New Testament times were taught the duty of baptism. "Many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized." (Acts 18:8.) "But when they believed Philip preaching good tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." (Acts 8:12.) If preachers do their full duty now, all believers will learn they should be baptized and will be baptized just as they were in the days of the apostles. If not, why not? Thus it is established by him that obedience in baptism is essential to salvation. Hence, I may with much propriety ask him the same questions he puts to me: Is a man saved by faith or by works? Where do you draw the line of salvation, at faith or at works? If at works, what works? Do you limit the works to one work, baptism? Must a man obey in only one respect to be saved, or must he obey in every respect? If he must obey in every respect, then who can be saved? Can he be saved? If a person must save himself by his works, then what use has he for Christ?

It is time to ask him to draw the line of salvation.

Are we to understand that the man who is saved by faith cannot be justified by works? This is the clear import of his question; but this also contradicts his position that the man who knows his duty on the subject of baptism, if he refuse to be baptized, will be lost. A man cannot have true faith without works. "Even so faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself. Yea, a man will say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: show me thy faith apart from thy works, and I by my works will show thee my faith. Thou believest that God is one; thou doest well: the demons also believe, and shudder. But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith apart from works is barren? Was not Abraham our father justified by works, in that he offered up Isaac his son upon the altar? Thou seest that faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect; and the scripture was fulfilled which saith, And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness; and he was called the friend of God. Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith. And in like manner was not also Rahab the harlot justified by works, in that she received the messengers, and sent them out another way? For as the body apart from the spirit is dead, even so faith apart from works is dead." (James 2:17-26.) Faith and works are handmaidens.

If the man "who is fully informed as to the scriptural teachings upon the subject of baptism, and who knows his duty upon the subject," "must save himself by his works, then what use have you for Christ?" When he harmonizes his position with his question, his question will need no further answer.

Christ died to make it possible for God to save those that obey him. "Though he was a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation." (Heb. 5:8, 9.) A man has a heavy debt hanging over him which he cannot pay. He is hopelessly involved, and has no way without help to redeem his home. A philanthropist comes to his relief and freely offers him enough, on condition that he will go to the bank and get it, to satisfy all his debts. So Christ came to this world, died to satisfy the demands of justice, to make it possible for God to save man through the gospel. The making of this salvation possible to man was not of works of man, but of the grace of God. "For by grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, that no man should glory. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God afore prepared that we should walk in them." (Eph. 2:8-10.) The grace that makes salvation possible ordains good works "that we should walk in them."

A stream has overleaped its banks and is flooding the country. A man is in his canoe. The canoe breaks away from its moorings. The man has nothing with which to steer it, so he swiftly glides down the swollen stream in danger of being thrown out at any moment. His friends on shore see his danger, and telephone to a town below on the river for help. A bridge spans the river. Many citizens procure a rope and rush out to the bridge and throw it down to the water. Soon they see the man in his dangerous

condition. As he nears the bridge, they shout to him to lay hold of the rope. He seizes it, is drawn up to the bridge and saved. If he had not laid hold of the rope, he would not have been rescued. So Peter shouted on the day of Pentecost: "Save yourselves from this crooked generation." But here he comes and says: If the man is going to save himself by catching the rope and holding on, what use has he for the rope?

The way to test whether a man's heart is right and his conversion is genuine is to state to him clearly the scriptural teaching on the subject of baptism and see whether he will be baptized. This is what inspired teachers did in New Testament times. "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." (Matt. 28:19.) "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." (Mark 16:15, 16.) "John came, who baptized in the wilderness and preached the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins." (Mark 1:4.) "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." (Acts 2:38.) "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name." (Acts 22:16.) This is the way inspired men taught the people. All who believed were baptized. Those who refused or neglected to be baptized simply declined to become disciples. Those who received his word were baptized. "They then that received



his word were baptized: and there were added unto them in that day about three thousand souls." (Acts 2:41.) Those who declined to be baptized of John's baptism rejected the counsel of God against themselves. "But the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected for themselves the counsel of God, being not baptized of him" (Luke 7:30.) Whether a man received or rejected the counsel of God depended on whether he was baptized. The idea that a man can believe on the Lord to the saving of his soul and still neglect or refuse to be baptized is not in the New Testament at all. The New Testament abundantly teaches that the man "who trusted in Jesus Christ as his personal Savior" was always baptized. I challenge him to give one single exception, but this he will never do. "If any man speaketh, speaking as it were oracles of God." (1 Pet. 4:11.)

A shootless root, a dry fountain, a fruitless tree, and a dead faith may satisfy him, but they will never measure up to the New Testament standard. "Nevertheless even of the rulers many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess it, lest they should be put out of the synagogue: for they loved the glory that is of men more than the glory that is of God." (John 12:42, 43.) Such dead faith, fruitless lives, and lovers of the glory of men are not pleasing to God. "Jesus therefore said to those Jews that had believed him, If ye abide in my words, then are ye truly my disciples; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." (John 8:31, 32.) Here are believers who are in bondage to sin because they did not abide in his word. Because these same believers would not love and obey God, Jesus said to

them: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do." (Verse 44.) Only the faith that moves a man to obey God justifies. Naaman was healed when he had dipped seven times in the river Jordan as directed by the prophet. The children of Israel who were bitten by fiery serpents were healed when they had the faith to look. The walls of Jericho fell down when the children of Israel marched around it as directed. When the faith of the Israelite was strong enough to look, God healed him. When Naaman had faith strong enough to dip in the Jordan seven times, God cured him. Baptism is a development of faith, marks the degree of faith at which God pardons. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Saul of Tarsus had faith. He was told to go into the city, and there it should be told him what he must do. When his faith led him to arise and be baptized, God washed away his sins. "And what shall I more say? for the time will fail me if I tell of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah; of David and Samuel and the prophets: who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the power of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, from weakness were made strong, waxed mighty in war, turned to flight armies of aliens." (Heb. 11:32-34.)

## **"Baptism is Necessary to Salvation."**

---

### **ANSWER I. BY E. E. FOLK.**

The editor of the *Gospel Advocate* evidently thought that he had drawn quite a "deadly parallel" on me. He takes my remark, "Salvation is necessary to baptism," entirely out of its connection. The *Advocate* had asked me, "Will the *Baptist and Reflector* tell us whether salvation is before and without baptism?"

I replied: "I answer unhesitatingly, Yes. Salvation is 'before and without baptism.' Salvation is necessary to baptism, but baptism is not necessary to salvation."

I then added: "Now will the editor of the *Gospel Advocate* answer his own question and tell me whether salvation is before and without baptism? The tone of his question indicates that he would answer the question in the negative. But I should be glad to have him give as straightforward an answer to it as I have done."

*Such an answer the editor of the Advocate has not given.* Indirectly, however, he has advocated the converse of the proposition, "Salvation is necessary to baptism," and would make it read: "Baptism is necessary to salvation." This' is implied in everything that he has said and is expressed in a different form in his remark in the above article: "The baptism of a penitent believer is unto the remission of sins." This, by the way, is about the first positive statement the *Advocate* has ventured.

Now, then, let us run a parallel on that proposition:

GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

NEW TESTAMENT.

Baptism is necessary to salvation.

("The baptism of *a* penitent believer is unto the remission of sins.")

"Thy faith hath made thee whole." (Matt. 9:22; Mark 5:34; Mark 10:52.1 "Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace." (Luke 7:50.) "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." (John 3:14,15.) "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John 3:16.) "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." (John 3:36.) "Verily, verily, I say unto you. He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." (John 5:24.) "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." (John 6:35.) "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." (John 6:47.) "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." (John 20:31.) "And his name through faith in his name hath made this man strong, whom ye see and know: yea, the faith which is by him hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all" (Acts 3:16.) "And Put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." (Acts 15:9.) "And they said. Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." (Acts 16:31) "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." (Rom. 1:16.) "Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay; but by the law of faith" Rom. 3:27.) "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by

GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

NEW TESTAMENT.

faith without the deeds of the law." (Rom. 3:28.)  
"But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." (Rom. 4:5.) "For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." (Rom. 4:13.) "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. 5:1.) "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (Rom. 10:10.) "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." (Gal. 2:20.) This only would I learn of you. Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" (Gal. 3:2.) "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith." (Gal. 3:11.) "Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." (Gal. 3:21.) "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3:26.) "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." (Eph. 2:8.) "In whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him." (Eph. 3:12.) "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." (Eph. 3:17.) "The righteousness which is of God by faith." (Phil. 3:9) "That they all might be damned who believed not the truth." (2 Thess. 2:12.) "The Lord, destroyed them that believed not." (Jude 1:5.) "Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time" (1 Pet. 1:5.) "Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls." (1 Pet. 1:9)

Baptism is necessary to salvation.

("The baptism of a penitent believer is unto the remission of sins.")

I have already, at the request of the *Advocate* editor, in a previous article, published some weeks ago,

given the interpretation of most of the passages which he quotes in his parallel. I have shown how beautifully, with the proper interpretation, they harmonize with the scriptures which teach that salvation is necessary to baptism. Or, in other words, that we are saved by faith, and that baptism is simply the outward symbol expressing in a beautiful picture the fact of our salvation by repentance and faith. I have several times asked the editor of the *Advocate* to give the interpretation of many of the passages which I have quoted above, but he has steadfastly refused to do so. I insist that he shall do so. I shall be deeply interested in the effort the *Gospel Advocate* makes to harmonize these scriptures with its own position that baptism is necessary to salvation. I am anxious for all Disciples to see how fruitless are his efforts to obscure the scriptural teaching: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life."

The editor of the *Advocate* says he accepts "in their obvious meaning" "the passages that ascribe salvation to faith." If he intends that remark in its "obvious meaning," then there is no controversy between us and our discussion may as well end here. For the "obvious meaning" of these passages is that "by grace are ye saved through *faith*" (Eph. 2:8), and that the "*end of your faith*" is "the *salvation* of your souls" (1 Pet. 1:9), and that when the penitent sinner accepts Jesus Christ as his Savior through faith in him, he is saved. Will the editor of the *Advocate* stick to his position that he accepts these passages in their "obvious meaning," or was he simply talking for effect?

Of course the Bible does not "contradict itself." That was the very point I made. My purpose in

quoting these passages was not to "make the Bible contradictory." I meant, however, that they would show the Bible to be contradictory, *if a few passages* are given the interpretation put upon them by the *Gospel Advocate*. It is all right to talk about harmonizing "scripture with scripture," but, as a matter of fact, it is impossible to harmonize "scripture with scripture," if a few passages are interpreted in a way which brings them into hopeless conflict with every other passage and with the whole tenor of the Bible.

The *Advocate* says: "He cannot break the force of the scriptures I have quoted until he finds a scripture that teaches we are saved by faith alone and that there is no element of faith connected with baptism. This he cannot do."

I have already found a number of scriptures that teach we are saved by faith alone, as quoted above. I repeat only two or three of them: "He that *believeth* on the Son hath everlasting life." (John 3:36.) "He that *believeth* on me hath everlasting life." (John 6:47.) "*Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." (Acts 16:31.) "By *grace* are ye saved through *faith*." (Eph. 2:8.) "Receiving the *end of your faith*, even the *salvation of your souls*." (1 Pet. 1:9.)

I do not say that there is necessarily "no element of faith connected with baptism." There may be or there may not be. With every true baptism there should be the "element of faith" preceding it. The essential point, however, is: *Is baptism necessarily connected with faith, in the plan of salvation?* As shown in the above passage and many others, this is not the case.

The editor of the *Advocate* does not seem to understand how a man can be saved by faith alone, and also saved by grace and by the blood of Christ. I am not surprised at his inability to understand. The fault is not in himself, but in his theology. Here is what Paul says: "*By grace are ye saved through faith.*" (Eph. 2:8.) I presume that this is above the comprehension of the editor of the *Advocate* with his present theology. Evidently, however, what Paul meant was that *grace* is the *procuring* cause, and *faith* in the blood the *instrumental* cause of salvation. Grace planned the way, which was the blood. Faith accepts the way. Grace is God's part, faith is man's part, in the plan of salvation. Man is saved by grace, which arranged the plan of salvation for him. He is saved by faith alone, so far as his own efforts are concerned.

The *Advocate* says that "faith is a work of God." So it is a "*work of God*" in the heart of man. But the *Advocate* makes it a work not of God, but a *work of man*, which is very different.

I have never said that some people would be lost "if they were not baptized." What I have said is that they will be lost "*because their heart is not right, their faith is not genuine.*" They may show that their heart is not right, their faith is not genuine, by refusing to be baptized, or refusing to go to church, or refusing to give to missions, or failure to live a good life, or in many other ways. "By their fruits ye shall know them." (Matt. 7:16.) By their *fruits* they show, if their heart is not right, their faith is not genuine, that they will not be saved. The essential point, however, is as to whether their *heart* is *right* and their *faith* is *genuine*. *Faith* is the *root* and



*works the fruit of the tree of salvation. The fruits do not make the tree; they show the tree. The works do not make the Christian; they show the Christian. The life is in the root, and the fruit is only the expression, the flowering out of that life.*

The reference of the *Advocate* editor to communion, while parenthetical, is unfortunate for him. Does he believe in putting the Supper before baptism? Is he in favor of communing with those who have not been baptized, and who, according to his theory, have not been saved? If so, he flies in the face of some of the strongest and most prominent Disciples in the land. The question of communion, however, is not now in dispute between us.

Yes, I have "several times" reminded the *Advocate* editor that the "issue between us is: Can a man be saved who is *not* fully informed as to the scriptural teachings on the subject of baptism, who does *not* know his duty upon the subject and does *not* deliberately and persistently refuse to be baptized, and yet is *not baptized?*"

I repeat that this is the essential issue. This is the crux of the matter in dispute between the editor of the *Advocate* and myself. This issue, however, the *Advocate* editor *has never met*. He refuses to meet it, and continually dodges all around it like a shying horse. But I insist that he shall answer that question and meet that issue squarely. What about it? Come to the point, Brother Editor.

The editor of the *Advocate* says that such a case as that of a man who does not know it to be his duty to be baptized and is not baptized, being saved, if he has trusted in Jesus and repented of his sins, "never oc-

curred in the days of the apostles." As a matter of fact, such a case occurred not only in the "days of the apostles," but it occurred in the days of Jesus as well as in the days of the apostles. It occurred in the case, for instance, of the *thief on the cross*. He was not baptized, but he was *saved*.

I do not know of any Baptist preacher in these parts who teaches that believers are commanded to put off baptism. I do not know of any who "refuses or neglects to teach the Scriptures on the subject of baptism." On the other hand, Baptist preachers generally are very earnest and zealous in teaching the Scriptures on the subject of baptism. It is only such preachers as the editor of the *Advocate* who try to be "wise above that which is written," and who teach more than the Scriptures on the subject of baptism. Of course, I have quoted the Scriptures to "prove that a man is saved by faith alone without obedience to the law of Christ." *And they prove it*. They show that a person is saved by faith, and at faith. It must, however, be a genuine faith, or there would not be salvation.

## The Position of the Gospel Advocate.

---

### ANSWER II. BY E. E. FOLK.

The editor of the *Gospel Advocate* begins his second article (his Reply No. 1 was originally two articles) in reply to my editorial of November 2 with a quotation from the *Baptist and Reflector* some time ago. He ignores the real issue between us, to which I have repeatedly called his attention, as follows: Can a man be saved who is *not* fully informed as to the scriptural teachings on the subject of baptism, who does *not* know his duty upon the subject, and does *not* deliberately and persistently refuse to be baptized, and yet is *not baptized*? I say that he will be saved if he has repented of his sins and trusted in Jesus Christ as his personal Savior, whether he has been baptized or not. What does the editor of the *Gospel Advocate* say? What about the pious unimmersed? Will they be saved? Or, to put the matter in a concrete form, I will ask this: *What about D. L. Moody?* Was he saved? I insist on an answer to these questions. It will help to clear the atmosphere of controversy between the *Advocate* editor and myself. It is the essential issue, and his answer to these questions will serve to show his real position, and will also, I think, show its falsity. I asked the editor of the *Advocate* some questions which he has never attempted to answer. He puts the same questions to me, as follows: "Is a man saved by faith or works? Where do you draw the line of salvation, at faith or works? If at

works, what works? Do you limit the works to one work, baptism? Must a man obey in only one respect to be saved, or must he obey in every respect? If he must obey in every respect, then who can be saved? Can the editor of the *Baptist and Reflector* be saved? If a person must save himself by his works, then what use have you for Christ?"

I am under no obligations to answer these questions until the editor of the *Advocate* shall answer them, because they are my questions to him. I asked them first. But I will answer them, anyhow. A man is saved by *faith*, and not by works. I draw the line of salvation at *faith*, not at works. I do *not* limit the works which a person must do to one work, baptism. A man does *not* have to obey either in every respect, or in any one respect, in order to be *saved*. Certainly the editor of the *Baptist and Reflector* could not be saved, if he must obey in every respect to be saved. If a person must save himself by his works, then we would have no need for Christ.

I have answered these questions without any obligation upon me to do so. I have answered them fairly and fully. I now insist that the editor of the *Advocate* shall answer them.

In answer to the question, "What use have you for Christ?" the *Advocate* says that "Christ died to make it possible for God to save those that obey him." "Christ died to make it possible for God to save" men. Of course, but to save them *how*? The *Advocate* says: "Save those that *obey* him." The editor of the *Advocate* thus makes salvation a matter of obedience. But if we must obey now since Christ came, in order to be saved, why could we not have been saved by obedi-

ence before Christ came? The question is not, "Is it possible for God to save man?" but, "*Is it possible for man to save himself by his own obedience?*" And if after Christ has died to save man, man must still save himself, what use has he for Christ? I repeat the question to the editor of the *Advocate*: What use have you for Christ?

I presume that the *rope* in the illustration used by the *Advocate* is intended to refer to Christ. But suppose the man in the canoe should refuse to allow himself to be saved by the rope and insist that he is able to save himself, and should *keep on rowing*. What use would he have for the rope? That is the situation of the *Advocate*. When a man grasps the rope, he abandons the effort to save himself. If he continues trying to save himself, he has no use for the rope.

Or, to take the illustration of the *debt*. Suppose the man should refuse to accept the offer of the philanthropist, but should *insist on working to pay the debt himself*. Or, suppose, if the *Advocate* pleases, the man should *grasp the rope and still keep on struggling*. Suppose he should accept the offer of the philanthropist and *still keep on working to pay the debt*. What use would he have for the rope or for the philanthropist?

But the *Advocate* insists that a person must obey in order to be saved. Is it not said that God "became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him?" The question comes, What kind of obedience is meant? Is it external or internal obedience, an obedience in action or an obedience in heart? Said Paul: 'But thanks be to God, that ye were servants of sin,

but obeyed *from the heart* that form of teaching unto which ye were delivered." (Rom. 6:17.) True obedience is necessarily obedience of the heart. It is inward, not outward. Obedience of the body without obedience of the heart is not real obedience at all. And if you have an obedience from the heart, you have the *essence* of obedience, even if there be no outward manifestation in action.

Besides, it is not *our obedience* that saves, but *Christ's obedience*. Hear Paul: "For as through the disobedience of one man the many were constituted sinners, so also through the obedience of the one will the many be constituted righteous." (Rom. 5:19.) Notice that he says: "For as through the disobedience of one man [Adam] the many were constituted sinners, so also through the obedience of the one [of One, of *One*, of *ONE*, and that one Christ Jesus] will the many be constituted righteous." I should like to burn that verse upon the heart of every one who is trying to save himself by his own obedience. Poor, sinful slave! It is not his obedience, but Christ's, that saves him. I believe in obedience, of course, but in the obedience which is the *result*, and not the *cause*, of salvation; in the obedience of the *child*, and not of the *slave*. The free, glad, voluntary obedience of the child to his father is a beautiful thing; but the hard, cold obedience of the slave to his master, driven to his task under the compulsion of the lash, is terrible.

Notice, too, that *all obedience must spring out of relationship*—of child to parent, servant to master, subject to sovereign, etc. Only such *relationship* gives the right to command, on the one hand, or imposes the duty to obey, on the other hand. Notice, also, that

obedience is not *in order to become* a child or a servant or a subject, but *because of being such*. Obedience does not *make* the person a child or a servant or a subject; it *shows* him to be a child or a servant or a subject.

The *Advocate* says, though, that a person must *do his duty* in order to be saved. But was it not exactly because *we did not and could not do our duty*, because we were sinful, that it became necessary for Christ to come into the world and die for us? If we could have done our duty, there would have been no need for him. And if now we could do our duty, there would be no need for him. As a matter of fact, there are *none of us who do our duty*. And so our sins are continually piling up against us—piling up wrath against the day of wrath. But even if from this time on we could do our duty perfectly, then our past sins would stand out against us. What is to become of them? How are they to be wiped away? There is no such thing as works of supererogation. Even if we could do our full duty, we cannot do more than our duty. Hear the words of Jesus: "So also ye, when ye have done all the things that were commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which it was our duty to do." (Luke 17:10.) Yes, after we have done all those things which are commanded of us, after we have done that *which it was our duty to do*, we must still say we are "unprofitable servants."

The person who starts out on the line of trying to save himself by his own works, by obedience to the law, by doing his duty, reminds me of a *blind horse on a treadmill*. Here he goes round and round,

and round and round again, a ceaseless, weary round, and always coming back to the place from which he started. Or he reminds me of the mythological character, *Sisyphus*, who was condemned to roll a stone up the side of a mountain; and every time when he had nearly reached the top, it would slip from his grasp and go tumbling down to the bottom again, and he would have to go back and begin his task anew. And here is a man trying to roll the *stone of duty* up the side of the mountain of salvation. And if ever he gets near the top—and I do not believe he will—every time it will slip from his grasp and go tumbling down to the bottom, and he will have the whole thing to go over again. It is a terrible piece of business.

No *galley slave* chained to his bench ever had a harder lot in life than such a man. No *Egyptian taskmaster*, no *Southern overseer* in times of slavery, was ever more ruthless in driving those under him to their task than is this master under whom he has placed himself—this master of salvation by *works*, salvation by *obedience*, salvation by *duty*.

This was what Peter meant when he said: "Now therefore why tempt ye God, putting a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" (Acts 15:10.) And those who, like the editor of the *Advocate*, are insisting upon salvation by works, or by obedience, or by duty are doing that very thing, putting a yoke upon the necks of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear. It was to break that yoke that Christ came, to give us liberty from its galling power. Listen to Paul again: "With freedom did Christ make us



tree; stand fast, therefore, and be not entangled again with a yoke of bondage" (Gal. 5:1)—the yoke of bondage to the law, of bondage to obedience, of bondage to duty. Paul continues: "Behold, I, Paul, say to you, that if ye become circumcised, *Christ will profit you nothing*. And I testify again to every one who becomes circumcised, that he is *a debtor to do the whole lava*." (Gal. 5:2, 3.) Paul means to say that if those Galatians should cease trusting in Christ for their salvation and should depend upon circumcision, if they should cease to rely upon faith and should depend rather upon obedience to the law, Christ would profit them nothing. They had no use for Christ. But, on the contrary, if that was the way they proposed to be saved, *by obedience to the law*, they could not stop with obedience in one respect, but *must obey in every respect*, and so Christ would become of no effect to them. There would be no room for him in their plan of salvation. He "came not to call the righteous, but *sinner*s to repentance." (Luke 5:32.) He came "to save *sinner*s" (1 Tim. 1:15), not those who in their self-righteousness were relying upon their own good works, their own obedience, for salvation.

And *it is impossible to be saved by Christ and obedience both*. Christ has obeyed the law in our stead, and *he offers salvation through his obedience*. If we accept it by trusting our salvation to him, he will save us. But if we hesitate about it and insist upon trying to save ourselves, then he will have nothing to do With it. Our salvation must be *all by Christ or all by self*. It must be *all of grace or all of works*. There is no mixing the two. And if we try to justify our-

selves by the law, then we have *fallen away from grace*—we have left off grace and have gone to trying to save ourselves by our own obedience.

This doctrine of salvation by works, or by obedience, or by duty, cuts the very heart out of the gospel—it squeezes all the blood out of it and leaves only a bare and grinning skeleton. It puts Christianity essentially upon a level with Judaism or with Buddhism, with the only difference that Christians are to obey the laws of Christ instead of the laws of Moses or of Buddha. It is simply a difference in laws. How low a conception! How degrading to Christianity! But Paul said that "Christ is the *end of the law* for righteousness *to every one that believeth.*" (Rom. 10:4.) When one has believed on Christ, he has fulfilled the law. He receives righteousness, or Tightness, or salvation. That is the end of all controversy about it. It settles the matter. The law has no further claims upon the person. There is nothing more to be said, and when the person has thus believed on Christ, then he can sing:

"My hope is built on nothing less  
Than Jesus' blood and righteousness;  
I dare not trust the sweetest frame,  
But wholly lean on Jesus' name!  
On Christ, the solid rock, I stand;  
All other ground is sinking sand.  
All other ground is sinking sand."

## The Position of the Gospel Advocate.

---

### ANSWER III. BY E. E. FOLK

The editor of the *Advocate* urges that there must be works in order to salvation. But here is what the Scriptures say about it. Listen: "For by grace ye have been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any should boast." (Eph. 2:8, 9.) If we could save ourselves by our own works, we should have occasion to be proud and boastful. We could stand in the very presence of God in heaven and *brag* about how we have *saved ourselves*, and say to him: "I do not owe any honor or any glory to you for my salvation, but all the honor and all the glory belong to me." "*Not of works, lest any should boast.*"

Again, Paul says: "And if by *grace*, it is no longer of *works*; otherwise the grace becomes no longer grace. But if of *works*, it is no longer *grace*; otherwise the work is no longer work." (Rom. 11:6.)

Hear Paul again: "Where then is the glorying? It is excluded. By what kind of law? Of works? Nay; but by a law of *faith*. For we reckon that a man is justified by *faith apart from works of law*." (Rom. 3:27, 28.) Again: "For if Abraham was justified by *works*, he has ground of glorying; *but not towards God*. For what says the Scripture? And Abraham *believed* God, and *it* was reckoned to him for righteousness. Now to him that *works*, the reward is not reckoned as of *grace*, but as of *debt*. But to him that

*works not, but believes* on him who justifies the ungodly, his *faith* is reckoned for righteousness. . . . And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the *faith* which he had while in uncircumcision; that he might be father of all that *believe* while in uncircumcision; that the righteousness might be reckoned to *them* also." (Rom. 4:2-5, 11.) And again: "What then shall we say? That Gentiles, who were not following after righteousness, obtained righteousness, but righteousness which is of *faith*; but Israel, following after a law of righteousness, did not arrive at [such] a law. Wherefore? Because [they sought it] not by *faith*, but as it were by the works of *law*. They stumbled against the stone of stumbling; as it is written, Behold, I lay in Zion a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offense; and he that *believes* on him shall not be put to shame." (Rom. 9:30-33.) These passages are all in Romans.

I give some quotations also from the Epistle to the Galatians, where the same thought of *salvation by grace through faith, not of works*, is expressed and argued by Paul. Says he: "Yet knowing that a man is not justified by *works of law*, but *only through faith* in Jesus Christ, even we *believed on* Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by *faith in Christ*, and not by *works of law*; because by *works of law* no flesh shall be justified. . . . I do not set aside the grace of God; for if *through law* there is righteousness, *then Christ died without cause*." (Gal. 2:16-21.)

In the third chapter of the Epistle, the apostle discusses the matter at length. He says: "This only I wish to learn from you: Was it from *works of law* that ye received the Spirit, or from the *hearing of faith*? Are

ye so foolish? Having begun in the *Spirit*, are ye now being made perfect in the *flesh*? Did ye suffer so many things in vain? If indeed it be in vain. Does he therefore, who supplies to you the Spirit, and works miracles among you, do it from *works of law*, or from the *hearing of faith*? Even as Abraham *believed God*, and it was reckoned to him for righteousness. Know then that *they who are of faith, these are sons of Abraham*. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by *faith*, announced beforehand the glad tidings to Abraham, saying, In *thee* shall all the nations be blessed. So that they who are of *faith* are blessed with believing Abraham. For as many as are of *works of law* are under a *curse*; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continues not in *all* the things written in the book of the law, to do them. But that by *law* no one is justified with God, is evident; because, *the righteous shall live by faith*. Now the *law* is not of *faith*; but, *he that does them shall live in them*. Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us; because it is written, Cursed is every one that hangs on a tree; that to the Gentiles the blessing of Abraham might come in Christ Jesus, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit *through faith*." (Gal. 3:2-14.) And again in the same chapter he says: "Is then the law against the promises of God? Far be it! For if a law had been given which is able to make alive, truly righteousness would have been from *law*. But the Scripture shut up all under sin, that the promise *by faith in Jesus Christ* might be given to those who *believe*. But before *faith* came, we were guarded under *law*, shut up to the *faith* about to be revealed.

So that the *law* has become our tutor, unto Christ, that we may be justified by *faith*. But *faith* having come, we are no longer under a tutor. For ye are all *sons of God through faith* in Christ Jesus. For all ye who were baptized into Christ, did put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is no male and female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye are Christ's, then are ye *Abraham's seed*, heirs according to the promise." (Gal. 3:21-29.) I do not see how the doctrine of salvation *by grace through faith, not of works*, could possibly be taught more plainly or strongly than in these passages. It seems as if Paul had in mind just such persons as the editor of the *Advocate* when he was writing. Why does the *Advocate* editor ignore these passages and many others like them?

But the *Advocate* contends that salvation is *both by faith and works*. To this I reply: (1) In that case the *line of salvation* would be *drawn at works* and not at *faith*, because the salvation would not be *complete* until there had been some *work*. But all of the above passages show that the line of salvation is drawn at *faith*, and that it is the *ground of salvation*. (2) This view coordinates as on equal footing the *physical* with the *spiritual*, and thus makes salvation a kind of hybrid, a *conglomerate mixture*, with its body of gold but its feet of clay, which is an anomaly and, in fact, an impossibility. (3) It makes salvation ultimately a *physical* and not a spiritual matter, an *external* and not an internal affair, contrary to all scripture.

I believe in works, of course, but the *relation between faith and works* is this: Faith is the *sub-*

*stance* and works the *shadow*, faith the *cause* and works the *effect*, faith the *antecedent* and works the *consequent*, faith the *engine* and works the *train of cars*, faith the *root* and works the *fruit*, faith the *essential element* in salvation and works the *outcome*, the *evidence* of faith. "By their fruits ye shall know them." (Matt. 7:20.) The *fruits* don't *make* the tree. They *show* the tree. The *works* don't *make* the Christian. They *show* the Christian. We were "*created* in Christ Jesus *unto* good works." (Eph. 2:10.) The creation is *first*, and then the *works follow*. We work, not *in order to be saved*, but *because we are saved*. Our obedience is the obedience of *love* and not of *fear*, of a *child* and not of a *slave*. "The grace that makes salvation possible ordains good works that we should walk in them," of course. But "By grace are ye saved, through faith: . . . not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works." (Eph. 2:8-10.) We are first "created in Christ Jesus" by *grace through faith*. Then the good works will follow as the *result* and *fruit* of the faith.

But, again, I want to ask the editor of the *Advocate*, does he limit the works which he says are necessary to salvation to *one work, baptism*? If so, by what authority? Does not James say faith without *works* is dead? Not faith without *work is dead*. Is not the word in the *plural*, not in the *singular*? Again, I ask: If, then, a person must obey in *one respect* in order to be saved, must he not obey in *every respect* to be saved? If a man starts out on the line of saving himself by his own *works*, by *doing his duty*, by *obedience to the law*, he *cannot stop halfway*, he *must*

*go the whole way.* Listen! Paul said: "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in *all things* which are written in the book of the law to do them." (Gal. 3:10.) And James, whom the *Advocate* editor is fond of quoting as the apostle of works, says: "For whosoever shall keep the *whole law*, and yet offend in *one point*, he is guilty of all." (James 2:10.) He does not have to offend in *every* point to be lost. If he offends in any "one point," he is "guilty of all," *and he is lost*. Who, then, can be saved? Can the editor of the *Advocate* be saved?



## The Position of the Gospel Advocate.

---

### ANSWER IV. BY E. E. FOLK.

I was surprised at the remark of the editor of the *Gospel Advocate* that "it is time to ask Mr. Folk to draw the line of salvation." I have repeatedly done so. I have repeatedly shown that when a person believes on Christ he is saved. I have already quoted many scriptures proving this point, and I need hardly do so again, unless the *Advocate* insists upon it. It will be necessary, perhaps, simply to refer to them. They are as follows: Matt. 9:22; Mark 5:34; Luke 10:48; Mark 10:52; Luke 7:50; John 3:14-16, 36; John 5:24; John 6:35-47; John 10:31; Acts 3:16; Acts 13:39; Acts 14:9, 10; Acts 15:9; Acts 16:32; Rom. 1:16; Rom. 3:23; Rom. 3:27, 28; Rom. 4:5, 13; Rom. 10:10; Heb. 11:4 (see also Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:11; Heb. 10:38); Rom. 5:1; Gal. 2:20; Gal. 3:2; Gal. 3:21; Gal. 3:26; Eph. 2:8; Eph. 3:12; Eph. 3:16; Phil. 3:9; 1 Thess. 2:12; Jude 1:5; 1 Pet. 1:5; 1 Pet. 1:9.

And so I might go on referring to passage after passage. But these ought to suffice. They not only teach in the strongest possible manner the doctrine of *salvation by faith, or salvation by grace through faith*, but they also prove, it seems to me, beyond a question, that *the line of salvation is drawn at faith*, that when a person has believed, he is saved; that he then has everlasting life; and that *the end of his faith* is the *salvation of his soul*. This means not only

that salvation is the object of his faith, the purpose of his faith, but that the end of his faith is salvation. And so I draw the line of salvation at *faith*, and I boldly proclaim, with all of these passages and a hundred others to support me, that *before* the person has believed, no matter what else he may have done, *he is not saved*; but *when he has believed*, when he has stepped over the line, *he is saved*, and all the powers of earth and all the devils in hell cannot keep him from being saved. If he is saved, he will join the church, be baptized, will do good works to a greater or less extent as a result of his salvation. But *he is saved when he believes*. "Baptism marks the degree of faith at which God pardons." Does it? Is anything said about degrees of faith in the above passages? Is *saving faith* divided into degrees? Where is that taught? How can physical baptism be a "degree" of spiritual faith? A thing, to be the degree of another, must be of the same nature.

Now it is "time to ask the editor of the *Gospel Advocate* to draw the line of salvation." In fact, I have asked him before to do so, but he has never clone it. I again insist that he shall draw the line and say when and where a person is saved. Is he saved at faith? Is he saved at baptism? When he is baptized, is he then saved? Is he saved at works? If so, at one work or all works? Let the editor of the *Advocate* answer as plainly as I have done.

The *Advocate* says: "The way to test whether a man's heart is right and his conversion is genuine is to state to him clearly the scriptural teaching on the subject of baptism and see whether he will be baptized."

That is *one test* certainly, but it is *not the only test*. Another test which Jesus gave was: "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." (John 13:35.) This he called a "new commandment." John emphasized this test when he said: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death." (1 John 3:14.)

I should like to ask: What right has the editor of the *Gospel Advocate* to make only *one* test of the genuineness of conversion? What right has he to limit the commandments of God to one commandment?

But the "*test*" of a thing is not the thing itself. It is only the *proof* and *evidence* of it, the *shadow* of the substance. And so keeping the commandments, love of the brethren, baptism, and so forth, are *not salvation* and do not bring salvation. They are only *the evidence of salvation*.

The *Advocate* editor says: "The New Testament abundantly teaches that the man 'who trusted in Jesus Christ as his personal Savior' was always baptized. I challenge Mr. Folk to give one single exception, but this he will never do."

The *Advocate* editor is mistaken in this latter assumption. I have already given the instance of the thief on the cross as a man "who trusted in Jesus Christ as his personal Savior," who was not baptized, but who was *saved*. I give it again. I will change the remark of the *Advocate* a little and say: "The New Testament abundantly teaches that the man 'who trusted in Jesus Christ as his personal Savior' was

*always saved*. I challenge the editor of the *Advocate* to give one single exception, but this he will never do."

The *Advocate* instances the children of Israel, Naaman, Paul, and others as persons who were saved by works. I have not time to discuss each of these cases at length. I may only call attention to the fact that the emphasis in each case was on *faith*, as shown by the editor of the *Advocate* himself. Their works were simply the result and expression of their faith.

In conclusion, I again put the questions to the editor of the *Advocate*, which I have asked him a number of times before, but which he has never answered. They are as follows:

Is a man Saved by faith or by works? Where do you draw the line of salvation, at faith or at works? If at works, what works? Do you limit the works to one work, baptism? Must a man obey in only one respect to be saved, or must he obey in every respect? If he must obey in every respect, then who can be saved? Can the editor of the *Gospel Advocate* be saved? If a person must save himself by his works, then what use have you for Christ?

Can a man be saved who is *not* fully informed as to the scriptural teachings on the subject of baptism, who does *not* know his duty upon the subject and does *not* deliberately and persistently refuse to be baptized, and yet is *not baptized*? I say that he will be saved if he has repented of his sins and trusted in Jesus Christ as his personal Savior, whether he has been baptized or not. What does the editor of the *Gospel Advocate* say? What about the pious unimmersed? Will they be saved? What about D. L.

Moody? Was he saved? I repeat the questions in a little different form, as I asked them before: Is the obedience which the *Advocate* editor claims is essential to salvation, limited to baptism? Is the command to be baptized the only one which a person must obey in order to be saved? If obedience to *one command* is essential to salvation, is not obedience to *all commands* essential to salvation? Will the editor of the *Advocate* please draw the line of salvation and tell us just when and where a person is saved? If he must obey in one respect in order to be saved, must he not then obey in every respect? Who does that? Who then can be saved? Can the editor of the *Advocate* be saved? This suggests another question. Paul said: "For if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." (Gal. 2:21.) If salvation is a matter of obedience to the law, if we have to obey the law to be saved, then there was no need for Christ to have died. Will the editor of the *Advocate* tell us what use he has for Christ?

I have answered every question which the editor of the *Advocate* has put to me in a plain and straightforward way. I insist that he shall answer my questions in the same way. I have also given the interpretation of every passage whose interpretation he has asked me to give. I insist that he shall give the interpretation of the passages which I put to him, but whose interpretation he has never attempted to give. They are as follows: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever *believeth* in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John 3:16.) "He that *believeth* on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth

not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." (John 3:36.) "And brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, *Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." (Acts 16:30, 31.) "Therefore being justified by *faith*, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. 5:1.) "For as many as are of the *works of the law* are under the curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not *in all things* which are written in the book of the law to do them." (Gal. 3:10.) "For by *grace* are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: *not of works*, lest any man should boast." (Eph. 2:8, 9.) "For whosoever shall keep the *whole* law, and yet offend in *one* point, he is guilty of all." (James 2:10.) "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the *blood of Jesus Christ* his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (1 John 1:7.)

I have quoted a good many other similar passages in the course of this discussion. But these will do for the present.

## **"We Are Saved By Faith Alone."**

---

### **REPLY II. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.**

Elsewhere in this issue appears an article from the *Baptist and Reflector* reviewing an article in the *Gospel Advocate* which held that God saves when we obey and that there is no saving efficacy in baptism, but that it is simply one of the conditions on which pardon is promised to the penitent believer. The following scriptures were quoted in support of the position: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16:16.) "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Acts 2:38.) "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3:5.) "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." (Acts 22:16.) "Know ye not, that so 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." (Rom. 6:4, 5.) "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." (1 Cor. 12:13.) "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." (Gal. 3:26, 27.) "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." (Eph. 5:25, 26.) "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.) "Baptism doth also now save us." (1 Pet. 3:21.) In regard to these I said: "It is wholly unnecessary for him to quote by way of rebuttal any of the passages that ascribe salvation to faith, for I accept all these in their obvious meaning as readily as he, for not one of the passages quoted by him denies that 'he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' In fact, it could; not without making the Bible contradict itself. I can see no reason for quoting these scriptures unless it is to make the Bible contradictory." It was further stated that he could not break the force of these passages until he found a scripture which says we are saved by faith alone.

In another article, which was in the hands of the editor when his review was written, the following passages which show beyond all doubt men are not saved by faith alone were quoted: "Even so faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself. Yea, a man will say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: show me thy faith apart from thy works, and I by my works will show thee my faith. Thou believest that God is one; thou doest well: the demons also believe, and shudder, But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith apart from works is barren? Was not Abraham our father justified by works, in that he offered up Isaac his son upon the altar? Thou seest that faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect; and the scripture was fulfilled which saith, And



Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness; and he was called the friend of God. Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith. And in like manner was not also Rahab the harlot justified by works, in that she received the messengers, and sent them out another way? For as the body apart from the spirit is dead, even so faith apart from works is dead." (James 2:17-26.) "But the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected for themselves the counsel of God, being not baptized of him." (Luke 7:30.) "Nevertheless even of the rulers many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess it, lest they should be put out of the synagogue, for they loved the glory that is of men more than the glory that is of God." (John 12:42, 43.) "Jesus therefore said to those Jews that had believed him, If ye abide in my words, then are ye truly my disciples; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." (John 8:31, 32.) Here are believers who are in bondage to sin because they did not abide in his word. Because these same believers would not love and obey God, Jesus said to them: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do." (Verse 44.)

Read carefully the column of scriptures quoted by the *Baptist and Reflector*. Does one single passage intimate that "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" is false? Not one. Does the editor of the *Baptist and Reflector* try to harmonize the passages quoted by the Advocate with those quoted by the *Reflector*? Nay, verily. He does not say that one scripture presented is not correct or true, but he en-

deavors to array scripture against scripture. James says: "Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith." After making a long list of quotations, only a few of which have any bearing on the subject, he says: "I have already found a number of scriptures that teach we are saved by faith alone, as quoted above." This is not an issue between the Gospel Advocate and the *Baptist and Reflector*, but one between James and the *Baptist and Reflector*. Such a course is not calculated to make believers in the religion of Christ. It is time to suspect ourselves in error when we must contradict inspiration in order to defend our doctrine.

I suggest that our readers use a microscope in reading the scriptures presented by the *Baptist and Reflector*, for I am sure with it they will not be able to find one passage which even hints "we are saved by faith alone." It is an abuse of both logic and scripture to quote scriptures which ascribe salvation to faith, and then draw the fallacious conclusion: "We are saved by faith alone." I have quoted passages of scripture that ascribe salvation to faith and baptism, but not one that denies it is ascribed to faith. Editor Folk quotes a number that "ascribes it to faith, but not faith alone," and then draws the soul-destroying conclusion: "We are saved by faith alone." In doing this he seeks to make the Bible falsify itself. To change, take from, or add to the word of God is dangerous. "I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto them, God shall add unto him the plagues which are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy,

God shall take away his part from the tree of life, and out of the holy city, which are written in this book." (Rev. 22:18, 19.) While "the book of this prophecy" refers to Revelation, the principle is true of the Bible.

The Scriptures teach baptism saves us (1 Pet. 3:19-21); we are saved by the blood and life of Christ (Rom. 5:9, 10); we are saved by hope (Rom. 8:24); we are saved by works (James 2:24); and we save ourselves (Acts 2:40). The same audacity that adds to faith "faith alone" may as consistently teach: We are saved by baptism alone, works alone, hope alone, life of Christ alone, blood of Christ alone, grace alone, and we save ourselves alone. If not, why not? Such blundering and presumptuous tampering with the word of God demand the most serious consideration of Editor Folk. His contention is with Revelation, and not me. Will he tell us how a man is saved by each alone?

He could as relevantly quote the book of Deuteronomy to prove his position as most of the scriptures he has quoted. This is a complete answer to all he says about attention to the passages he quotes, so far as the issue is involved.

He quotes a number of scriptures, some of which refer to the healings of Christ before the establishment of the church, some to the law of Moses, some to being saved by faith, and some to living the Christian life by faith. In one column I give the scriptures as quoted by the *Reflector* to prove salvation by faith alone; in the other I give them in their connection and true meaning:

AS QUOTED BY THE BAPTIST  
AND REFLECTOR.

"Thy faith hath made thee whole." (Matt. 9:22; Mark 5:34; 10:52.)

"Thy faith hath saved thee: go in peace,"  
(Luke 7:50.)

"And his name through faith in his name hath made this man strong, whom ye see and know: yea, the faith which is by him hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all" (Acts 3:16.

AS THEY APPEAR IN THE BIBLE.

"And behold, a woman, who had an issue of blood twelve years, came behind him, and touched the border of his garment: for she said within herself. If I do but touch his garment, I shall be made whole. But Jesus turning and seeing: her said. Daughter, be of good cheer; thy faith hath made thee whole." (Matt. 9:20-22.) Faith in expression, in action, saved her.

"And turning to the woman he said unto Simon, Seest thou this woman? I entered into thy house, thou gavest me no water for my feet: but she hath wetted my feet with her tears, and wiped them with her hair. Thou grayest me no kiss: but she, since the time I came in, hath not ceased to kiss my feet. My head with oil thou didst not anoint: but she hath anointed my feet with ointment. Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little. And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven. And they that sat at meat with him began to say within themselves. Who is this that even forgiveth sins? And he said unto the woman. Thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace." (Luke 7:44-50) Her faith led to obedience and love.

"And Peter, fastening his eyes upon him, with John, said. Look on us. And he gave heed unto them, expecting to receive something from them. But Peter said, Silver and gold have I none, but what I have, that give I thee. In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, walk. And he took him by the right hand, and raised him up; and immediately his feet and his ankle bones received strength. And leaping up, he stood, and began to walk; and he entered with them into the temple, walking, and leaping, and praising God." (Acts 3:4-8.) "And by faith in his name hath his name made this man strong, whom ye behold and know: yea, the faith which is through him hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all" (Verse 16) He was commanded to walk, and had faith to make the effort. It should be noted that these are not examples of conversion, and occurred before Christ died.

AS QUOTED BY THE BAPTIST

AND REFLECTOR

#### AS THEY APPEAR IN THE BIBLE.

For convenience, the passages quoted on faith are grouped. All have the same bearing on the subject, so it is only necessary to show that the faith which justifies leads to obedience.

"And they journeyed from Mount Hor by the way to the Red Sea, to compass the land of Edom: and the soul of the people was much discouraged because of the way. And the people spake against God, and against Moses, Wherefore have ye brought us up out of Egypt to die in the wilderness? for there is no bread, and there is no water; and our soul loatheth this light bread. And Jehovah sent fiery serpents among the people, and they bit the people; and much people of Israel died. And the people came to Moses, and said, we have sinned, because we have spoken against Jehovah, and against thee; pray unto Jehovah, that he take away the serpents from us. And Moses prayed for the people. And Jehovah said unto Moses, Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a standard: and it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when he seeth it, shall live. And Moses made a serpent of brass, and set it upon the standard: and it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he looked unto the serpent of brass, he lived." (Num. 21:4-9) "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life." (John 3:14.15.) When he looked unto the serpent of brass, he was healed It would be hard to find a better example of faith and obedience. Even so of the faith in Christ that justifies.

Take the case of the jailer in its connection: "And brought them out and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house And they spake the word of the Lord unto him, with all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, immediately." (Acts 16:30-33.) Here faith and baptism are clearly expressed. Baptism was so important that he was baptized immediately.

"And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." (John 3: 14, 15 ) "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John 3:16.) "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." (John 3:36 ) "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation: but is passed from death unto life." (John 5:24.) "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." (John 6:35 ) "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God: and that believing ye might have life through his name." (John 20:31) "And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." (Acts 15:9.) "And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." (Acts 16:31.)

"For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power

AS QUOTED BY THE BAPTIST  
AND REFLECTOR.

of God unto salvation to every one that believeth: to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." (Rom. 1:16.) "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. 5:1.)

"Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay; but by the law of faith." (Rom. 3:27.) "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law," (Rom. 3:28.) "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." (Rom. 4:5.) "For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." (Rom. 4:13.) "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." (Gal. 2:20.) "This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" (Gal. 3:2.) "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith." (Gal. 3:11.) "Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." (Gal. 3:21.)

AS THEY APPEAR IN THE BIBLE.

John 5:24 speaks of hearing in the sense of heeding, and John 6:35 speaks of coming to Jesus. In both it is faith in action.

" He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." (John 3:36.) This passage shows the faith which does not obey is vain. The Common Version renders "believeth not," and in the margin of the American Revised Version it is "believeth not," showing that the scholarship of the world holds it impossible to sever obedience and the faith that justifies.

These scriptures refer to the law of Moses. The Gospel Advocate is as far as the Reflector from believing we are justified in obedience to the law of Moses. It believes that it is even dangerous for a Baptist to go back to the law of Moses, for Paul says: "Ye are severed from Christ, ye who would be justified by the law: ye are fallen away from grace." (Gal. 4:5) "But before faith came, we were kept in ward under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. So that the law is become our tutor to bring: us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But now that faith is come, we are no longer under a tutor. For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ." (Gal. 3:23-27.) Here the law of faith is contrasted with the law of Moses, and shows that the law of Moses served its purpose when it led to Christ. It also shows how the Galatians were the children of God by faith. "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ." Col. 2:14 shows that Christ nailed the law of Moses to the cross.

These scriptures do not teach that we are saved without obedience to any law, as is shown by Paul: "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death." (Rom. 8:2.)

It is needless to notice the passages quoted on living by faith, for I teach "we walk by faith, and not by sight," and that "he that disbelieveth shall be condemned," for "he that offendeth in one point is guilty of all."

The children of Israel bitten by fiery serpents were healed when they looked. Naaman was healed of his leprosy when he had dipped seven times. When the children of Israel marched around the walls of Jericho as commanded, the walls fell down. The blind man received his sight when he went and washed in the pool of Siloam. "But when they believed Philip preaching good tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women. And Simon also himself believed: and being baptized, he continued with Philip." (Acts 8:12, 13.) "And many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized." (Acts 18:8.)

The *Baptist and Reflector* is inconsistent with its own affirmation, "We are saved by faith alone." Here is his position: "Our reply to the question was that such a man could not be saved, not because he was not baptized, but because such a deliberate and persistent refusal upon his part, after having been thus fully informed as to his duty, would show that his heart was not right and that his conversion was not genuine." He now says: "I do not know of any who 'refuses or neglects to teach the Scriptures on the subject of baptism.' On the other hand, Baptist preachers generally are very earnest and zealous in teaching the Scriptures on the subject of baptism." Accepting the statement of the *Baptist and Reflector*

wherever Baptist preachers go the people are taught "the Scriptures on the subject of baptism," then, so far as the Baptist preachers and the people are concerned, the question of being fully informed is eliminated. Then, Editor Folk, will these people who are thus fully informed by these Baptist preachers be lost, or "saved by faith alone," "who refuse to be baptized?" Stripped of needless verbosity, the position of Editor Folk is: Those who are fully taught the Scriptures on baptism and refuse to be baptized will be lost because such refusal shows the heart not right, the conversion not genuine.

His language necessarily connects baptism with faith in the plan of salvation, for the informed man who refuses or neglects to be baptized has not genuine faith. He now says: "The essential point, however, is: Is baptism necessarily connected with faith in the plan of salvation? As shown in the above passage and many others, this is not the case."

Here is another sample which shows that he is so blind religiously that he repeatedly contradicts himself, and, forgetting the position by which he stands, "dodges all around it like a shying horse:" "I answer unhesitatingly, Yes. Salvation is 'before and without baptism.' Salvation is necessary to baptism, but baptism is not necessary to salvation."

"Salvation is before and without baptism," and yet a man is lost who is not baptized. It is a strange theology that saves a man, and then damns him because his heart is not right in refusing to do a non-essential thing; damns him, though "he is saved by faith alone," and without obedience to the law of Christ.



## **Faith and Obedience.**

---

### **REPLY III. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.**

In this discussion we should not lose sight of the fact, God saves. While he saves, salvation is predicated of certain conditions, and these conditions are to be complied with by man. These conditions are in no sense the cause of salvation, and the relation between them and salvation is not the same as that between cause and effect. The obedience that springs from faith does not merit salvation, which is a gift, a gratuity, from God. Salvation is the gift of God. This truth is emphasized in the parable of the householder when Jesus said unto the laborers in the vineyard: "It is my will to give unto this last, even as unto thee." When we have done our very best, and nothing short of this will be pleasing to God, we should count ourselves "unprofitable servants."

The infinite wisdom and power of God conceived and executed the plan of salvation. The grace of God bowed the heavens low and brought Jesus to die to atone for sin. "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission." It is evident that God could not save the world without the death of Christ, from the words of Jesus himself: "My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt." (Matt. 26:39.) The blood of Christ is the life of the gospel, and renders the gospel efficacious.

God, in infinite love and compassion, provides sal-

vation for all. "For by grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, that no man should glory." (Eph. 2:8, 9.) Man's work had nothing to do with offering salvation. But the same grace that saves has ordained "good works, which God afore prepared that we should walk in them." (Verse 10.)

Take, for example, the salvation of the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage. They heard the message of Moses, believed, and turned their backs on Egypt, journeying toward the promised land. They came to the Red Sea. Their enemies in hot pursuit are just at their back, the sea in front, and they are hemmed in by the mountains on either side. They murmur against Moses. Humanity can see no way of escape. Man's extremity is God's opportunity, Moses appeals to God. Moses tells the people: "Stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord." A vast difference between seeing and enjoying the salvation. The Lord commands Moses to stretch out his rod over the sea and divide it. The waters roll back in a great heap on either side and a passage is made. God did this for them. He does for man what he cannot do for himself. Through wonderful grace they now see the salvation of the Lord. The command comes: "Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward." Every one who enjoys salvation must go forward. It would have been vain to talk of robbing God of the glory by marching, to sing of being saved by grace while doing nothing. God would not pick one up by the hair of his head and set him down on the other side. There was but one passage. A man must go through that one way. So the Savior teaches

there is one way leading to heaven: "Enter ye in by the narrow gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many are they that enter in thereby. For narrow is the gate, and straitened the way, that leadeth unto life, and few are they that find it." (Matt. 7:13, 14.) "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no one cometh unto the Father, but by me." (John 14:6.) After they had passed through the sea they were saved from their enemies. "Thus Jehovah saved Israel that day out of the hand of the Egyptians; and Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the seashore." (Ex. 14:30.) After the passage of the sea they sung the song of deliverance. Their baptism "unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" is a type of Christian baptism. We are baptized into Christ and in Christ are freed from our sins. (Rom. 6:3.) The Israelites were delivered by grace through faith, but not by faith alone. Their faith was obedient. Every one marched through the passage. So Christ flew to our relief and opened up the way for us. He worked many miracles that we may believe him, as Moses worked wonders that the Israelites might believe. "Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name." (John 20:30, 31.) It is not possible to magnify the importance of faith. "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. 23), and without faith it is impossible to please God (Heb. 11:6.) As the Israelites had to turn away from Egypt, which is a type of repentance, so the

sinner must repent. (Luke 24:46, 47; Acts 17:30.) Moses, the lawgiver to the Jews, commanded them to go through the sea, or to be "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." So Christ, our Lawgiver, commands: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." (Matt. 28:19.) "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." (Mark 16:15, 16.) Is it less important for us to obey Christ than for the Jew to obey Moses? Nay, verily. "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things that were heard, lest haply we drift away from them. For if the word spoken through angels proved steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great a salvation? which having at the first been spoken through the Lord, was confirmed unto us by them that heard." (Heb. 2:1-3.)

We enjoy our bread by the grace of God, but must work for it. The air we breathe is the gift of God, but we must inhale and exhale in order to enjoy it. Nature robed in her beautiful dress and the heavens above garnished in beauty are the gifts from his hands, but we must open our eyes and look out upon them to enjoy. So much for the divine and human in salvation. In the light of these plain Bible truths, these statements of Editor Folk are essentially wrong: "Our salvation must be all by Christ or all by self. It must be all of grace or all of works." The Holy

Spirit teaches it is of faith and works. (James 2:14-26.)

The *Baptist and Reflector* is very anxious to have me draw the line of salvation. This is something I cannot do. Christ has drawn the line of salvation from past sins in the following: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16:16.) Peter draws the line of salvation in heaven at the end of a faithful life: "Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls." (1 Pet. 1:9.) In drawing the line of salvation, the *Baptist and Reflector* repeatedly contradicts Revelation: "A man is saved by faith, and not by works." Read along with this: "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, in that he offered up Isaac his son upon the altar? Thou seest that faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect; and the scripture was fulfilled which saith, And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness; and he was called the friend of God. Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith." Here is a square issue. Which will you take, Editor Folk's unsupported statement or James' writing as inspired of God?

Editor Folk is learning, for he now admits "Christ died to make it possible for God to save;" but he now asks, "Save them how?" Certainly not unconditionally, for this would mean universal salvation. Not by "faith alone," for Jesus says: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "Except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner perish." (Luke 13:3.) He quotes me as saying to "save those that obey him." A greater than the Advocate says: "Though he was a

Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation." (Heb. 5:8, 9.) All the eloquence of the *Baptist and Reflector* against the doctrine of obedience to the law of Christ and of salvation by works is flying in the face of Revelation. Peter said to believers: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. . . . And with many other words he testified, and exhorted them, saying, Save yourselves from this crooked generation." (Acts 2:38-40.)

The remarks of the *Baptist and Reflector* about the rope are amusing: "But suppose the man in the canoe should refuse to allow himself to be saved by the rope and insist that he is able to save himself and should keep on rowing? What use would he have for the rope? That is the situation of the Advocate. When a man grasps the rope, he abandons the effort to save himself. If he continues trying to save himself, he has no use for the rope." The man on the bridge rescued the man by the rope. This is the means he provided to save the man in the canoe. My position is that he placed himself in position to be saved by seizing the rope and holding on. The position of the *Baptist and Reflector* is that he was saved by the man on the bridge, by "faith alone," before and without seizing the rope and holding on. Editor Folk is the man who refuses to seize the rope and pleads his inability to do anything. The man did not abandon his effort to save himself, but held on till he was safe on the bridge. If he had abandoned all effort by let-

ting loose the rope, he would have been lost in the water. If such had been the case, "the last state of that man becometh worse than the first." We must hold on in faith till death, notwithstanding Mr. Folk says "when a man grasps the rope, he abandons the effort to save himself." I pity the child that does not understand that the man was seeking to save himself by holding on to the rope and to be saved by the man who was pulling him upon the bridge by the rope. "He that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved." (Matt. 10:22.) In expressing the same thing to the brethren scattered abroad, Peter says: "Unto an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who by the power of God are guarded through faith unto a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." (1 Pet. 1:4, 5.) The man might have jumped and beaten himself unmercifully in the canoe, and yet have been lost because he would not accept the means provided. I have never advocated that works of man's wisdom or appointment saves, but, by humbly trusting and obeying God, that man places himself in a position where God saves him. So in one sense he saves himself when he believes God and complies with the conditions of salvation. Man's works, works of his own, works not commanded of God, always damn, while those ordained of God for man to do always justify.

The offering of Cain brought condemnation because it was not commanded of God, while the offering of Abel brought a blessing because it was authorized by Jehovah. Noah was justified in building the ark, because as God commanded, so did he; while Uzzah was smitten for steadying the ark of the covenant,

which was not authorized. Saul brought ruin to himself and kingdom by saving the king and the best of the flocks. This was a work of his own, and forbidden by the command of Jehovah.

Faith is a work of God, because God has ordained that man believe: "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." (John 6:29.) So it is a work of God that man repent. God commands man to repent: "The times of ignorance therefore God overlooked; but now he commandeth men that they should all everywhere repent." (Acts 17:30.)

God commands believers to be baptized. It is therefore a work of God for believers to be baptized. It is not a work of merit or of man's own righteousness, as is shown from Titus 3:5: "Not by works done in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit." In baptism a man loses sight of self. He can assign no special reason for this institution only that God commands it. In baptism he pleads his own weakness and inability to save himself. He obeys God and looks to him to save. Passive in the hands of the administrator, breath suspended, eyes closed, and hands folded over the breast, he goes down beneath the yielding wave, looking to God to save. The Savior said: "Suffer it now; for thus it cometh us to fulfill all righteousness." In nothing can a man plead more eloquently his inability to save than in baptism. In submitting to it he is fulfilling God's righteousness.

The *Reflector* turns away from God's righteousness, contends it "squeezes all the blood out of the gospel



and leaves only a bare and grinning skeleton." Editor Folk seeks to establish a righteousness of his own by preaching "faith alone," and that a man is saved without obedience to the law of Christ, which law is righteous and holy. Paul says of Israel: "For being ignorant of God's righteousness, and seeking to establish their own, they did not subject themselves to the righteousness of God." (Rom. 10:3.) It is clear from Paul's teaching that God saves us in obedience to the truth: "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death." (Rom. 8:2.) Christ says of those who set up a standard for themselves: "But in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men." (Matt. 15:9.)

The *Baptist and Reflector* says: "True obedience is necessarily obedience of the heart. It is inward, not outward. Obedience of the body without obedience of the heart is not real obedience at all. And if you have an obedience from the heart, you have the essence of obedience, even if there be no outward manifestation in action." It is impossible to have obedience in the heart and not in the life. Obedience springs from the heart. The heart is the source, the fountain. If the source be pure, the stream will also be pure, "For out of the heart come forth evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, railings." (Matt. 15:19.) Solomon says: "Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life." (Prov. 4:23.) A greater than Solomon says: "Either make the tree good, and its fruit good: or make the tree corrupt, and its fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by its fruit. Ye offspring of vipers, how can ye, being

evil, speak good things? For out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. The good man out of his good treasure bringeth forth good things; and the evil man out of his evil treasure bringeth forth evil things." (Matt. 12:33-35.) A good tree, good fruit; a pure heart, a holy life. Virtue and vice will blend as readily as obedience in the heart and disobedience in the life. A pure and an obedient life flow from a pure heart as a pure stream from a pure fountain. The Advocate contends the tree is worthless where there is no fruit, and that there can be no stream when the fountain is as dry as a powder horn. There is as much difference between a dead and living faith as there is between a dead and living man. I insist when a man refuses to be baptized, there is neither fountain nor stream. Editor Folk says his faith is not genuine.

But if obedience is only inward, in the heart, then the same is true of disobedience. Then Mother Eve did not pluck the forbidden fruit; she only disobeyed in the heart. Cain did not murder Abel in deed, but only in his heart. Noah did not build the ark— only in his heart. His heart must have been very large! Does Brother Folk mean to teach us that he never baptizes a man outwardly, but baptizes his heart? To be consistent, he must never baptize a person in obedience to the command of Christ; for the baptism which he administers is outward, and not inward.

The Bible is full of obedience. The man who hears and does the sayings of Jesus is wise. (Matt. 7:21-27.) "But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deluding your own selves. For if any one is a hearer of the word and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a mirror: for he

beholdeth himself, and goeth away, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was." (James 1:22-24.) "Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have the right to come to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates into the city." (Rev. 22:14.) I might fill pages with quotations showing the necessity of obeying the Christ, but will close with a passage from Eccles. 12:13, 14: "This is the end of the matter; all hath been heard: .Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God will bring every work into judgment, with every hidden thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil."

## **Obedience in the Heart.**

---

### **REPLY IV. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.**

The Bible teaches that the heart is that with which we understand, love, and obey.

The heart is spoken of as the understanding. "For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest haply they should perceive with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should turn again, and I should heal them." (Matt. 13:15.)

The understanding is not all the heart. A man must receive the love of the truth; the affections must be involved. The affections are spoken of as the heart. "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, where moth and rust consume, and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth consume, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: for where thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also." (Matt. 6:19-21.) One's heart is in heaven, where; his treasure is. The affections are there. (Read also 2 Sam. 15:1-6; Col. 3:1-4.)

The understanding and the affections are not all the heart. The heart is spoken of as the courage or will. "And David said to Saul, Let no man's heart fail because of him; thy servant will go and fight with this Philistine." (1 Sam. 17:32.) David had the moral , courage to meet the Philistine.

Then the heart involves the understanding, the affections, and the will. A man's heart is scripturally right when he understands the truth, loves the truth, and obeys the truth. Faith is applied to the understanding. "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness." (Rom. 10:10.) Repentance involves the affections. "Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long-suffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?" (Rom. 2:4.) Baptism appeals to the will. "But thanks be to God, that, whereas ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered." (Rom. 6:17.) Christ died, was buried, and rose again. So the Romans had died to the love and practice of sin, had been buried with Christ in baptism and raised up again. "We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united with him in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." (Rom. 6:4, 5.)

Editor Folk tells us that the man who refuses to obey from the heart this form of teaching will be lost because his heart is not right and his conversion is not genuine. Thus I have shown from both *Revelation* and the *Baptist and Reflector* that the man's heart is not right who refuses to be baptized.

He has grown weary of the position by which he says he stands and is anxious to change the issue. "Can a man be saved who is not fully informed as to the scriptural teachings on the subject of baptism,

who does not know his duty upon the subject and does not deliberately and persistently refuse to be baptized, and yet is not baptized? We say that he will be saved if he has repented of his sins and trusted in Jesus Christ as his personal Savior, whether he has been baptized or not. What does the editor of the Gospel Advocate say?"

Here is another plan of salvation. One who is informed and not baptized is lost; another who is sufficiently informed to trust in the Savior and repent of I his sins is saved without baptism. The Bible teaches one way, and not two. There was but one passage through the Red Sea. "For narrow is the gate, and straitened the way, that leadeth unto life, and few are they that find it." (Matt. 7:14.) I must stand by the Book. The Bible nowhere tells of two ways to heaven. This second way is another gospel. My brother, tread lightly along here. "I marvel that ye are so quickly removing from him that called you in the grace of Christ unto a different gospel; which is not another gospel: only there are some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema." (Gal. 1:6-8.)

The editor of the *Reflector* cares so little for contradicting Revelation by his "ipse dixit" that I almost grow weary of pointing out contradictions, but I shall continue in the good work for the benefit of our readers. He teaches that baptism is a commandment, but that some who obey not will be saved. Hear Paul: "And to you that are afflicted rest with us, at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the

angels of his power in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus." The *Reflector* says they will be saved; Paul says they will not.

It would break the monotony of this discussion if he would give us one single example where a person ever believed under the gospel dispensation and did not learn it to be his duty to be baptized. In New Testament times inspired preachers not only baptized all who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ under their preaching, but they baptized them as soon as they believed. There was no waiting between believing and being baptized. They did not wait for even a vote of the church. They baptized them when they believed (Acts 8:12); "as they went on their way" (Acts 8:35-39); "the same hour of the night," "immediately" (Acts 16:33); "in that day" (Acts 2:41); and in one case they baptized a man who had not eaten a bite nor drunk a drop in three days, and who was weak from his long fast, before they fed him" (Acts 9:1-20). Under the preaching of the editor of the *Baptist and Reflector* and his brethren many of the converts are never baptized at all; and in many cases of those who are, days, weeks, months, and even years intervene before they are baptized. Why this difference? Is it not because these Baptist preachers do not teach the people as did inspired teachers? If not, why not? There is not a promise in the Bible to the man who neglects or refuses to obey God, whether he be impious or "pious unimmersed." Editor Folk tells us the "pious unimmersed" who are fully taught their duty on the subject of baptism and refuse to be baptized will be lost. He manages to get right one time.

He argues that the thief was saved by "faith alone," and that he was not baptized. Granting he was saved, it was not by faith alone, but his faith expressed itself when he said: "Remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom." It was faith in action, in expression. The editor of the *Baptist and Reflector* assumes he was not baptized. It is not conclusively taught that he was baptized, but the probabilities are greater that he was baptized than they are that he was not. "Then went out unto him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about the Jordan; and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins." (Matt. 3:5-7.) Probably "all" included the thief, for he was in that region. At the time the thief was; on the cross the church was not established. Christ! healed and forgave sins while he was on earth. It would be just as scriptural and sensible to claim that we can be justified now as was Noah by building an ark, as was the Jew by offering burnt sacrifices. All are beyond the death of Christ. After Christ sealed "the new and living way" with his own blood, we are shut up to the conditions contained in his will. "For where a testament is, there must of necessity be the death of him that made it. For a testament is of force where there hath been death: for it doth never avail while he that made it liveth." (Heb. 9:16, 17.) All the *Reflector* says about "meritorious works" and works of the law of Moses is irrelevant to this discussion. In vain does he grow eloquent against what he terms "physical" and "external" salvation. No one has advocated such a salvation. It is a "hybrid" theology that teaches the man who has "faith alone" and no faith to do what God commands is spiritual, while



the man who has faith to do just what God requires enjoys physical and external salvation.

There are strange things in his philosophy, for, after writing a number of articles to prove salvation by "faith alone" and without works, he says: "We believe in works, of course, but the relation between faith and works is this: Faith is the substance and works the shadow, faith the cause and works the effect, faith the antecedent and works the consequent, faith the engine and works the train of cars, faith the root and works the fruit, faith the essential element in salvation and works the outcome, the evidence of faith." Verily our brother believes more in works than I do. It is true faith is the work of God and that God has ordained that men believe; but the doctrine, "faith the cause" of salvation, as the effect follows the cause, is unscriptural. The infant dying in infancy enjoys denial salvation without faith. Faith is a condition of salvation and appropriates the promises. Conditions are as inflexible and as essential as causes. Bread is a condition of life, yet it is not the cause of life. The air is a condition of the bird's flying, yet not the cause of the flying. God saves when we have faith in him. When we have faith in him, we obey him. A man is very sick. He sends for a physician. The physician tells him he knows he can cure him, has never failed to cure all similar cases, and leaves medicine with instructions how to take. When he starts to leave, the patient says: "Doctor, I shall not take the medicine; my faith is in you as a physician, and not in your remedies." The physician says: "You have no faith in me as a doctor if you will not take the remedies. Faith in me as a physician will lead you to take

the remedies I prescribe." Christ is the Physician of the sin-sick soul. He has never failed to cure one who follows his orders. Editor Folk is so blinded by his "faith-alone" theory that he acts as the patient. Did the patient have any faith in the physician? No. Has Editor Folk faith in Christ? No; when he does, he will do what Christ commands. The faith that saves lays hold of the promises. We are not contending the fruit makes the tree, but our contention is where there is a tree there will be fruit, unless it be a dead or worthless tree. The Savior had the fig tree with no fruit cut down; it must not cumber the ground. When a man refuses to obey God, there is neither "substance" nor "shadow," neither "antecedent" nor "consequent," neither fountain nor stream. James bears out this position when he says: "Pure religion and undefiled before our God and Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep oneself unspotted from the world." (James 1:27.)

Homer nods. Listen: "Is anything said about degrees of faith in the above passages?" Faith is faith. It may differ in degree, but not in kind. The *Reflector* has repeatedly spoken of a faith that was not genuine. This makes degrees in faith, and so does the Bible. The Bible talks of "little faith" (Matt. 8:26), "great faith" (Matt. 8:10), "weak in the faith" (Rom. 14:1). These passages clearly teach degrees in faith.

The *Baptist and Reflector* says: "But when he has believed, when he has stepped over the line." This is news that a man steps over the line of faith. "We walk by faith" (2 Cor. 5:7); we go from "faith unto faith" (Rom. 1:17). "But now abideth faith, hope,

love." (1 Cor. 13:13.) But the editor of the *Reflector* steps over the line of faith when he teaches saved by "faith alone," and then tries to work out his salvation at the mourners' bench, a work of his own ordaining.

I have already answered why Christ died. He died, learned obedience, humbled himself even unto the death of the cross, so that "he became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation." In his death he became the author of salvation and made it possible for God to save the world through him. A man is sold for debt. He cannot possibly pay the debt. A philanthropist places a sufficient sum in a bank to his credit to cancel the obligation. It is subject to his use on the following conditions: That he will believe the philanthropist, resolve never to get into bondage to his creditor again, and then write a check making the amount payable to the creditor. All the man did was to accept the gift. He did not and could not earn the money. It would have been a weak faith that would not write the check. Alan cannot earn salvation. He is saved by grace through faith. But it is a weak faith that will not lay hold of the promises.

"Is a man saved by faith or works?" God saves him when he has the faith that obeys.

"Where do you draw the line of salvation, at faith or at works? If at works, what works?" We have already seen that salvation from past sins is drawn at faith and baptism. (Mark 16:16.)

"Do you limit the works to one work, baptism?" Baptism is the first act of submission to Christ which grows out of faith. It is the degree of faith at which

God pardons. The faithful man does the best he can all through life.

"Must a man obey in only one respect to be saved, or must he obey in every respect?" "He that offends in one point is guilty of all." (James 2:10.) "He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also to walk even as he walked." (1 John 2:6.)

"If he must obey in every respect, then who can be saved? Can the editor of the *Gospel Advocate* be saved?" "He that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven." (Jesus.) "And hereby we know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." (1 John 2:3, 4.)

## **Baptism and Remission.**

---

### **REPLY V. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.**

As will be observed by the casual reader, Editor Folk sings over the same tune in the same words. I have heard of singing the same tune in different ' words, but never knew any one before to sing the same tune to the same words all the time.

The contention of the *Baptist and Reflector* is that faith which is barren justifies, though the paper straddles and saves before and without baptism, then damns the scripturally informed man who refuses to be baptized. The editor has even made an issue of his own, contending that the man who is not informed as to the duty of baptism, who trusts Jesus and is not baptized, is saved. He has deserted his first position, leaving it to the mercy of a cold and merciless world. Is he ashamed of his own child? If he is, I may adopt his orphan!

My position is that faith in the heart leads to obedience in the life. As to how well this view is upheld and supported by the Scriptures, I leave our readers to judge from what has already been written.

For the enlightenment of the editor of the *Baptist and Reflector*, I shall quote from the ablest Baptist scholars, showing that they are in perfect accord with my position. I quote first James W. Willmarth, member of the Board of the American Baptist Publication Society and chairman of the Committee of Publication. The quotations from him are from the

Baptist Quarterly, Philadelphia, July, 1877, "Baptism and Remission."

"It is feared that if we give to 'eis' its natural and obvious meaning, undue importance will be ascribed to baptism, the atonement will be undervalued and the work of the Holy Spirit disparaged. Especially is it asserted that here is the vital issue between Baptists and Campbellites. We are gravely told that if we render 'eis' in Acts 2:38 'in order to,' we give up the battle, and must forthwith become Campbellites; whereas if we translate it 'on account of,' or 'in token of,' it will yet be possible for us to remain Baptists.

"Such methods of interpretation are unworthy of Christian scholars. It is our business, simply and honestly, to ascertain the exact meaning of the inspired originals, as the sacred penmen intended to convey it to the mind of the contemporary reader. Away with the question, 'What ought Peter to have said in the interest of orthodoxy?' The real question is: 'What did Peter say, and what did he mean, when he spoke on the day of Pentecost, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit?'" (Page 304.)

I contend that salvation from past sins is promised to believers after baptism. The *Baptist and Reflector* has stoutly argued that salvation is necessary to baptism. Read Willmarth:

"Fourth. Finally, suppose we force 'eis' in Acts 2:38 to bear the unnatural and unauthorized meaning of 'on account of.' After all, we have gained nothing. Other passages there are which cannot be explained away. Thus our Savior said, just before he ascended the heavens: 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' We shall hardly dare to tamper with his

royal word and make it run, 'He that believeth and is saved shall be baptized.' And unless we do thus change his saying, we have by the highest authority an importance attributed to baptism certainly not less than that given to it in Acts 2:38, translated according to its obvious meaning. What, then, is the advantage of violently torturing 'eis,' the construction and the context?

"We conclude without hesitation, and in accordance with such authorities as Hackett, Winer, Meyer, etc., that the proper rendering of 'eis aphasin hamartion' in Acts 2:38, as in Matt. 26:28, is 'unto,' 'for'— i. e., 'in order to'—remission of sins." (Page 306.)

The *Baptist and Reflector* contends men may trust and be saved without baptism, while I contend the New Testament does not give an example of believers failing to be baptized under the preaching of the apostles. Again Willmarth agrees with this position:

"The catechumenical system was yet unknown. 'Anxious seats,' 'rising for prayers,' and all modern 'revivalistic' methods, good and bad, were unheard of. The gospel was preached as a practical thing—a divine message to be at once obeyed. Those who received it were made the subjects of no spiritual diagnosis; but their profession of faith in the Lord Jesus was accepted, and they were immediately baptized. By that act the convert crossed the great gulf which separated the church from Jews and pagans, and rendered himself liable to persecution, perhaps to death. Everything was in solemn earnest; sensationalism and fanaticism were not yet introduced, and hypocrisy was rare." (Page 307.)

Willmarth says of John 3:5.

"We are confirmed in this by our Savior's words to Nicodemus, who came to him during that early period to learn more fully, no doubt, of the kingdom which Christ and John were preaching. Christ said to him: 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God'—i. e., baptism and renewal by the Spirit are the conditions of true citizenship in the kingdom of God on earth. Unquestionably remission was one of the blessings of that kingdom" (Page 309.)

I have contended that to refuse to be baptized is to disbelieve. Willmarth says:

"Note also that in those early days baptism swiftly followed that which it expressed, closely conjoined with repentance and faith, in time as well as in teaching, so that little opportunity was given for the question, 'What is the status of an unbaptized believer?' No one who accepted the gospel in reality was ever known to refuse baptism; and as to exceptional cases, such as the impossibility of receiving the ordinance, be it remembered that God was then, is now, free to go before the letter of his gospel promise, or to go beyond it, whenever, in his own sovereignty, he may see sufficient cause for so doing." (Pages 314, 315.)

The *Baptist and Reflector* talks of baptism as an emblem, a symbol of forgiveness through faith alone. Brother Willmarth says:

"Certainly, it would seem that baptism must be very important, intimately connected with remission and salvation. How can an unprejudiced mind survey this testimony and then relegate baptism to the realm of mere emblem, symbol, and profession? However they are to be explained, the facts from the record



are these: Our Lord before his departure commanded that those who would be his disciples should be baptized, and united baptism with faith in the promise of salvation. The apostles and their colaborers directed inquirers to repent, believe, and lie immersed in order to remission. Baptism is often alluded to in the Epistles in harmony with this view of it, and also as related to other important things in Christian life and hope. The apostles seem never to have conceived of the possibility of a penitent believer refusing to be baptized; but if one professing this character had refused baptism, is it possible to doubt, with this record before us, that they would have warned him of the guilt and danger of 'rejecting the counsel of God concerning' himself? If these are the facts, and that they are is obvious, the Scriptures do teach that baptism is a part of what is meant by 'obedience to the gospel,' which has the promise of remission of sins and of eternal life." (Pages 311, 312.)

After producing many scriptural reasons connecting baptism and remission, Mr. Willmarth summarizes as follows and holds that baptism is a condition of salvation, just as I hold.

"1. The relation of baptism to remission is not that of an emblem or a profession of an assured fact regarded as already accomplished.

"2. The relation of baptism to remission is not that of a single, specific, and invariable condition, on which remission absolutely depends.

"3. The relation of baptism to remission is this: Baptism is the third of three gospel requirements or conditions, to which, jointly, is annexed the promise of remission. The others are repentance and faith,

which baptism is designed to express, embody, and consummate." (Pages 318, 319.)

I next quote from Alvah Hovey. He was president of Newton Theological Institution, Newton Center, Mass.; professor of Theology in the same institution; editor of "An American Commentary on the New Testament," in which series he wrote the "Commentary on John." The quotations are made from "Handbook on Baptism."

"We may say that being 'born of water' (baptized) must signify being cleansed from sins, or forgiven; while being born of Spirit' cannot signify less than being ingenerated, if we may use the word, with a new and holy principle of life by the Spirit of God." ("Commentary on John," Appendix, page 423.)

"Repent, and be baptized every one of you in [or upon] the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission [or forgiveness] of your sins.' (Acts 2:38, R. V.) Here repentance and baptism are represented as leading to the forgiveness of sins." ("Commentary on John," Appendix, page 420.)

"Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.' (Acts 22:16.) Of course there is no such thing possible as a literal washing away of sins. But there is such a thing as forgiveness of sins; and this may be described figuratively as washing them away, so that henceforth the soul may be 'clean' from the guilt or stain of sin." ("Commentary on John," Appendix, page 420.)

I quote next from Horatio B. Hackett, a Baptist scholar of much note, professor of Biblical Literature and New Testament Exegesis in Rochester Theo-

logical Seminary, "Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles:"

"'In order to the forgiveness of sins' (Matt. 26:28; Luke 3:3) we connect naturally with both the preceding verbs. This clause states the motive or object which should induce them to repent and be baptized. It enforces the entire exhortation, not one part of it to the exclusion of the other." ("Commentary on Acts," 2:38, page S3.)

"'And wash [bathe] away thy sins.' This clause states a result of the baptism in language derived from the nature of that ordinance. It answers to 'for the remission of sins,' in Acts 2:38—i. e., submit to the rite in order to be forgiven." ("Commentary on Acts," 22:16, page 258.)

I close these quotations with one from J. R. Graves, who stood, in his day, head and shoulders above any other Baptist in the South in influence. One Matilda T. Hoy had written him to express his views on John 3:5. His answer is:

"If Brother Vaughn convinced us that 'born of water' refers to anything but the baptism of one previously born of the Spirit, we never knew it, and we would have owned it to him and to our readers. It means nothing else, and no Baptist we ever heard or read of ever believed otherwise until A. Campbell frightened them away from an interpretation that is sustained by the consensus of all scholars of all denominations in all ages." (Tennessee Baptist, page 5, October 30, 1886.)

My position in this discussion is upheld by the leading Baptist scholars as well as by the words of inspiration. There can be no appeal from the Bible.

I call upon the editor of the *Baptist and Reflector* to harmonize his positions, not only with the Bible, but also with the leading lights and scholars of the Baptist Church. This he will never do, for he is overwhelmed by the Scriptures and the weight of the scholarship of his own leading lights.

Editor Folk manufactures scripture to suit his cause. I find in one instance a part of a passage from the Revised Version and a part from the Authorized Version without calling attention to the change. Here is Eph. 2:8, 9, as quoted: "For by grace ye have been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any should boast." The passage reads in the Authorized Version: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." The same scripture reads in the Revision: "For by grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, that no man should glory." He also quotes a number of passages from Romans and Galatians. I have not been able to find the scriptures as quoted in any version. He quotes the following: "Yet knowing that a man is not justified by works of law, but only through faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by works of law, because by works of the law no flesh shall be justified." It is a perversion of this scripture to quote it to prove we are saved by faith alone. . We are saved only through Christ, but not by Christ alone. Gal. 2:16, in the Authorized Version, reads: "Knowing that a man is not justified by the. works of

the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." The Revision reads: "Yet knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law; because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." Satan did no worse than this when he added "not" to the word of God. Editor Folk could not find a scripture to prove his doctrine, so he perverts one. The Holy Spirit says: "Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith." Space and time will not permit me to call attention to other glaring misquotations. .

The scriptures he claims to quote from Romans and Galatians refer to the law of Moses. I have never taught that we could be justified in obedience to that law. Those of the circumcision must obey the law, but the bloody sacrifices could not blot out sin, only roll them over from year to year. (Heb. 10:1-4.) They must look forward to Christ, and the blood of Christ reached backward and blotted out the sins of the obedient. (Heb. 9:15.) So obedience has been required in every age of the world.

Faith has a law (Rom. 3:27), and by this law we are required to walk in order to justification by faith: "And the father of circumcision to them who not only are of the circumcision, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham which he had in uncircumcision." (Rom. 4:12.) Paul settles beyond all question that the obedient are justified in

compliance with the law of faith: "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death." (Rom. 8:2.)

The scriptures that I have presented remain unquestioned, while I have answered the questions and exposed the sophistries of the *Baptist and Reflector*. Here are a few of the contradictions and inconsistencies of our brother editor:

(1) The scripturally informed who refuse to be baptized are lost.

(2) Salvation is before and without baptism.

(3) Those who personally trust Jesus and do not know it to be their duty to be baptized are saved without baptism.

(4) Here are three plans of salvation, while the Bible knows but one. Will the editor tell us, if any, which one is the Bible plan?

(5) The editor contradicts inspiration when he says we are saved by faith alone. (James 2:24.)

(6) Again, he positively asserts we are not justified by works, while inspiration says we are.

(7) He makes the Baptist Church a "nonessential," for he teaches salvation before and without baptism, and yet no man can get into the Baptist Church without being baptized.

(8) He says we "put on Christ" in baptism, still we are saved before and without baptism. This makes Christ a "nonessential."

I shall continue to teach with earnestness: "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous." (John 5:3.)

## **We Are Saved By Faith.**

---

### **ANSWER V. BY E. E. FOLK, TO II. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.**

I publish on another page the first of several articles by the editor of the *Gospel Advocate* in reply to my articles in the *Baptist and Reflector*. It is not necessary that I shall reply at length to this article of the *Advocate*. It seems to me that it carries its own refutation.

To offset my parallel, in which I published the statement of the *Advocate* that baptism is necessary to salvation, or expressing the statement in its own words, "The baptism of a penitent believer is unto remission of sins," and then published in a parallel column a number of passages of scripture showing that "we are saved by faith," the *Advocate* publishes these passages and then in a parallel column publishes their context. The context has no essential bearing upon the question under discussion, and it does not change the meaning of the passages. In reply I might publish the whole of the New Testament, or, in fact, the whole Bible in parallel columns to the *Advocate's* statement, but it is unnecessary to do so. The *Advocate* asks: "Does one single passage intimate that 'he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved' is false? Not one." No, but *every one* of these passages *docs* intimate that the *interpretation* which is put by the editor of the *Advocate* on the expression, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," *is false*. The editor of the *Advocate* is contending, and is using the above expression to

prove, that *baptism is necessary to salvation*, whereas all of the passages I quoted prove that *we are saved i by faith, without the need of baptism to complete the salvation*. The *Advocate* then asks:

"Does the editor of the *Baptist and Reflector* try to harmonize the passages quoted by the *Advocate* with those quoted by the *Reflector*? Nay, verily, he does not say that one scripture presented is not true, but he endeavors to array scripture against scripture."

I beg pardon. I did harmonize the passages quoted by the *Advocate* with those quoted by me by showing that the passages quoted by me mean that we are saved by faith *actually*, whereas the passages quoted by the *Advocate* mean that we are saved by baptism *figuratively*. The *Advocate* editor charges me with arraying scripture against scripture. I might easily make the same charge against the editor of the *Gospel Advocate*, and with far more reason. I quoted a large number of passages to show that we are saved by *faith*. He quoted a few to show that we are not saved by faith alone, but by *baptism* also. The great preponderance of scripture is on my side, taking these passages in the meaning the editor of the *Advocate* ascribes to them. Besides, I did harmonize the scriptures quoted by him with the scriptures quoted by me, as I have just said, while he did not, and cannot, harmonize the scriptures quoted by me with the scriptures quoted by him, on his *interpretation* of these scriptures.

John says: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." (John 3:36.) The *Advocate* says that "the baptism of a penitent believer is unto the remission of sins." This is not an issue between the *Baptist*



*and Reflector* and the *Gospel Advocate*, but one between John and the *Gospel Advocate*. To quote the *Advocate*:

"Such a course is not calculated to make believers in the religion of Christ. It is time to suspect ourselves in error when we must contradict inspiration in order to defend our doctrines."

If we are saved by *faith*, as the Scriptures abundantly 'teach, then nothing is needed to be added to faith in order that we may be saved. If salvation is "by grace through faith" (Eph. 2:8), it is not through baptism or works or anything else. Paul adds immediately, "Not of works." (Eph. 2:9.) If we are saved by faith, it is necessarily by faith alone, else it would be 110 more salvation by faith, but salvation by faith and something" else, with emphasis on the something else, whatever that might be.

The *Advocate* says that we are saved in several different ways—by baptism, by the blood and the life of Christ, by hope, by works, and by ourselves. As I have already shown, *there is only one plan of salvation*. We receive it *procuratively* by the blood of Christ, and *instrumentally* by faith in him. The statement that "we are saved by hope" means simply that we are saved *in anticipation*. We are saved by faith really, by baptism figuratively. Baptism expresses in a picture—in a beautiful object lesson—the salvation which we have experienced in the heart. It is the *shadow of the substance*; the *outward expression of the inward reality*. James does not say that we are saved by works, but simply that "by works a man is Justified, and not only by faith." Works are the fruit of faith. Faith is the root of works. *The life is in the*

*root*. The works are only the flowering out of that life. It is true that Peter said to the Jews: "Save yourselves from this untoward generation." But the very next verse tells us how they were to save themselves: "They that gladly *received his word*"—received it by faith— "were baptized."

To say, "We are saved by baptism alone, works alone, hope alone, life of Christ alone, blood of Christ alone, grace alone, and we save ourselves alone," is to make several different kinds of salvation. It is to confuse the minds of the people by jumbling things together; it is a juggling with scripture. "Such blundering and presumptuous tampering with the word of God demand the most serious consideration of Editor McQuiddy. His contention is with Revelation, and not us." Will he tell us how a man is saved by each of these several ways?

As I said before, Baptist preachers are very earnest in teaching the Scriptures on baptism. Unfortunately, however, every one does not accept Baptist teaching on the subject. Despite the eloquence and persuasion of Baptist preachers, some people take a different view of baptism from that presented by Baptist preachers, and so cannot be said to be "fully informed" on the subject. I repeat, though, that if they were "fully informed" and then deliberately and *persistently* refused to be baptized, they would not be saved—*not* because they were not baptized, but because such deliberate and persistent refusal would show that their heart was not right, their faith was not genuine.

With all due respect to the editor of the *Advocate*, this language does not necessarily connect baptism with faith in the plan of salvation. Far from it. It only

shows that faith is the cause and baptism the result of salvation. (The order in which they come is: Faith, salvation, baptism; not faith, baptism, salvation.) again call attention to the fact that I have several times reminded the *Advocate* that the issue between us is: "Can a man be saved who is *not* fully informed as to the scriptural teachings on the subject of baptism, who does *not* deliberately and persistently refuse to be baptized, and yet is *not* baptized?" Although I have asked this question a number of times, the editor of the *Advocate* has not attempted any answer to it.

I call attention also to the fact that the *Advocate* editor has not attempted to answer a number of points which I made in the article to which he was replying. For instance, I showed that "faith is a work of *God*" in the *heart of man*. But the *Advocate* makes it, not a work of God, but a work of *man*, which is very different. I showed also that a person may show that his heart is not right, his faith is not genuine, by refusing to be baptized, or by refusing to give to missions, or to go to church, or by failure to live a good life, or failure in a great many other ways. I showed also that the instance of a man who did not know it his duty to be baptized and was not baptized, but was saved, occurred in the days of Jesus as well as in the days of the apostles, in the case of the thief on the cross, who was not baptized, but was saved. The *Advocate* editor does not even refer to any of these points, much less attempt to answer them. I again call his attention to them.

## Faith and Obedience.

—

### ANSWER VI. BY E. E. FOLK, TO III. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.

It is well for our readers to have clearly before them the issues between the editor of the *Gospel Advocate* and myself in this discussion. The question is, "*What is the plan of salvation?*" or, "*What must I do to be saved?*" "God saves." There are "conditions to be complied with by man." I agree thus far with the editor of the *Advocate*. But *what are these conditions?* I say that they are simply "repentance and faith"--"repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." Paul said this was "all the counsel of God." "Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." "For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." (Acts 20:21, 27.) The Revised Version expresses it, "the *whole counsel* of God." There are two words which express the whole substance of the plan of salvation—*sinner, Savior*. To these two words correspond the other two words—*repentance, faith*. I say that when a person has repented of his sins and believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, *he is saved*. I draw the line of *salvation at faith*, as I have shown by numerous passages is done in the New Testament. The editor of the *Advocate* says that in order to be saved a person must believe, repent, and be baptized, that then he is saved only from "past sins." After that he must obey God's command-

ments and keep the "whole law" to be saved. *These are the issues between us.*

Let me say in passing that wherever in the New Testament the words "repentance" and "faith" are both used, it is always *repentance first and faith second*. I challenge the *Advocate* to quote one passage to the contrary. (See Matt. 21:32; Mark 1:15; Acts 19:4; 20:21; Heb. 6:1.)

To put faith before repentance, as the *Advocate* does, is to put the cart before the horse, the train before the engine, the consequent before the antecedent. It is an absolute impossibility and an utter absurdity.

The editor of the *Advocate* quotes over and over again the text, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved from his 'past sins;' and then he shall be every occasion. Wherever he starts, he comes back to that. Yet, he does not believe his own proof text. Here is the way he would make it read: "He that believeth and repenteth of his sins and is baptized shall be saved from his 'past sins;' and then he shall be saved from his future sins if he obeys God's commandments, keeps the whole law, and does not fall from grace." I challenge the editor of the *Advocate* to deny that this is his doctrine. It will clear up the issue between us and save a good deal of confusion when our readers understand this.

The *Advocate* editor insists upon obedience. He said in the article which I quoted last week that we are not required to obey the law of Moses. But if we are required to obey the law, why not the law of Moses? Is not the law of Moses the *moral law*? Is not that law *fundamental to all law*? Christ came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it. (Matt. 5:17.)

The moral law of Moses still remains in all its force, and if we are to obey any law to be saved, we must obey that. The Ten Commandments have never been abrogated. They are still binding. The error of the *Advocate* editor comes from thinking that obedience to law is essential to salvation. Christ nailed the law of Moses to the cross in the sense that he obeyed the law in our stead. He obeyed it perfectly, as we could not have done. And when we accept him as our substitute, the law has no further claims upon us. This is the clear, direct teaching of the apostle Paul in Romans and Galatians, and, in fact, throughout all of his Epistles. It is amazing to see how the editor of the *Advocate* can so misunderstand Paul and pervert his meaning as he has done.

The *Advocate* insists that baptism is a matter of *obedience*. So it is. But it is no more a matter of obedience than the Ten Commandments. Or, if the *Advocate* editor wishes to come over to the New Testament, it is no more a matter of obedience than is the commandment to love one another, to partake of the Lord's Supper in remembrance of Christ, to forsake not the assembling of ourselves together, to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, to add to our faith virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, charity. The *Advocate* instances the children of Israel crossing the Red] Sea as an illustration of obedience, and says: "Everyone who enjoys salvation must go forward." It forgets, however, the important distinction that the going forward of the children of Israel was a physical act, while salvation is a spiritual matter. The fact that; they had to go forward in order to cross the Red Sea

proves nothing as to the salvation of our souls. We must "go forward" to save our souls. But how? That is the question. The *Advocate* says "the Savior teaches there is one way leading to heaven." *So he does*. And yet the editor of the *Advocate* says we are saved in several different ways—by baptism, by the blood and the life of Christ, by hope, by works, and by ourselves. (See *Gospel Advocate*, February 8, 1906.) I leave the editor of the *Advocate* to reconcile his own statements. He seems to be consistent only in his inconsistency.

The Holy Spirit teaches that salvation is "by grace through faith, not of works." (Eph. 2:8, 9.) He teaches also that "if it is by grace, it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace." (Rom. 11:6.)

In response to my request that the editor of the *Advocate* draw the line of salvation, he says "This is something we cannot do." Evidently so. He adds, however: "Christ has drawn the line of salvation from past sins in the following: 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' (Mark 16:16)" The *Advocate* editor again quotes his proof text, a text which I have shown he does not himself believe. While saying that he cannot draw the line of salvation, he *attempts* to draw it at baptism. And yet, strange to say, he claims that baptism only saves from "past sins." When a person is baptized, therefore, he is not saved; only his past sins are wiped out. What must he then do to be saved? That is the question, the issue.

The *Advocate* adds: "Peter draws the line of salvation in heaven at the end of a faithful life: 'Receiv-

ing the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.' (1 Pet. 1:9.)" Notice that the *Advocate* claims that a person will be saved in heaven only "at the end of a faithful life." He tries to prove this by a quotation from Peter. But what Peter said very distinctly was, "Receiving the end of your *faith*, even the salvation of your souls," not receiving the end of your *faithful life*. There is all the difference between faith and a faithful life. It is astounding to see how the *Advocate* editor thus perverts scripture and attempts to twist it to suit his theory.

Brother McQuiddy speaks of my "unsupported statement" in advocating justification by faith. The truth is that I supported my statement by numerous quotations from the Scriptures, and could support it by many more if necessary. If there is any one doctrine taught in the Scriptures more conclusively than any other, it is the doctrine of justification by faith.

As to the illustration of the rope: *The rope is Christ*. The man seizes hold of the rope by *faith*. His seizing the rope indicates that he has abandoned all efforts to save himself *by his own efforts*. *That is salvation by faith*. If, however, he refuses to seize the rope and keeps on rowing, trying to save himself by his own efforts, that is *salvation by works*. Or if he seizes the rope, and then is afraid to trust himself to it, and holds on to the rope with one hand and continues rowing with the other, that is *salvation by faith and works*. It indicates a distrust of the rope, which is Christ, and a *trust in himself*. Sooner or later he will be apt to turn loose the rope and depend upon his own efforts. Holding on to the rope is not a matter of works, but a matter of faith.



The *Advocate* makes a distinction between man's works and those of God, as follows: "Man's works, works of his own, works not commanded of God, always damn, while those ordained of God for man to do always justify." This is an unjustifiable distinction. Man's works mean *any works which he attempts to do for his salvation. All good works are commanded by God.* If the editor of the *Advocate* means simply to say that if a man does bad works, if he does evil deeds, he will be damned, while if he does good works and good deeds he will be saved, that is to make salvation simply a matter of works. It puts the responsibility of his salvation upon the man himself. It makes salvation a question, not of what *Christ has done* for him, but of what *he can do for himself.* This is the very thing against which Paul argues and contends over and over in his Epistles to Romans and Galatians.

The *Advocate* refers to *Cain and Abel.* The difference between Cain and Abel was this: Cain brought the *fruit of the ground* as an offering to the Lord. He had cultivated that fruit. He had probably planted it. He had nurtured it. It represented what *he* had clone and what he *could do.* He felt that for this reason the Lord ought to accept the sacrifice. Abel, on the contrary, brought a *lamb* as an offering. And

the shed blood of that lamb pointed away from himself to the Lamb of God which would be slain on Calvary, and indicated his *trust,* not in anything which he had done or could do, but *in the blood of Christ.* The Lord accepted the sacrifice of Abel and rejected that of Cain. And that is precisely the difference between salvation by faith and salvation by works. The of-

fering of Cain represented *salvation by works*; the offering of Abel, salvation by faith. I contend for salvation by faith. The editor of the *Advocate*, in all this discussion, has been contending for salvation by works. I take the sacrifice of Abel for my example and guidance. He takes that of Cain. The Lord, long ago, pronounced judgment in favor of Abel.

But with the *Advocate*, baptism is only *one work*. After the person has been baptized, *he is not saved*. This may seem a paradox, but it expresses the position of the *Advocate*. He is saved only from his "past sins." He must then lead the "faithful life." He must, says Brother McQuiddy, "fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." This is the injunction of the wise man. But what he meant by it was that this was to be the *standard* after which we are to aim. The *Advocate* contends that a man must fear God and keep his commandments—not all his commandments, it is true, but only those laid down in the New Testament—and must do his whole duty *in order to be saved*, which the wise man did not say. The *Advocate* thus puts into his mouth something which he did not mean and did not intend, and perverts his whole meaning. A person *would* be saved if he could do his whole duty. But is there any one who can keep God's commandments perfectly? Is there any man who can do his "whole duty?" Does the editor of the *Advocate* do his "whole duty?" Mark you, according to his theory, he must *do his "whole duty"* to be saved.

I shall have more to say along this line next week. This is the crucial point in the discussion between the editor of the *Advocate* and myself.

## Salvation By Faith or By Works?

---

### ANSWER VII. BY E. E. FOLK, TO IV. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.

Let our readers again mark the issues between the editor of the *Gospel Advocate* and myself. I say that *in order to be saved* a person must repent of his sins and believe on Christ, trusting to him as his personal Savior. The *Advocate* says that he must believe, repent, and be baptized, and then he will be saved only from his "past sins." To be saved from his *future sins*, he must obey God's commandments, keep the "whole law" and do his "whole duty." He says the "Bible teaches one way, and not two." This is true. Jesus said: "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." (John 14:6.) How does any man come unto the Father by him? "*Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." (Acts 16:31.) The editor of the *Advocate*, however, teaches that there are a *number of different ways*. He teaches that by baptism we are to be saved from all "past sins," and then must save ourselves by our *works* from future sins. He teaches that we are saved by baptism, by the blood and life of Christ, by hope, by works, and we save ourselves. Whom shall we believe—the Bible or Editor McQuiddy?

Editor McQuiddy quotes Paul: "I marvel that ye are so quickly removing from him that called you in the grace of Christ unto a different gospel, which is not another gospel: only there are some that trouble

you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema." (Gal. 1:6-8.) What is that "other gospel" to which Paul refers? Let Paul answer: "For if righteousness come by the *law*, then Christ is dead in vain." (Gal. 2:21.) "This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the *works of the law*, or by the hearing of *faith*? Are ye so foolish? Having begun in the *Spirit*, are ye now made perfect by the *flesh*? He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the *works of the law*, or by the *hearing of faith*? Even as Abraham *believed* God, .and *it* was accounted to him for righteousness. For as many as are of the *works of the law* are under the curse; for it is written, *Cursed* is every one that continueth not in *all* things which are written in the] book of the law to do them. But that no man is justified by the *law* in the sight of God, it is evident; for *the just shall live by faith*. And the *law* is not of faith; but, the man that *doeth* them shall live in them. 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*. Wherefore, the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, *that we might be justified by faith*." (Gal. 3:2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 24.) "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." (Gal. 5:1.) Of bondage

to the law. "Christ is become of no effect unto you, *whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace.*" (Gal. 5:4.)

I have quoted only a few verses from Paul in Galatians. Throughout the Epistle he is arguing against the very doctrine which the *Gospel Advocate* teaches —the doctrine of salvation through the law, of *salvation by works*. *This* is what he calls "another gospel" from the gospel which he had preached to the Galatians, of *salvation by grace through faith*. In the Epistle to the Romans the apostle expands this doctrine of salvation by faith, or what we usually term justification by faith. It sounds strange to hear any one, and especially one who claims to be a Christian teacher, 1900 years after the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans were written, advocating the very doctrines which Paul had so thoroughly demolished in these Epistles. And it sounds much stranger still to hear that person now claiming that the gospel which Paul preached was a gospel of works, and that the "other gospel" to which he referred in Gal. 1:8 was the gospel of salvation by faith. Such a perversion of Paul's teachings is almost enough to make him rise from the dead in indignant protest. I am astonished that the editor of the *Advocate* not only perverts the gospel of Christ, but perverts the teachings of Paul. But while Paul cannot now speak in person, he did leave on record a declaration that any one who should preach such a gospel as that the editor of the *Advocate* is preaching should be "anathema."

In response to my question, "What about the pious unimmersed—will they be saved?" the editor of the *Advocate*, after dodging all around it, finally says:

"There is not a promise in the Bible to the man who neglects or refuses to obey God, whether he be impious or 'pious unimmersed.'" This is about as near as the *Advocate* editor ever comes to making a plain, straightforward statement. The evident intention of this remark, however, was to say that the pious unimmersed *would not be saved*. This theory condemns to hell with one fell swoop all the pious unimmersed, such as our Methodist and Presbyterian brethren. The *Advocate* did not answer my other question, which put the matter in a concrete way: "What about *D. L. Moody*—was he saved?" Some of the advocates of this theory are bold enough to accept the conclusions to which it leads. For instance, an editorial contributor to the *Christian Leader*, a paper published in Cincinnati, said recently: "Now if *D. L. Moody* was a Christian, our plea is vain, and our preaching false, and there is no place in Christendom for us." The brother *was right about it*. According to his theology, baptism is essential to salvation, baptism is only by immersion, and if *D. L. Moody* had not been immersed, he was not saved. Logically, consistently, he and others, like the editor of the *Advocate*, who teach the doctrine of baptismal salvation, must hold to this belief. But what a horrible doctrine, which would damn such a man as *D. L. Moody* and others like him, who have repented of their sins, believed on Christ, and have shown their faith by godly lives consecrated to the service of Christ! Nothing could show the falsity and hollowness of the doctrine of baptismal salvation more thoroughly than the conclusion to which it logically leads. But the brother himself has raised a serious issue. "If *D. L. Moody* was a

Christian, our plea is vain, and our preaching false, and there is no place in Christendom for us." *I accept the issue* as stated by the writer in the *Christian Leader*, and implied in the above remark of the *Gospel Advocate*, and I take my stand upon the claim that *D. L. Moody was a Christian*—that he was the *child of God by faith*, that he had been *cleansed by the blood* and did not need the water to cleanse, and that he is *saved*. That this is true scarcely needs argument now. It is the almost universal consensus of the Christian world that if there ever was a Christian, D. L. Moody was one. The alternative, that the plea of this brother and his fellow-believers is vain, that their preaching is false, and there is no place in Christendom for them, is the brother's *own logic*.

The effort of the *Advocate* editor to prove that the *thief on the cross* had been baptized would be amusing if the editor did not seem so serious about it. He quotes Matt. 3:5-7, as follows: "Then went out unto him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about the Jordan; and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins." The *Advocate* then adds: "Probably 'all' included the thief, for he was in that region." If the "all" included the thief, then it included everybody in Jerusalem and Judea and all the region round about the Jordan. If the thief was baptized, and was saved because he was baptized, so was everybody in all these places, including Pharisees, Sadducees, publicans and sinners of every description. Then, if everybody was saved because everybody was baptized, the preaching of Jesus to these people was unnecessary and his denunciations of the scribes and Pharisees were, to say

the least, out of place. The position of the *Advocate* editor is really absurd, but it grows logically out of his theory that the thief on the cross was not saved without being baptized. In order to get the thief baptized, the *Advocate* editor simply has *everybody* in Jerusalem and Judea and the region round about the Jordan baptized. This was a bold stroke on the part of Brother McQuiddy—the boldest position, I believe, I have ever known any one to take—but it was rendered necessary by his desperation. He just *had* to get the thief baptized in some way, and this was the only way to do it. I admire his courage, but I cannot say so much for his judgment.

The *Advocate* adds that "at the time the thief was on the cross the church was not established." I take square issue with the *Advocate* here. I believe that Christ established his own church while he was on earth, as he said in Matt. 16:18 he would do. It is not necessary, however, to enter into any lengthy discussion now as to the time the church was established. That question is only incidental to the main question of the plan of salvation, which is under discussion.

The *Advocate* says that no one has advocated "physical" or "external" salvation. But any one who, like the *Advocate* editor, advocates salvation by baptism, or salvation by works, or that baptism or works are a part of the plan of salvation, advocates physical and external salvation. Necessarily so, because baptism and works are both of them physical and external. I do not wonder that the editor of the *Advocate* is unwilling to acknowledge that he advocates "physical" and "external" salvation. Any one with the open Bible before him ought to be ashamed to take



such a position. And yet that is just what the *Advocate* editor has done. He must accept the logical conclusion of his own position.

Healing the sick is a physical matter. Healing the soul is a spiritual matter. The sick man is healed when he takes the medicine of the physician. That medicine is material and physical. The sin-sick man is healed when he takes the medicine of the Great Physician. That medicine is spiritual. The Philippian jailer was sin-sick, and cried out: "What must I do to be saved?" To him the reply was: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." He accepted the medicine and was healed.

The *Advocate* says: "The editor of the *Reflector* steps over the line of faith when he teaches saved by 'faith alone,' and then tries to work out his salvation at the mourners' bench, a work of his own ordaining." I said that when a person has believed he steps over the line of salvation *at faith*. Here is what John says about it: "He that *believeth* on the Son hath everlasting life." (John 3:36.) I do not say that one who has been saved by faith must try to "work out his salvation at the mourners' bench." I care little about the bench part of the mourners' bench, except as a convenient place to which a penitent person may come, so that Christians may pray for him and talk with him. I do care everything, however, for the mourners' part of it. But I put the mourners' part *before*, not *after*, faith. I showed that *repentance always comes before faith*, never faith before repentance, as the *Advocate puts it*. The mourners' bench, then, if you have it at all, comes *before*, not *after*, salvation.

The *Advocate* says, with reference to the death of Christ: "In his death he became the author of salvation and made it possible for God to save the world through him." Yes, but *how* "save the world through him?" What must the world do to be saved? Jesus answered the question himself when he said: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever *believeth in him* should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John 3:16.) Paul answered it when he said to the jailer: "*Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.*" (Acts 16:31.) Here was a question—plain, direct, "What must I do to be saved?"—asked *by* a penitent just as plain and direct: "*Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.*" We have been discussing the plan of salvation. If this answer of Paul sing the plan of salvation. If this answer of Paul does not settle it to any one who accepts Paul as an inspired teacher, I do not know what can. The *Advocate* editor, however, says that Christ's death only "makes it possible for God to save the world through him"—by every man being baptized to save him from his past sins, and then working out his own salvation by obedience to God's commandments and doing the whole duty required of him. That is to say, Christ's death only made it possible *for every man to save himself*. But in that case, wherein is a man better off now than he was before Christ died? If he has to save himself now, why could he not have done it before Christ died as well as afterwards, and have spared him that magnificent sacrifice on Calvary?

The editor of the *Advocate*, after dodging my questions for several months, now answers sonic, not all,

of them, and does his best to give as vague and indefinite answers as possible to them. Through the veil of sophistry which he attempts to throw around his answers, however, there can clearly be seen these positions: that a person is saved by works; that he is saved by baptism, but saved only from his "past sins;" that for the future he must obey in every respect to be saved. He correctly quotes James as saying: "He that offends in one point is guilty of all." (James 2: ,10.) According, therefore, to James, and according to the editor of the *Advocate*, if a person offends in "one point," if he sins in the least, if he violates God's law in any respect, if he fails to do his whole duty, if he slips anywhere, he is as guilty as if he had violated the whole law. The law says: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." (Ezek. 18:20.) He comes under the condemnation of that law. There is no hope for him. He is gone, and he is gone *forever*, as Paul tells us in Heb. 6:4-6.

I want our readers to understand the position of the *Advocate*, and so I repeat it. 1. When a person is baptized, he is saved from his "past sins." 2. He must then do his "whole duty" to be saved from future sins. 3. If he fails in "one point," he is lost, and he is lost forever. This is an awful, terrible, horrible doctrine. Again I ask: Who, then, can be saved? Can the editor of the *Advocate* be saved? I will answer my own question for him by saying, *Not according to his own doctrine*. The only way he can be saved is by repenting of his sins and accepting of Jesus Christ as his Savior, trusting to Christ, and *to him alone*, for salvation, and not trusting to himself or anything that he has done or can do. I do most respectfully, but most earnestly, exhort him that he will do this.

## Salvation By Faith.

---

### ANSWER VIII., BY E. E. FOLK.

Brother McQuiddy says: "My position is that faith in the heart leads to obedience in the life." That is my position also. But the question is: *Which saves*, faith in the heart or obedience in the life? At *what* point is a person saved, when he believes or when he obeys? Is the salvation a matter of the *heart* or of the *life*? Is it *spiritual* or *physical*? If a man is not saved when he *believes*, but is saved only when he *obeys*, must he obey only in *one* respect to be saved, or in *every* respect? Editor McQuiddy takes the position that he is saved by obedience and that he must obey in every respect, quoting James 2:10 to prove it. If in this position he is right, the old question comes back, *Who then can be saved?* That a person is saved by *faith in the heart*, and is saved *when he believes*, is proven overwhelmingly by numerous passages of Scripture which I have already quoted. I may only refer to a few. See John 3:16; 3:36; Acts 16:31; Rom. 5:1; Eph. 2:8; and many others which I need not now take the time to quote or even refer to.

The *Advocate* says: "The *Baptist and Reflector* contends men may trust and be saved without baptism, while the *Gospel Advocate* contends the New Testament does not give an example of believers failing to be baptized under the preaching of the apostles." The New Testament, however, *does* give an example of a believer failing to be baptized under the preach-

ing of *Jesus*, in the case of the thief on the cross. The New Testament also tells us that "Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples." (John 4:2.) It also represents Paul as saying that "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." (1 Cor. 1:17.) Thus showing that both Jesus and Paul did not put the emphasis upon baptism which the editor of the *Advocate* puts on it, that they regarded *preaching the gospel*—the gospel of salvation by grace through faith—as the *essential* thing, and baptism as *incidental*. If baptism had been so important a matter as the editor of the *Advocate* claims it to be, both Jesus and Paul certainly would have made it a special point to baptize their converts. It is true that those who believed were baptized. So they ought to have been. So they ought to be now, and among Baptists they are. It is not true, however, that they were baptized *in order to be saved*, as the *Advocate* has been contending, but only as a *symbol of the fact that they had been saved*, expressing figuratively, in a beautiful picture, in an object lesson, the salvation which had come to the person through repentance and faith. This is shown in the great commission. (Matt. 28:19, 20.) We are first to go and "*make disciples*," and *then* baptize them. It is shown in the case of the people on the day of Pentecost. Only those that "gladly received" the message of Peter were baptized. (Acts 2:41.)

The editor of the *Advocate* quotes several Baptist authors to sustain his position. Against the three or four quoted by him, I might quote a thousand or even ten thousand Baptists on the other side. The question is not, however, what *men* say, but what *God* says.

*What say the Scriptures?* The Scriptures, as I have shown, overwhelmingly sustain my position that salvation is "by grace through faith, not of works," while the contention of the *Advocate* has been that salvation is not through faith, but of works, which is in direct contravention of the scriptural teaching in Eph. 2:8, and in a thousand other passages. Besides, the *Advocate* perverts the meaning of these Baptist authors. They did not mean to teach that baptism saves actually, as the *Advocate* contends, but only figuratively. Take the quotation from Dr. Graves, for instance. I happen to know definitely the views of Dr. Graves. He took the position that John 3:5 referred to baptism. In this I think he was mistaken. He contended, however, very earnestly, and with his characteristic vigor and logic, that the expression "born of water" is to be taken in a figurative sense, and not *literally*, as the *Gospel Advocate* takes it. No one contended more vigorously against the doctrine of baptismal salvation than did Dr. J. R. Graves. It was a matter utterly abhorrent to him. In the very passage quoted by the *Gospel Advocate*, he says that "born of water" refers to the "baptism of one *previously born of the Spirit*," thus indicating his position that the regeneration of the soul comes from the Holy Spirit, and that baptism is simply the figurative expression of that regeneration. In answer to an inquirer, "J. G.," as to the meaning of John 3:5, Dr. Graves, in the *Baptist*, quoted with approval the remark of Dr. Harvey, in *The Church*: "Jesus said, 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God,' where 'water' evidently refers to baptism as the *outward symbol*, in which the

work of the Spirit finds expression." Dr. Graves then adds: "Of course, this inward work must *precede* the profession of it."

In his "Christian Baptism the Profession of the Faith of the Gospel," Dr. Graves said: "We know Christ was not baptized 'in order to the remission' of his sins—'to wash away' his sins—for he was 'holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners;' nor are we to come to the water for any such purpose, for we are not warranted to come until we have been washed in his blood, which cleanseth from *all* sin. Therefore we have no sins for water to cleanse, if it had cleansing power. We come not to the water *for* pardon, but *with* pardon—with the sweet consciousness of pardon in our hearts." (Page 19.) And again: "The Holy Spirit expressly declares that the rite of baptism is only a *figure*—"The like *figure* whereunto baptism doth now also save us.' If baptism is only a figure, whatever it is said to do, or we are said to do in or by it, must be done *figuratively*. If it saves us, it saves us *figuratively*. If it washes away our sins, it does it *figuratively*—i. e., declaratively. If we are by it baptized into Christ, it is done *figuratively*, as the Jews were into Moses. If we are baptized into his death, we only *figure, symbolise* it." (Page 21.)

After discussing the subject at some little length, he sums up his "Conclusions from These Positions," as follows: "1. *Baptism is in no sense a 'sacrament,' or means of securing the grace of remission of sins, or regeneration of heart.* We can see, therefore, to baptize the unregenerate, to obtain for them spiritual regeneration and salvation, is to pervert the gospel to the subversion of men's souls. 2. *We see*

*that baptism cannot be 'the law of pardon,' nor the act that unites the soul to Christ. Faith, and faith alone, independent of all overt acts, unites to Christ, and secures our justification before God. 'Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.'* (Rom. 3:24.) Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without deeds of law. To faith, as the medium of salvation, nothing can be added without destroying the whole scheme of salvation.

"Christ has become of none effect unto you, whosoever of you are [or seek to be] justified by law [the law of pardon or any other law]; ye are fallen from grace.' (Gal. 5:4.)

"The 'all righteous' of Christ is the only *efficient*, and faith the only *instrumental*, cause of our salvation. Neither baptism, nor any other rite or ordinance, is a means in order to this end." He then quotes Rom. 10:4-11. Dr. Graves continues: "3. *Nor is it by baptism that we become the children of God.*

“‘For we are all children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.’ (Gal. 3:26.)

"4. *Nor is baptism the seal of the Covenant of Grace.*

" 'In whom [Christ] also *after that ye believed*, ye were sealed by that Holy Spirit of promise.' (Eph. 1:13.)

"5. We also see *that baptism does nothing toward cleansing the soul from the guilt, or seeming the remission, of sin.*

"The blood of Christ alone does this. 'The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from *all sin.*' (1 John 1:7.)



"To say that something must be added to his blood is to say that his blood alone is not sufficient, which is to profane it. While false religions direct the sinner to *water* for his cleansing, the Holy Spirit, by all the types, and the evangelists and apostles in all their writings, point us to the blood of Christ alone, by which we have peace, and by which our consciences are purified from dead works, and by which we have access unto God.

*"6. Nor are we anywhere in God's word taught that we come to this blood of Christ through water, but by faith alone.*

*"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.' (Rom. 3:25.)*

"7. We learn the great central truth, that, in the plan of salvation, the blood of Christ must, in every case, be applied to the *conscience* before *water* is applied to the body.

"It is BLOOD BEFORE WATER.

"All the types of the Old Testament, referring to remission of sin, teach this. All the teachings of Christ assert this. The teachings of the apostles establish this: 'Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed in pure water, let us hold fast the profession of our faith.' (Heb. 10:22.)

"The unbroken practice of the apostles confirms this as the divine order. This is the grand and distinguishing test of genuine Christianity. It teaches the sinner to come to the water through blood—to the church

through Christ; and not through water to blood, or through the church to Christ.

"This is the *vital* saving doctrine that distinguishes us as Baptists from all other denominations. We put blood, in every case, *before* water. All others put water before the blood. We do not teach that baptism is essential to salvation, but that *salvation is essential to baptism.*" (Pages 30-35.) The Italics in the above quotations are all Dr. Graves'.)

And yet, in the face of such teachings, Brother McQuiddy dares quote Dr. Graves as teaching that baptism is a part of the plan of salvation. That a dozen years after his death any one should claim him as teaching baptismal salvation is a matter of the utmost astonishment, and is almost enough to make him rise from the grave and again raise his clarion voice against that unscriptural doctrine. The use which the editor of the *Advocate* tries to make of the name of Dr. Graves only shows the straits to which he is put in order to uphold his position.

Take also his quotation from Dr. Hovey. Let me give it a little more fully, taking it from his own text-book, the "Handbook on Baptism," gotten up by one of Brother McQuiddy's brethren, Brother J. W. Shepherd:

"Hovey—'Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.' (Acts 22:16.) Of course there is no such thing possible as a *literal* washing away of sins. But there is such a thing as forgiveness of sins; and this may be *described figuratively* as washing them away, so that henceforth the soul may be 'clean' from the guilt or stain of sin. Dr. Hackett remarks, 'that this clause

*(and wash away thy sins)* states a result of the baptism in language derived from the nature of the ordinance. It answers to *unto the forgiveness of sins*, in 2:38—i.e., submit to the rite in order to be forgiven. In both passages, baptism is represented as having this importance or efficacy, because it is *the sign of the repentance and faith which are the conditions of salvation.*" (Commentary on John, Appendix, page 420. Quoted from "Handbook on Baptism," by J. W. Shepherd, pages 364-365.)

After the sentence, "Of course there is no such thing possible as a literal washing away of sins," Dr. Hovey adds: "*A removal of sins from the soul by bathing the body in water is absurd.*" This sentence Brethren Shepherd and McQuiddy omit. They also omit the following remark by Dr. Hovey in discussing John 3:5: "We do not hesitate to say that it is irrational to think of 'water' as holding the same relation to the new birth as that held by the Holy Spirit. A material substance cannot be supposed to effect a moral change. It may naturally enough *signify* a moral or spiritual change, but that is all. Dead matter cannot be a spring of moral power to the soul. And it is almost equally difficult to conceive of it as a physical medium of the Spirit." (Com. on John, Appendix, page 422.)

Discussing 1 Peter 1:21, Dr. Hovey says: "Now we have seen that '*calling on his name,*' or prayer, is associated by Ananias with baptism, while '*forgiveness of sins*' is represented by Peter *as a result of the beginning of spiritual life, signified by baptism.* But in this passage, baptism itself is spoken of as an *embodied* request or prayer unto God. And what can

be truer than this, *if it is a symbol of repentance*, that is to say, of a change of mind and heart, if it is a *sign and figure* of entering into a new life? Is not the *first motion of faith a beginning of actual trust* in God, through Christ, for the forgiveness of sins? *And is not this trust an implicit and earnest request for that forgiveness?* Baptism, therefore, saves, because it *stands for and means genuine reliance*, for the first time, upon the mercy of God in Christ, and, indeed, an earnest request for pardon: *it expresses the act of the soul in turning to God, committing itself to God, and seeking his grace.*" (Com. on John, Appendix, page 421. Quoted from "Handbook on Baptism," by J. W. Shepherd, page 419.)

While quoting from Hovey, Brother McQuiddy might have quoted also the following: "*Repent, and be baptised every one of you in [or, upon] the name of Jesus Christ, unto the remission [or, forgiveness] of your sins.*" Acts 2:38, Rev. Ver.) Here repentance and baptism are represented as leading to the forgiveness of sins. We understand repentance to be a voluntary turning of the soul from the exercise of unbelief to the exercise of belief, and from a paramount love of self and sin to a paramount love of God and holiness; while baptism is the prescribed *symbol, sign, or expression* of that *inward change*. The two are, therefore, properly united in our thought; but one as the *essential, inward change*, and the other as a divinely required *confession or sign* of that change. This view of the relation of baptism to repentance or faith is confirmed by the 41st verse below: "They that gladly received his word were baptized." But there is *no hint in these verses of any connection between*

*baptism and regeneration by the Spirit of God; no suggestion, even, that the change called repentance was conditioned on the rite of baptism."* (Com. on John, Appendix, page 420.)

Let me complete the quotation from Hackett. I make this quotation also from Brother McQuiddy's text-book, Shepherd's "Handbook on Baptism:"

"Hackett—'*And wash (bathe) away thy sins.*' This clause states a result of the baptism in language derived from the nature of that ordinance. It answers to *for the remission of sins, in 2:38*—i. e., submit to the rite in order to be forgiven. In both passages baptism is represented as bearing this importance or efficacy, because it is the *sign of the repentance and faith which are the conditions of salvation.*" (Com. on Acts 22:16, page 258. Quoted from "Handbook on Baptism," by J. W. Shepherd, page 264.) Why did Brother McQuiddy, with the book before him, suppress this last remark, both in his quotation from Hovey and from Hackett? "Baptism ... is the *sign of the repentance and faith which are the conditions of salvation*" That is the position both of Hackett and Hovey. It is the Bible position. It is the Baptist position. It is my position.

With reference to the quotations from Dr. Wilmarth, I have only to say, that they do not correctly represent Baptist principles. Nor do they represent the views of other Baptists in and around Philadelphia.

The editor of the *Gospel Advocate* attempts to offset the numerous passages which I quoted from Romans and Galatians, to show that baptism is not a matter of works, by claiming that he cannot find these quotations, as I gave them, in any version.

They were taken from what is known as the Improved Version, by Broadus, Weston, and Hovey, which is really the best version of the New Testament ever made. It is similar to the Revised Version, from which the *Gospel Advocate* has usually been quoting, but is better than that in many respects. It may be that some mistakes were made in copying either by the stenographer or the printer. It makes very little difference, however, about the version from which the quotations are made. Take them from the King James Version, or the Revised Version, or the Improved Version, or the Twentieth Century New Testament, or any other version, and they are practically the same. Throughout all of them there runs the clear note of salvation "by grace through faith, not of works." In the quotations which I gave, Paul not only asserts this doctrine, but he goes on to prove it beyond any controversy. I again refer the editor of the *Advocate* to these passages. He may take them in any version he pleases. After charging that I had made a version of my own, and put in the word "only" in Gal. 2:16, "only through faith in Jesus Christ," the editor of the *Advocate* now claims that it does not make any difference anyhow, that "we are saved only through Christ, but not by Christ alone." But if we are saved only through Christ, we are saved by Christ alone, so far as the procuring cause of salvation is concerned. And so if we are saved only through faith, we are saved by faith alone, so far as the instrumental cause is concerned.

He says, however, that the passages referred to the "law of Moses." *What if they did?* The Ten Commandments are the law of Moses. Have they been

abrogated? Are we not under obligation to obey them? Christ gave his indorsement and authority to the law of Moses when he summed it up in his reply to the rich young man who asked Jesus what he should do to have eternal life: "And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. He saith unto him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honor thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. The young man saith unto him, All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet? Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me. But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions." (Matt. 19:16-22.) As a matter of fact, the law means *the law*, the *moral law*, the *law of God*, whether expressed by Moses or Jesus or Paul or whom. "But when the Pharisees had heard that he had put the Sadducees to silence, they were gathered together. Then one of them, which was a lawyer, asked him a question, tempting him, and saying, Master, which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy

neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." (Matt. 22:34-40.) "And, behold, a certain lawyer stood up, and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? He said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live." (Luke 10:25-28.) Paul also gives his authority and indorsement to it. "Owe no man anything, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." (Rom. 13:8-10.)

If the editor of the *Advocate* still insists that only the law of Christ is binding, I call attention to the commandment given by Jesus to his disciples, when he said, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another." (John 13:34.) He repeats this commandment in John 15:12-17. Paul says that "love is the fulfilling of the law," and quotes the Ten Commandments. (See Rom. 13:8-10.) As I said, "the law" means the law of God, whether expressed by Moses or Jesus or Paul or whom. If we propose to save ourselves by obedience to the law, then we must



obey that law in every respect. It was because we *could not* obey the law perfectly, because we had violated it, *because we were sinners*, that it became necessary for Christ to come and die for us. "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." (1 Tim. 1:15.)

The *Advocate* says: "The blood of Christ reached backward and blotted out the sins of the obedient." To prove this the editor refers to Heb. 9:15. The passage not only does not prove that position, it has no bearing on it. As a matter of fact, "the blood of Christ reached backward and blotted out" the sins of those *who believed on him*. (See Rom, 4:3-16; Gal. 3:6-8.)

The *Gospel Advocate* tries to make it appear that I have been inconsistent in my teachings as to the plan of salvation. Really, my position is very simple and unequivocal. That there may be no misunderstanding about it, I state it again briefly. Man is a *sinner*. He is a *condemned* sinner. He *needs salvation*. He *cannot save himself*. Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners. What man needs to do to be saved is simply to *repent of his sins* and *believe on Christ as his Savior*. He needs to say: "Lord, I am a sinner. Thou art a Savior. I cannot save myself. Thou canst save me. I take thee for my Savior." When a man does that, *he is saved*. After he is saved, Works will follow from his regenerated heart as the stream from the fountain, as the fruits from the tree. put the stream does not make the fountain. *The fountain makes the stream*. The fruits do not make the tree. *The tree makes the fruits*. The fountain and the tree are the *essential* things. The stream

and the fruits are *incidental*. We are "created in Christ Jesus unto good works." (Eph. 2:10.) But we are first "created" in him "by grace through faith, not of works."

Certainly, I make "the Baptist Church a 'non-essential' "—not "non-essential," of course, in the sense that no such thing is needed, but "nonessential" in the sense that it is not *essential to salvation*. I have shown, and need not repeat here, that salvation comes through Christ, and not through the church. Christ first, the church second. Christianity, not churchianity. But let me ask: Does the *Gospel Advocate* mean to make the "Christian Church," or Church of Disciples, or Campbellite Church, or whatever it may be called, essential to salvation? That is the logical and natural inference from its remark, and is also in harmony with all of its previous utterances. Here is ecclesiasticism with a vengeance!

I explained some time ago what is meant by the expression to "put on Christ" in baptism. The apostle has just said in the preceding verse: "Ye are all the *children of God by faith* in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3:26.) After we become children of God by faith in Christ, we openly and outwardly *express* that fact to the world in baptism. This it means to "put on Christ" in baptism. The soldier takes an oath to fight for his country. The *oath* makes him a soldier. Afterwards he puts on uniform to *declare to the world* that he is a soldier. *Faith* is like the soldier's *oath*. It is that which makes the man a Christian. Baptism is the uniform. The soldier, however, may still be a soldier and may fight *without a uniform*. So may a man be a Christian without baptism. It is *essential*

that we have faith in Christ, and so become the "children of God." It is *not* essential *to our salvation* that we openly proclaim to the world that we are saved. The *oath* is *essential to make the soldier*. The *uniform* is nonessential, though important.

Here are some of the inconsistencies of the editor of the *Gospel Advocate*:

1. There is "one way." "The Bible teaches one way, and not two." But he says we are saved by baptism, by the blood and life of Christ, by hope, by works, we save ourselves, we are saved through the church.

2. He quotes over and over again: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." But his position is that he that believeth and repenteth of his sins and is baptized shall be saved, if he obeys God's commandments, keeps the whole law, does his whole duty, and does not fall from grace.

3. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." But he claims that he shall be saved only from his "past sins." Baptism only wipes out the past and gives him a chance for salvation. After that he must get up and hustle to save himself.

4. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." But the *Advocate* editor says he is not saved. He must obey God's commandments, keep the whole law, do his whole duty; he must "continue in all things written in the book of the law, to do them." If he "offends in one point, he is guilty of the whole." (James 2:10.)

5. The "law of Moses" is not binding upon us now. Christ said that he came not to destroy, but to fulfill the law. He indorsed and emphasized and extended it. The apostle Paul did the same. But Edi-

tor McQuiddy has destroyed it, because it stands in the way of his theory. He has abrogated the Ten Commandments, nullified the moral law, and so has undermined the foundations of the gospel itself.

6. The *Advocate* editor says that "Christ died for men," but that he died only to make it possible for men to save themselves. They are saved not through him, but by themselves. His death only puts them where they may save themselves. But really the *Advocate* leaves them where they were before he died; for if they must save themselves after his death, they are no better off than they were before.

7. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." That seems easy. It's catching. But that only saves him from "*past sins*." The plan of salvation laid down by Editor McQuiddy is a severe, difficult, impossible one. Under it *no one* can be saved, not even Editor McQuiddy himself. No one can obey all of God's commandments perfectly, either as laid clown in the Old Testament or the New Testament. As a matter of fact, the commandments in the New Testament are harder to obey than those in the Old Testament, because they must be obeyed in the spirit, as well as in the letter; in the heart, as well as in the act, as Jesus tells us in the Sermon on the Mount. No one can keep the whole law absolutely. No one can do his whole duty. It was exactly because we *could not do so* that it became necessary for Christ to die.

8. Editor McQuiddy, therefore, not only has abrogated the moral law, but in teaching his plan of salvation by works, which he himself shows is absolutely impossible, because no one can live up to the standard

laid down, he thus teaches "another gospel" from that taught by the apostle Paul. He contravenes the simple plan of salvation, "by grace through faith, not of works." He nullifies the teachings of Jesus and Paul. He contradicts Jesus in John 3:16, John in John 3:36, Paul in Acts 16:31 and Rom. 5:1; and then winds up by contradicting *himself*, teaching in one place that there is "one way," and then that there are many ways; teaching that baptism saves, and then that it only saves from "past sins," and in fact that it does not save, but only puts us in a way to save ourselves, and yet that it is impossible for us to save ourselves, because to do so we must keep the "whole law," and not offend even in "one point," which is impossible. Such inconsistencies seem inconceivable. And yet Editor McQuiddy has been guilty of all of them in the articles to which I have been replying. The fault, however, is not with him. The fault is with his principles. He has upheld them as faithfully and ably as they could well be upheld. But it was an impossible task set before him. No one could uphold such principles without constant inconsistencies and contradictions.

9. Editor McQuiddy proposes to preach the gospel. But instead of the gospel, the good news, the glad tidings to the sinner that he may receive pardon for his sins, and peace through believing in Christ, he preaches to that sinner the hard doctrine that he must save himself *by his own deeds*, and that these deeds must be absolutely perfect, which is impossible. Thus, instead of the gospel of hope, he preaches the gospel of despair. Instead of good news, he brings bad news. Instead of glad tidings, he brings woeful

tidings. Instead of happiness, he brings misery. Instead of peace, he brings unrest. Instead of light, he brings darkness. Instead of life, he brings death. And thus at one fell swoop he undoes all that Christ has done, nullifies the whole plan of salvation, demolishes the teachings of the New Testament and throws overboard the whole Bible.

Never has any one taken upon himself so terrible a task as has Editor McQuiddy. And yet, despite all the efforts of Editor McQuiddy, I am glad to believe and to assure my readers that "the foundation of God standeth sure;" that the old Bible still remains, and that the simple plan of salvation "by grace through faith, not of works," is still offered to the sinner, and that he may be saved through Christ without trying to ] save himself by his own works. It still is true,

"There is a fountain filled with blood,  
Drawn from Immanuel's veins;  
And sinners plunged beneath that flood  
Lose all their guilty stains."

Dr. Frank Johnson, of Georgia, used to tell about a man who was trying to turn over a mountain with a pickax. That man is Editor McQuiddy. *But the mountain is still there.*

Before closing this article I must again call Editor McQuiddy's attention to the passages whose meaning I asked him to give, and which he has never attempted to give. They are as follows:

"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John 3:16.) "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life;

and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." (John 3:36.) "And brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." (Acts 16:30, 31.) "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. 5:1.) "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." (Gal. 3:10.) "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast." (Eph. 2:8, 9.) "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." (James 2:10.) "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (1 John 1:7.)

I pause for a reply. And, meanwhile, I shall continue to teach with earnestness the old gospel of salvation "by grace through faith, not of works" (Eph. 2:8, 9), and the blessed truth that "he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life" (John 3:36).

## **"We Are Saved By Faith."**

---

### **REPLY VI., BY J. C. McQUIDDY.**

The casual reader will doubtless observe Mr. Folk seeks to change the issue. No one has intimated we are not saved or justified by faith, but I have emphasized throughout this discussion the doctrine of justification by faith. He has contended we are saved by a dead faith, or faith only; while I have stoutly argued we are justified by the faith which works by love, and that it is not possible to divorce the faith that saves from obedience to the law of Christ.

The *Baptist and Reflector* published four articles, in not one of which did it intimate we are saved by faith alone, but now changes its affirmation, as is clear from the following: "And then published in a parallel column a number of passages of scripture showing that we are saved by faith." He adds in the revision of his articles for this book: "If we are saved by faith, it is necessarily faith alone." Who says this—God, Christ, or the Holy Spirit? Neither. It is simply the unwarranted and unscriptural conclusion of Editor Folk. The Holy Spirit flatly contradicts his assertion. "Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith," (James 2:24.) Editor Folk testifies that the man who is informed has not genuine faith if he refuses to be baptized. This is true, and it is also true that the man who refuses to do what Christ commands has not faith. Men of faith will always save themselves, as did the Jews at



Jerusalem. "They then that received his word were baptized." (Acts 2:41.) For what were those who in faith received his word baptized? "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." (Acts 2:38.) Listen to him: "But the very next verse tells how they were to save themselves. 'They that gladly received his word'—received it by faith—'were baptized.'" This is all I have ever contended—that men of faith gladly receive his word; but this is as far removed from faith alone as obedience is from disobedience. It follows that those who heard and were not baptized did not receive the word in faith.

He reverses God's order: "The order in which they come is: Faith, salvation, baptism; not faith, baptism, salvation." Christ said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." The order is faith, baptism, salvation. Editor Folk's practice makes the passage read: "He that believeth and is saved actually, relates a Christian experience, is voted on by the church, and is accepted, must be baptized to get into the Baptist Church, but not into heaven."

Here is what he claimed to prove by the passages of scripture quoted in the parallel: "I have already found a number of scriptures that teach we are saved by faith alone, as quoted above." In almost the beginning of this discussion I said: "It is wholly unnecessary for Editor Folk to quote by way of rebuttal any of the passages that ascribe salvation to faith, for the *Gospel Advocate* accepts all these in their obvious meaning as readily as the *Baptist and Reflector*, for not one of the passages quoted by the *Baptist and*

*Reflector* denies that 'he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' In fact, they could not without making the Bible contradict itself. I can see no reason for quoting these scriptures unless it is to make the Bible contradictory." This fixes the issue made by him.

Now listen to him again as he makes the second futile effort to get away from his own position: "We quoted a large number of passages to show that we are saved by faith. He quoted a few to show that we are not saved by faith alone, but by baptism also. The great preponderance is on our side." This is a strange way to harmonize scripture. If Editor Folk wishes to give up his former unscriptural position the *Gospel Advocate* is glad to extend to him the right hand of fellowship; but he should not ascribe to the *Gospel Advocate* a position it has never taken in order to pull himself out of the ditch dug by Editor Folk.

I would have some hope for him, as he seems to be learning, if it were not for the fact that he appears to be wholly unable to take the same position in two consecutive issues of his paper. He has abandoned "faith only," and now asserts it is "faith actually." Hear him: "I did harmonize the passages quoted by the *Advocate* with those quoted by me, by showing that the passages quoted by me mean that we are saved by faith actually, whereas the passages quoted by the *Advocate* mean that we are saved by baptism figuratively." It is so easy to prove by mere assertion. Let him quote the passage showing we are saved by faith actually and by baptism figuratively. He will never do it. I shall not be surprised if he seeks to figure faith, baptism, and salvation out of the Bible.

If baptism saves figuratively, then faith saves figuratively; for the Savior connects them with salvation and places salvation beyond both. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." But here is the way he interprets the Savior's language: "He that believeth [is saved actually] and is baptized shall be saved." This is worse than nonsense, for it is tampering with and adding to the word of God. "As we have said before, so say I now again, If any man preacheth unto you any gospel other than that which ye received, let him be anathema." (Gal. 1:9.) "I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto them, God shall add unto him the plagues which are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the tree of life, and out of the holy city, which are written in this book." (Rev. 22:18, 19.) Just one passage, brother editor, stating we are saved by faith actually and by baptism figuratively, will suffice. People should not be asked to accept the bald assertion of the *Baptist and Reflector* as proof.

I regret Brother Folk is not satisfied with changing his own position, but repeatedly misrepresents the position of the *Gospel Advocate*. "To say, 'We are saved by baptism alone, works alone, hope alone, life of Christ alone, blood of Christ alone, grace alone, and we save ourselves alone,' is to make several different kinds of salvation. It is to confuse the minds of people by jumbling things together; it is a juggling with scripture. 'Such blundering and presumptuous tampering with the word of God demand the most serious consideration of Editor McQuiddy. His con-

tention is with Revelation, and not us.' Will he tell us how a man is saved by each of these several ways?" I shall not characterize this gross perversion as it deserves, but shall give again the language and position of the *Gospel Advocate*, which Editor Folk had before him when he penned the above: "The Scriptures teach baptism saves us (1 Pet. 3:19-21); we are saved by the blood and life of Christ (Rom. 5:9, 10); we are saved by hope (Rom. 8:24); we are saved by works (James 2:24); and we save ourselves (Acts 2:40). The same audacity that adds to faith 'faith alone' may as consistently teach: We are saved by baptism alone, works alone, hope alone, life of Christ alone, blood of Christ alone, grace alone, and we save ourselves alone. If not, why not? Such blundering and presumptuous tampering with the word of God demand the most serious consideration of Editor Folk. His contention is with Revelation, and not us. Will he tell us how a man is saved by each alone?" As Editor Folk added to faith "faith alone," the above fitly applies to him; so, in the language of Nathan to David, I say to him: "Thou art the man." May we hope for the same integrity which led David to say: "I have sinned?" Editor Folk asserts as follows: "The *Advocate* says that we are saved in several different ways—by baptism, by the blood and the life of Christ, by hope, by works, and by ourselves. As we have already shown, there is only one plan of salvation." I have repeatedly shown from the Scriptures there is only one way of salvation. "Strait and narrow is the way." "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no one cometh unto the Father, but by me." (John 14:6.) He will never

quote the language where the *Gospel Advocate* says there are several ways and that we are saved "by ourselves." The *Gospel Advocate* did say: "We should not lose sight of the fact, God saves. While he saves, salvation is predicated of certain conditions, and these conditions are to be complied with by man." As already shown, the *Baptist and Reflector* has taught at least three plans of salvation: (1) The scripturally informed who refuse to be baptized are lost; (2) salvation is before and without baptism; (3) those who personally trust Jesus and do not know it to be their duty to be baptized are saved without baptism. To these we may add: (4) We are saved by faith actually.

The editor of the *Reflector* unintentionally does the *Gospel Advocate* overmuch honor in stating it says we are saved by baptism, by works, by faith, etc. The Holy Spirit says this. The *Baptist and Reflector* has committed itself to the position that to say we are saved by baptism (1 Pet. 3:19-21), by faith (Mark 16:16), by hope (Rom. 8:24), by grace (Eph. 2:8), by works (James 2:24), is to teach several different ways of salvation. The editor then commits himself to the position the Bible teaches one way. If he is correct in claiming because different conditions enter into one's salvation there are different ways, will he please to tell us was the Holy Spirit right when he taught different ways by ascribing salvation to different conditions, or was he right when he taught one way? He will never give an intelligent answer to this Question. The *Baptist and Reflector* talks about harmonizing scriptures, simply that and nothing more.

The wisdom of God originated the plan of salvation,

the infinite power executed it, the grace of God bowed the heavens low and brought the Savior down on the wings of mercy to save a lost and ruined race. He lived a perfect life for about thirty years and was tempted in all points as we are, yet without sin. He left us an example that we should walk in his steps. He selected and sent out the apostles. He commanded them to preach the gospel to the whole creation. He laid upon them this inhibition not to tell any man that he was Jesus the Christ until after they had received power from on high. "They therefore, when they were come together, asked him, saying, Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel? . . . But ye shall receive power, when the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." (Acts 1:6-8.) On the day of Pentecost the Holy Spirit came upon them. They preached the gospel of Christ for the first time. Peter charged them with the murder of Jesus. They were cut to the heart. He gives them a positive command for faith: "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified." They must believe him the Christ to know it. In answer to the question, "What shall we do?" Peter commanded these believers: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. . . . And with many other words he testified, and exhorted them, saying, Save yourselves from this crooked generation. They then that received his word were baptized: and

there were added unto them in that day about three thousand souls." (Acts 2:36-41.) (They were baptized into Christ. (Rom. 6:4; Gal. 3:26, 27.) They were saved by Jehovah, by grace, by Christ, by the life and blood of Christ, by faith, by baptism, and they saved themselves in that they laid hold of the promises by placing themselves in the position where God saved them. This is God's way of saving. If you strike God out of the chain, there will be no salvation. Neither can you strike out grace, Christ, blood and life of Christ, faith, baptism, or anything God has put in the chain. To do so is disbelief and rebellion. They were baptized in the name of Christ unto the remission of sins, that they might be saved by grace. They were baptized into Christ, so that they might be saved by faith. Their baptism grew out of their faith and belonged to it. It was a development, a result of their faith, and marks the degree of faith at which God pardons. }

Editor Folk would have us believe that because a number of and the same conditions enter into every salvation, that therefore these are so many different ways of saving. Ah, indeed! There is the same number of conditions entering into every life. Air is one condition of life, breathing is another, food is another, and drink is still another. It takes them all to make one life, and each is essential to all life. He would have us believe air alone is one way of living; breathing, another plan; food, another; and drink, still another! I am sorry to consume space with such ridiculous absurdities. Try an illustration: A boy is in a burning building. Every way of escape is cut off,

save one. His father, in a fireproof vault below, sees the danger of his son. He cries to the son to jump into the vault and he will save him. The son cannot see the father, but he has faith to jump and lands safe in his father's arms. The faith of the son saved him, the father saved him, and the boy placed himself in position to be saved by jumping. It was not a dead faith that saved him, but a faith that led him to jump. The father was not one way of salvation, the son was not one way of salvation, and faith alone was not one way of salvation; but all together complete the one way of salvation.



## "Faith and Obedience."

---

### REPLY VII., BY J. C. McQUIDDY.

It was clearly shown in the last paper that air, water, and food all sustain life; so when God teaches we are saved by grace, by faith, by the life and blood of Christ, by baptism, by works, by hope, and we save ourselves, he does not teach different plans of salvation, but that all these conditions are present in the salvation of a soul. He repeats the misrepresentation by saying, "The *Advocate* says we are saved in several different ways—by baptism, by the blood and the life of Christ, by hope, by works and by ourselves," notwithstanding I had shown these all enter into the one way of salvation and he has made no effort to show the conclusion false.

It may be encouraging to the editor of the *Baptist and Reflector* to know that a Baptist also accepts this truth. Mr. J. B. Jeter says: "Now, God saves us by all the means which he employs to instruct, impress, and preserve us. The written word, the ministry of the word, mediation, prayer, baptism, the Lord's Supper, afflictions, are all means by which God saves us. We are said to be saved by faith, saved by hope, to save ourselves and others, to work out our own salvation. Salvation is promised to him that endureth to the end. Christ is the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him. And we are saved by baptism." Does the editor of the *Baptist and Reflector* reject as heresy the teaching of the great

and mighty Jeter? To do so will not help him, unless he disavows all obedience and boldly proclaims that the adulterer, the murderer, and the drunkard will be saved.

Listen: "The *Advocate* insists that baptism is a matter of obedience. So it is. But it is no more a matter of obedience than the Ten Commandments. Or, if the *Advocate* editor wishes to come over to the New Testament, it is no more a matter of obedience than is the commandment to love one another, to partake of the Lord's Supper in remembrance of Christ, to forget not the assembling of ourselves together, to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, to add to our faith virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, charity." Brother Folk says a man is saved before and without baptism; therefore he is saved without brotherly love, without partaking of the Lord's Supper, without the worship, without preaching the gospel to every creature, and without adding to his faith any of the Christian virtues. With him baptism is a non-essential; and as he puts the Christian graces in the same category, they are nonessential. According to Editor Folk, Christ is not the author of eternal salvation to those who obey him. Christ is mistaken in teaching: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven." (Matt. 7:21.) I regret the necessity of exposing such ridiculous absurdities, and commend Editor Folk to the charity of a generous reader.

It does not overthrow the doctrine of baptism unto the remission of sins to say that faith and hope are

also necessary to salvation. It is freely conceded they are, but not that they are necessary in the same sense in which baptism is necessary. To assume such is just as erroneous as to assume that, since life is a process to which eating, sleeping, and drinking are necessary, any one lives by sleeping in the sense in which he lives by eating. If there is any argument in what Editor Folk says, this is what it amounts to.

We are seriously informed the Ten Commandments are as much a matter of obedience as is baptism, the Lord's Supper, brotherly love, etc. Poor Brother Folk! He is bent on damning himself! The Jew was not permitted to do any work on the Sabbath. "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is a sabbath unto Jehovah thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." (Ex. 20:9, 10.) A man was stoned to death for picking up sticks on the Sabbath. As Editor Folk claims to be under the Sabbath, he should not hitch up his horse to go to the place of worship; he should not do anything. If he knows no better, he is to be pitied; if he knows better, he is to be censured. The Holy Spirit, through Paul, teaches: "Having blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us: and he hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross." (Col. 2:14.) The Ten Commandments were engraven on stones. This is the law which passed away. "But if the ministration of death, written, and engraven on stones, came with glory, so that the children of Israel could not look steadfastly upon the face of Moses for the glory

of his face; which glory was passing away: how shall not rather the ministration of the spirit be with glory? For if that which passeth away was with glory, much more that which remaineth is in glory," (2 Cor. 3:7-11.) All the Ten Commandments, save the Sabbath, have been incorporated into the New Testament. They are binding because in the New Testament, not because in the law of Moses. After the colonies threw off the yoke of England, they made a constitution of their own. Into this new constitution they incorporated such laws of England as would suit their new conditions. Some of these laws are binding to-day, not because found in the laws of England, but because they are incorporated into the constitution of the United States.

The *Baptist and Reflector* now admits that salvation is conditional and that "God saves," and "there are conditions to be complied with by man." Still, no one should suppose because they are conditions, that they are not essential to whatever is made dependent on them. A condition may be as absolutely essential to whatever is dependent on it as though it were a cause. This distinction should be made: The connection between a cause and its effect is necessary— it exists in the very nature of things; the connection between a condition and whatever depends on it is merely arbitrary. The conditions of salvation exist at the will and by the appointment of Jehovah. Hence conditions have no power to produce or merit that which depends on them. Salvation in all cases is conferred as a gratuity, a favor.

What are the conditions? The *Baptist and Reflector* answers: "They are simply 'repentance and faith'—

'repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.'" In the beginning of this discussion Editor Folk had but one condition of salvation. Listen; "We have already found a number of scriptures that teach we are saved by faith alone." In the issue of March 29 he again states his position: "We say that in order to be saved a person must repent of his sins and believe on Christ, trusting to him as his personal Savior." He has now added a new condition —repentance. If he has a right to add one, why not two? This he has almost done, for he says "trusting to him as his personal Savior." Does a man trust Christ as his Savior who refuses to be baptized? Brother Folk says he will be lost because his faith is not genuine. Then the man of genuine faith, who trusts Christ, will be baptized. This has been my contention throughout this discussion.

I prefer to accept the conditions of salvation as taught by Christ. "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." (Matt. 28:19.) "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." (Mark 16:15, 16.) "Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem." (Luke 24:46, 47.) As stated by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, the conditions are faith, repentance, and baptism. He represents me as speaking of his "'unsupported statement' in advocating

justification by faith." Wrong again. I said "faith alone." I might feel aggrieved if Editor Folk took the same position in two consecutive issues or if he did not misrepresent Paul. After assuming that repentance and faith are the conditions of salvation, he represents Paul as saying this was "all the counsel of God." No evidence exists in the word of God of the truth of this statement. Had such been the case, Brother Folk, whose fondness for a pedantic array of texts shows itself on the most trivial occasions, would have spared us the labor of seeking such proof. Paul would never have taught that men are baptized into Christ and that we should work out our own salvation with fear and trembling, if repentance and faith were "all the counsel of God." I insist that the *Baptist and Reflector* attend to my well-defined position and that it cease to be addicted to erring—always unintentionally, it is true, but peculiarly in favor of itself.

When we assume that the conditions of salvation are the same in every case, we do not refer to the innocent babe, the irresponsible idiot, or the untaught heathen. We refer to taught, responsible people. Does a man inquire of us, "What must I do to become a Christian?" Authorized by Christ, we tell him to believe, repent, and be baptized. Matthew plainly teaches the disciples to be baptized. Mark gives us faith and baptism: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." The *Reflector* complains that we quote this scripture so frequently. Is it wrong to quote Christ's words? He is complaining at Christ. He has given no attention to it, only to complain. Tell us of whom this scripture says "he . . . shall be saved." Of him who believes and is not baptized it says nothing; of

him who is baptized and does not believe it says nothing. Salvation is affirmed of him who believes and is baptized. Of him alone who believes and is baptized it does say he shall be saved.

The apostles were directed to preach the gospel to the whole creation. Of the whole preached to, it selects a class and rejects all others. The class selected believes and is baptized; therefore it is saved. Luke gives us repentance and the "remission of sins." Where Mark gives salvation, Luke has "remission of sins." "Shall be saved" by Mark means "remission of sins" by Luke. Thus we have faith, repentance, and baptism unto the remission of sins. Here is a rule that may be helpful to our readers: "Where salvation is promised to a person, or affirmed of him, on certain named conditions, though it may depend on more conditions than those named, it can never depend on less." We boldly challenge Brother Folk to produce an exception to this rule.

This brings me again to the consideration of an objection that is offered by him. He has advocated we are saved by faith alone, and quoted to sustain the contention: "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." (John 3:36.) Apply the rule. Faith is the named condition. Salvation can never depend on less than faith, but may depend on more conditions. It does depend on more unless Mark 16:16 and Luke 24:47 are false. Brother Folk now arbitrarily adds repentance, showing he does not himself limit faith to "faith alone." Why not add obedience, as "he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on

him?" The latter clause of this passage, in using the phrase "obeyeth not" instead of "believeth not," shows conclusively that "believeth" in the preceding clause includes obedience.

The apostles, in obedience to Christ, when the first gospel sermon was delivered, commanded believers: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." If they had not believed Christ had risen and was responsible for the wonderful outpouring of the Holy Spirit, they would not have been cut to their hearts. Believing this, they realized they were the murderers of the Christ, and therefore condemned. Hence they asked: "What shall we do?" Thus it is clear the order is faith, repentance, and baptism. If this be not true, then were they promised salvation without faith. No man can please God without faith, and "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." (Heb. 11:6; Rom. 14:23.) This leads me to say there is always some faith before any repentance. In turn, repentance reacts on faith and produces more faith. It is not all faith and then repentance, or all repentance and then faith. There is not an exception in the Bible to this; for where people obeyed God, some faith always preceded repentance. The order of faith and repentance, however, is not essential to this discussion. It is not possible for a man to get the cart before the horse in exercising them. Neither is it possible to sever faith and obedience. When Naaman had faith, he dipped in

the Jordan seven times; when the children of Israel had faith, they marched around the walls of Jericho, and looked on the brazen serpent; when the blind man



had faith, he went and washed in the pool of Siloam; and when to-day a man has faith, he will be baptized in obedience to the Christ and in his name. To doubt this is to doubt God. "For as the body apart from the spirit is dead, even so faith apart from works is dead." (James 2:26.)

## "Salvation By Faith or By Works?"

---

### REPLY VIII., BY J. C. McQUIDDY.

Even the casual reader has doubtless observed that much space is consumed in correcting misstatements. of the *Baptist and Reflector*. Instead of noticing the scriptures presented by the *Gospel Advocate*, it passes them by in silence and devotes most of its time and space to assigning positions to the *Gospel Advocate* which have already been contradicted by the real positions taken by this paper.

After quoting a number of scriptures referring to the law of Moses and that the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith, he says: "And it sounds much stranger still to hear that person now claiming that the gospel which Paul preached was a gospel of works, and that the 'other gospel' to which he referred in Gal. 1:8 was the gospel of salvation by faith." Frankly, I am frequently at a loss to know how to characterize many of Brother Folk's assertions without transcending the limits which courtesy imposes. To call this assertion a downright falsehood would be too harsh, and to pass it as truth would be a falsehood. Nameless, then, I let it stand.

The teaching of the *Gospel Advocate* has been and is: "Faith has a law (Rom. 3:27), and by this law we are required to walk in order to justification by faith." Paul by faith was justified in obedience to this law of faith: "For the law of the Spirit of life

in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death." (Rom. 8:2.) The law led us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith. How foolish and presumptuous some men appear!

The *Baptist and Reflector* seeks to obscure the issue and hide its defeat by raising a great dust about D. L. Moody and the "pious unimmersed," until we would say he is anxious to commune with all the unbaptized. If Editor Folk thinks this a Bible argument, I pity him. If Moody were lost or saved, does that change the plan of salvation as taught in the Bible? I never knew a man to appeal to the argumentum ad hominem if he had any scripture to uphold his position. Does the *Baptist and Reflector* accept "Vox populi, vox Dei"--"The voice of the people, the voice of God?" This appeal to the prejudices of the unbaptized is a confession of weakness and inability to meet the issue, for Editor Folk's love of display and the novel would have led him to bring forth every scripture at his command. It would be generous not to take from him his only source of appeal, but love for the truth forces me to show that he is in the ditch dug for me. His contention is that D. L. Moody has never been baptized. D. L. Moody was fully instructed on the subject of baptism. He was familiar with the Bible teaching on baptism, and it is that which makes it one's duty to be baptized. Editor Folk is committed to the position that those who are informed on the subject of baptism who refuse to be baptized will be lost because their faith is not genuine. Thus the *Baptist and Reflector* condemns Moody. Poor Brother Folk! He cannot pull himself out of the

ditch. In kindness I would suggest to him that "those who live in glass houses should not throw stones."

I have made no argument based on the baptism of the thief. I only showed that the *Baptist and Reflector* begged the question when it assumed he was not baptized. It was not intimated that "all" meant every one, but that it meant a great number. How does the *Reflector* know he was not in the number? I only showed that he could not show the thief was not baptized, but that he based his argument on an assumption. He assigns me a position denied by a fair construction of my language and fights the position I disavow. Pardon, but the vanity of the editor of the *Baptist and Reflector* leads him to assume the point at issue. Whether the thief was or was not baptized is immaterial to the position of this paper. Thousands who were never commanded to be baptized were saved without baptism. A testament is of force after men are dead. (Heb. 9:16, 17.) Christ was not dead when he spoke to the thief on the cross. Editor Folk could as consistently contend he may now be saved, as was the Jew, by offering bloody sacrifices. Noah was saved by building an ark. Will the *Baptist and Reflector* tell us if people can be saved by offering bloody sacrifices or building an ark now?

If the *Baptist and Reflector* is correct in contending the church was established while Jesus was on the cross, it was a church without a head. According to the *Reflector*, the church was not established when Jesus uttered the language of Matt. 16:18: "Upon this rock I will build my church." This brings the establishment of the church after the days of John the Baptist, and also after the sending out of the twelve,

when J. N. Hall said it was built. A very short time intervenes between Matt. 16:18, 19, and the death on the cross. As Editor Folk is so near the time, I insist he give us the exact time. We find that after his resurrection and before his ascension it was not established, for his disciples asked: "Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" (Acts 1:7.) They were commanded to tarry in Jerusalem for the promise of the Father, which was the baptism of the Spirit. "But ye shall receive power, when the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." (Acts 1:8.) On the day of Pentecost the Holy Spirit came upon the apostles. Christ was preached for the first time and thousands were obedient. In the name of Christ believers are now commanded to be baptized into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. There is now no promise to the man who neglects or refuses to be baptized. From this time on we do not have one case in the word of God where a believer in Christ neglected or refused to be baptized. The possibility of a believer refusing or neglecting to be baptized seems never to have entered the mind of an apostle. Such a thing as a man receiving the word and not being baptized is unknown to the language of the Holy Spirit. "They then that received his word were baptized." (Acts 2:41.) "But when they believed Philip preaching good tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." (Acts 8:12.) When Jesus was preached to the eunuch, and his faith came by hearing "the

word of Christ" (Rom. 10:17), "as they went on the way, they came unto a certain water; . . . and they both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him." (Acts 8:36-38.) In one case the believer, though he had fasted three days, refused to break his fast until baptized. (Acts 9.) The Philippian jailer and his household were baptized "the same hour of the night." (Acts 16.) "And many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized." (Acts 18:8.) Will Brother Folk give us just one example after the church was established where a believer neglected or refused to be baptized? Just one will suffice.

Editor Folk condemns James along with me. God pity the man who is so blinded by his creed that he indulges in such wholesale denunciation and condemnation of the teaching of the Spirit. Will he tell us if he denies the inspiration of the book of James? If not, then harmonize the teaching of the *Reflector* with the Bible and cease to sin against the Holy Spirit by scoffing at his words. No one has intimated that the Christian never slips. There is a difference between a willful, presumptuous sin and a sin of weakness. David prayed to be delivered from presumptuous sins. But men must repent of all sins; they must turn away from them. The law of God makes provisions for those who sin. All sin. Only one sinless being, the Christ. Noah was perfect in his day and generation. There is a law of forgiveness to the Christian. "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (1 John 1:8,

9) Abraham, David, and Peter slipped—made mistakes; but they did not persist in wrongdoing. To persist in any sin, to fail to repent of it, is to be lost. The interpretation the *Baptist and Reflector* puts on James 2:10 is something new under the sun. To be free from offending in one point does not mean absolute perfection, as Editor Folk would have us believe. How little and foolish a man appears when he presumes to force on the word of God an unwarranted meaning! To persist in so misrepresenting the Holy Spirit is to be guilty of all.

He charges the *Gospel Advocate* and others of teaching a baptismal salvation or regeneration. For the sake of Editor Folk, I hoped he would not do this. Fifty years ago we might have expected such conduct in the ignorant. But I want to be charitable, and so find this way to excuse Brother Folk, as he teaches sin is inward, and not outward. Even J. B. Jeter knew the disciples did not teach a baptismal regeneration, and Dr. Jacob Ditzler, who has had many debates with the disciples, exonerates them from the charge of the *Baptist and Reflector*. Read what Mr. Jeter says: "Mr. Campbell has been frequently—but, I think, unfairly—charged with teaching baptismal regeneration. As popularly understood, baptismal regeneration denotes a moral change effected through the influence of Christian baptism. Some things which Mr. Campbell has written, as we have seen, seem to imply this doctrine, and he has exposed himself to the suspicion of holding it by quoting its advocates in support of his peculiar views; but certainly he has not formally proclaimed it—he earnestly advocates principles at war with it." ("Campbellism Examined,"

page 197.) In a letter written to Brother J. W. Shepherd, on January 4, 1906, Jacob Ditzler writes: "In answer, will say that all Disciples (Campbellites) preachers have always said I did them exact justice, and was the only writer who did so. They all teach, have always taught, that to a proper subject 'baptism is for, or in order to, the remission of sins.' They all have always taught that: (1) To believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God; that, say they all, changes the heart. (2) You repent; that changes the conduct or character. (3) You are immersed for the remission of sins; that changes your state. You in the water, nowhere else, come in contact with the merit of Christ's blood; that secures remission of sins."

The position of this journal is that (1) the new birth and regeneration are identical; (2) that the new birth consists of two parts—namely, being begotten, or quickened, by the Spirit, and being baptized; and (3) that, therefore, baptism is not itself regeneration—that is, the whole of it.

The Savior taught that the new birth consists in being born "of water and of the Spirit." (John 3:5.) That to be born of water and the Spirit is to be "born again" no honest man doubts. And this is regeneration. Hence, regeneration consists not in being born of water alone, neither in being begotten by the Spirit alone, but in the two jointly and inseparably. This is the doctrine the *Baptist and Reflector* must meet. "Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." The importance of the passage cannot be exaggerated, as the Savior shuts the kingdom of heaven against all who are not born of water and the Spirit. That "born of



is metaphorical no one doubts. The kingdom of God, coming to language that is free from a figure, is open to him who believes and is baptized. Hence, to believe and be baptized is to be born of water and the Spirit. All those who were born of water and of the Spirit in the days of the apostles believed and were baptized, repentance intervening between faith and baptism. No man can believe and be baptized without repenting.

John 3:5 makes remission of sins depend on baptism as well as faith. So does Mark 16:16. "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." (Acts 2:38.) Now I unhesitatingly affirm this teaches repentance and baptism are unto the remission of sins. I challenge the *Reflector* to deny it. The Greek particle "eis," followed by an accusative, denotes the object for which anything is done. The following testimonies clearly establish this: (1) "'Eis,' followed by an accusative, in almost innumerable instances designates the object or end for which anything is or is done." (Prof. M. Stuart.) (2) "'Eis,' a preposition governing the accusative, and denoting entrance into, or direction and limit; into, to, toward, for, among." (Thayer.) Many authorities could be given, but these are amply sufficient, for this form of speech is of frequent occurrence in the New Testament. (1) "And behold, all the city came out [eis] to meet Jesus." (Matt. 8:34.) (2) "Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which this woman hath done shall be spoken of for [eis] a memorial of her." (Matt. 26:13.) (3) "For this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out

for many unto [eis] remission of sins." (Verse 28.) (4) "For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end [eis] ye may be established." (Rom. 1:11.) Space forbids giving other examples, but the principle is fully established.

It becomes monotonous to correct so many mistakes. "We said that when a person has believed, he steps over the line of salvation at faith." Here is what Brother Folk said: "When he has believed, when he has stepped over the line, he is saved, and all the powers of earth and all the devils in hell cannot keep him from being saved." While I commend Editor Folk to the charity that "thinketh no evil," I must insist he correct his mistake without misrepresenting me.

The *Baptist and Reflector* editor gives up his contention when he admits: "The sin-sick man is healed when he takes the medicine of the great Physician." Christ has prescribed faith, repentance, and baptism for the sin-sick soul. The jailer believed and was baptized "the same hour of the night." If the *Baptist and Reflector* will stick to this, I am ready to close this discussion. He now virtually concedes our position that there is no fountain when the stream is as dry as a powder horn, and that faith leads to the healing of the sin-sick soul when the guilty culprit takes the medicine of the great Physician. May this convert never fall from grace!

## 'Salvation By Faith.'

---

### REPLY IX., BY J. C. McQUIDDY.

There is not much in the article of Brother Folk that needs answer. Striking out misrepresentations and wholly irrelevant matter, very little remains. As the caption of this article shows, Brother Folk has abandoned his original position in four consecutive articles.

All the sophistry about the thief on the cross and his criticism of "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all" (James 2:10), has been met and exposed.

I am unable to see the distinction between avowed infidelity and that system of religion which compels the Bible to falsify itself. Judged in the light of the following utterance, the religious condition of Brother Folk is really pitiable: "The contention of the *Gospel Advocate* has been that salvation is not through faith, but of works, which is in direct contravention of the scriptural teaching in Eph. 2:8, and in a thousand other passages." The charitable view of such an utterance, in the light of the emphasis the *Gospel Advocate* has given to salvation through faith, would be to presume that Brother Folk had not read the articles he was attempting to review, or that his memory was so perverted by his creed that he should never attempt to review anything. "A thousand other passages" teach "salvation is by grace through faith, not of works." In all, the word "faith" occurs just about

two hundred and forty-three times in the New Testament. "For by grace have ye been saved through faith" occurs one time in the Bible. One time is enough, however, and I most heartily accept it. I call attention to the fact simply to show how wide of the mark is Brother Folk. He could quote ten thousand Baptists on the other side! We will excuse him if he will quote one Baptist scholar that renders "eis," in Acts 2:38, "because of."

In the revision of the discussion for this book, Editor Folk has made some additional quotations from Baptist authorities. Over one year has elapsed since the discussion was first written. In this time he has undergone a conversion. He said, when I quoted the Baptist authors: "Against the three or four quoted by him, I might quote a thousand or even ten thousand Baptists on the other side." Now he puts the ten thousand Baptists on the side of error and Hovey and Hackett as teaching the truth of the Bible. He says of their position: "It is the Bible position, it is the Baptist position, it is my position." I indorse all that he has quoted from Hovey and Hackett. They both, teach that baptism saves, and in the only sense I believe it saves.

When Ananias was told by Saul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins," Hovey tells us that he was to submit to the rite in order to be forgiven. In other words, he makes baptism save in the sense that before faith and repentance lead us to the position where God saves they must express themselves in action. Hovey and Hackett make baptism an expression of faith. I have contended throughout this discussion that in baptism we commit ourselves to

God in order that we may be saved by grace through faith.

Editor Folk contends that when a man believes before and without baptism he is really and actually saved, and that when Ananias said to Saul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins," he had no sins to be forgiven. Unless he has given up all that he has contended for in this discussion, his position is as far from the Bible position and as far from the position of Hackett and Hovey as truth is from error. I left off part of the quotation from the Baptist scholars because I was simply quoting them as scholars to get their translation of "eis" in Acts 2:38. The part that I left off was the comment they made as Baptists, but this comment did not change the truth they had already taught.

If it is now the position of Editor Folk that Saul was baptized in order to be forgiven, and that baptism was an expression of his faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, this discussion may as well close on baptism.

In regard to the indorsement of Dr. J. R. Graves of Harvey's position in "The Church," it does not change J. R. Graves' position as I quoted it in the least. J. R. Graves says that "born of water" refers to baptism, and the Saviour says: "Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3:5.)

It appears that Graves, with Hovey and Hackett, makes water baptism necessary to get into the kingdom of God; that it not only saves, but is also an expression of faith.

I have repeatedly shown that God does not bless the faith which refuses to express itself in action. Faith

is always blessed when it expresses itself in action, and not until it does. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16:16.)

Then Editor Folk tells us that the informed man who refuses or neglects to express his faith in baptism will be lost because his faith is not genuine. The only faith that saves is that which expresses itself in obedience. Hence the faith that will not express itself in baptism, which is the first act of obedience that belongs to faith, will not save.

Brother Folk has people to repent to be saved, and then baptized because they are saved, for he contends salvation is necessary to baptism. The Baptist scholars quoted were too honest to mistranslate the Scriptures, but their religious bias often led them to force an unwarranted interpretation on the Scriptures. Pervert, indeed! The Baptist authorities spoke in their own language. Brother Folk says they meant to teach baptism saves figuratively. They do not say so. Here is Willmarth on this subject: "Certainly, it would seem that baptism must be very important, intimately connected with remission and salvation. How can an unprejudiced mind survey this testimony and then relegate baptism to the realm of mere emblem, symbol, and profession?" Must we conclude that Editor Folk is so blind he refuses to read the literature of his own scholars? The *Gospel Advocate* agreed with the Baptist scholars in the positions presented, but Editor Folk dissents and asserts ten thousand Baptist scholars are on the other side. Well, he is good at one thing—asserting. Had their belief and ours differed, would he have dissented? He is singularly perverse. "When the belief of the orthodox unbaptized and ours

differ, he appeals to the prejudices of the unbaptized and grows clamorous and urgent for the authority of orthodoxy; but when the belief of Baptist scholars and ours agree, then he dissents from both. "We piped unto you, and ye did not dance; we wailed, and ye did not mourn," is a severe arraignment of hypocritical folly. Why did not Brother Folk quote where the *Gospel Advocate* had said "salvation is not through faith?" Manifestly because he knew the *Gospel Advocate* had taught the reverse of what he says. It would have been far more honorable in him had he confined himself to the clearly defined positions of the *Gospel Advocate*, and not have assigned to me those which I have combated with great earnestness, merely for the sake of deducing from them some conclusions which, after all, render no one half so ridiculous as himself.

Every candid reader knows the *Gospel Advocate* has contended the phrase "born of water" is metaphorical, and not literal; and yet Editor Folk asserts the *Gospel Advocate* takes it literally. His vain repetitions concerning the Ten Commandments and baptismal salvation have all been met and exposed. Also, in seeking to convict us of teaching different ways of salvation, Editor Folk has rendered himself ridiculous in opposing the plain teaching of the Bible. He has the unfortunate faculty of doing this on all occasions.

The *Gospel Advocate* has never objected to any correct translation of the Bible, but to a misquotation of any translation. It is hardly just to quote from a Baptist translation without stating the fact. When I asked Brother Folk for a copy of the Improved Version, he said his copy was stolen about two years ago,

so he could not let me have it. Of course he must explain, as the quotations have been used in the last few months; so he explained that he was quoting from the old files of the *Baptist and Reflector*. As I now recollect, he quoted from a June number of the volume of 1901. This explains why so many of his arguments and quotations have no bearing whatever on the subject in hand. May I ask why he did not quote from an almanac? But, in full justice to him, I must say he assured me if there were any mistakes, they were not intentional. I ordered the Improved Edition. Later he loaned me a copy. I compared the scriptures quoted with the Improved Version, and noted only seventeen changes and mistakes. But Brother Folk has the adroitness to inform us that the changes were not intentional and the skill to transmute the stenographer and printer into scapegoats to carry off his sin. Stenographers and printers err at times, as do other men. But there is another class of men singularly addicted to erring—unintentionally, it is true; but, peculiarly, they never err in favor of an opponent. Better discharge a proofreader that errs so much.

Singularly, Editor Folk accepts Hovey's translation of the Bible and commends it as the best; but when I quote Hovey against the theory of Brother Folk, he boasts about being able to put against Hovey ten thousand Baptists! Verily, it does make a difference "whose ox is gored." Editor Folk must have the fright of which Dr. Graves wrote years ago: "We are in receipt of an exegesis of John 3:5, from our old friend, Elder J. M. McMurray. . . . Our dear brother, at an early day, received a startling fright from the Campbellites as he stood by the old



interpretation of John 3:5, and he jumped clear away from it, and he exceedingly fears to come near it. lest he might get into too much water, and the Campbellites down him."

Seriously Editor Folk informs us: "'Certainly we make the Baptist Church a nonessential'—not 'non-essential,' of course, in the sense that no such thing is needed, but 'nonessential' in the sense that it is not essential to salvation." Please tell us what we are discussing if not salvation. I am not discussing whether or not the Baptist Church is a good institution in which to make money or in which to travel to London. Gravely we are told it is nonessential and it is not nonessential! Honest reader, if you cannot suppress a smile, be merciful and pass over these absurdities, remembering that a false theology makes a man as blind as a bat.

There are many other glaring inconsistencies, but I shall pass them for the present at least and pay some attention to the admissions of Editor Folk. He now says that "faith in the heart leads to obedience in the life" "is my position also." Then it follows when disobedience is in the life, there is not faith in the heart. This is especially true when a man refuses to perform the first act of obedience that grows out of faith. All obedience to God grows out of faith. "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." "By faith Enoch ... had been well-pleasing unto God." "By faith Noah . . . prepared an ark to the saving of his house." "By faith Abraham . . . obeyed to go out unto a place which he was to receive for an inheritance. . . By faith he became a sojourner in the land

of promise." "By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau." "By faith Jacob . . . blessed each of the sons of Joseph." "By faith Joseph . . . made mention of the departure of the children of Israel." "By faith Moses . . . was hid three months by his parents." "By faith Moses . . . refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter." By faith we are baptized into Christ. If not, why not? "And what shall I more say? for the time will fail me if I tell of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah; of David and Samuel and the prophets: who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the power of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, from weakness were made strong, waxed mighty in war, turned to flight armies of aliens."

He becomes an unwilling witness to the truthfulness of my position: "It is true that those who believed were baptized." Then it is true that those who were not baptized did not believe. No fruit, no tree; no stream, no fountain.

Editor Folk raises the question: "Which saves, faith in the heart or obedience in the life?" Why ask such a question, after stating his position is "faith in the heart leads to obedience in the life?" If this be true, they are inseparable, and that the } cannot be divorced is as true as God himself. "Even so faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself. Yea, a man will say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: show me thy faith apart from thy works, and I by my works will show thee my faith. Thou believest that God is. one; thou doest well: the demons also believe, and shudder. But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith

apart from works is barren?" (James 2:17-20.) As Editor Folk is an expert at turning theological somersaults, he renders himself foolish in vainly contending a man is saved when he has a dead faith. Jesus says a man is saved when "he believes and is baptized." Jesus told persons who believed on him they were of their father, the devil. (Read John 8.) Rulers believed on Christ who loved the glory of men more than the glory of God. (John 12:42, 43.) Were such characters saved?

Ananias appeared to Saul when he was a penitent believer and said to him: "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name." (Acts 22:16.) When Ananias appeared to Saul, who was a believer, according to Editor Folk, he had no sins to remit. They were simply a nonentity. He had been pardoned when he believed, and hence had no sins to be washed away, none to be remitted. And yet Ananias, the Lord's special messenger, is represented as saying to him: "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins!" Did Ananias, in the name of truth, command Saul to be baptized and wash away his sins when absolutely he had not one sin? If the position of Editor Folk is correct, it but if the Bible language is true, it brands the theory of Mr. Folk as false.

I have never made more of baptism than Jesus did. His last command on earth to the apostles was: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." (Matt. 28:19.) After he had gone to heaven we have his indorsement of baptism. He appeared to Saul to make him an apostle.

(Acts 26:16.) He did not preach the gospel to Saul but told him to go into the city and there it should be told him what he must do. Ananias was sent to tell him what he must do. He commanded him: "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name." Thus Jesus taught a man must be baptized.

If Editor Folk had read John 4:2 in its context, he would have seen that Jesus attached much importance to baptism. "When therefore the Lord knew that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus was making and baptizing more disciples than John (although Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples)." (John 4:1, 2.) The part in parentheses quoted by him was put in to show how Jesus did the baptizing. Whatever one does through his agent, he does by himself, This principle is so generally accepted and understood that it needs no elaboration. Paul baptized a number of people. Crispus, Gaius, and the household of Stephanas were among the number. He would not have baptized any if it were wrong. He thanked God he had baptized none other of the Corinthians, as one was a Cephasite, another a Paulite, and another an Apollosite, "lest any man should say that ye were baptized into my name." As was Paul, so are all preachers sent to preach the gospel, or Jesus. But no man can preach Jesus who does not preach baptism. We are told Philip preached Jesus to the eunuch. "As they went on the way, they came to a certain water; and the eunuch saith, Behold, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" From the preaching of Jesus he learned he should be baptized. They spoke the word of the Lord to the Philippian jailer, with all that were in his house. From this preaching of the

word of the Lord they learned they should be baptized "the same hour of the night." No preacher can now preach the gospel without teaching the duty of baptism.

Christ is the head of the body, the church. We are baptized into Christ. When by faith we are baptized into Christ, we are added to the church. "And in him ye are made full, who is the head of all principality and power." (Col. 2:10.) If Christ is essential to salvation, so is entrance into the kingdom which he founded. Doing the will of God is most assuredly essential. "For whosoever shall do the will of my Father who is in heaven, he is my brother, and sister, and mother." (Matt. 12:50.) He strikes the right key when he closes his argument with: "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sins." (1 John 1:7.) There is no "faith alone" in this. I pray he may get in the light and walk in it.

He seriously informs us that "the oath makes him a soldier." According to this, a man may never serve, never fire a gun, and may never get a glimpse of the enemy, and yet be a soldier. The truth is, the man who believes on the Lord Jesus Christ with all his heart, repents of his sins, and is baptized into the Lord Jesus Christ enlists as a soldier. He is then in the kingdom of God and a member of the body of Jesus Christ. He has been born of water and the Spirit, he is saved from past sins; but it is not enough to be born, he must grow. This is true in the kingdom of nature as well as in the kingdom of grace. The child that is born naturally, if it does

not grow and develop, will die. So when one is born into the kingdom of God, if he does not grow spiritually, he will die spiritually. Hence the Holy Spirit admonishes: "Putting away therefore all wickedness, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil speakings, as new-born babes, long for the spiritual milk which is without guile, that ye may grow thereby unto salvation." (1 Pet. 2:1, 2.)

Hence the Holy Spirit said of the Thessalonians: "We are bound to give thanks to God always for you, brethren, even as it is meet, for that your faith groweth exceedingly, and the love of each one of you all toward one another aboundeth." (2 Thess. 1:3.)

After enlisting in the kingdom of God as soldiers, in order to be good soldiers we must war a good warfare. "This charge I commit unto thee, my child Timothy, according to the prophecies which led the way to thee, that by them thou mayest war the good warfare." (1 Tim. 1:18.)

Again, the Holy Spirit teaches: "Fight the good fight of the faith, lay hold on the life eternal, whereunto thou wast called, and didst confess the good confession in the sight of many witnesses." (1 Tim. 6:12.) Read again: "Suffer many hardships with me as a good soldier of Jesus Christ." After Paul had fought a good fight, after he had sought the things which are above, he says: "For I am already being offered, and the time of my departure is come. I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give to me at that day; and not to me only, but

also to all them that have loved his appearing." (2 Tim. 4:6, 8.)

It is not enough to enlist in the kingdom of God. The Holy Spirit, in writing through Paul to those who had been baptized into Christ, says: "If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is, seated on the right hand of God. Set your mind on things that are above, not on the things that are upon the earth." (Col. 3:1, 2.)

The Bible abounds in the teaching that those who have enlisted as soldiers must continue in well-doing in order to be saved in heaven. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven." (Matt. 7:21.)

It is vain for Editor Folk to try to offset such teaching by quoting the scriptures which show that we are not required to obey the law of Moses. The scriptures quoted from Galatians and Romans by him, bearing on this point, I believe as implicitly as does he. We are not saved by the works of the law of Moses, but God saves us whenever we have the faith that leads us to obey the law of Christ. Works are not our Savior, but God. There is not a promise in the Bible to the disobedient. (2 Thess. 1:7-10.)

## We Are Saved By Faith.

---

ANSWER IX. BY E. E. FOLK, TO VI. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.

"The casual reader will doubtless observe how the" *Gospel Advocate* seeks to *dodge* the issue. It has not only intimated, but *contended*, that we are not saved or justified by faith and at faith. It has also emphasized and argued throughout this discussion the doctrine of justification by *works*, or, at least, by faith *and* works, and that the justification does not come at faith, but at works. I have contended that we are saved by a living faith, by faith only, and at faith—that faith is the root and works the fruit of the tree, that the life is in the root, and that the fruit is simply the expression, the flowering out of that life, that the tree has life before it has fruit.

The *Gospel Advocate* has stoutly argued that we are justified by "faith that works by love," *when it works*, and only *at* works, and that it is "not possible to divorce faith that saves from obedience to the law of Christ," but that the faith must express itself in obedience *before it saves*. And not only so, but when a person has expressed his faith by obedience in baptism, he is then only saved from his *past sins*. Afterwards, in order to be saved, he must keep the "whole law." He must obey in every respect. If he offends in one point, he is "guilty of the whole." The *Advocate* thus makes salvation a physical matter, or, at least, a hybrid between the spiritual and the physical, and also makes salvation a hard, severe, and, indeed,



impossible task. This is the issue between us, as we have presented it a number of times, and no amount of dodging on the part of the *Advocate* editor can obscure this issue. I propose to hold him to it. He has made his own bed, and he must lie on it. Instead of my misrepresenting him, he continually misrepresents himself, and then misrepresents me as misrepresenting him. If we are saved by faith, as Brother McQuiddy admits, then we are saved by *faith*. And if we are saved *by* faith, we are saved *at* faith. I have quoted over and over the passages which go to prove this. But after admitting that we are saved by faith, Brother McQuiddy turns right around and says: "Men of faith will always *save themselves*." If they are saved by *faith*, what need is there for them to save *themselves*? And *how* can they "save themselves?" It was exactly because they could *not* "save themselves" that a plan of salvation was provided by which they might be saved by *faith*. Editor McQuiddy boldly claims that "the order is faith, baptism, salvation." He thus puts baptism before salvation and makes baptism a part of the plan of salvation, without which no one can be saved. But, as I have shown, the thief on the cross was saved without baptism. If *one* may be saved without baptism, *all* may be. It shows that baptism is not a necessary part of the plan of salvation, as are repentance and faith. Besides, if "the order is faith, baptism, salvation," and if baptism is only by immersion, as both Brother McQuiddy and myself believe, then immersion is essential to salvation. Then those who have not been immersed are lost. Then the pious unimmersed, such as our Methodist and Presbyterian brethren, are lost *because they have*

*not been baptized.* Then salvation becomes a matter of being immersed. It becomes a physical, external, material, if I may not say mechanical, affair. It depends on a *third* person. It is not a matter between the soul and its God, but it becomes a matter between the soul and its God *and somebody else.* Getting into a church is one thing. Getting into heaven is another. A church is physical, material. Heaven is spiritual, immaterial. The entrance into one is by a physical, material process, after the person is saved by grace through faith. The entrance into the other is by a spiritual, immaterial process.

As I said before, if the editor of the *Advocate* really accepts the passages that ascribe salvation to faith in their "obvious meaning as readily as the *Baptist and Reflector,*" then there is no issue between us, and the discussion may as well close here. But it is very curious how, while Editor McQuiddy insists that he accepts these passages in their "obvious meaning," he immediately turns around and argues against the passages and does his best to persuade his readers that the passages that ascribe salvation to faith are not true, but that something must be *added* to faith before the person can be saved, such as baptism, works, obedience, etc.

"I would have some hope for Editor McQuiddy, as he seems to be learning, if it were not for the fact that he appears to be wholly unable to take the same position in two consecutive issues of his paper." When I prosecute him in one position, he flees to another. When I drive him from one text, he takes refuge in another. Like the famous snake,

"He goes winding in and winding out,  
Leaving the beholder still in doubt  
Whether the snake that made the track  
Is coming in or going back."

So far as I am concerned, I have taken the same position in every issue of the *Baptist and Reflector* during this discussion. I have shown over and over again that salvation is "by grace through faith, not of works." We are saved by *faith*. If we are saved by faith, we are not saved by works. If we are saved by faith, we are not saved by faith *and* works.

The distinction which the *Advocate* attempts to make between faith *only* and faith *actually* is a distinction without a difference. If we are saved by faith only, we are saved by faith actually, or really. If salvation is a matter of *faith only*, it is not a matter of baptism or of works or of obedience. If we are saved by faith actually or *really*, we are not saved by baptism or by works or by obedience. The following passage shows that we are saved by faith actually or really, by baptism figuratively. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark 16:16.) This passage shows that the emphasis in salvation is on *faith*, and that we are saved at faith. The following passage shows that we are saved by faith actually or really: "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever *believeth* on him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John 3:16.) The following passage shows that we are saved by baptism figuratively: "Jesus answered Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born

of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3:5.) That this is to be taken in a figurative or metaphorical sense is admitted by Editor McQuiddy himself, when he says in his issue of May 10: "Every candid reader knows the *Gospel Advocate* has contended the phrase 'born of water' is metaphorical and not literal." Editor McQuiddy contends that the phrase "born of water" refers to baptism. He thus admits that baptism saves metaphorically or figuratively, which is the same thing. *A metaphor is simply a figure.* This is the position for which I have contended. I am glad to have the editor of the *Advocate* come over to it. If he will stand by that position and not get off of it, there is no issue between us.

While I am on this point, let me add that the same principle of interpretation which applies to baptism will apply to the Lord's Supper as well. If Acts 22:16 ("Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins") is to be taken in a literal sense, so is Matt. 26:26 ("This is my body"). If baptismal regeneration is true, so is transubstantiation. Catholics are consistent in interpreting both passages by the same rule, and accepting both the doctrines which logically follow— baptismal regeneration and transubstantiation. How any person can accept one doctrine and not the other, I do not understand. But some people are consistent only in their inconsistency. On the other hand, if the expression, "this is my body," is to be taken in a figurative sense, so is the expression, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins," and so is the expression "born of water," if that has any reference to baptism at all. That the expression, "this is my body,"

is to be taken in a figurative sense is proven by the following paragraph:

"*This is my body.*" 'And as they were eating [that is, before they had arisen from the table where they were eating the passover supper], Jesus took bread ["a loaf"—margin], and blessed and brake it.' (Luke 22:19.) And Paul (1 Cor. 11:24) says, 'when he had given thanks,' which is the same thing. The bread was the unleavened bread of the passover, of which they had just eaten. Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul all say he gave thanks, or 'blessed' and brake it. He then said to his disciples, 'Take, eat; this is my body;' and Luke (22:19) adds, 'which is given for you.' The bread represents his body, or is symbolic of his body. With his literal body of flesh and blood whole in all its parts before them, they knew they were not eating his literal body and drinking his literal blood. This is like many other expressions which we have no trouble in understanding: 'The seven good kine are seven years,' 'the seven good ears are seven years,' and 'the seven lean and ill-favored kine' and 'the seven empty ears' 'are seven years' (Gen. 41:26, 27); 'the seed is the word' (Luke 8:11); 'the field is the world' 'the reapers are angels,' etc. (Matt. 13:38, 39); 'I am the door;' 'I am the vine.' Jesus is not a literal door or vine. The bread, then, is not his literal body, but *represents* it. It was a memorial of his body so soon to be torn by the nails *and pierced by the spear,*"

Perhaps the reader will be surprised when I state that the above paragraph was taken from the *Gospel Advocate*. But to reverse my proposition stated above, the same principle of interpretation which applies to

the Lord's Supper will apply to baptism as well. If the supper is "metaphorical" or "symbolic" or "figurative," *so is baptism*. But why argue the matter? The *Advocate*, while contending against the doctrine that "baptism saves figuratively," in its issue of April 19, turns around and in its issue of May 10 admits that "the phrase 'born of water' is metaphorical, and not literal." And thus the editor of the *Advocate* admits that baptism saves metaphorically or figuratively.

The *Advocate* editor says: "He will never quote the language where the *Gospel Advocate* says there are several ways and that we are saved by ourselves." Yet, in the same paragraph, just above, the *Advocate* quotes its own language to that effect, as follows: "The Scriptures teach baptism saves us (1 Pet. 3:19-21); we are saved by the blood and life of Christ (Rom. 5:9, 19); we are saved by hope (Rom. 8:24); we are saved by works (James 2:24); and we save ourselves (Acts 2:40.)" If this language does not indicate the belief of the *Advocate* that there are several ways of salvation, and that we are saved by ourselves, then I do not know how to take language.

The editor of the *Baptist and Reflector* has been consistent in contending all the way" through for only *one plan* of salvation, as indicated by the words "sinner," "Savior," to which correspond the words "repentance," "faith." Sinner, repentance; Savior, faith.

I regret that Brother McQuiddy is not satisfied with changing his own position, but repeatedly misrepresents the position of the *Baptist and Reflector*. I shall not characterize his gross perversion of my

teachings as it deserves. I have never said that "the scripturally informed who refuse to be baptized are lost."

In trying to explain its position that men save themselves, the *Advocate* says that they "saved themselves in that they laid hold on the promises, placing themselves in the position where God saved them." But how did men "place themselves in the position where God saved them?" By repentance and faith? Then I agree. By works? I deny. Evidently the editor of the *Advocate* intends to say that they placed themselves in this position *by their own works*, which means that they saved themselves by their own works, which is contrary to the whole tenor of scripture. I deny that "baptism marks the degree of faith at which God pardons." I call upon the *Advocate* to quote one passage of scripture which so teaches. *Just one will do.*

With reference to the position of the *Advocate* that there is only one way of salvation, but that faith and baptism and the blood of Christ and hope and works and our own efforts are so many conditions entering into that way, I have to say: The conditions to any result must be:

1. In *harmony* with the result. They must be of the same character as the result.
2. They must be *adequate* to produce the result.
3. They must be ever and everywhere *the same* to produce the same result.
4. They must *never be more* than those laid down on which something is predicated, and which have been proven adequate to produce that something.

Now apply these rules to repentance and faith:

1. Salvation is a spiritual matter. Repentance and faith are spiritual. They are, therefore, in harmony with the result and of the same character as the result. 2. They are also adequate to produce the result. 3. With the same human nature, the same sinfulness, the same Savior, repentance and faith are ever and everywhere essentially the same. And they ever and everywhere produce the same result—salvation. 4. They do not need anything, either less or more, to secure salvation. Repentance and faith always go together logically. Where repentance is mentioned by itself, it is presumed that faith will follow. Where faith is mentioned by itself, it is presumed that repentance has preceded. And so whenever salvation is predicated on faith, it is understood that it is the faith of a repentant man, like, for instance, the jailer. For this reason we frequently use the term "faith" by itself. But it is always intended to include a preceding repentance. Keep in mind the fundamental words—"sinner," "Savior." To these correspond the other words—"repentance," "faith." Repentance for sin, faith in Jesus Christ as Savior. That is all. And that is all that is needed.

Now apply the above rules to baptism: 1. It is not in harmony with the result. It is not of the same character as the result. It is physical and not spiritual. 2. It is not adequate to produce the result. No physical act is adequate to produce so tremendous a result as the salvation of an immortal soul. 3. You cannot ever and everywhere have baptism. Many conditions arise in which baptism is impossible. Consequently, if baptism be an essential condition of salvation, the soul, under some circumstances,



must be lost. 4. Salvation having been offered on the terms of repentance and faith, baptism is an addition to those terms.

Now apply these rules to works and you have the same result as in the case of baptism:

1. Works are not in harmony with the result. They are not of the same character. They are physical and not spiritual. 2. Physical works are not adequate to produce the spiritual result of the salvation of a soul. 3. Physical works cannot be ever and everywhere the same in each individual. 4. They add to the terms which have been offered by God.

To the above four rules should be added two others:

5. If, in the plan of salvation, various and inharmonious methods are proposed, these are *not different conditions* of the same plan, but they are really *different ways* of salvation. This is especially true if it is proposed that one must be saved by faith and also that he must be saved by baptism *and* by works. These are different ways, and they amount to different plans of salvation.

*The plan of salvation is one in all ages of the world.* It is ever and everywhere the same. With the same human nature, the same sinfulness, the same Savior, the same God, the same heaven, the same hell, it must be so. The soul being spiritual, its salvation must be a spiritual matter. And so the plan of salvation must be *spiritual*. It *cannot be physical*. It cannot be *partly* spiritual and partly physical. Whatever conditions enter into this plan must be of a spiritual nature. These conditions, as repeatedly expressed by Christ and his apostles, as I have shown, are simply "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord

Jesus Christ" (Acts 20:21); repentance for sin and faith in Christ as the Savior. To introduce any other elements in the plan of salvation, and especially any *physical elements* like baptism, or works, or obedience, or salvation by our own efforts, is to make *different ways* of salvation. Such a plan is not and cannot be ever and everywhere the same. It must depend upon each individual and upon his circumstances. One individual may be saved in one way and another in another way, some by one kind of works and others by another kind of works. If all are to be saved by the same kind of works, then it must be by *all works*, in which case no one can be saved, because no one can do all works. No one can keep the whole law. And yet, if he "offend in one point, he is guilty of the whole," and so is lost.

6. Now add another rule which I express in the language of scripture. "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book." (Rev. 22:18.)

With reference to the analogy which the *Advocate* attempts to draw between physical and spiritual life, let me say simply, the *Advocate* seems to forget what I have repeatedly shown, that salvation is spiritual, not physical. You cannot take a physical act and make it apply to a spiritual matter. Nothing is more misleading than the attempt to apply natural law to the spiritual world.

## Faith and Obedience.

---

### ANSWER X. BY E. E. FOLK, TO VII. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.

The *Advocate* says: "When God teaches we are saved by grace, by faith, by the life and blood of Christ, by baptism, by works, by hope, and we save ourselves, he does not teach different plans of salvation, but that all these conditions are present in the salvation of a soul." I have previously shown that the blood of Christ is the *procuring* cause of salvation and faith the *instrumental* cause. Grace *planned* the way through the blood. Faith *accepts* the way. Grace is *God's side* of the plan of salvation and faith is *man's side*. We are discussing now man's side. I have shown also that "saved by hope" means saved in anticipation. I have shown, too, that while we are to save ourselves in a sense, it is not by our own works, but through our faith in the blood of Christ and our acceptance of him by faith as our personal Savior. In my last article I showed that to include all of the conditions mentioned by the *Advocate* as a part of the plan of salvation is not only to make different conditions, but to make *different plans* of salvation. I not only made the "effort," but I sustained the effort, to show that the conclusion which the editor of the *Advocate* draws that baptism, the blood, the life of Christ, hope, works, ourselves, "all enter into the one way of salvation," is "false." Some of these terms are mutually exclusive from the same plan of salvation, such as the blood, works, Christ, ourselves. If we

are saved by the blood, we do not need works to save us. If we are saved by Christ, we do not need to save ourselves. It was because we could not save ourselves that it became necessary for us to be saved by Christ.

The *Advocate* quotes Dr. J. B. Jeter to substantiate its position. Dr. Jeter is known as one of the staunchest supporters of our Baptist faith and also as one of the most strenuous opponents of Mr. Campbell and his views. One of the very strongest books written on the subject of Campbellism was written by Dr. Jeter under the title of "Campbellism Examined." It certainly sounds strange at this late day to hear any one quote Dr. Jeter in advocacy of Campbellism. I might quote page after page from Dr. Jeter's book to show his views, but that is unnecessary. Let me simply call attention to the fact that the *Advocate* misrepresents him. What Dr. Jeter said was: "God saves us by all *means* which he employs to instruct, impress, purify, and preserve us," etc. *Means* are one thing and *conditions* are another thing. The things which Dr. Jeter mentions are, for the most part, the means for *bringing us to Christ to be saved by him*. The attempt on the part of the *Advocate* to make it appear that he considered these as so many *conditions* in the plan of salvation is an utter perversion of his teachings. And especially is this true of the last clause, "we are saved by baptism." To make Dr. Jeter say that and then stop there is absolutely inexcusable. What he meant was that we are saved by baptism only in a *figurative sense*, not in any real sense.

The *Advocate* again says: "Brother Folk says a man is saved before and without baptism; therefore

he is saved without brotherly love, without partaking of the Lord's Supper, without the worship, without preaching the gospel to every creature, and without adding to his faith any of the Christian virtues." Certainly, I say that *these things are not a part of the plan of salvation*. A man does not have to do them to be saved. But suppose I turn that around. Brother McQuiddy says "a man is *not* saved before and without baptism; therefore he is *not* saved *without* brotherly love, *-without* partaking of the Lord's Supper, *-without* the worship, *-without* preaching the gospel to every creature, and *-without* adding to his faith all of the Christian virtues." That is to say, according to Brother McQuiddy, a man is not saved until he has been baptized. He is not saved until he has shown *brotherly love*. John says: "We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren." The love of the brethren is a test by which we *know* that we *have passed* from death unto life, not by which we *do pass* from death unto life. Brother McQuiddy says also that a man is not saved until he *partakes of the Lord's Supper*, thus making partaking of the Lord's Supper a condition of salvation. He also makes *attendance upon church* a condition of salvation. He says that in order to be saved one must *preach the gospel to every creature*. I believe in missions, of course, but this is carrying the doctrine pretty far. He says also that a man is not saved at faith, but that to be saved he must *add to his faith* virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, charity. What the apostle Peter said was: "If these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither

be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." (2 Pet. 1:8.) Again, he said: "For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you *abundantly* into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." (2 Pet. 1:11.) Brother McQuiddy not only makes these graces the condition of an abundant entrance into the heavenly kingdom, but of *any entrance* at all. With so many, so varied, so difficult conditions of salvation, what a *complicated* and *hard*—and, indeed, *impossible*—plan of salvation is that taught by Brother McQuiddy! In what contrast is it with the *simple gospel* as preached by Jesus (John 3:16), by John (John 3:36), by Peter (Acts 15:9), by Paul (Acts 16:31; Rom. 8: 1), etc.!

Certainly the Christian graces are essential—as *Christian graces*, as the graces of a Christian. But they are *not* essential as *conditions of salvation*. I have repeatedly shown that works are simply the fruits of the tree. The fruits do not make the tree—they show the tree. The works do not make the Christian—they show the Christian.

Certainly "the Ten Commandments are as much a matter of obedience as is baptism, the Lord's Supper, brotherly love," etc. And if we must be baptized, partake of the Lord's Supper, show brotherly love, go to church, preach the gospel to every creature, add to our faith virtue, knowledge, etc., in order to be saved, *we must obey the Ten Commandments* to be saved. Brother McQuiddy says however: "All the Ten Commandments, save the Sabbath, have been incorporated into the New Testament. They are binding because in the New Testament, not because in the law of Moses." I think the

fourth commandment is still binding. Jesus said that he came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it. The law included the fourth as well as the other commandments. He said that while man was not made for the Sabbath, the Sabbath was made for man. But leave out this commandment, if you wish. Brother McQuiddy admits that all the others are binding upon us now, and, as such, that they are all essential to salvation. Now, let us see about it.

The first three commandments were summed up by the Savior when he said: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and all thy strength." (Mark 12:30.) Who does that? Does Brother McQuiddy?

4. (I omit the fourth.)

5. "Honor thy father and mother." There must be no disrespect shown or *felt* toward them.

6. "Thou shalt not kill." Now, compare this with our Savior's interpretation of it: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: but I say unto you, that whosoever is *angry* with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." (Matt. 5:21, 22.)

7. The seventh commandment says: "Thou shalt not commit adultery." Compare with this: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath

committed adultery with her already *in his heart.*" (Matt. 5:27,28.)

The interpretations which Jesus puts on the sixth and seventh commandments show that while the Pharisees had regarded sin as consisting only in the *act*, he places it in the *heart*. In order that a man may not sin, he must not only never *say* anything bad or *do* anything wrong, but he must never *feel* anything bad, he must never *think* anything wrong. If he does, he sins. And if he sins, according to Editor McQuiddy, then he is lost.

8. The eighth commandment says: "Thou shalt not steal." By inference the same interpretation would be put upon this by Jesus as the two preceding commandments. Stealing is in the heart. To *desire* what belongs to another is stealing.

And so as to the ninth commandment.

9. "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." If the position of Editor McQuiddy be true, that the violation of any commandment means that a person will be lost, then, judging from the many misrepresentations of myself and others of which Brother McQuiddy has been guilty during this discussion, he had better look out. He is in considerable danger.

10. So also as to the tenth: "Thou shalt not covet." Covetousness is in the *heart*, and not simply in the act.

We have thus gone through the commandments in order to show the absurdity to which Editor McQuiddy's position logically leads him. In brief, it is simply this: A man must obey in every respect in order to be saved. He must be baptized, love his breth-



ren, partake of the Lord's Supper, attend church, preach the gospel to every creature, add to his faith virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, charity. He must keep every commandment (except the fourth, which is not binding). And according to Jesus, he must obey these commandments, not only in act, but in his *heart*. Editor McQuiddy agrees with Paul thus far when he said: "Cursed is every one that continueth not in *all things* which are written in the book of the law to do them." (Gal. 3:10.) The difference, however, between Editor McQuiddy and Paul is that while he insists that a person must keep the whole law in order to be saved, Paul recognizes that a person *cannot keep the whole law*, and so that a plan of salvation has been provided for him, and that "by grace are ye saved through faith, not of works;" that salvation is not a matter of *obedience to the law*, as Editor McQuiddy makes it, but a matter of *grace through faith*. He says: "But that no man is justified by the *law* in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by *faith*. And the law is not of faith: but, The man that *doeth* them shall live in them." (Gal. 3:11, 12.) And there is an infinite difference between the position of Paul and that of Editor McQuiddy—in fact, the difference of heaven and hell.

Editor McQuiddy says again: "After assuming that repentance and faith are the conditions of salvation, he represents Paul as saying this was 'all the counsel of God.' No evidence exists in the word of God of the truth of this statement." In Acts 20:20, 21, Paul says to the Ephesian elders at Miletus: "And

how I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have shewed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." A little later, in the same discourse, he added: "For I have not shunned to declare unto you *all the counsel* of God." (Acts 20:27.) This evidently had reference to what he said he had taught them. In the Revised Version the expression reads the "*whole counsel* of God," and also in the Improved Version.

Editor McQuiddy says again: "Does a man inquire of us, 'What must I do to become a Christian?' Authorized by Christ, we tell him to believe, repent, and be baptized." In this Editor McQuiddy differs from Paul. When the jailer asked him, "What must I do to be saved?" which meant "What must I do to become a Christian?" the answer that Paul gave to him was: "*Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Paul said this to a repentant man, to a man who "*trembling for fear*, fell down before Paul and Silas, and brought them out and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" (Acts 16:30, A. R. V.) "Trembling for fear." For fear of what? Of the Romans? No. There had been fear of the Romans. That fear of the Romans had led the jailer to draw his sword and to be about to kill himself. Now a *higher fear* took possession of his soul—a *fear of God*. He was a repentant man. Now, tell us, whose advice should the man take in order to become a Christian—that of Editor McQuiddy or that of the apostle Paul? As I have said before, this answer of Paul to the jailer, it seems to me, settles the question

at issue between Mr. McQuiddy and myself, as to what constitutes the plan of salvation.

I do not "complain" that the editor of the *Advocate* quotes Mark 16:16 so frequently. I only called attention to the fact that he quotes it upon every occasion. It seems to be his *proof text* for *everything*. But, as I showed, he *does not believe* his own proof text. He adds to it things to suit himself, and things which Jesus did not say. Let him either stick to it or cease quoting it as proof of his position.

Will the Advocate tell us of whom these scriptures speak? "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever ... on him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John 3:16.) "He that . . . on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that . . . not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." (John 3:36.) "Purifying their hearts by . . . ." (Acts 15:9.) "And they said ... on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." (Acts 16:31.) "Therefore, being justified by ... we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. 5:1.)

The *Advocate* quotes the following rule: "Where salvation is promised to a person, or affirmed of him, on certain named conditions, though it may depend on more conditions than those named, it can never depend on less." The *Advocate* should have told its reader? that this was a rule laid clown by Moses E. Lard. It should have told them also that Dr. A. P. Williams, in his "Campbellism Exposed," has pretty thoroughly demolished this "rule." I quote only a part of the reply. He says: "I believe all logicians

admit that a rule which proves too much is unsound. Well, the following example shows that Mr. Lard's rule proves too much: Luke 18:18-26. Here we have recorded the case of a young ruler, who, full of anxiety, came to Jesus, and asked him what he must do to inherit eternal life. Jesus required, among other things, that he should sell all he had and distribute to the poor, and affirmed that he should have treasure in heaven. Now, note—to have eternal life, to have treasure in heaven, and to be saved, are equivalent expressions. That is proved by the question of the apostles: 'Who then can be saved?' Now, according to Mr. Lard's rule, as salvation is here affirmed of this young ruler on the conditions of his selling all he had, and giving the proceeds to the poor, it can never depend on less than this condition! Is Mr. Lard prepared for this conclusion? If so, he is still in his sins, and without eternal life, for he has never, himself, complied with it! Jesus finally affirmed: 'There is no man who hath left house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting.' (Verses 29, 30.) Now let Mr. Lard apply his rule to this affirmation, and then ask himself if he has ever forsaken house, parents, brethren, wife, children, for the kingdom of God's sake. If he has not, it is time he was up and doing; for he must either do these things, or lose his rule, or lose his soul!" I commend this reply to Editor McQuiddy.

But I *deny the rule* laid down by Mr. Lard. It is *not true*. In fact, the very *reverse* is true. Where salvation is promised to a person, or affirmed of

him, on certain named conditions, though it may depend on *less* conditions than those named, it can never depend on *more*. If it depends on *less* conditions, it will, of course, be simply through the grace of the one who lays down the rule. But if it is made to depend on *more* conditions, it will be exceedingly unfair and unjust to the one to whom the rule is given. If, for example, I were offered a house for one thousand dollars by a man, I should not expect him to let me have it for less than one thousand dollars. And yet he might graciously do so. But, on the other hand, I should certainly not expect to have to pay *more* than one thousand dollars for it. And if, after having told me and told me repeatedly that I might have the house for one thousand dollars, if, after having put the terms in writing, and after I had complied with his condition and offered him one thousand dollars for it, he should then impose other conditions and demand of me that I must pay fifteen hundred dollars, and not only that, but that I must continue paying him something all during the balance of my life, and should never let up on me, exacting the *last farthing* under the penalty of taking the house away from me, *what would you think of such a man?* You would certainly consider that he had acted in very *bad faith*, and would lose respect for him. When God's word tells me that "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever *believeth* on him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16); when it says, "*Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved" (Acts 16:31); when it says, "By grace are ye saved *through faith*; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not

of works, lest any man should boast" (Eph. 2:7,8); when it says, "Therefore being *justified by faith*, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5:1), I accept it and I am saved. If now, after having said these things, God should say to me that I am not saved when I believe, but that in order to be saved I must be baptized, and then I must save myself by *keeping the whole law*, I should feel that God had acted in bad faith with me, that he had imposed *some* conditions as necessary to salvation, and after I had complied with them he had demanded *other and harder*, if not *impossible*, conditions.

The Advocate says "there is always some faith before repentance." As a rule, there is an *historical* faith in Christ before there is repentance, but not always and not necessarily. The heathen frequently repent before they know anything about Christ. And even people in Christian lands who know about him, but who do not believe in him as the Son of God, the Savior of the world, are brought to repentance. We are talking, however, not about an historical faith, but about a *saving faith*, about *faith in the plan of salvation*. This kind of faith is *always* preceded by repentance, and necessarily must be. I have previously called attention to the fact that wherever the two are mentioned together, the Scriptures always put repentance before faith. There is *not one single exception* to the rule. I have also given the passages in which both occur, as follows: Acts 19:4; Mark 1:15; Acts 20:21; Heb. 6:1; Matt. 21:32. In fact, to put faith before repentance is an utter absurdity, an absolute impossibility, a logical

blunder, a chronological anachronism, and a theological monstrosity. It is to put the cart before the horse, the cars before the engine, the consequent before the antecedent, the Savior before the sinner, the acceptance of the Savior before the realization of the need for him. In short, it is the *most absurd*, the *most illogical*, the *most preposterous* proposition ever conceived by rational men.

## Salvation By Faith or By Works?

---

### ANSWER XI. BY E. E. FOLK, TO VIII. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.

"Even the casual reader has doubtless observed that" much space is consumed in correcting misstatements of the *Gospel Advocate*. I have noticed the scriptures presented by the *Advocate* editor and have given the interpretation of every one whose interpretation he has asked me to give. But, on the other hand, he has studiously avoided giving the interpretation of *any of the passages* of scripture which I have *repeatedly* asked him to give.

I said that a man will be saved if he has repented of his sins and trusted in Jesus Christ as his personal Savior, whether he has been baptized or not. The *Advocate* spoke of this as "another gospel," and then quoted Gal. 1:6-8. The simple, natural, and logical inference is that Brother McQuiddy believes that salvation by baptism, or by works, or by faith and works, is one gospel, and that salvation by faith is "another gospel."

If he did not mean that the gospel which Paul preached was the gospel of works and that the "other gospel" to which he referred in Gal. 1:6-8 was a gospel of salvation by faith, then I do not know how to take language. What does he mean?

All through this discussion the editor of the *Advocate* has been taking positions with apparent boldness, and then when I would show him the logical consequences of his position, he would draw back and



deny that he had ever taken any such position. "Frankly, I frequently am at a loss to know how to characterize much of Brother McQuiddy's conduct without transcending the limits which courtesy imposes. To call the above implied denial a downright falsehood would be too harsh, but to pass it as truth would be a falsehood. Nameless, then, I will let it stand."

It is true that Paul speaks of the "law of faith." But what does he mean by it? He evidently does not mean to put faith on the level of *law*, like the ceremonial law or the moral law. Here is what he says: "Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law—of works? Nay, but by the law of faith." (Rom. 3:27.) Westcott and Hort define the word "law" in this verse as meaning "a *rule, standard.*" Thayer defines it as a "law demanding faith." What Paul means, then, by the "law of faith" is a rule or standard of faith, the rule which requires faith rather than works in the plan of salvation. It is similar to the expressions, "law of my mind," "law of sin" (Rom. 7:23), "law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:2), "law of righteousness" (Rom. 9:31), "law of liberty" (James 1:25; 2:12).

He does not mean that we are "required to walk" by the law of faith in the sense that we must do and keep on doing certain things required of us by the law of faith. On the contrary, his meaning is *directly opposite*. It is simply that faith has taken the place of works, that we are saved not by works, but by faith, and that consequently there is no room for boasting. We are not saved by anything which we have done, but only by our faith in Christ and through

his blood. This is the plain, simple, evident meaning of the passage. It is strange that an attempt should be made to twist it into meaning the very opposite. "How foolish and presumptuous some men appear!"

The reference to *Mr. D. L. Moody* was not "an appeal to the prejudice of the unbaptized." If Moody were lost or saved does not change the plan of salvation as taught in the Bible, but it certainly does change the plan of salvation as taught by the *editor of the Gospel Advocate*. Here is the issue: Mr. D. L. Moody was a believer in Christ. He was a pious man. He lived a consecrated, Christian life, devoted to the service of his Master. This every one admits. But he was not immersed. Now, *was he saved?* If he was *lost*, then *immersion is essential* to salvation. If he was *saved*, it is *not essential*, and others like Moody may be saved by faith and at faith. This is the issue as presented in the case of Mr. Moody and thousands and hundreds of thousands and millions of pious Methodists and Presbyterians and Congregationalists, etc. As I have said before, I take my stand upon the claim that D. L. Moody was a *Christian* and that he was *saved*. The alternate conclusion of a writer in the *Christian Leader*, to which I have previously referred, and in which conclusion the editor of the *Gospel Advocate* would presumably concur. "Now, if D. L. Moody was a Christian, our plea is vain and our preaching false, and there is no place in Christendom for us," is *their own conclusion*, but it is a logical one.

The *thief on the cross* seems to trouble the dreams of Brother McQuiddy. I gave him as an example of a man who was saved without being baptized. This

would never do, however. It would completely demolish the theory of the *Advocate* editor. So he had to get the thief baptized in *some way*. The way he did it was by claiming that "the probabilities are greater that he was baptized than they are that he was not.

In proof of this he quoted Matt. 3:5-7, and added: "Probably 'all' included the thief, for he was in that region." I showed that if the "all" included the thief, then it included *everybody* in Jerusalem and in Judea and in the region round about the Jordan. And if the thief was saved, *and was saved because he was baptized*, so was everybody in those regions, including Pharisees and Sadducees and publicans and sinners of every description. In that case the preaching of Jesus was unnecessary and his denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees out of place. To escape this conclusion, however, the *Advocate* now says: "It was not intimated that 'all' meant every one, but that it meant a great number. How does the *Reflector* know that he was not in the number?" This is amusing. The "all" did not mean all at all. It just simply meant a "great number." In the "great number," of course, was the thief who was saved, but the two who were lost were not of this "great number." And so all the Pharisees and Sadducees who were baptized were of this great number, but those who were not baptized were not of this "great number." This is certainly very convenient. It reminds me of the argument of the preacher that "into" does not mean *into*, but simply near by, or, as the puzzled Dutchman said, "just near enough to be comfortable," as in the case

of the Hebrew children in the fiery furnace, Daniel in the lions' den, etc.

The *Advocate* editor asks: "How does the *Reflector* know he was not in the number?" Now this is certainly a poser. I do not, of course, know that the thief on the cross was not in the number of those baptized. I was not there. I never saw the thief and never saw any one who did see him, and so I could not swear that he was not baptized. Of course, there is nothing to indicate that he *was*, and everything indicates that he *was not*. It is presumed that he would not have been baptized if he had not been a believer in Christ, and it is evident that he did not become a believer until he was on the cross. All the probabilities are that he was not baptized. So strong are they that it amounts to a moral certainty. May I ask the editor of the *Advocate*, though, a question or two? Does he "know" that the thief was in the number of those baptized? How does he know it? Will the editor of the *Advocate* swear that he was? Pardon, but the "vanity" of the editor of the *Gospel Advocate* leads him to assume the point at issue, which is a vital one to his theory, without the slightest proof of it, and then to answer any objection by triumphantly exclaiming: "How do you know that it was not so?" If I cannot show that the thief was not baptized, Brother McQuiddy cannot show that he *was*. He bases his argument on the assumption that he was. His whole argument depends on that. The thief was saved. If he was saved without baptism, then baptism is not necessary to salvation. The conclusion is irresistible. The burden of proof is on Brother McQuiddy to prove that the thief was

baptized. He affirmed it. I am not required to prove a negative.

You see the dilemma in which he is placed. The editor of the *Advocate* claims that it is immaterial to his position whether the thief was or was not baptized. I must insist, though, that it is *absolutely material* to his position. The plan of salvation is ever and everywhere the same. Every one must be saved in the same way. There are not different plans of salvation for different ages and countries, or for different individuals. One is not to be saved in one way and another in another way, according to his circumstances or convenience. God does not give separate commandments to different persons. The plan of salvation for every one is, as expressed by Paul, *repentance toward God and faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ*. The Jew was not saved "by offering bloody sacrifices," but because the offering of the bloody sacrifices indicated his belief in the Messiah that was to come, the Lamb of God that should be slain on Calvary to take away the sin of the world, and *indicated his trust in the blood of the Lamb*, and not in himself or anything which he had done or could do. Noah was saved from the physical death of drowning by building an ark, but the salvation of his soul came through faith in the Savior that was to come. This faith was indicated by his building the ark, and also indicated by the fact that as soon as he came out of the ark he "builded an altar" and "offered burnt offerings on the altar." (Gen. 8:20.) These burnt offerings *showed his trust*, not in himself, but in the blood which they represented.

Jesus said: "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached,

and every man presseth into it." (Luke 16:16.) Just at what time he established his church, whether when he first began his public ministry, or when he preached the Sermon on the Mount, or when he selected and sent forth his twelve apostles, cannot be determined exactly. The essential point is that he said that *he himself* would build his church, and that the old dispensation closed with John and the new dispensation began with Jesus.

The question of the disciples after his resurrection, "Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" does not prove, as Editor McQuiddy tries to make it prove, that the church had not then been established. What the disciples had reference to was not a spiritual, but a *temporal kingdom*. They had thought all along that he was going to establish such a kingdom, and that he would reign over it in power and glory as the king, with themselves as his chief ministers. In his reply he indicated to them that his kingdom was not to be a temporal, but a spiritual one. (Acts 1:8.)

The assertion that on the day of Pentecost Christ was preached for the first time is entirely gratuitous. Did not Jesus himself preach Christ when he said, "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life" (John 3:14, 15), and also when he said: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16)? This was in the beginning of his ministry.

The *Advocate* says: "There is no promise for the man who neglects or refuses to be baptized." Well, here is one: "*He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life.*" (John 3:36.) Here is another: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word,' and *believeth* on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." (John 5:24.) It seems to me that that is a pretty good promise. It seems to me also that the promise of Paul to the jailer was a good one, when he said: "*Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.*" (Acts 16:31.) I want to repeat what I have said before, that this answer of Paul to the jailer settles the question in dispute between Brother McQuiddy and myself as to what is the plan of salvation.

The *Advocate* says: "Will Brother Folk give us just one example after the church was established where a believer neglected or refused to be baptized? Just one will suffice." Well, the thief on the cross was one example. If, however, the *Advocate* wishes an example after the day of Pentecost, I may refer to the remark of Paul that Christ had not sent him to *baptize*, but to *preach the gospel*, indicating that not baptism, but preaching the gospel, was the important, the essential, thing. We are not told about all of those to whom Paul preached the gospel, whether they were baptized or not. It is entirely possible to suppose that some of them to whom he preached and who believed were not baptized, though it was the natural and usual thing then, as it is now, that one who repents of his sins and believes on Christ should be baptized to express the fact of that

repentance and faith. It is at least as natural to suppose that some of those to whom Paul preached the gospel were *not* baptized as it is to suppose that the thief on the cross *was* baptized, and more so. The essential question, however, is not *whether* people were baptized, but *why* were they baptized?

In substantiation of his theory that a person must obey in every respect to be saved, the editor of the *Advocate* quoted James as saying: "He that offends in one point is guilty of all." (James 2:10.) With reference to this, I said: "According, therefore, to James, and according to the editor of the *Advocate*, if a person offends in 'one point,' if he sins in the least, if he violates God's law in any respect, if he fails to do his whole duty, if he slips anywhere, he is as guilty as if he had violated the whole law." Brother McQuiddy calls this "scoffing" at the words of the Holy Spirit. I beg pardon. I was simply showing the logical conclusion to which the position of the editor of the *Advocate* leads him. I am not surprised that he should draw back from it. But here is the position which the editor of the *Advocate* now takes: Men must "keep the whole law" in order to be saved. If they "offend in one point," they are "guilty of all," but "they must repent of all sins." They must "confess" each sin. "To fail to repent" of any sin "is to be lost." This means that we must repent of every sin, conscious or unconscious, in the act or in the heart, as soon as it is committed, or we are lost. Talk about the mourners' bench! This theory of the *Advocate* keeps us *constantly* on the mourners' bench, on the anxious seat. It keeps us sitting on the stool of repentance every day and every hour and every



minute. We have got to watch ourselves very carefully to see that we do not sin, and if we do, that we shall at once repent of it, because if we do not we may be overtaken by death and be lost. In other words, we may *never know when we are saved*. There is *no line of salvation*, no way we can ever be sure of our salvation, because we can never be sure that we have repented of every sin. And thus we go through life, with a threatening Damocles sword hanging over us! What a fearful, terrible ordeal! What an awful life! How strongly in contrast with this theory is the simple gospel message: "He that *believeth* on the Son *hath* everlasting life" (John 3:36)—has it now, *has it when he believes*. There is no need for fear or dread. It is all settled for time and eternity.

The *Advocate* says that the interpretation which I put on James 2:10 is "something new under the sun." Here is what it says: "For whosoever shall keep the *whole law*, and yet offend in *one point*, he is *guilty of all*." (James 2:10.) If this does not mean *what it says*, I do not know what it does mean. Will the editor of the *Advocate* tell us?

The *Advocate* calls in Dr. Jacob Ditzler to prove what he and his brethren teach, as follows: "They all have always taught that: (1) To believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God; that, say they all, changes the heart. (2) You repent; that changes the conduct or character. (3) You are immersed for the remission of sins: that changes your state. You in the water, nowhere else, come in contact with the merit of Christ's blood; that secures remission of sins." As Brother McQuiddy introduces Dr. Ditzler as his witness, it is presumed that Dr. Ditzler correctly

represents him when he said: "You *in the water nowhere else*, come in contact with the merit of Christ's blood." In other words, the doctrine of the Disciples, as expressed by Dr. Ditzler and indorsed by the editor of the *Advocate*, is that a person goes into the water unsaved, he comes out saved; he goes in a goat, he comes out a sheep. The change occurs "*in the water*," for here, "*nowhere else*" he comes in "contact with the merit of Christ's blood."

Now, if that is not *baptismal salvation*, will Brother McQuiddy please tell us what it is? When Dr. Ditzler says, however, "that secures remission of sins," he should have said remission of *past sins*. As the editor of the *Advocate* has stated, remission of all sins after that is to be secured only by *keeping, the whole law*.

But, as if not quite satisfied with the statement of Dr. Ditzler, the editor of the *Advocate* adds: "The position of this journal is that (1) the new birth and regeneration are identical; (2) that the new birth consists of two parts—namely, being begotten, or quickened, by the Spirit, and being baptized; and (3) that, therefore, baptism is not itself regeneration—that is, the whole of it." Baptism, then, is not "the whole of regeneration," but only half of it. The *Advocate* claims that it is the latter half, and, consequently, there is no regeneration or new birth, except in and at baptism. The *Advocate* adds: "The Savior taught that the new birth consists in being born 'of water and of the Spirit.' (John 3:5.) That to be born of water and the Spirit is to be 'born again' no honest man doubts. And this is regeneration. Hence regeneration consists not in being born of water alone, neither in being begotten by the Spirit alone, but

in the two jointly and inseparably. This is the doctrine the *Baptist and Reflector* must meet." Very well, I shall meet it. 1. In the first place, please notice that what Jesus said was: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God"—not *of the Spirit and of water*. Jesus puts *water before the Spirit*. Brother McQuiddy's brethren generally take the position that the *water* is the *mother* and the *Spirit* the *father* of the plan of salvation, and I presume that he takes the same position, as he seems to do. But this is to *put the mother before the father*, which is *unnatural and impossible*, and shows the absurdity of this theory. 2. In the second place, it is seen that Jesus could not mean by the expression "born of water" what the editor of the *Advocate* makes him mean. What, then, did he mean? In the early part of this discussion I showed that he was speaking of *two births*, the *physical* and the *spiritual* birth. "Born of water" referred to the first birth, and "of the Spirit" to the second birth. That this is true is shown by the following verse: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." (John 3:6.) 3. In any event, however, the *Advocate* admits that the expression "born of water" is "metaphorical"—that the new birth was simply *figurative*. This was the view of the passage taken by Dr. J. R. Graves, and which is taken now by a number of our Baptist brethren. I do not agree with them, but it is entirely possible, and in harmony with Baptist views on baptism.

The remark of the *Advocate* that "all those who were born of water and of the Spirit in the days of

the apostles believed and were baptized, repentance intervening between faith and baptism," is entirely gratuitous and unsupported. Repentance does not intervene between faith and baptism. On the contrary, as I showed last week, *faith intervenes between repentance and baptism.*

I gave some time ago the meaning of Acts 2:38, showing that the preposition for "in," in the expression "in the name of Jesus Christ," is "epi," which means "on" or "upon." The verse, then, means: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you, trusting on, relying upon, the name of Jesus Christ unto remission of your sins." The remission of our sins depends not on our being baptized, but upon our *trusting upon* the name of Jesus Christ. And so this passage teaches that *repentance and belief on the name of Jesus Christ* are unto the remission of sins.

It is true that the Greek particle "eis" followed by an accusative usually looks forward; but not always. For instance, Jesus said: "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; because they repented *at the preaching* of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here." (Matt. 12:41.) The Greek word for "at" in the expression "at the preaching of Jonas" is "eis." Of course, the men did not repent *in order* to the preaching of Jonas, *to secure* that preaching. They repented *on account of* the preaching of Jonas. Here is an instance in which the word "eis" undoubtedly looks backward, not forward. And if it looks backward in one case, it may in another. The same expression occurs also in Luke 11:32. But, as I said, "eis" usually looks forward, and I take it that way in Acts 2:38.

But the remission of sins depends, not on baptism, but on *belief on the name of Christ*. Compare with this: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name *whosoever believeth in him* shall receive remission of sins." (Acts 10:43.) The *Advocate* says: "Christ has prescribed faith, repentance, and baptism for the sin-sick soul." This statement is absolutely unsupported, and made simply upon the *ipse dixit* of the editor of the *Advocate*. He seems incorrigible. After all my teaching I almost feel discouraged. This is the *very point at issue*. I deny that Christ has prescribed "faith, repentance, and baptism" for the sin-sick soul. What he did prescribe was, "Repent ye, and *believe* the gospel." (Mark 1:15.) Or, as Paul expresses it, "*repentance* toward God, and *faith* toward our Lord Jesus Christ." (Acts 20:21.) Repentance first, faith, second, *no* baptism for the sin-sick soul, to cure the soul of its sin-sickness, to save the soul.

## Salvation By Faith.

---

### ANSWER XII. BY E. E. FOLK, TO IX. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.

"There is not much in the article" of Brother McQuiddy "that needs answer. Striking out misrepresentations and wholly irrelevant matter, very little remains." Unfortunately, though, there are a good many "misrepresentations" and there is a good deal of "irrelevant matter" in his article. When I speak of "*salvation by faith*," what I mean, of course, is *salvation by faith*—not salvation by works, or salvation by obedience, or salvation by duty, or salvation by faith *and* works, or salvation by anything else, but just simply salvation "*by grace through faith*, not of *works*," nor of anything else but faith. Of course, as I have previously shown, faith is always and necessarily must be preceded by repentance in the plan of salvation—"repentance toward God, and faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ." This Paul called the "whole counsel of God." All of Brother McQuiddy's "sophistry" about the thief on the cross, in claiming that the thief was baptized because he was included in the "all" who went out to John, and afterwards that the "all" meant simply a "great number," and that he was one of the "great number," and Brother McQuiddy's "sophistry" in his position on James 2:10, has been met and exposed. Editor McQuiddy is funny. He quotes a passage of scripture, gives his interpreta-

tion of it, and when I show by other passages that his interpretation is wrong, he says that this "compels the Bible to falsify itself," and that I render myself "ridiculous" in opposing "the plain teaching of the Bible"—*as if Brother McQuiddy were the Bible*. Let me ask, when did he get to be infallible? When did he come to be the pope, whose interpretation of the Bible is infallible, and must not be doubted or disputed? By what authority does he assume that his interpretation is the "plain teaching" of the Bible, and any other views must necessarily be erroneous?

I beg Brother McQuiddy's pardon. But I must respectfully insist that "the light of the emphasis the *Gospel Advocate* has given to salvation through faith" is a very *dim light*, so dim, in fact, as not to be visible. On the contrary, instead of giving emphasis to salvation through faith, the *Gospel Advocate*, throughout the whole of this discussion, has *denied the doctrine* of salvation through faith, and has steadily and stoutly *contended and urged* that salvation is *not* through faith, but through *works*, or, at least, through faith and works, including in the term "works" baptism, obedience, keeping the whole law, virtue, knowledge, temperance, etc. If the *Gospel Advocate* will now "give emphasis to salvation through faith" by saying that we are saved *by faith* and *at faith*, and *do not need works* of any kind to save us, our controversy may end here. This has been the point of discussion and contention between us from beginning to end—his claim that we are not saved through faith, but through works, or at least through faith and works. I am not surprised that the editor of the *Advocate* should want to recede from his posi-

tion, but I am surprised that he should *attempt to deny* that he ever took such a position, in the face of the thousands who have been reading the discussion.

I say "thousands." I may be mistaken. It is possible that there are only 243 persons who have been reading the discussion. I had not taken the pains to count the times in which the word "faith" occurs in the Bible. Since Brother McQuiddy wishes to be so literally exact, however, I have gone through my Cruden's Concordance, and find that the words "faith," "faithful," "faithfully," "faithfulness," occur about 350 times. The words "believe," "believed," "believers," "believest," "believeth," occur about 300 times. The words "trust," "trusted," "trustest," "trusteth," occur about 150 times. I state these figures in round numbers. If insisted upon, I can give them exactly. This would make about 800 times in which the kindred words "faith," "believe," and "trust" occur. This would seem to leave me 200 short of my 1,000 passages. Of course, I was speaking in round numbers; but if Brother McQuiddy insists upon my making up those 200, I think I can find them in a number of passages in which neither of those words occur, but in which they are implied. But what is the use? How weak is the argument that will insist on literal numerical exactness! It is the drowning man clutching at straws.

"One Baptist scholar that renders 'eis' in Acts 2:38 'because of'" was Dr. John A. Broadus. He gave that as one possible meaning of the passage. I do not know that I could mention a thousand other Baptist scholars who render it in the same way, but I



could, at least, mention a number of others. But Dr. Broadus will be sufficient.

By agreement, both Brother McQuiddy and myself have revised our articles as they appeared in the papers for publication in book form. He, as well as myself, has made numerous changes in the original articles for clearness of statement or strength of argument. I have not thought it necessary, though, to call special attention to these changes of his each time.

In the newspaper discussion, I did not have time to look up the quotations from Hovey and Hackett. I accepted them at the time as correct. I said then, however, "The *Advocate* perverts the meaning of these Baptist authors. They did not mean to teach that baptism saves actually, as the *Advocate* contends, but only figuratively."

Before the publication of the discussion in permanent form, I thought I would see if the quotations were correct. I confess I was surprised to find how, by quoting a few sentences from them, skipping some and suppressing others, Brother McQuiddy had utterly misrepresented them and perverted their meaning. Brother McQuiddy says: "Now he puts the ten thousand Baptists on the side of error, and Hovey "and Hackett as teaching the truth of the Bible." I beg pardon. I simply put Hovey and Hackett with the ten thousand Baptists on the side of truth "as teaching the truth of the Bible."

Brother McQuiddy now says: "I indorse all that he has quoted from Hovey and Hackett." All? Does he indorse this: "A removal of sins from the soul by bathing the body in water is absurd?" Then why did he *skip* this sentence? Does he indorse this: "Bap-

tism is the prescribed *symbol, sign, or expression* of that *inward change?*" And this: "Baptism is represented as having this importance or efficacy, because it is the *sign* of the repentance and faith, *which are the conditions of salvation?*" Then why did he suppress this remark in his quotations from both Hovey and Hackett? He says: "The part I left off was the comment they made as Baptists." Then he admits that they are Baptists? And that these comments were made "as Baptists?" And he "indorses" them? That means, that can mean, but one thing—that he is a Baptist. Is this intended as an announcement of his conversion? As it is so recent, may I not claim the honor of having led him in this discussion to see and accept the truth? I congratulate myself. I congratulate him still more.

Indorsing "*all* that I have quoted from Hovey and Hackett," *including* "the comments they made as Baptists," Brother McQuiddy must acknowledge his conversion to Baptist views. Having deliberately suppressed these comments, however, he now pleads guilty to the charge of garbling. He quoted a few sentences from Hovey and Hackett to sustain his position, and then suppressed the very next sentences, which were directly contrary to his position. "This comment did not change the truth they had already taught." No, but it threw a new light on the previous expressions and showed the falsity of the interpretation put on them by Brother McQuiddy. Else why should he want to suppress the comment? Brother McQuiddy says, though, that Hovey and Hackett "both teach that baptism saves, and in the only sense I believe it saves." They both teach that "*baptism is the sign of the re-*

*pentance and faith, which are the conditions of salvation.*" And he believes that this is the "only sense in which baptism saves?" Good! Here is fresh evidence of conversion.

But while I was getting ready to extend the right hand of fellowship to Brother McQuiddy as a Baptist, he turned around and added in the very next sentence: "When Ananias was told by Saul to 'Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins,' Hovey tells us that he was to submit to the rite in order to be forgiven." I beg pardon, but Dr. Hovey did not teach any such thing. Here is what Hovey said: "Of course, there is no such thing possible as a literal washing away of sins. A removal of sins from the soul by bathing the body in water is absurd. But there is such a thing as forgiveness of sins; and this may be described *figuratively* as washing them away." Hovey then quotes approvingly the remark of Hackett: "Baptism is represented as having this importance or efficacy, because it is the sign of the repentance and faith, which are the conditions of salvation." This is very far from saying that Paul was "to submit to the rite *in order to be forgiven.*" And if Brother McQuiddy understood Dr. Hovey to mean that, he is 'mistaken. And if he thinks Ananias meant to teach that, then Brother McQuiddy is not a Baptist. For no Baptist from the days of John the Baptist until now ever taught or thought that.

As to my position, it is well expressed by Hovey and Hackett that "baptism is the *sign* of the repentance and faith, *which are the conditions of salvation.*" Hovey, Hackett, Graves, and every other Baptist teaches that baptism is "an expression of faith," but none of

them teach that it "saves" except "figuratively." If, however, faith must "express itself in baptism" before it can *save*, why must it not express itself in other ways before it can save? "The only faith that saves is that which expresses itself in *obedience*," says Brother McQuiddy. Then *why limit* this obedience to baptism? That is "the first act of obedience." But it is not the *only* act of obedience. There are acts of obedience all through life—adding to our faith virtue, knowledge, temperance, etc. (2 Pet. 1:5-7); partaking of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11:24, 25); attendance upon the services of the sanctuary (Heb. 10:25); loving one another (John 13:34, 35; John 15:12); going into all the world and preaching the gospel to every creature (Mark 16:15); observing all things commanded by Christ (Matt. 28:20). Why must not faith "express itself" in all of these things *before it saves*? What right has Brother McQuiddy to limit obedience to the commandments of Christ in order to secure salvation to the one commandment of baptism? I ask again: If we must obey in *one* respect *to be saved*, must we not obey in *every* respect? If not, why not? The question comes back, Who then can be saved?

The *Advocate* editor again quotes from Dr. Willmarth. I wrote to Dr. E. B. Pollard, professor in Crozer Theological Seminary, inclosing a copy of the quotations from Dr. Willmarth, and asked the following" questions: "(1) Do the quotations from Dr. Willmarth correctly represent his views at the time he wrote the lessons in the *Quarterly*? (2) Do these quotations correctly represent his views now, or have these changed during the thirty years since they were writ-

ten? (3) Do these quotations correctly represent the views of the Baptists in and around Philadelphia? (4) Do they believe that baptism is a part of the plan of salvation, or simply that it expresses symbolically the salvation which has been secured through repentance and faith?" Dr. Pollard replied as follows: "In reply to your four questions, I should say, first, the quotations substantially represent Dr. Willmarth's article of 1877, though other sentences may be selected which modify the Campbellism of it, and probably would not be palatable to that type of belief. Second, Dr. Willmarth is broken in health, and for years has represented nobody but himself. But you can say upon good authority that in his latter days Dr. Willmarth modified his views. Third, the views expressed in the article of 1877 do not, *and never did*, represent the views of Baptists of this section. Fourth, they believe universally, so far as I can discover, that baptism expresses symbolically the salvation which has been secured through repentance and faith. All the consolation that the *Advocate* can possibly get out of the article is this, that one rather eccentric Baptist once held Campbellistic views which the denomination as a whole has always repudiated."

Dr. Pollard also sends some quotations from Dr. Willmarth's article in the *Baptist Quarterly* for July, 1877, which put rather a different phase on the article from the extracts made in the *Advocate*. They are as follows:

"Page 319, *Baptist Quarterly*, July, 1877. Rev. J. W. Willmarth: 'Now, if baptism alone were connected with the promise of remission, we should be shut up to the belief that sin is actually and only forgiven at

the moment of baptism. But it is associated with repentance and faith, which precede it by an appreciable, and in some cases a considerable, interval of time. The general drift of scripture seems to indicate that the prodigal is actually forgiven as soon as he returns. Instances are on record where divine assurance of pardon was given on the spot. It is not asserted that pardon is always delayed till baptism, or that it is *actually* bestowed in the act, or that it is invariably refused to the baptized. The *gospel simply guarantees pardon to the penitent believer baptized*. Baptism does not necessarily fix the exact moment of forgiveness; it *assures of forgiveness*. So that whoever *neglects* or *refuses* baptism *has not* the certainty of being forgiven, and whoever properly receives it has such certainty. Perhaps we may suppose that God *in his own mind* forgives the sinner *when he repents*, justifies him when he *believes*; but as a judicial act of his government, declares or pronounces his sins forgiven in baptism, both by virtue of his written word and by the sealing of his Spirit. Naturally the believer awaiting baptism, whether for a few moments or many days, is likely to feel peace and joy; but baptism increases and assures both. It remains through life a *memorial* of God's covenant with the obedient soul.'

"Again, page 321: 'Philosophically speaking, only repentance is in the nature of the case necessary to salvation—a *sine qua non* in every conceivable case . . . Much less is baptism a *necessary* condition of salvation.

"Note: In the *same volume* is an article on 'Baptism and Remission,' by Dr. J. E. Farnam, of Georgetown, Ky., which presents the *true Baptist view* of this subject. In the article Dr. Farnam shows that

Hackett does not support Campbellite contentions at all but has been misrepresented by Campbellites."

Dr. Pollard adds: "Dr. Willmarth has always been regarded as an extremist and is not a representative Baptist. He no longer takes any part with Baptists."

In response to a letter inclosing the quotations from Dr. Willmarth, and asking similar questions to those asked Dr. Pollard, Dr. A. J. Rowland, corresponding secretary of the American Baptist Publication Society, of Philadelphia, writes:

"Philadelphia, June 4, 1907.

"E. E. Folk, D.D., Nashville, Tenn.

"Dear Brother: I have your favor of May 31st, inclosing ([notations from J. W. Willmarth. Unfortunately I am unable to verify these quotations, as we have here no copy of the *Baptist Quarterly* of July, 1877, in which Dr. Willmarth's article appeared. The fire of 1896 destroyed all our copies of the *Quarterly*, and we have been unable thus far to replace them. I should think, however, judging from what I know of Dr. Willmarth, that the quotations are correctly reported. He was always somewhat extreme in his views, and as he felt that the ordinance of baptism was, in sonic quarters, not receiving the attention which he thought it ought to receive, he probably took an extreme position. He represented only himself, and his article was published as embodying his own views, and not as committing anybody else. I do not know any Baptists in and around Philadelphia who would be willing to subscribe to Dr. Willmarth's article as representing their views either in his exegesis of passages in the Scriptures, or as to the position of

baptism in the gospel system. Certainly the Publication Society has never published anything- which would commit it to Dr. Willmarth's view of the case. I believe myself, and so, I think, do all my associates here, that baptism *is a symbol or an outward expression of an inward fact*, rather than an essential part of the plan of salvation. Of course baptism is important as an act of obedience. Any one who professes repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus, and is not willing to give expression to this in the ordinance our Lord has given for such expression, has reason to doubt whether his repentance and faith are genuine. This is really what I think Dr. Willmarth believed, though his extreme form of statement might lead to another conclusion. The fact that Dr. Willmarth was at one time a member of our Hoard, and chairman of the Committee of Publication, ought not to be used as committing the Society to his personal views. We must disclaim very strongly against our Society being involved in that way. Trusting that this will sufficiently answer your inquiries, and with best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

"A. J. ROWLAND."

Brother McQuiddy says: "Every candid reader knows the *Gospel Advocate* has contended the phrase 'born of water' is metaphorical and not literal." That was the way the *Advocate* spelled it—"metaphorical;" and as its printers and proofreaders make no mistakes, I presume that the editor meant to spell it that way. I confess I do not know the meaning of the word, as I do not find it in the dictionary. I presume that Editor McQuiddy did not mean to use the word "meta-



phorical," as that means figurative, and he denies that baptism, to which he claims "born of water" refers, is figurative. If, however, he did mean to take that position—and it is becoming increasingly difficult to tell what position the editor of the *Advocate* does mean to take on any question, as he will take a position in one issue and then deny in the next issue, and even in the same issue, that he ever took any such position—if, however, he really meant to take the position that baptism is figurative, then it sounds strange to hear him turn around in this very same article which I am now reviewing and quote the words of Ananias to Paul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins," as if it meant that the sins of Paul would be washed away *in baptism*, and not simply that baptism expressed in a symbol, in a figure, in a beautiful object lesson, the washing away of his sins which had already been experienced in his heart through repentance and faith. In other words, he says that "born of water" is "metaphorical"—supposing that he meant "metaphorical." That word means *figurative*. But he then turns right around and quotes the expression, "be baptized, and wash away thy sins," as if it meant that sins are literally to be washed away in baptism. Such inconsistency is amazing.

The vain repetitions of Brother McQuiddy concerning the Ten Commandments and baptismal salvation have all been met and exposed by me. My positions on those questions, however, have certainly not been "met and exposed" by him. They still stand.

With reference to my quotations from the Improved Edition, let me say:

1. I stated to Brother McQuiddy the facts with

reference to the edition. In brief, they were as follows: After the Improved Edition came out, I was accustomed for some time to using- it almost to the exclusion of other versions, considering it the best edition made. Later the book disappeared from my study in some way, much to my regret. I think it was stolen by a negro cook. In writing a series of articles on the "Plan of Salvation," several years ago, I quoted from that edition. In my discussion with Brother McQuiddy, for the sake of convenience, I had my stenographer to copy a part of one of those articles containing some of these quotations, as the discussion was along the same line.

2. Brother McQuiddy had evidently never heard of the Improved Edition. He seemed to think that I was trying to impose upon his credulity when I mentioned the edition from which I had quoted. I told him where he could get a copy of the edition. He admitted to me afterwards, however, that he had not sent for it. He still did not seem to believe that there was such an edition. He said he thought I was talking about the Bible Union Version. I, however, secured a copy of the Improved Edition and loaned it to him.

3. He says he "compared the scriptures quoted with the Improved Edition, and noted only seventeen changes and mistakes." I myself made the same comparison, and found *seven* variations. I would say that the word "seventeen" in the *Gospel Advocate* was a typographical error for "seven," but for the fact that the *Gospel Advocate* never makes any typographical errors. Here are the seven "changes and mistakes," or variations, or whatever they may be termed. In Rom.

3:27 the word "by" was omitted in the expression but by a law of faith." In Rom. 4:11 the word "who" was used for "that" in the expression "that believe." Rom. 9:32 was omitted. Rom. 9:33 was made to read, "And behold he *who* believes on him shall not be put to shame," instead of reading, "And he *that* believes on him shall not be put to shame." In Gal. 3:7, which reads, "Know then that they who are of faith, these are sons of Abraham," the word "then" was omitted. In Gal. 3:27 the word "unto" was used instead of "into." In Gal. 3:28 the expression "there is neither Jew nor Greek" was omitted.

I have thus gone through the passages very carefully and in detail to show their unimportance. Any one who is at all familiar with a printing office can readily understand how such errors could be made. I say "any one." I except, of course, Editor McQuiddy, who never himself makes any mistakes, and whose stenographers and typographers and proofreaders never make any. The above errors were corrected in preparing these articles for publication in book form.

4. But I do not intend that Brother McQuiddy shall get around these passages so easily, by finding a few typographical errors in them and harping on those, and so I repeat the passages as they occur in the Revised Version, from which Brother McQuiddy has usually been quoting:

"For by *grace* have ye been saved through *faith*: and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; *not of works*, that no man should glory." (Eph. 2:8, 9.)

"But if it is by *grace*, it is no more of *works*: otherwise grace is no more grace." (Rom. 11:6.)

"Where then is the glorying? It is excluded. By

what manner of law? of *works*? Nay: but by a law of *faith*. We reckon therefore that a man is justified by *faith* apart from the works of the *law*." (Rom. 3:27, 28.)

"For if Abraham was justified by *works*, he hath whereof to glory; *but not toward God*. For what saith the scripture? And Abraham *believed* God, and *it* was reckoned unto him for righteousness. Now to him that *worketh*, the reward is not reckoned as of *grace*, but as of *debt*. But to him that *worketh not*, but *believeth* on him that justified! the ungodly, his *faith* is reckoned for righteousness. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the *faith*, which he had while he was in uncircumcision: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be in uncircumcision, that righteousness might be reckoned unto them." (Rom. 4:2-5, 11.)

"What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, who followed not after righteousness, attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of *faith*: but Israel, following after a law of righteousness, did not arrive at that law. Wherefore? Because they sought it not by *faith*, but as it were by *works*. They stumbled at the stone "of stumbling; even as it is written, Behold, I lay in Zion a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense: and he that *believeth* on him shall not be put to shame." (Rom. 9:30-33.)

"Yet knowing that a man is not justified by the *works of the law*, but *through faith* in Jesus Christ, even we *believed* on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by *faith* in Christ, and not by the *works* of the law: because by the *works of the law* shall no flesh be justified. I do not make void the grace of God:

for if righteousness is through the *law*, then Christ died for naught." (Gal. 2:16, 21.)

"This only would I learn from you, Received ye the Spirit by the *works of the law*, or by the *hearing of faith*? Are ye so foolish? having begun in the *Spirit*, are ye now perfected in the *flesh*? Did ye suffer so many things in vain? if it be indeed in vain. He therefore that supplieth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the *works of the law*, or by the *hearing of faith*? Even as Abraham *believed* God, and *it* was reckoned unto him for righteousness. Know therefore that they that are of *faith*, the same are *sons of Abraham*. And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by *faith*, preached the gospel beforehand unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all the nations be blessed. So then they that are of *faith* are blessed with the *faithful* Abraham. For as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse: for it is written, *Cursed is every one who continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law, to do them*. Now that no man is justified by the law before God, is evident: for, *The righteous shall live by faith*: and the law is not of *faith*; but, *He that doeth them shall live in them*. Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us; for it is written, *Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree*: that upon the Gentiles might come the blessing of Abraham in Christ Jesus; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit *through faith*." (Gal. 3:2-14.)

'Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a *law* given which could make alive, verily righteousness would have been of

the *law*. But the scripture shut up all things under sin that the promise by *faith* in Jesus Christ might be given to them that *believe*. But before *faith* came, we were kept in ward under the *law*, shut up unto the *faith* which should afterwards be revealed. So that the law is become our tutor to bring us "unto Christ, that we might be justified by *faith*. But now that *faith* is come, we are no longer under a tutor. For ye are all *sons of God, through faith*, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did *put on* Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus. And if ye are Christ's, then are ye *Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise.*" (Gal. 3:21-29.)

Here are the passages as they appear in the Twentieth Century New Testament:

"For it is by God's loving-kindness that you have been saved, *through your faith*. It is not due to yourselves; the gift is God's. It is not due to *obedience to Law*, lest any one should boast." (Eph. 2:8, 9.)

"But if in love, then no longer as a result of *obedience*. Otherwise *love* would cease to be *love*." (Rom. 11:6.)

"What, then, becomes of our boasting? It is excluded. By what sort of Law? A Law requiring obedience? No, a Law requiring faith. For we conclude that a man is pronounced righteous on the ground of *faith, quite apart from obedience to Law.*" (Rom. 3:27, 28.)

"If he was pronounced righteous as the result of obedience, then he has something to boast of. Yes, but *not before God*. For what are the words of

Scripture? 'Abraham had *faith* in God, and *his faith* was regarded by God as righteousness.' Now wages are regarded as due to the man who *works*, not as a *favor*, but as a *debt*; while, as for the man who *does not rely upon his obedience*, but *has faith* in him who can pronounce the godless righteous, his *faith* is regarded by God as righteousness. And it was as a sign of this that he received the rite of circumcision—to attest the righteousness clue to the faith of an uncircumcised man—in order that he might be the father of all who have *faith* in God even when uncircumcised, that they also may be regarded by God as righteous." (Rom. 4:2-5, 11.)

"What are we to say, then? Why, that Gentiles, who were not in search of righteousness, secured it— a *righteousness which was the result of faith*; while Israel, which was in search of a Law which would insure righteousness, failed to discover one. And why? Because they *looked to obedience* and *not to faith*, to secure it. They stumbled over 'the Stumbling-block.' As Scripture says: 'See, I place a Stumbling-block in Zion—a Rock which shall prove a hindrance; and he who *believes in him* shall have no cause for shame.'" (Rom. 9:30-33.)

"Know that no one is pronounced righteous as the result of *obedience to Law*, but ONLY *through faith in Christ Jesus*. So we placed our *faith* in Christ Jesus, in order that we might be pronounced righteous, as the result of *faith* in Christ, and not of *obedience to Law*; for such *obedience* 'will not re-Suit in even one soul's being pronounced righteous.' I do not reject the love of God. *If righteousness*

*comes through Law*, then there was no need for Christ to die!" (Gal. 2:16, 21.)

"Here is the one thing that I want to find out from you: Did you receive the Spirit as the result of *obedience to Law*, or of your having listened with *faith*? Can you be so foolish? After beginning with what is *spiritual*, do you now end with what is *external*? Did you go through so much to no purpose?—if indeed it really was to no purpose! He who supplies you abundantly with his Spirit and endows you with such powers—does he do this as the result of *obedience to Law*, or as the result of your having listened with *faith*? It is just as it was with Abraham—'He had *faith* in God, and his *faith* was regarded by God as righteousness.' You see, then, that those whose lives are based on *faith* are the Sons of Abraham. And Scripture, foreseeing that God would pronounce the Gentiles righteous as the result of *faith*, foretold the Good News to Abraham in the words, 'Through thee all the Gentiles shall be blessed.' And, therefore, those whose lives are *based on faith* share the blessings bestowed upon the faith of Abraham. All who rely upon *obedience to Law* are under a curse, for Scripture says: 'Cursed is every one who does not abide by *all that is written* in the Book of the Law, and do it.' Again, it is evident that no one is pronounced righteous before God *through Law*, for we read: '*Through faith* the righteous man shall find Life.' But the law is not based on faith; no, its words are: 'Those who practice these precepts will find life through them.' Christ ransomed us from the curse pronounced in the law, by taking the curse on himself for us, for Scripture says: 'Cursed is any one who is



hanged on a tree.' And this he did that the blessing given to Abraham might be extended to the Gentiles through their union with Jesus Christ; that so, *through our faith*, we also might receive the promised gift of the Spirit" (Gal. 3:2-14.)

"Does that set the Law in opposition to God's promises? Heaven forbid! For if a Law had been given capable of bestowing Life, then righteousness would have actually owed its existence to Law. But the words of Scripture represent the whole world as being in bondage to sin, so that the promised blessing, dependent as it is upon *faith* in Jesus Christ, may be given to those who have *faith* in him. Before the coming of faith, we were kept under the guard of the Law, in bondage, awaiting the Faith that was destined to be revealed. Thus the Law has proved a guide to lead us to Christ, in order that we may be pronounced righteous as the result of *faith*. But now that faith has come we no longer need a guide. For you are all *Sons of God, through your faith* in Christ Jesus. For all of you who were baptized into union with Christ clothed yourselves with Christ. All distinctions between Jew and Greek, slave and freeman, male and female, have vanished; for in union with Christ Jesus you are all one. And, since you belong to Christ, it follows that you are Abraham's offspring, and, under the promise, sharers in the inheritance." (Gal. 3:21-29.)

I have tried to see that no mistakes were made either by the stenographer or the typographer in the above quotations, but I will not guarantee absolutely that they are precisely as they were in the versions from which they were quoted. I think, however, they are

correct, and Editor McQuiddy or any reader, if he wishes, can compare them as quoted with those versions. Or, if Editor McQuiddy is not satisfied with my quoting these passages from the versions mentioned, he may take them from the King James Version if he wishes. I need hardly quote from this version, as it is easily accessible to any one, and it is not necessary for me to take the space to quote them from this version, though I should be glad to do so if I had the space. They are practically the same in all the versions. The arguments are the same, with only a variation of phraseology. Or, as I have said before, Brother McQuiddy may take them in any version he chooses. *Here they are.* Let him explain them away if he can. They were evidently written for just such persons as Editor McQuiddy, and they *completely and effectually demolish his theory of salvation through works, or through the law, or through obedience.* How they could possibly have been made plainer or stronger, I do not see. It will not do to say, as Brother McQuiddy does, that these passages simply refer to the "law of Moses." They mean the *law*, the moral law, whether expressed by Moses or Christ or Paul or whom. Besides, Christ expressly indorsed the moral law of Moses, saying that he came not to destroy, but to fulfill the law. (Matt. 5:17.) The point of the passages is that we are not saved by *law* at all, by *any* law, whether that of Moses or Christ or any one. Besides, to substitute simply the law of *Christ* for the law of *Moses* in the plan of salvation is still to require salvation by law. Only, the law of Christ is harder to fulfill even than the law of Moses,

because he requires obedience in the heart and not only in act.

There is one passage to which I wish to call special attention. Editor McQuiddy said that I had slipped in the word "only" in Gal. 2:16, and to emphasize the MII of doing so he said that "Satan did no worse than this when he added 'not' to the word of God." I may say in passing that my recollection is that Satan, instead of adding "not" to the word of God, took out the word "not" from God's command to Adam and Eve. This only goes to show that Editor McQuiddy is not quite so infallible as he would have it appear. Editor McQuiddy said: "Editor Folk could not find scripture to prove his doctrine, so makes one." I do not wish to expose him, but I must call attention to the fact that both in the Improved Edition and in the Twentieth Century New Testament the word "ONLY" occurs, as follows: "Yet knowing that a man is not justified by works of law, but *only* through faith in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 2:16, Improved Edition.) "Know that no one is pronounced righteous as the result of obedience to Law, but *only* through faith in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 2:16, Twentieth Century New Testament.) The Improved Edition was translated by Baptists. But they were among the greatest scholars of the age in any denomination, and have made about the best translation of the New Testament that has been made by any one. It was said that the "translators of the King James Version knew English, but they did not know Greek, and that the translators of the Revised Version knew Greek, but they did not know English." But the translators of the Improved Edition certainly knew both Greek and English. At

any rate, the translators of the Twentieth Century New Testament were not Baptists. It was published by Fleming H. Revell Company, of Chicago. They translate Gal. 2:16 "only through faith," etc. But go to the Greek. The expression is a strong one: "*Ban me dia pisteos Christou Iesou.*"

By the way, speaking of the Twentieth Century New Testament, I wish I had space to make other quotations from it. I should be glad, for instance, to quote the whole of the third and fourth chapters of Romans and the third chapter of Galatians. They make very interesting reading, and completely demolish the claims of any one that salvation is a matter of works, or law, or obedience, or anything of the kind. I must, however, be allowed to quote a few passages, in addition to those quoted above, as follows: "For the promise that he should inherit the world did not come to Abraham or his descendants *through Law*, but *through the righteousness due to faith*. If those who take their stand on Law are to inherit the world, then faith is robbed of its meaning, and the promise comes to nothing." (Rom. 4:13, 14.)

"To take an illustration, brothers, from daily life: No one sets aside even an agreement between two men, when once it has been confirmed, *nor does he add conditions to it*. If our heritage is the result of Law, then it has ceased to be the result of a promise. Yet God conferred it on Abraham by a promise. What, then, you ask, was the use of the Law? It was a later addition, to make men conscious of their wrongdoings, and intended to last only till the coming of that 'offspring' to whom the promise had been made; and it was delivered through angels by a

mediator. Now mediation implies more than one person, but God is one only. Does that set the Law in opposition to God's promises? Heaven forbid! For, if a Law had been given capable of bestowing Life, then righteousness would have actually owed its existence to Law. But the words of Scripture represent the whole world as being in bondage to sin, so that the promised blessing, dependent, as it is, upon faith in Jesus Christ, may be given to those *who have faith* in him. For you are all Sons of God, *through your faith* in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3:15, 18, 19-22, 26.)

I must call attention also to the fact that Dr. Alvah Hovey was one of the translators of the Improved Edition, in which occur the words: "Yet knowing that a man is not justified by works of law, but *only* through faith in Jesus Christ." I call attention to this for the reason that Editor McQuiddy attempted to make Hovey substantiate his position on baptismal salvation. But here is Hovey representing Paul as saying that "*salvation is only through faith in Jesus Christ.*" He introduced Dr. Hovey as one of his main witnesses. Will he accept the testimony of his own witness?

In my previous article I said: "Certainly I make the 'Baptist Church a nonessential'—not 'nonessential,' of course, in the sense that no such thing is needed, but 'nonessential' in the sense that it is *not essential to salvation*. I have shown, and need not repeat here, that salvation comes through Christ, and not through the church. Christ first, the church second. Christianity, not churchianity. But let me ask, Does the *Gospel Advocate* mean to make the 'Christian Church,

or Church of Disciples, or Campbellite Church, or whatever it may be called, essential to salvation? That is the logical and natural inference from its remark, and is also in harmony with all of its previous utterances. Here is ecclesiasticism with a vengeance!"

Instead of answering my question directly, the editor of the *Advocate* attempts to offset the force of it by "ridicule" or "scoffing." But through all of his "sophistry" the "honest reader" may discern his position that he believes in *salvation through the church*, especially when taken in connection with his remarks at the close of his article: "Christ is the head of the body, the church. We are baptized into Christ. When by faith we are baptized into Christ, we are added to the church. If Christ is essential to salvation, so is entrance into the kingdom which he founded." Editor McQuiddy evidently means that the kingdom and the church are identical, and so that entrance into the church is essential to salvation! I repeat, here is ecclesiasticism with a vengeance!

I deny that the kingdom and the church are identical. I deny that church membership is essential to salvation.

Right in the middle of the writer's expressions in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, "By faith Enoch," "By faith Noah," "By faith Abraham," Editor McQuiddy slips in the expression, "By faith we are baptized into Christ," and then naively asks: "If not, why not?" Well, for one thing, the sacred writer *did not say that*. For another thing, he *would not have said it* in the sense in which Editor McQuiddy pretends he said it: that we are *saved* by being baptized into Christ.

It is curious to hear Editor McQuiddy say, "No fruit, no tree; no stream, no fountain." As a matter of fact, it is the other way: *No tree, no fruit; no fountain, no stream*. You can have the tree without the fruit and the fountain without the stream, but there cannot be fruit without the tree and a stream without the fountain, though, of course, it is natural and logical that the tree should have fruit and the fountain a stream.

Despite his previous statement that baptism is "metaphorical and not literal," Editor McQuiddy again quotes the words of Ananias to Paul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins," as if the sins of Paul were literally to be washed away in baptism. Over against that passage I put, "The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin." (1 John 1:7.) If the blood of Christ cleanses us from sin, we do not need the water to wash it away. If the water washes away sin literally, we do not need the blood to cleanse from sin. How, then, are the passages to be reconciled? The reconciliation is very easy for a Baptist. The blood cleanses really and baptism figuratively. The blood cleanses inwardly and baptism outwardly. Baptism simply expresses in a symbol, in an object lesson, the cleansing which had taken place in the soul through repentance and faith. I leave Brother McQuiddy to reconcile the passages for himself—*if he can*.

Yes, Jesus said, "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them," etc. (Matt. 28:19.) We are first to make *disciples* or *Christians* and *afterwards* baptize them. Does Brother McQuiddy claim, and will he assert, that what Jesus meant was,

"Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations *by baptising them?*" The simple truth is that neither Jesus nor Paul attached sufficient importance to baptism to baptize their disciples themselves. Paul baptized some. "He would not have baptized any if it were wrong." But he would have baptized *all* if the baptizing them had been essential to their salvation.

"Philip preached Jesus to the eunuch," and he seems also to have taught him the duty of baptism. At any rate, he afterwards baptized him. Yet, there is nothing to indicate that the baptism was necessary to his salvation. "Paul spoke the word of the Lord to the Philippian jailer," and then baptized him "the same hour of the night." But there is nothing to indicate that Paul told the Philippian jailer he must be baptized in order to be saved. On the contrary, in response to the question of the jailer, "What must I do to be saved?" the distinct and direct answer was: "*Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." After the jailer was baptized, he rejoiced, *not because he was baptized*, but because he "*believed in God.*" Brother McQuiddy says: "No preacher can now preach the gospel without teaching the duty of baptism." If by "the gospel" he means the *whole system of Christianity*, I agree with him. But if by "the gospel" he means, as the term does really mean, the good news, the glad-tidings, the *plan of salvation*, then I must respectfully and earnestly dissent. Baptism is a *duty*, an important duty. But one does not have to do his duty to be saved, else no one could be saved. To tell a person that he must do his duty to



be saved is no good news to him. It is bad news. It is no glad tidings. It is most sorrowful tidings.

"Doing the will of God is most assuredly essential"—to what? To salvation? Does the will of God make us brother or sister or mother to Christ, or does it *show us to be such*? The oath *makes* the soldier. The fighting *shows* the soldier. There are many soldiers in the United States Army who have never been in a battle. A person does not have to grow to *live*. Did Brother McQuiddy never see a *dwarf*? He does not grow, but he is *alive*. A person who is alive will do acts. But the acts do not make the life. They are simply the outcome, the outgrowth, of the life. The soldier will "suffer hardship," etc. But it is *because* he is a soldier, not to make him a soldier.

In conclusion, I wish to call attention to several things:

1. Let me remind Brother McQuiddy that the terms "sophistry," "hypocritical folly," "ridiculous," "foolish," etc., in which his articles abound, hurt the one who uses them much more than the one to whom they are intended to be applied. They are evidences of weakness in argument. When a disputant lacks strength in argument, he usually attempts to make up for it by strength of expressions. Strong words are not strong arguments.

2. I showed that Editor McQuiddy does not believe his own proof text, Mark 16:16, the text on which he relied to prove everything, and which he was accustomed to quote over and over again. I showed that what he believed was quite different from that text. He does not deny and will not deny that I am right in my statement of his position, and in his

last article he has not quoted Mark 16:16 one time.

3. I mentioned nine different inconsistencies of which Editor McQuiddy had been guilty, and then I did not exhaust them all. He does not deny any of them, and does not even attempt to explain them away. They still stand.

4. I must again call Editor McQuiddy's attention to the passages whose meaning I asked him to give, and which he has never attempted to give.

## **"We Are Saved By Faith."**

---

### **REPLY X. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.**

The *Baptist and Reflector* has published four lengthy articles on the plan of salvation. Upon the ground of merit or that my real position has been replied to, the four articles should be passed unnoticed. As I am expected to notice them, I shall make these articles the occasion of restating the plan of salvation, which will exhaust their value to the world.

Principles are eternal in their nature. God has required obedience in all ages of the world. Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Solomon must all obey. Solomon concludes: "This is the end of the matter; all hath been heard: fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God will bring every work into judgment, with every hidden thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." (Eccles. 12:13, 14.)

The specific acts constituting obedience have been different in different ages. This was necessary on account of the condition of man. On account of the exceedingly great sinfulness of man in the patriarchal and Jewish ages, God revealed himself only in the distance. "So that the law is become our tutor to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But now that faith is come, we are no longer under a tutor." (Gal. 3:24, 25.) The law of Moses was a tutor to lead to Christ, but now we are no longer under that law, but under the law of faith.

Faith has been required in every age, but a man in any age proves his faith by doing what God commands him to do. Had Noah offered Shem on the altar instead of building an ark, it would have been disbelief and disobedience of the very worst type. Had Abraham built an ark and not have offered Isaac on the altar, the act would have been rebellion against God. Noah was saved in building the ark (Heb. 11; 7), and Abraham was justified in offering Isaac on the altar (James 2:21), because each by faith did what God commanded him to do. The Jew was justified in offering the goat of the sin offering as directed by Jehovah. (See Lev. 16.) "Keep therefore the words of this covenant, and do them, that ye may prosper in all that ye do." (Deut. 29:9.) The Jew was justified in obedience to the law of Moses.

In the days of John the Baptist, the people who accepted John's baptism justified God. "And all the people when they heard, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected for themselves the counsel of God, being not baptized of him." (Luke 7:29, 30.) Why were they justified in obedience to the baptism of John? Because this baptism was then authorized of God. (1) "John came, who baptized in the wilderness and preached the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins." (Mark 1:4.) (2) "And there went out unto him all the country of Judea, and all they of Jerusalem; and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins." (Verse 5.) (3) "And he came into all the region round about the Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins." (Luke 3:3.) John prepared a peo-

ple for the Christ. They were to repent of their sins, believe in the coming Messiah, and be baptized unto the remission of sins. Christ also preached to the Jews to repent and believe the gospel. "Now after John was delivered up, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe in the gospel." (Mark 1:14, 15.) The gospel was preached to them in the sense of good news, and not in fact. The facts of the gospel are the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ "according to the scriptures." (1 Cor. 15:3, 4.) Christ preached the gospel to them as good news, for he certainly would not preach his own death, burial, and resurrection before they occurred. They were to repent of their sins and believe in the Messiah. After the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, men believe the gospel in fact, repent of their sins, and obey the commands of the gospel.

After Christ had suffered, died, and risen again, just before his ascension he said: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; 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." (Matt. 28:19, 20.) "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." (Mark 16:15, 16.) "Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all

the nations, beginning from Jerusalem." (Luke 24-46, 47.) Thus Christ, through Matthew, Mark, and Luke, gives us faith, repentance, and baptism unto the remission of sins.

The apostles, acting under this commission, in obedience to Christ, require the same conditions to be complied with in order to salvation. "And being assembled together with them, he charged them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, which, said he, ye heard from me. . . . Rut ye shall receive power, when the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." (Acts 1:4-8.) In Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost, they were baptized in the Holy Spirit. The remarkable sermon of Peter convicted of sin. Guilty believers ask: "What shall we do?" The Holy Spirit answers through Peter: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." (Acts 2:38.) No man can be saved without faith. (Heb. 11:6; Rom. 14:23.) "He that disbelieveth shall be condemned." (Mark 16:16.) Without faith they would not have been convicted of sin. Faith is the very groundwork of repentance. In this model conversion it is clear that some faith preceded repentance. Believers were commanded to repent and be baptized. "But when they believed Philip preaching good tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." (Acts 8:12.) Philip preached Jesus to the eunuch. From the preaching of Jesus he learned he should be

baptized. He believed and was baptized. When Saul had believed and repented, he did neither eat nor drink to break his fast of three days until he was baptized. (Acts 22:16.) The Philippian jailer believed and was baptized "the same hour of the night." (Acts 16:30-34.) The editor of the *Baptist and Reflector* finds repentance in this conversion. He says: "Whenever salvation is predicated on faith, it is understood that it is the faith of a repentant man, like, for instance, the jailer." Why can he not say, "Whenever salvation is predicated on faith, it is understood that it is the faith of an obedient man, like, for instance, the jailer," especially since he was baptized "the same hour of the night?" Is Editor Folk singularly perverse, or is he blinded by his creed? As he finds repentance in the conversion of the jailer, he finds it in every other conversion and in the commission as recorded by Mark. Lydia believed and was baptized. (Acts 16:14, 15.) "Many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized." (Acts 18:8.) No conversion takes place without repentance. (Acts 17:30.) It is found in the commission (Luke 24:47), and is also found in Acts 2:38. This is proof sufficient to show it present in every conversion. The Ninevites repented. (Matt. 12:41.) The Ninevites turned from sin. (Jonah 3:10.) Therefore repentance is a change of mind produced by godly sorrow which leads to turning from sin. The man who believes and is baptized turns from sin.

The position that faith always includes a preceding repentance is unworthy of Editor Folk. He presumes too much on the credulity of our readers when he thinks they will accept his unsupported assertions.

Baptism grows out of faith and an element of faith is in baptism, but faith and baptism are not identical. Repentance is not necessarily included in faith. If faith cannot exist without repentance, why does the Holy Spirit ever enjoin repentance? The very fact that God enjoins faith and repentance shows they are not one and the same thing.

Under Christ the Holy Spirit has always required of responsible beings faith, repentance, and baptism. It seems the apostles, guided by the Holy Spirit, never conceived the possibility of a believer not being baptized. All the conversions show most conclusively that baptism is a development of faith and marks the degree of faith at which God pardons. The building of the ark marked the degree of faith at which God saved Noah, and the offering of Isaac on the altar marked the degree of faith at which God justified Abraham. Dipping in the Jordan seven times marked the degree of faith at which God healed Naaman. When the Jew had faith enough to bring the goat for a sin offering as God directed, this marked the degree of faith at which God blessed him or rolled forward his sins from year to year. In view of these facts, it is indeed remarkable to read from Editor Folk: "The plan of salvation is one in all ages of the world. It is ever and everywhere the same." As he has the unfortunate faculty of rendering himself so extremely ridiculous, I should not be surprised to see him hunting up a goat and a Jewish priest to make a sin offering for him. Neither should I be surprised to find him offering his child on the altar. It was the same blind theology that dethroned the reason of Freeman and led him to murder his own child in the name of



religion. Editor Folk appears to be as blind as the Jew and to have a veil over his eyes in the reading of the old covenant. "For if that which passeth away was with glory, much more that which remaineth is in glory. Having therefore such a hope, we use great boldness of speech, and are not as Moses, who put a veil upon his face, that the children of Israel should not look steadfastly on the end of that which was passing away: but their minds were hardened: for until this very day at the reading of the old covenant the same veil remaineth, it not being revealed to them that it is done away in Christ." (2 Cor. 3:11-15.) "Having blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us: and he hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross." (Col. 2:14.)

Abraham could not in faith have been baptized. God never commanded him to be baptized. He could in faith offer Isaac on the altar, because God commanded him so to do. The believer cannot to-day keep the law of Moses in faith, because it is not binding on him and is not authorized by Christ. He can be baptized in faith, for Christ authorizes baptism and says: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." How does a man become a child of God by faith? "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ." (Gal. 3:27.)

Editor Folk admits that faith always leads to baptism, for he says: "It is true that those who believed were baptized." Then it is true that those who were not baptized did not believe. Then those who were not baptized were lost, for all believers are baptized and all disbelievers are condemned.

Mark 16:16 is quoted to prove that faith saves really and baptism figuratively. Grant this wicked assertion is correct. Then what? He is saved the very instant he believes. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be"—what? Not saved, surely, for he is really saved the very moment he believes. We never say of an event which is past and can be but once, it "shall be." I fail to see the distinction between avowed infidelity and an interpretation of a passage of scripture which compels it to falsify itself.

The passage, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," is incontrovertible proof that baptism marks the degree of faith at which God pardons. The promise is to the baptized believer. I agree to print and bind a book for Editor Folk for five hundred dollars. I print, but refuse or neglect to bind. Would he pay the five hundred dollars? Nay, verily. Yet the reasoning and logic he applies to "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" would compel him to pay the five hundred dollars when the book was printed and not bound. "But he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." Without faith no man can be baptized. The man who refuses to take the first step cannot take the second or third. A refusal to do one thing God commands will condemn any one. He that sows and cultivates will reap, but he that sows not will not reap. I do not say he who sows not and cultivates not will not reap, for he may cultivate all his life without sowing and not reap. If the Savior had said, "He that believeth not and is not baptized shall be damned," then he must refuse to do both before he would be lost, whereas a willful refusal to do one thing God

commands, persisted in, will lead to the condemnation of the one who does it.

It is the essence of folly to quote John 3:16 to break the force of the many scriptures already quoted. "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life." (Verses 14-16.) If there were any difficulty here, Editor Folk would remove it, for he says: "It is true those who believed were baptized." The man who believed Moses looked on the serpent. The man who believes Christ obeys him in baptism. I am surprised John 3:36 was not quoted, which shows that belief embodies obedience. Editor Folk makes faith and belief the same. "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."

The vanity of Editor Folk is his most valued weapon and is used on all occasions. John 3:5 shows that we are saved by baptism figuratively. Who teaches this? The vanity of Editor Folk. Mark 16:16 shows "we are saved by faith actually or really, by baptism figuratively." Who said it? The vanity of Editor Folk. Who teaches John 3:16 shows "we are saved by faith actually or really?" Nobody but the vanity of Editor Folk. And, seriously, he seems to expect somebody to believe it. "Vanity of vanities, saith the Preacher; vanity of vanities, all is vanity." If he will be blind, I am really glad he can revive his drooping spirit from this source.

He assumes because I teach "born of water" is metaphorical and that "born of water" refers to baptism, that therefore I admit that baptism saves figuratively. He assumes that my position is that "wash away" is literal. I have never intimated such a thing, but it suits Editor Folk to demolish a position of his own creation rather than give attention to my real positions. In his desperation he makes all of John 3:5 and Acts 22:16 figurative. Why does he not tell us what is figurative and what is literal? He writes as though the man of John 3:5 is figurative, the water is figurative, the Spirit is figurative, the kingdom of God is figurative, and the salvation is figurative. This figures out all real salvation. We would think from his language that in Acts 22:16 "arise" is figurative, "be baptized" is figurative, and "sins" is figurative. This leaves no real sins to be remitted.

Figures are based on facts. If "water" is figurative, what is the real thing? Will my opponent affirm "water" is figurative? The scorn of reason lies on such an affirmation, and the honest heart spews it out as a vile conception. Everything in the context shows that "water" must be taken literally. It is not "born as," like, or so, but "born of water." By no law of language can it be said truly "water" is used metaphorically. What is true of "water" is true of "man," of "Spirit," and of "the kingdom of God." All critics and scholars agree that "born" is metaphorical. As one is born of his mother, so must one be born of water and the Spirit. There is a decided resemblance between the natural birth and the birth of the water and the Spirit. The scholarship of the world teaches the phrase "born of water" refers to baptism.

I indorse the statement of Dr. Graves, who said it refers to baptism and that "no Baptist we ever heard or read of ever believed otherwise until Alexander Campbell frightened them away from an interpretation that is sustained by the concensus of all scholars of all denominations in all ages." Will Editor Folk accept the position of his own brother and witness? "Wash away" in Acts 22:16 is metaphorical. Sins are not literally washed away; they are remitted. This will not be questioned. Hence Saul, the penitent believer, was baptized unto the remission of sins. He was baptized into the death of Christ. He thus enjoyed the benefits of Christ's death. "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission." This ruins the theory of salvation by faith only.

Editor Folk *assumes*: "If we are saved by faith, we are saved at faith." When we are saved by faith, faith goes with us to the end of the journey of life. This is clear from the word of God. "For therein is revealed a righteousness of God from faith unto faith: as it is written, But the righteous shall live by faith." (Rom. 1:17.) The faith which justifies makes steps: "And the father of circumcision to them who not only are of the circumcision, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham which he had in uncircumcision." (Rom. 4:12.) The Holy Spirit further teaches that the faith that saves is that which works through love. "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith working through love." (Gal. 5:6.) Since faith comes by hearing the word of God (Rom. 10:17), the one who hears and does the will of God is justified by faith. Faith

is not something *at* which a man is saved, but is that by which he walks. "For we walk by faith." (2 Cor. 5:7.) How long do we walk by faith? Until death. The Holy Spirit, writing to those who were Christians, and hence already enjoying salvation in the kingdom of God, says: "Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls." (1 Pet. 1:9.)

If a man travels by the Nashville and Chattanooga Railroad from Nashville to Chattanooga, he goes by that road all the way. If he were to stop *at* Wartrace, he would never reach Chattanooga.

He contends that a man is saved *at* faith. He draws a line *at* faith. A man is lost before he reaches this line of faith, and after he reaches it is saved for time and eternity, though that faith be a dead one and does not lead him to one act of obedience. The first step in obedience is taken by faith, which goes with us all the way, and is not something *at which* we are saved and then stops, but goes forward in obedience, working through love.

My opponent has repeatedly throughout this discussion assigned me positions which I do not believe and which I have disavowed. He assumes the construction he puts on my language is true, and proceeds to destroy the child of his own creation. Truth demands no such weapon of defense, and all honorable discussion forbids it. Such a course would be branded as downright discourtesy in business. If he can stand it, I can; for I am sure even his Baptist readers know it is a shallow artifice to hide his most crushing defeat.

Here are a few of his assumptions and misrepresentations: "But it is very curious how, while Brother McQuiddy insists that he accepts these pas-

sages in their obvious meaning, he immediately turns around and argues against the passages and does his best to persuade his readers that the passages that ascribe salvation to faith are not true; but that something must be added to faith before the person can be saved, such as baptism, works, obedience, etc." Why did he not give the language? Simply because I never used such language. I believe with all my heart we are saved by faith.

The Holy Spirit denies we are saved by faith alone. (James 2:24.) It did not suit his purpose to say "faith alone," so he must charge me with doing something I do not believe and never said. Neither do I add anything to faith, for every act of obedience commanded of God belongs to faith, is a part of faith, and is inseparable from it. Even Editor Folk cannot separate faith and obedience, for he says: "My position is that faith in the heart leads to obedience in the life." If I add something to faith, so does he. A greater than either of us teaches that faith and works are inseparable. (James 2:14-26.) If he should make a similar charge again, what will our readers think of him? I plead with them to find no fault with the man, but to remember that a weak cause is hard to defend. He charges me again with teaching: "And if he sins, according to Editor McQuiddy, then he is lost." This is no further from what I have taught than falsehood is from truth. I believe and teach that all sin, but there is a *law of forgiveness* to the Christian who sins. "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we *confess* our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

(1 John 1:8, 9.) Will he assign a reason for such misrepresentation, if it is not because he is not able to meet my real position?

While I have said it is immaterial to my position as to whether the thief was or was not baptized, he bases all his argument on the position that his baptism is material to my position: "I must insist, though, that it is absolutely material to his position." No, but this *assumption is absolutely* material to his argument. He can make no argument unless he denies me the right to state my own position even in the words of the Holy Spirit: "For where a testament is, there must of necessity be the death of him that made it. For a testament is of force where there hath been death: for it doth never avail while he that made it liveth." (Heb. 9:16, 17.)

Christ was not dead when he spoke to the thief on the cross. Christian baptism was not in force at this time. Thousands were saved without baptism who lived in the patriarchal and Jewish dispensations. What a dust he can raise over what is "*absolutely material*" to his argument, though not to my position!

Because I, with the Holy Spirit, teach salvation by grace (Eph. 2:8), by faith (Rom. 5:1), by works (James 2:24), by baptism (1 Pet. 3:21), by hope (1 Rom. 8:24), and by the blood of Christ (1 John 1:17), I am charged with teaching "there are several ways." I have shown that these all enter into the one salvation—that every responsible, informed man is saved in precisely the same way—and that he cannot strike out one item in this chain. However, Editor Folk strikes out every item but "faith only." He makes "faith only" the cause of salvation. The Holy



Spirit ascribes salvation to all of these and he teaches one way of salvation. "For narrow is the gate, and straitened the way, that leadeth unto life, and few are they that find it." (Matt. 7:14.) Whenever Editor Folk can reconcile how we are saved by all these with "there is only one way," he will have no difficulty in understanding my position. It is time he was proving that he does not array scripture against scripture. He must give up his affirmation, "We are saved by faith alone," unless he persists in contradicting the Scriptures, We are saved by works (James 2:24), by baptism (1 Pet. 3:21), by hope (Rom. 8:24 and other scriptures). Instead of this, however, it suits his position better to charge that I teach different ways of salvation, which I have repeatedly denied. The charge is against the Holy Spirit, and not me.

I must pass unnoticed other misrepresentations, such as teaching a baptismal salvation and that I have denied the doctrine of salvation through faith.

He assumes that, baptism is "a physical, external, material, if I may not say mechanical, affair." "It is physical, and not spiritual."

Where did he learn faith and repentance are spiritual and baptism is physical? *Not* in the Bible. Where did he learn one command of God is more spiritual than another? In his creed, but not in the Bible. Man is composed of soul, body, and spirit. God is a Spirit. The Spirit of God operating on the spirit of man affects the physical man, which leads to spiritual results and service. If Editor Folk is right, why does the Holy Spirit admonish: "Present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your spiritual

service?" (Rom. 12:1.) The obedience of the body to the commands of God leads to a spiritual service.

That baptism is physical and not spiritual is far from the truth. Baptism is from the heart. "But thanks be to God, that, whereas ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered." (Rom. 6:17.) He who regards it as simply a physical act, apart from the exercise of the heart, should take some lessons in the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, who said of his own baptism: "Suffer it now; for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." (Matt. 3:15.) When the Holy Spirit teaches that baptism is the interrogation of a good conscience toward God, he puts it on a much higher plane than a mere bodily act. (1 Pet. 3:21.) Baptism as a mere bodily act is not Christian baptism. I have never contended for a baptism that was not preceded by repentance toward God and faith in Christ. Such a baptism would be sheer mockery in the sight of God. It is the essence of folly to call a command of God, obedience to which involves the heart, a physical, and not a spiritual, act.

## **"Faith and Obedience."**

---

### **REPLY XI., BY J. C. McQUIDDY.**

The gospel plan of salvation is a system of redemption. It delivers its subjects from sin, guilt, and bondage. It contemplates a new creation—a transformation of man in body, soul, and spirit. It is, therefore, a system of physical, spiritual, and moral means for the accomplishment of its glorious end. Hence, its doctrine, its commands, and its promises are developments of the plan of redemption, originating in the goodness of God, guided by his wisdom, and perfected by his omnipotence.

This gospel system is not without parts, and each of these parts has its own peculiar object. No one can be substituted for the other. Faith cannot be substituted for repentance, holiness, or righteousness; it is a means to these ends. It is, indeed, indispensable to each and every one of them. Blot out faith, and the others have no existence in the life. Reading, prayer, and meditation are means of sanctification. Any one without the other would be incomplete and incompetent to the end to be attained. The same is true of the positive institutions of the remedial system. Baptism, the Lord's day, and the Lord's Supper are indispensable provisions of redeeming grace. Baptism is the acceptance of the provisions of the grace of God for saving men. "Not by works clone in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regenera-

tion and renewing of the Holy Spirit." (Tit. 3:5.) Not one of the means or conditions can be dispensed with by any one who desires the perfection of the Christian state and character. Eating, sleeping, drinking, and exercising are all essential to the preservation and enjoyment of the human system. In the face of these indisputable facts and of the teaching of the Holy Spirit, the following language from Editor Folk sounds like blasphemy: "If we are saved by faith, we are not saved by works." The Spirit says: "Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith." (James 2:24.)

Our readers should not lose sight of the fact that God saves and that the system of salvation provided by his grace is not of the works of man. Man's works had nothing to do with the provisions of grace. The same grace that offers salvation to every man has ordained good works "that we should walk in them." (Eph. 2:10.) Grace does not save unconditionally or without means. In the sense of producing, causing, or furnishing salvation, neither faith, nor repentance, nor baptism, nor righteousness does so. It is impossible to see any more natural fitness in belief than baptism to produce salvation. The fact is, neither does it. God produces, furnishes, or generates salvation. There is nothing in faith to produce salvation. If so, faith in the Chinese idol will save. "Even so ye also, when ye shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do." (Luke 17:10.) When we believe, we do not produce salvation or merit it. When we are baptized, we do not merit it. Salvation is a gift, a gratuity; and when we

have done our duty, we are unprofitable servants. In the light of truth we cannot teach: "Repentance and faith are ever and everywhere essentially the same. And they ever and everywhere produce the same result—salvation."

Faith and repentance are no more spiritual than baptism. Salvation affects the body, soul, and spirit. Faith and repentance are works as well as baptism. "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent" (John 6:29.) Belief is a work that God has ordained for man to do. It is not God that believes, but man. He does God's work in believing. The same is true of repentance, as it is also ordained of God. Baptism is also authorized by God and is a work of God. "And Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground." Stop here, and we have the lifeless lump of clay, the body without the spirit, which is dead. (James 2:26.) "And breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." (Gen. 2:7.) When the dead form or body received 'the breath of life, man became a living soul. This spirit controls and directs the body. It holds it together. When the spirit goes out of the body, it dies and crumbles back to dust, from which it sprang. So God moves upon the body of man through the spirit of man. The physical, springing from spiritual causes, affects the physical man. The Lord's Supper, springing from a spiritual source, affects both the physical and spiritual man. The man is moved upon by the Spirit of God operating through the truth, and moves the physical man to observe this institution, so that the spiritual may be fed and strengthened. Baptism, ordained of God, commanded by Christ, and origina-

ting only in spiritual causes, affects the physical man The spirit of man in baptism, in the most passive submission, bows to the authority of God, the great spiritual source of all good.

In all ages, obedience to the commands of God has affected the physical man. It is the essence of absurdity to talk about obedience not affecting the body. Obedience affected the physical in the case of Noah. He built the ark. Abraham offered Isaac on the altar. Moses forsook Egypt. Rahab hid the spies.

The truth is abundantly established by the Bible that the spirit, soul, and body must work together in obedience and service to God. "And the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Thess. 5:23.) Our bodies shall be fashioned anew and conformed to the body of Christ. "Who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, according to the working whereby he is able even to subject all things unto himself." (Phil. 3:21.) The body is a temple of the Holy Spirit. "Or know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have from God? and ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price: glorify God therefore in your body." (1 Cor. 6:19, 20.) We glorify God in the body by keeping the body in subjection to the Spirit. "But I buffet my body, and bring it into bondage: lest by any means, after that I have preached to others, I myself should be rejected." (1 Cor. 9:27.) "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy,

acceptable to God, which is your spiritual service." (Rom. 12:1.) In like manner obedience in baptism is spiritual. If not, why not?

A man is fighting God when he opposes the doctrine of obedience applying to the whole man—body, soul and spirit. The Bible is full of doing the will of God. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven: but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven." (Matt. 7:21.) "Marvel not at this: for the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment." (John 5:28, 29.) "So then, my beloved, even as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God who worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure." (Phil. 2:12, 13.) "And whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through him." (Col. 3:17.) "And to you that are afflicted rest with us, at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of his power in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus; who shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might." (2 Thess. 1:7-9.) ". Though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation." (Heb. 5:8, 9.) "Wherefore,

brethren, give the more diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never stumble." (2 Pet. 1:10.) "Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have the right to come to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates into the city." (Rev. 22:14.) "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou dost not commit adultery, but killest, thou art become a transgressor of the law." (James 2:10, 11.) it is needless to multiply other passages, for to deny obedience to the law of Christ leads to salvation is to deny the teaching of the Holy Spirit.

There is absolute and relative perfection. God is absolutely perfect. Jesus did not claim to be absolutely good until made perfect through suffering. (Mark 10:18; Heb. 2:10.) Perfection in man would not be perfection in an angel. Jesus lived an absolutely sinless life. Noah was the one faithful man in the midst of a faithless generation, yet he got drunk. In faith Abraham towers far above those of his clay, yet he practiced deception. The grace that brings salvation and requires obedience to Christ has made provisions for those who sin. When man repents of his sins and prays for forgiveness, God forgives. "Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray the Lord, if perhaps the thought of thy heart shall be forgiven thee." (Acts 8:22.) "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (1 John 1:9.) "And if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is



the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world." (1 John 2:1, 2.) Though a man commit many sins, if he is not willful and confesses them, God will forgive. "Come now, and let us reason together, saith Jehovah: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." (Isa. 1:18.) The blood of Christ will not make as white as snow the sins of the man who willfully persists in adultery. He becomes guilty of all. I cannot accept for one moment that faith is obedience—that the man who professes faith is saved, though he is guilty of lying, stealing, adultery, theft, covetousness, and the entire catalogue of sins. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

We are not under the Ten Commandments as such. The Jew only was commanded to keep the Sabbath. If Editor Folk is under the law of Moses, he should not work any on Saturday, or the Sabbath. The covenant made with the house of Israel and of Judah was not faultless. "For if that first covenant had been faultless, then would no place have been sought for a second. ... In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. But that which is becoming old and waxeth aged is nigh unto vanishing away." (Heb. 8:7-13.) The old law served its purpose, when it was done away in Christ. (2 Cor. 3:14.) "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also were made dead to the law through the body of Christ." (Rom. 7:4.) "So that the law is become our tutor to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But now that faith is come, we are no longer under a tutor." (Gal. 3:24, 25.) As the purpose of the law was to lead to

Christ, Christ fulfilled and did not destroy the law. The law was perfect as a tutor to lead to Christ. For its uses it was as perfect as the new covenant for its uses. The sun is 110 more perfect for his than the moon for her uses.

Where Moses gave us *a* precept, Christ has given us a better. This shows the laws are not identical. The very fact that the Savior discriminates between adultery in the heart and in the life should be convincing evidence that faith alone is not obedience in life. Sin is conceived in the heart before it is clothed in action. (James 2:15.) Faith in the heart leads to obedience in the life. Eve believed a lie, and that belief led to disobedience. Belief of the truth always leads to obedience.

Editor Folk says: "To desire what belongs to another is stealing." It is covetousness, and not stealing. I gave Mr. Lard's rule in quotation marks. I approved it. The rule has not been answered. The case of the rich young ruler was before Christ died, and therefore has no bearing on the question. "For a testament is of force where there hath been death: for it doth never avail while he that made it liveth." (Heb. 9:17.) It is said the Lord saw Leah was hated. In another scripture it is said Jacob loved Leah less than Rachel. So it is said a man must hate his father, mother, and other relatives, and his own life, to be Christ's disciple. The man who loves Christ less than these is unworthy of Christ.

Editor Folk's illustration of one thousand dollars is not true to the facts. There are four witnesses testifying on salvation. Now let us have four witnesses testifying to the fact Mr. Folk contracted to

pay for a house one thousand dollars, but that no witness names the entire amount. John says he paid five hundred dollars in money; Matthew says he gave a horse, one hundred and fifty dollars in value; Mark tells of a horse and buggy, two hundred and fifty dollars in value; Luke tells of a mule, one hundred dollars in value. Add the amounts, the result is one thousand dollars. Thus we see all the witnesses tell the truth, and there is no conflict. But, according to Mr. Folk's rule, the house may be bought according to the contract for less than five hundred dollars, and yet the contract calls for one thousand dollars. The correct position is: According to John's evidence, the contract may call for more than five hundred dollars, but not less. So with the amounts named by Matthew, Mark, and Luke. If we make it less than the amount named by Luke, which was one hundred dollars, then we falsify John, who says he paid in money five hundred dollars. So if we adopt Editor Folk's rule and make salvation depend on less than faith alone, we falsify the Holy Spirit, who said, through Mark: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." By his rule he now makes salvation depend on less than faith. His rule falsifies the following scriptures: "According to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit." (Tit. 3:5.) "Wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved through water: which also after a true likeness doth now save you, even baptism, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Only baptism is named in 1 Pet. 3:21 as saving. According to

Mr. Folk's rule, salvation may depend on less than baptism, but never no more. So he cuts out by his rule both faith and repentance. (1 Pet. 3:20, 21.) "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it; that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word." (Eph. 5:25, 26.) "For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ." (Gal. 3:26, 27.) "And brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house. And they spake the word of the Lord unto him, with all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, immediately." (Acts 16:30-33.) Faith comes by hearing the word of God. (Rom. 10:17.) They spoke "the word of the Lord" so he could hear and believe. The preaching of the word of the Lord was such that led him to be baptized immediately. His belief was not less than faith alone, but a faith that led to baptism. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

## **"Salvation By Faith or By Works?"**

---

### **REPLY XII. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.**

As the plan of salvation has been fully developed in my last two articles, I shall notice a few of the inconsistencies of Editor Folk. He says: "Repentance and faith, are ever and everywhere essentially the same." In another article he says: "And even people in Christian lands who know about him, but who do not believe in him as the Son of God, the Savior of the world, are brought to repentance." Men without faith are brought to repentance, and yet faith is repentance. We are seriously told men without repentance are brought to repentance!

"Repentance and faith are ever and everywhere essentially the same;" but "wherever the two are mentioned together, the Scriptures always put repentance before faith." That is, a thing precedes and goes before itself! It is vain to talk about different kinds of faith, as the Holy Spirit says: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." (Eph. 2:5.) Faith differs in degree, but not in kind.

The order of faith and repentance is not essential to this discussion. A man cannot make a mistake in their exercise if he would, cannot put the cart before the horse. It is no evidence, however, that because a thing is mentioned first it occurs first. Try a scriptural example: "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, hanging him on a tree." (Acts 5:30.) According to the order argument, he was

raised up, slain, and afterwards hung on a tree. The facts reverse this order. Take another: "He is like *a*. man building a house, who digged and went deep, and laid a foundation upon the rock." (Luke 6:48.) According to the order argument, the house stands in the air without a foundation.

Repentance should come first in Mark 1:15. As has already been shown, the Jews were to repent of having sinned against God and were to believe the gospel as good news, not in fact. Christ, who preached to them, had not at that time died, been buried, and risen again. (1 Cor. 15:3, 4.) The death, burial, and resurrection of Christ "according to the scriptures" constitute the facts of the gospel. These Jews had been raised up to believe in the true God. After a godly manner they needed to sorrow for their sins, thus changing the purpose of their lives, that they might be ready to receive and accredit the good news. The same reasoning may be applied to Acts 20:21: "Testifying both to Jews and to Greeks repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." These Greeks were not Gentiles; they were Jews who spoke the Greek dialect, and were either outside of Judea or had been proselyted from the Gentiles. The word "Hellenist" is a better translation of the Greek. The same word in the original is in Acts 6:1, where we know it could not refer to the Gentiles. The "Helleesin" of Acts 20:21 and "Helleeniston" of Acts 6:1 have an entirely different meaning from the "Ethnesin" ("Gentiles") of Acts 11:18. Therefore, these persons believed in God, and were most earnestly urged to "repent toward God." They were not to repent in Christ before they believed him, for such

would be impossible. No man ever repented of sin before he believed he was guilty of sin. No man can repent toward Christ unless he first believes in Christ. These men believed in God and were required to adjust their lives in harmony with their faith, so that they would be better prepared to accept the truth concerning Christ. Moreover, no man can please God without faith. "And without faith it is impossible to be well-pleasing unto him; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek after him." (Heb. 11:6.) It is, therefore, clear that the first possible approach toward God is to believe in him. "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." (Rom. 14:23.) If repentance goes before faith, it is not of faith, and is therefore sin. The idea, therefore, that repentance toward Christ precedes faith in Christ is contrary to both reason and Revelation.

The Ninevites heard the preaching of Jonas, believed, and repented. The Pentecostians hearing, believed, repented, and were baptized. Paul wrote the Corinthians a letter; they read it, believed, and sorrowed to repentance. There is not an exception to this rule in the oracles of God.

Editor Folk has affirmed repeatedly: "We are saved by faith alone." He claims the only condition of salvation is faith as named in John 3:16. He now says: "Where salvation is promised to a person, or affirmed of him on certain named conditions, though it may depend on less conditions than those named, it can never depend on more." Therefore salvation may depend on less than faith. This is plan No. 2 according to Editor Folk. "We say that in order to be saved

a person must repent of his sins and believe on Christ trusting to him as his personal Savior," says Editor Folk. This is his plan No. 3. The editor of the *Baptist and Reflector* also holds the position that the man who persistently and willfully refuses to be baptized after he has been scripturally informed on the duty of baptism will be lost, not because not baptized, but because his heart is not right and his conversion not genuine. This is plan of salvation No. 4.

Editor Folk says I misrepresented Jeter. I quoted Jeter's language. He seeks to make it appear that "means" as used by Jeter is not used in the sense of "condition." According to the Century Dictionary, "means" is much wider and broader than "condition." One meaning to the word is "the way or manner of doing a thing." Webster gives as a meaning of the noun "mean," which is now almost invariably used in the plural, "a necessary condition." Misrepresent indeed! But Editor Folk knows what Jeter meant, though he did not say it! He knows assertion is not proof, but adopts this shallow artifice to evade the force of an unanswerable position.

The facts concerning "another gospel" shall speak for themselves. In our issue of April 19 I held that Editor Folk was adding to and tampering with the word of God when he teaches he that believeth is saved actually. To warn him of his danger, I quoted Gal. 1:9. He then said: "And it sounds much stranger still to hear that person now claiming that the gospel which Paul preached was a gospel of works, and that the other gospel to which he referred in Gal. 1:8 was the gospel of salvation by faith." I said nothing of the kind, and laid down no premise that



gave the shadow of an excuse for such an unwarranted assertion. The truth is, I believe the gospel system has its parts, that each has its own peculiar object, and that no one part can be left out or substituted for the other without making a system different from the gospel system. This is just what Editor Folk has done. He has preached the gospel of faith alone. Paul did not preach a gospel of "faith alone" to the Galatians. When Paul wrote them, they were children of God. "For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3:26.) How "through faith" did they become sons of God? "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ." (Verse 27.) The Galatians through faith in baptism "did put on Christ." This is the gospel Paul preached to the Galatians; it is the gospel system with each part performing its proper function. Editor Folk preaches a man is saved by faith alone, and therefore by faith alone puts on Christ. Having seen what Paul preached is different from what Editor Folk preaches, the warning of Paul to him is much needed and should be heeded: "But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema." (Gal. 1:8.) It would be far more honorable in my opponent if he would attend to my clearly denned positions and cease to ascribe to me positions which I do not believe. This would be more creditable to both his heart and head.

D. L. Moody gives Mr. Folk much concern. "Mr. D. L. Moody was a believer in Christ. He was a pious man. He lived a consecrated Christian life, devoted to the service of his Master," says Editor Folk. If

all this be true, he was certainly informed as to the duty of baptism, and refused or neglected to be baptized. We will let Editor Folk tell us whether he is saved or lost: "Our reply to the question was that such a man could not be saved, not because he was not baptized, but because such a deliberate and persistent refusal upon his part, after having been thus fully informed as to his duty, would show that his heart was not right and that his conversion was not genuine." Folk has hung himself on the gallows he erected for me. He is so singularly perverse, if I were to say he is lost, he would again contradict himself by saying he is saved; so I will go right on teaching "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." He tells us Mr. Moody was a believer in Christ, and yet was not baptized, or immersed. Again, he tells us: "It is true those who believed were baptized." As he was not baptized, he did not believe. "He that disbelieveth shall be condemned." It is not the weakness of Editor Folk that he is not consistently inconsistent, but it is the weakness of his cause. Truth is consistent with itself.

Editor Folk tells us of the establishment of the church: "Just at what time he established his church . . . cannot be determined exactly." It is not denied that the church was in existence on the day of Pentecost. He finds it not in existence when the disciples, just before Christ's ascension, asked: "Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" He says of Christ's answer: "In his reply he indicated to them that his kingdom was not to be a temporal, but a spiritual, one. If his kingdom was to be, it was not yet established." This is a very few days before

Pentecost, and yet Editor Folk tells us the church is yet "to be." I insist he tell us when it was established. We are now at least forty days this side of the death of the thief on the cross and still before the establishment of the church. Thousands were saved before the church was founded without baptism. It has been most conclusively shown that the conditions of salvation are not the same in all ages. It is wholly immaterial with me whether the thief was or was not baptized, since his salvation was before the death of Christ. (Heb. 9:16, 17.) All that I said as to the probability of the baptism of the thief was to show that no one knows whether he was or was not baptized. Lie now says: "We do not, 'of course, know that the thief on the cross was not in the number of those baptized." In trying to give an example of a believer who neglected or refused to be baptized after the church was established, he says: "Well, the thief on the cross was one example." When pressed to state what he does know, he frankly says he does not know; but when pressed in argument, he assumes to know as a matter of fact what he says he does not know. A lame cause must be bolstered up by assumptions, and then it will not stand.

The order argument concerning "born of water and of the Spirit" has already been demolished in the extract on the order of faith and repentance. A chair may be born of water, but not of the Spirit. The believer is born of water in obedience to the Spirit, and thus "born of water and the Spirit."

Editor Folk's position on the order of faith and repentance would make division and strife in heaven Between God and the angels. The Bible order which

the *Advocate* holds makes perfect harmony between God and the angels. God is pleased and the angels rejoice. A man believes and then repents. God is pleased "Without faith it *is* impossible to be well-pleasing unto him." (Heb. 11:6.) "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." (Rom. 14:23.) A man believes and then repents. The angels rejoice. "I say unto you, that even so there shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine righteous persons, who need no repentance." (Luke 15:7.) Try Editor Folk's order: A man repents and then believes. The angels rejoice. (Luke 15:7-10.) A man repents and then believes. God is displeased. (Heb. 11:6; Rom. 14:23.) So Editor Folk, in contending for an order that would create strife in heaven, has displeased God. I insist that he make an effort to reconcile his position with the Bible, and commend him to the mercy of the reader while he seeks to bring order out of chaos. I challenge him to his own issue, and in all confidence assure our readers he will never be able to sustain the issue he was so anxious to raise as to the order of faith and repentance. Where faith and repentance are exercised together as principles, it has been shown there is always some faith before any repentance. I have taken Editor Folk's guns from him by showing the scriptures quoted by him prove faith before repentance.

Editor Folk makes two births, while the Holy Spirit makes one birth, of water and the Spirit. In reality he makes every man born three times. Jesus said to a man: "Ye must be born again." "Born of water" does not refer to the natural birth, for this occurred with Nicodemus and occurs with every one

before Jesus says to him: "Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

We are seriously told that in Acts 2:38 the preposition for "in" is "epi," which means "on" or "upon." In Westcott and Hort, the Greek text almost universally recognized as the best and which Mr. Folk quotes approvingly, the preposition is "en," and not "epi." I challenge a denial of this statement. In the *Emphatic Diaglott*, by Wilson, which is from the Vatican manuscript and which is not regarded the best by critics, the preposition is "epi." This is an interlinear word-for-word English translation. Waiving the point of the best text, let us accept Editor Folk's version: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you, trusting on, relying upon, the name of Jesus Christ, unto the remission of your sins." If repentance relying upon the name of Christ is unto remission, so is baptism. Each is for identically the same purpose. Repentance and baptism relying on Christ are inseparably united, both looking unto the remission of sins. Will Editor Folk analyze the sentence and show us how repentance relying upon Christ is unto the remission of sins, and baptism relying on Christ is not unto the remission of sins? Then let him show us how, since repentance and baptism are tied together by the copulative conjunction "and," one can be unto the remission of sins and the other "because of" the remission of sins. If a man may repent relying on Christ to save him, why may he not be baptized relying on Christ to save him? Since in baptism a man is passive, and not in repentance, Editor Folk's own version shows

that a man trusts Christ to save as much in baptism -as in repentance. If not, why not? He says the doctrine of the "Disciples" is: "A person goes into the water unsaved, he comes out saved; he goes in a goat he comes out a sheep." I may add the doctrine of the Baptists is: The Spirit of God takes a live goat and kills him. He goes in a dead goat and comes out a dead goat. And worst of all, if the Spirit of God does not kill the goat, he must be lost eternally, though he was so created he could do nothing until God's Spirit killed him. When he is killed by the Spirit, he believes, is dead to sin, is saved for time and eternity without obedience to the law of God. He is now free from all law.

He tells us "eis" looks forward in Acts 2:38, but could not do otherwise unless he made repentance because of the remission of sins. But he cites Matt. 12:41 to show that "eis" looks backward, and not forward. "The men of Nineveh shall stand tip in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a greater than Jonah is here." The preposition is "eis," which usually means "into." A few writers contend it means here "in consequence of," a meaning foreign to the word. It is true, as a matter of fact, that the Ninevites repented in consequence of Jonah's preaching; but if it had been the purpose of the writer to express this thought, he would have used "dia" instead of "eis." The thought and intent of the passage are very different from this. They repented into the preaching of Jonah. This is not idiomatic English, but conveys the exact thought a Greek would derive from the original. Their repentance, in

other words, brought them into the course of life which the preaching required. Their repentance did not stop with the internal change which they underwent, but it brought them into the condition which the preaching demanded, looking unto deliverance from the threatened destruction. The rendering "at the preaching" does not bring out in full the idea, but is the best we can do without adopting an awkward circumlocution. We find the same difficulty in translating "eis" by "at" in Acts 8:40: "But Philip was found at Azotus." "But Philip was found into Azotus" expresses the full idea in Greek, though it is not a correct English idiom.

## **"Salvation By Faith."**

---

### **1.REPLY XIII. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.**

Editor Folk begins his article by telling us "there is not much in the article of Brother McQuiddy that needs answer," yet he stretches out his reply to about five and one-half columns solid print. He reminds me very much of the young drummer who was on a visit to his best girl. He wanted to make a good impression on the "old man," who was religious; so when called on to offer thanks, he made the effort. He said everything of which he could think, and wound up by quoting the second psalm, failing completely to offer thanks. His friend, after dinner was over, asked him what in the world he meant by saying and quoting so much. He replied he was trying to "p'int" the thing. If Editor Folk has reached the point, no one will be able to discover it with a magnifying glass.

As to my infallibility, I have much confidence in the infallibility of every inspired word of God, and realize that all men are weak and fallible. Editor Folk, apparently, having no argument to offer, has a way of saying, when I quote a passage of scripture without giving any interpretation, simply allowing it to speak for itself, that I claim infallibility. When he puts an unnatural and unwarranted interpretation on a passage of scripture and assigns the unreasonable interpretation to me, I respectfully disavow the interpretation and call for the proof. Then he talks



about the pope and infallibility in order to cover his defeat, and charges that I change my position. He may deceive himself with this shallow artifice, but I am sure no honest reader will be deceived by such shallow pretensions. I sincerely hope the reader will be merciful, for Editor Folk must do something to attract attention from the fearful wreck his theology has suffered. It is true it would be more righteous to throw overboard his false dogmas, but we must not forget that "a drowning man catches at straws."

I quoted approvingly James 2:10: "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all." In reply Editor Folk says: "According, therefore, to James, and according to the editor of the *Advocate*, if a person offends in one point, if he sins in the least, if he violates God's law in any respect, if he fails to do his whole duty, if he slips anywhere, he is as guilty as if he had violated the whole law."

I, in humility, beg not to be assigned the same infallibility that is accorded the Holy Spirit. Editor Folk is the man who places the *Gospel Advocate* on the same basis with James, and then "scoffs" at the teaching of the Holy Spirit in James 2:10. He says: "According, therefore, to James, and according to the editor of the *Advocate*, thus classing the editor of the *Advocate* with James. Editor Folk may as consistently ask of James as of the editor of the *Gospel Advocate*, so far as the interpretation of James 2:10 is concerned: "When did he get to be infallible? When did he come to be the pope, whose interpretation of the Bible is infallible, and must not be doubted or disputed?" Editor Folk's course, to the extent of

his influence, would cast a suspicion over the inspiration of James 2:10, though he surely did not mean to do so. This passage knocks the heart out of his creed, so he appears to hate it as much as the imaginary monster, "Campbellism," which disturbs his waking thoughts and gives him such terrible nightmares that he suffers the most excruciating theological hysterics.

I think the proofreaders of the *Gospel Advocate* should be congratulated, as Editor Folk has found only one typographical error. I stated: "Printers err at times, as do other men. But there is another class of men singularly addicted to erring." Editor Folk boasted he had or could quote a thousand passages teaching salvation by faith. I looked up the word "faith," and found it occurred about two hundred and forty-three times. Editor Folk takes the words "faith," "faithfully," "faithful," "faithfulness," "believe," "believed," "believer," "believest," "believed," "trust," "trusted," "trustest," "trusteth." Multiplying by thirteen, he gets in round numbers eight hundred! Does he wish us to discount all his statements by over thirteen? As to the changes and omissions from the Improved Edition, I did not claim to give a critical count. I have gone over and made the comparison again. Barring mistakes in punctuation, I find only twenty-two in one article. Editor Folk's errors are like his theology; the more the light is turned on, the worse they get!

I have used the Standard American Edition of the Revised Version of the Bible. It is considered the best by scholars and critics. Editor Folk quotes from a translation of the Bible made by Baptists, and does

not even intimate he is so doing. If I were to quote from "Living Oracles," the translation of Macknight, Campbell, and Doddridge, approved by Alexander Campbell, with some slight changes, Editor Folk would exhaust his vocabulary to show that I could prove anything from such a source. This is exactly the course he has pursued without giving the version from which he quoted until I called for it. The Improved Edition is the Baptist edition of the American Bible Union Version. It is wholly unnecessary to occupy space to quote again the scriptures from the Improved Edition and from the Twentieth Century New Testament. I accept all these scriptures in their obvious meaning and have showed repeatedly they refer to the law of Moses. The Greek-English Lexicon, by W. J. Hickie, M.A., and used in the Westcott and Hort Greek New Testament, gives "the Mosaic law" as the meaning of "nomos," in Rom. 2:17, 18. I do not argue the justification of the Christian in obedience to the law of Moses. It is Editor Folk that contends we are under the Ten Commandments, Sabbath and all. The law of Moses could not free the Jew from sin, but their sins were rolled forward in obedience to it from year to year. The blood of Christ reached backward and wiped out their sins. "And for this cause he is the mediator of a new covenant, that a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, they that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance." (Heb. 9:15.)

The language as found in the Improved Edition, the Baptist translation of Gal. 2:16, does not teach the doctrine of salvation by faith alone. "Yet knowing

that a man is not justified by works of law, but only through faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by works of law; because by works of law no flesh shall be justified." This is showing that we are not justified by obedience to the law of Moses, but only through faith in Christ Jesus. Justification only through faith in Jesus Christ and salvation by faith only are as far apart as the poles. Justification only through faith means that salvation to which faith leads, using all the means of faith and cutting off all means and instrumentalities not of faith. Salvation by faith alone means justification by a dead faith, cutting off all the means through which faith saves. It is well understood by all Bible students that justification is only through Christ, and that it is not through Christ alone. God, the Holy Spirit, and other agencies, all have much to do with justification. Yet there is no justification without Christ, and it may be appropriately added there is no justification through Christ only by the use of the means he has ordained for our justification. Take a scriptural example: "While he yet spake, there cometh one from the ruler of the synagogue's house, saying, Thy "daughter is dead; trouble not the Teacher. But Jesus hearing it, answered him, Fear not: only believe, and she shall be made whole. And when he came to the house, he suffered not any man to enter in with him, save Peter, and John, and James, and the father of the maiden and her mother." (Luke 8:49-51.) This restoration to life was only through belief or faith, and not without faith. But this same faith in Jesus led the father to follow Jesus and to enter

the house with him. So it is only through faith in Christ to-day. Faith leads us to follow Jesus, to do whatsoever he commands us to do. If the father had refused to follow and enter the house with Jesus, he would not have "only believed." When a man believes Christ, he will obey him. The *Gospel Advocate* has emphasized repeatedly that salvation is through faith, that faith is essential to the acceptance of the means of justification. While the American Revised Version does not give "only" in Gal. 2:16, I have no objection to Hovey's translation. Let us see if Editor Folk will accept his own witness as quoted by me.

There has never been any issue between the *Gospel Advocate* and the *Baptist and Reflector* as to whether or not we are saved by faith. A man could blot out the sun or create a world as easily as please God without faith. The issue is, who has faith? Editor Folk writes as though a man has faith who refuses to obey one single command of God. The man of faith, with him, is saved without all law, is saved without obedience to any law, while giving himself over completely to his appetites and baser passions. With him the man of faith is saved, though he be guilty of adultery, lying, drunkenness, stealing, and the whole catalogue of sins. I am persuaded our readers have not so read the Bible: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousies, wraths, factions, divisions, parties, envy-ings, drunkenness, revelings, and such like; of which I forewarn you, even as I did forewarn you, that they who practice such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." (Gal. 5:19-21.)

Lest some one may imagine I am misrepresenting Editor Folk, as his position appears so ridiculous, I give only a brief extract from much he has said of the same kind: "When one has believed on Christ, he has fulfilled the law. He receives righteousness, or Tightness, or salvation. That is the end of all controversy about it. It settles the matter. The law has no further claims upon the person. ... I should be glad, for instance, to quote the whole of the third and fourth chapters of Romans and the third chapter of Galatians. They make very interesting reading and completely demolish the claims of any one that salvation is a matter of works, or law, or obedience, or anything of the kind." Editor Folk, while contending for a dead faith, has repeatedly complained of the high degree of faith taught by the *Gospel Advocate*. We have held up no higher type or degree of faith than that taught from the first of Genesis to the last of Revelation.

I am sure that all our readers well understand that no man is given in the Bible as an example of faith who refused or neglected to do what God commanded him to do. The Holy Spirit defines faith in Heb. 11:1: "Now faith is assurance of things hoped for, a conviction of things not seen." He then, to help us better understand what it is, knowing that verbal definitions are hard to understand, gives us a number of examples of faith. By faith Noah built the ark. by faith Abraham offered Isaac on the altar, by faith Abel offered unto God an acceptable sacrifice. If Abraham had refused to offer Isaac on the altar, would the Holy Spirit give him as an example of faith? Nay, verily. If Noah had declined to build the ark, would

the Holy Spirit point to him as an example of faith? Most emphatically, no! What Editor Folk calls faith is not faith at all. The man who refuses to be baptized does not have faith. When Editor Folk has the faith he should have, he will not exhaust his vocabulary of adjectives in ridiculing obedience to Christ.

Every argument he has attempted to make against obedience to Christ can be turned with crushing effect against the position of Editor Folk, if his arguments . only had weight enough in them to crush anything.

Editor Folk being the judge, the informed man as to baptism who neglects or refuses to be baptized has not genuine faith and his heart is not right. He says: "Our reply to the question was that such a man could not be saved, not because he was not baptized, but because such a deliberate and persistent refusal upon his part, after having been thus fully informed as to his duty, would show that his heart was not right and that his conversion was not genuine." He says, again: "What we have said is that they will be lost because their heart is not right, their faith is not genuine."

Then, according to Editor Folk, the man who neglects or refuses to be baptized has not genuine faith. Faith is essential to salvation, and no man who is informed and refuses or neglects to be baptized has genuine faith; therefore, according to Editor Folk, baptism is essential to salvation in order that a man may be saved by faith. If a refusal to obey Christ in baptism shows the faith not genuine, then a refusal to obey Christ in any of his commandments will prove the faith not genuine, and, therefore, the man cannot be saved because his heart is not right. If this

position of Editor Folk does not make obedience to the commands of Christ essential, what does it do? When Editor Folk is fortunate enough to occasionally agree with the Bible position, he gets frightened because he finds himself in company with what he discourteously labels "Campbellism."

Editor Folk is in a bad plight. The man who refuses to do is lost because his faith is not genuine and yet salvation is not "a matter of works, or law, or obedience, or anything of the kind." Take either end of the dilemma he may, his position is ruined.

Editor Folk's own scholars are giving him much trouble. The ten thousand little Baptists whom he could first put against Hovey and Hackett he claims now to put on the side of truth with them. I cannot speak for the ten thousand Baptists, but I shall show that Editor Folk does not accept the teaching of his own scholars and that he repudiates the teaching of Alvah Hovey, whom he tells us has given the best translation of the Bible. Commenting on Acts 22:16, Hovey says: "Of course there is no such thing possible as a literal washing away of sins. A removal of sins from the soul by bathing the body in water is absurd. But there is such a thing as forgiveness of sins; and this may be described figuratively as washing them away, so that henceforth the soul may be clean from the guilt or stain of sin. Dr. Hackett remarks, 'that this clause (*and wash away thy sins*) states a result of the baptism in language derived from the nature of the ordinance. It answers to *unto the forgiveness of sins* in Acts 2:38—*i. c.*, submit to the rite in order to be forgiven. In both passages, baptism is represented as having this importance or effi-



cacy, because it is the sign of repentance and faith, which are the conditions to salvation." (Appendix to "Commentary on John," page 420.)

I represented Hovey as teaching of baptism that Ananias commanded Saul to submit to the rite in order to be forgiven. To this Editor Folk replies: "I beg pardon, but Dr. Hovey did not teach any such thing. Here is what Hovey said: 'Of course, there is no such thing possible as a literal washing away of sins. A removal of sins from the soul by bathing the body in water is absurd. But there is such a thing as forgiveness of sins; and this may be described figuratively as washing them away.'" Editor Folk ends the quotation from Hovey by breaking off at a comma and leaving out "so that henceforth the soul may be clean from the guilt or stain of sin." Why did he leave out this clause which teaches the truth he has combated in vain throughout this discussion? I challenge him to accept as true the clause which he left out. Whenever he does, he openly repudiates all he has taught in this discussion. He has taught that men were saved *at faith*, and that they had no sins to be forgiven when they came to baptism. Will he explain to us why he left out the clause that teaches the very doctrine that he does not accept and believe? But worse for him still, he leaves out part of the quotation from Hackett which is approved by Hovey. The very part left out sustains my contention and exposes his misrepresentation of both of his great scholars. "Dr. Hackett remarks, 'that this clause (*and wash away thy sins*) states a result of the baptism in language derived from the nature of the ordinance. It answers to *unto the forgiveness of sins* in Acts 2:

38—*i. e.*, submit to the rite in order to be forgiven" My contention is that both Hackett and Hovey teach that we are to submit to the rite of baptism in order to be forgiven. Why does Editor Folk leave out the very words that sustain my contention? Surely he would not have done so had the words of his own scholars sustained him.

As we have already quoted from both Hackett and Hovey, let me requote a few passages from Hovey and from Hackett as quoted by Hovey. Hovey says of Acts 2:38: "Here repentance and baptism are represented as leading to the forgiveness of sins." Of Acts 22:16 he says: "Of course there is no such thing possible as a literal washing away of sins. A removal of sins from the soul by bathing the body in water is absurd. But there is such a thing as forgiveness of sins; and this may be described figuratively as washing them away, so that henceforth the soul may be clean from the guilt or stain of sin." Dr. Hackett remarks "that this clause (*and wash away thy sins*) states a result of baptism in language derived from the nature of the ordinance. It answers to *unto the forgiveness of sins* in Acts 2:38—*i. c.*, submit to the rite in order to be forgiven."

Hovey, in commenting on 1 Pet. 3:21, concludes with this sentence: "Baptism, therefore, saves because it stands for and means genuine reliance for the first time upon the mercy of God in Christ, and, indeed, an earnest request for pardon; it expresses the act of the soul in turning to God, committing itself to God, and seeking his grace." Thus we see Hovey teaches that both repentance and baptism lead to the forgiveness of sins; that "wash away thy sins

answers to "unto the forgiveness of sins" in Acts 2:38; and that while there is no such thing as a literal washing away of sins, that people are to submit to baptism in order to be forgiven. This is the doctrine for which I have contended throughout this discussion. Editor Folk represents Hovey and Hackett as teaching the truth of the Bible. Then the truth of the Bible is that repentance and baptism lead to the forgiveness of sins, that people are to submit to baptism in order to be forgiven, and that "wash away thy sins" answers to "unto the forgiveness of sins" in Acts 2:38. This does not sound like a man is saved by "faith alone," that he is saved by faith really and actually before and without baptism. It is in harmony with the teaching of Christ when he said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

As I have taken from Editor Folk both Hovey and Hackett, his own great guns, what will he do? Will he scour the country over to find some Baptists who will write in private letters that they are extremists and not representative Baptists? Will he say of them, as Pollard said of Willmarth: "He no longer takes any part with Baptists?"

As he is discourteous enough sometimes to call those "Campbellites," who teach the truth on the subject of baptism and remission, we may not be surprised if he calls his own scholars "Campbellites."

Editor Folk seeks to extract a little comfort from the teaching of his scholars. While they teach repentance and baptism lead to the forgiveness of sins, and that "baptism, therefore, saves," and that we are to submit to the rite in order to be forgiven, they also teach, in both passages (Acts 2:38; 22:16), "bap-

tism is represented as having this importance or efficacy, because it is the sign of repentance and faith which are the conditions of salvation."

As has already been taught by me in this discussion, there is always an inward change that precedes baptism. I have never doubted that the baptism that saves is an expression of our faith in the Lord Jesus' Christ. In the very act of baptism, when in humility we bow to the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, we proclaim our repentance to the world. Nothing could more fitly symbolize our own inability to save and our trust in God to save us. A candidate for baptism submissively surrenders himself to the administrator; his eyes are closed, his hands folded over his breast, his breath suspended; and thus yielding up himself, he goes down beneath the yielding wave, calling upon the name of the Lord. While he knows there is no virtue in the water to save, and that "a removal of sins from the soul by bathing the body in water is absurd," he has faith to believe that God has power to forgive sins, and, when in trust and obedience he submits himself to God, that God will forgive, just as he cleansed Naaman, the leper, when he had dipped seven times in the Jordan in obedience to the command of God. This I understand Hovey, Hackett,

Willmarth, and other noted Baptist scholars to teach; but no one of them teaches that baptism saves figuratively, as does Editor. Folk. Editor Folk says: "Hovey, Hackett, Graves, and every other Baptist teaches 'that baptism is an expression of faith,' and none of them teach that it saves except figuratively. I deny that Hovey, Hackett, and Willmarth teach that baptism saves figuratively. Hovey teaches that

"there is such a thing as forgiveness of sins," and that this forgiveness of sins is "described figuratively as washing them away, so that henceforth the soul may be clean from the guilt or stain of sin." This teaches exactly the opposite of the contention of Editor Folk that baptism saves figuratively. The real thing, the forgiveness of sins, is described in the figurative phrase "wash away." Editor Folk again misrepresents his own great gun, Dr. Hovey, as teaching that baptism saves figuratively. He has taken unwarranted liberty with the quotations from his own authors. He does not follow their Italics, but Italicizes to suit himself, thus trying to make them teach and emphasize something which they do not intend. He accuses me of garbling his authors; this I deny. I quoted them to get their meaning of "eis" in Acts 2:38. I did not quote all their comments because I did not have space to do so. I quoted from Hovey as he was quoted in Shepherd's "Handbook on Baptism." One sentence was dropped out in the "Handbook on Baptism;" and as I did not have Hovey before me, of course I did not discover it. The sentence dropped out was this: "A removal of sins from the soul by bathing the body in water is absurd." I believe this sentence and would have been glad to have had it in the quotation. I shall be glad to give it decided emphasis in this discussion. I have never believed nor taught the doctrine of "baptismal regeneration." While this was unintentionally dropped out of the "Handbook on Baptism," it in no way combats the doctrine that I am upholding; but when Editor Folk goes to dropping out, he drops out the very thing that destroys his theory and upholds

the Bible doctrine. Why the difference? In view of these facts, I am justified in saying to Editor Folk: "Thou art the garbler."

When Baptist scholars come in the way of Editor Folk, he goes to work and writes over the country getting up private letters to show that they are not representative Baptists. While the article in the *Baptist Quarterly*, from which I quoted, was written some thirty years ago, E. B. Pollard writes: "(2) Dr. Willmarth is broken in health and for years has represented nobody but himself, but you can say upon good authority that in his latter days Dr. Willmarth modified his views. (3) The views expressed in the article in 1877 did not and never did represent the views of Baptists of this section." Thirty years have passed away. Dr. Willmarth is broken in health, and Mr. Pollard adds: "Dr. Willmarth has always been regarded as an extremist and not as a representative Baptist; he never takes any part with Baptists." This is bad treatment for Dr. Willmarth. Perhaps he is so old and infirm that he cannot now take part with Baptists. The infirmities of flesh would naturally make him less vigorous.

But as I am set for the defense of truth, and not error, I shall defend Dr. Willmarth from the unjust attacks of his own brethren. Let me show that J. W. Willmarth was a representative Baptist when he wrote that article in the *Quarterly* of 1877. When Brother J. W. Shepherd was preparing "Biographical Sketches" for "Handbook on Baptism," he wrote a letter to Dr. George D. Boardman, Philadelphia, Pa., asking: "Can you give me any information concerning J. W. Willmarth, a Baptist minister who once

lived in Pemberton, N. J?" This letter was referred to J. W. Willmarth, who wrote:

"Roxborough, Philadelphia, February 16, 1893.— Dear Sir: Yours to Dr. Boardman was sent by him to Mr. Henry E. Lincoln, and by him referred to me.

I have been pastor of the following Baptist Churches: Metamora, Woodford County, Ill.; Amenia, N. Y.; Wakefield, Mass.; Pemberton, N. J., 8 1/2 years; Roxborough, Philadelphia, since April 1, 1878 (nearly 15 years), where I still am. I was editor of the *Advanced Quarterly* and other publications on the International Sunday school Lessons of the American Baptist Publication Society, in 1882-1883. . . . Have been moderator of the West New Jersey and of the Philadelphia Baptist Associations, of the Philadelphia and Trenton Conferences of Baptist Ministers, etc. I am a member of the Board of American Baptist Publication Society, chairman of its Committee of Publication, trustee of Crozer Theological Seminary, on the City Mission Board, and a member of the Nugent Home. In 1889 received the degree of D.D. from Carson College (Tenn.) and LL.D. from Southwestern Baptist University (Tenn.)."

This is a pretty good record, and does not look like he is not a representative Baptist. Certainly he has held a number of positions of distinction and honor.

As to the standing of J. W. Willmarth, it is now in order to quote from Cathcart's Encyclopedia, which is a recognized authority among the Baptists and comes from Philadelphia, the home of J. W. Willmarth. The copy from which I quote bears date of 1881, four years after the article, "Baptism and Remission," was published in the *Baptist Quarterly*. It says:

"He [Willmarth] is a writer of great power, and he uses a prolific pen. His articles on 'The Future Life' and 'Baptism and Remission,' in the *Baptist Quarterly* show much originality, and produced a profound impression upon cultured men of God.

"No one stands higher in the estimation of his friends, but all that know him may be reckoned among the number. His position on any subject is very decided; he knows nothing of half-heartedness; his thoughts are as transparent as a sunbeam. He shuns no responsibility in defending any truth; he avoids no sacrifice in assisting a friend. He is an able preacher, with a noble intellect, ardent piety, and a bright earthly future, if his slender frame will permit him to stay on I earth for a few years."

My opponent is a great man, but can he show as high standing among the Baptists?

He tells us no Baptists ever taught, "Submit to the rite in order to be forgiven." We have seen that both Hovey and Hackett teach this; so he has turned them out of the Baptist ranks. And he must know Christ is not in the Baptist ranks; for he teaches, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

I quoted Dr. J. R. Graves to show that he said that he taught this. This Savior says: "Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

As Graves said "born of water" means baptism, no man can enter the kingdom of God unless he is baptized, Graves being judge. I have never taught that Graves was always consistent with his teaching. A man holding an error cannot always be consistent. The



long quotation from Graves is clear proof of this. While Graves and my opponent say baptism saves figuratively, God never said it. Men have no right to say baptism saves figuratively unless the Holy Spirit so declares.

## Salvation Through Faith, Not of Works.

---

### ANSWER XIII. BY E. E. FOLK, TO X. XI. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.

There are a good many things in the last articles of the *Advocate* to which I might reply, but I can notice-only the main points. Besides, much of what the *Advocate* says in these articles is simply a reproduction of what has been said before, and to which I have already replied.

At last the *Advocate* comes out in the open and boldly announces its position on the plan of salvation. It has done this tentatively before in different articles; but when I would show the falsity and unscripturalness of the position, it would draw back and deny that it ever took any such position. The editor of the *Advocate* has now gone too far, however, to draw back. This, in brief, is its plan of salvation: A man "must believe that God is," and that he himself is a sinner; must repent of his sins, and must be baptized for the remission of his "past sins." He must then "obey God's commandments" and "do his whole duty." He must "keep the whole law" and not "offend even in one point." If he does, he must at once "repent" and "confess" his sins, or he will be lost. In other words, salvation is a matter of *obedience*, not of *faith*. It is physical, not spiritual, because true obedience, he contends, must be a physical act. It is dependent upon our own actions, not upon God's grace.

Over against this plan of salvation proposed by the *Gospel Advocate* I put the simple plan laid down

in the New Testament of salvation by grace through faith, not of works (Eph. 2:8), of repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ (Acts 20:21). The fundamental words in Christianity are *sinner*, *Savior*. To these correspond the two words in the plan of salvation—*repentance*, *faith*. *Sinner*, *repentance*; *Savior*, *faith*. When a person has repented of his sins and believed on Christ, he is saved. (John 3:16, 36; 5:24; Acts 16:31.) *Repentance* springs from a godly sorrow and leads to a change of mind and of heart and of life, which does not need to be changed again. *Faith is a personal trust on Christ as a personal Savior*. Salvation, dealing with the soul, is a spiritual matter, not a physical one. No physical act can effect the cleansing of the soul. Our hearts are purified by *faith*. (Acts 15:9.) *Physical acts* are the outcome, the expression, the fruit of salvation, but they do not bring salvation. Fruits *show* the tree; they do not *make* the tree. Works *show* the Christian; they do not *make* the Christian. We are *sored to work*. (Eph. 2:10.) We do not *work . to be saved*.

Here is the issue between Brother McQuiddy and myself. The issue is broad and deep. It is the difference between salvation by faith and salvation by works; between salvation by grace and salvation by obedience; between salvation by God and salvation by ourselves; between the spiritual and the physical; between hope and despair; between life and death; between heaven and hell. For, as I have shown before, while any one may be saved by the plan of salvation which I advocate and which is taught in the Scriptures,

*no one* can be saved by the plan which Brother McQuiddy advocates, *not even himself*.

But let us notice some of the points made by Brother McQuiddy in his two foregoing articles. He makes Eccles. 12:13, 14 his fundamental premise. "This is the end of the matter; all hath been heard: fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God will bring every work into judgment, with every hidden thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." (Eccles. 12:13, 14.) True, it is the "whole duty of man" to "fear God, and keep his commandments." But does any one keep his commandments "perfectly?" Can any one do his "whole duty?" The position of the *Advocate* is that one must do his "*whole duty*" to be saved. My position is that it was *exactly because we could not keep God's commandments* perfectly, and could not do *our whole duty*—in other words, because *man was a sinner*—that it became necessary for Christ to come into the world and die in man's stead, taking man's place under the broken law, himself fulfilling the law perfectly, as man had not done and could not do, and thus enabling him to offer himself as man's substitute under the law as a Savior from sin. By his *fundamental premise*, therefore, the editor of the *Advocate rejects the gospel and goes back to the law as his dependence for salvation*.

"The different specific acts constituting obedience have been different in different ages." To this I object: (1) This makes salvation a matter of obedience; (2) it makes salvation depend upon the "acts of each person, not on his faith; (3) as it is a question of "specific acts" of *each person*, there are as many

plans of salvation as there are different persons in the world, or, at least, as there are different ages, which is absurd and impossible. It is astonishing that such a doctrine should be seriously put forth, and especially by any one claiming to be a Christian, and particularly any one claiming to belong to "the Christian Church." The doctrine scarcely amounts to respectable nonsense. It is an utter *perversion*, and, in fact, a *nullification*, of the gospel of Christ.

Paul explains in the third chapter of Galatians how it is that the law is "our tutor to bring us unto Christ." The law shows us our sinfulness and our need of a Savior, and so brings us to the foot of the cross. In fact, in the very same verse in which Paul says, "The law has become our tutor to bring us unto Christ" (Gal. 3:24), he adds, "that we might be *justified by faith*"—not by *law*, not by *works*, not by *obedience*, but by *faith* in Christ. This all seems so simple that I wonder any one should not see it. Hear Paul again: "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, That the man which doeth those things shall live by them. .But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ clown *from above*;) Or, Who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead.) But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, *even* in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach; That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For

*with the heart* man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the Scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed." (Rom. 10:4-11.) Could anything be plainer, clearer, stronger? If Paul had had the arguments of Brother McQuiddy before him, how could he have answered them more effectually?

"The Jew was justified in obedience to the law of Moses." Well, yes, *if he obeyed that law perfectly*. But if, not, then he had to depend for his justification upon *the Savior to come*. His sacrifices and offerings were intended to *express his faith* in that Savior, "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." (John 1:29.)

"After the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, men believe the gospel in fact, repent of their sins, and obey the commands of the gospel." But *before* "the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ," men believed the gospel in fact—not the facts of the gospel which *had occurred*, but the facts which *were to occur*—the glad tidings, the good news of the coming Messiah, the Savior of the world. *The cross of Calvary cast its shadow both backward and forward*. Not even *after* the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, however, were men required to "obey the commands of the gospel" to be saved. *After*, as *before*, what they needed was simply to repent of their sins and believe on Christ. It was "*after* the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ" that Paul said that "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," was "the whole counsel of God," the very sum and substance of the plan of salvation. (Acts 20:21, 27.) "*After* the death, burial, and resurrection of

Christ," Paul said: "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. 5:1.) It was *"after the death, burial, and resurrection"* that Paul said to the jailer, in response to the question, "What must I do to be saved?" *"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved."* (Acts 16:31.) In Acts 17:34 we are told that "certain men clave unto him and believed: among the which was Dionysius, the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and others with them." "Believed." We are not told that they were baptized or that they were required to obey God's commandments. Were they not saved? In Acts 18:8 we are told that "Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house." Was he not saved?

We do not have to put Matthew, Mark, and Luke together in order to get the gospel. Christ gave it to us when he said, at the very beginning of his ministry: "Repent ye, and believe the gospel." (Mark 1:15.) He expressed the gospel a little later, in his conversation with Nicodemus. (John 3:16.) John also expressed it. (John 3:36.)

"The apostles, acting under this commission, in obedience to Christ, require the same conditions to be complied with in order to salvation." Yes, the conditions of *repentance and faith*, as shown in the case of Philip (Acts 8:12), Peter (Acts 10:43; 15:9), Paul (Acts 16; 31; 20:21), etc.

"No man can be saved without faith." True. But that is not the question. Is a person saved only *by faith and at faith*, or is he saved *by faith and works and at works*? *That is the question.* "Faith is the

very groundwork of repentance." The very opposite is true. *Repentance is the very groundwork of faith* There can be no faith without repentance. Christ taught that when he said to the Jews: "And ye when ye had seen it, *repented not* afterward, *that ye might believe him.*" (Matt. 21:32.) As I have previously shown, wherever in the New Testament repentance and faith both are mentioned, it is *always* repentance first, faith second. "No conversion takes place without repentance." And "no conversion takes place without repentance" *as the foundation of faith, as the antecedent and condition of faith.*

"Under Christ the Holy Spirit has always required of responsible beings faith, repentance, and baptism." "Under Christ the Holy Spirit has always required of responsible beings" *repentance and faith for salvation, and baptism as the expression of repentance and faith.*

"All the conversions show most conclusively that baptism is a development of faith and marks the degree of faith at which God pardons." What about Dionysius? (Acts 17:34.) Crispus? (Acts 18:8.) They "believed." They were evidently saved. It does not say they were baptized, though they probably were. And even in cases of those of whom it is expressly mentioned that they had been baptized, it is *nowhere said* that they were baptized *in order to be saved.* Noah, Abraham, etc., were saved by *faith.* Their physical acts of obedience were simply *expressions of their faith.*

If I believed that salvation is a *matter of obedience*, that the "specific acts constituting obedience have been different in different ages," and that I, like



the Jews, am required to offer a goat as a sin offering *In order to be saved*, I should certainly be hunting up one, and that pretty soon. I believe that the plan of salvation is one in all ages of the world. It is ever and everywhere the same—"repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." The doctrine that the plan of salvation is a matter of "*specific acts*" on the part of individuals, which have been "different in different ages," is the doctrine of Editor McQuiddy. Just what is the "specific act" which he is required to do, I do not know. I imagine it must give him great concern to know what it is. It may be that he is required to offer a goat as a sin offering; and lest it should -be, I would advise him to be "hunting up a goat and a Jewish priest to make a sin offering for him," and to do it quick, lest he die before he has done the "specific act" required of him in order to be saved. In order to be sure that he does just the right thing, he might add a lamb and a bullock to the goat.

"It was the same blind theology that dethroned the reason of Freeman and led him to murder his own child in the name of religion." It was the theology of Freeman that salvation is a matter of *obedience* and that "specific acts constitute obedience." Freeman regarded the murder of his child as the "specific act" which constituted his obedience. In other words, it was such theology as that of *Brother McQuiddy* that dethroned the reason of Freeman, leading him to murder his child in the name of religion. The theology which I preach would have led him to repent of his sins and believe on Christ.

"The veil was done away in Christ." Instead of the

veil of salvation by the *law*, salvation by *obedience* salvation by *works*, has come the clear, pure gospel of salvation *by grace through faith, not of works* It is not true that "those who were not baptized did not believe." Dionysius believed. (Acts 17:34.) We are not told that he was baptized.

D. L. Moody believed. He was not baptized. In saying those who were not baptized were lost, Editor McQuiddy condemns to hell at one fell swoop, not only Dionysius and D. L. Moody, but all the pious unimmersed now and in all ages of the world. This is a fearful responsibility which he takes upon himself.

"The promise is to the baptized believer." The promise is to the *believer*. (John 3:16, 36; 5:24; 6:47; Acts 16:31; Rom. 5:1.) The illustration of printing and binding the book depends upon what it is *meant to illustrate*. If corresponding to *printing* you put *repentance* and to *binding* you put *faith*, the illustration illustrates God's conditions, but not otherwise. If, however, Editor McQuiddy should agree to print and bind an edition of one thousand copies of a book for me for \$500, and then when I went to get the book, and had paid the \$500, he should require me to pay \$100 more, and then should tell me that he could not deliver the *whole edition*, that only one hundred copies were bound, and that I should have to continue paying for the book until the whole edition was exhausted, and that if I failed to make any payment he would *take back all the books*, I confess that I should feel that he had treated me unjustly, and I would have a right to feel so. *That is just exactly the way he says God treats us in the plan of salvation*. If I may use

the expression reverently, I think it is a *slander on God*. "A refusal to do one thing God commands will condemn any one." And so we must do *everything* God commands or we will be condemned. This is true *if our salvation depends upon obedience to God's commands*. Paul said: "Cursed is every one that continueth not in *all things* that are written in the book of the law to do them." (Gal. 3:10.) James said: "For whosoever shall keep the *whole law*, and yet offend in *one point*, he is guilty of *all*." (James 2:10.) I do not think that it is necessary for us to keep the "whole law" *to be saved*, but Brother McQuiddy *does*. And if so, we must not fail in even *one point*. "A refusal to do *one thing* God commands will condemn any one."

I beg pardon. As I have said, I do not make all of John 3:5 and Acts 22:16 figurative. Only part of Acts 22:16 is figurative—"wash away thy sins." It simply expresses in a figure, in a beautiful object lesson, the cleansing of the soul which had taken place through the blood of Christ. (1 John 1:7.)

The editor of the *Advocate*, however, raises a very serious question. He says that "Saul, the penitent believer, was baptized unto the remission of sins. He was baptized into the death of Christ. He *thus* enjoyed the benefits of Christ's death." He then quotes: "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission." In other words, the editor of the *Advocate* takes the position that the only way to "enjoy the benefits of Christ's death" is *in baptism*. He makes the shedding of blood equivalent to baptism, or, at least, that we come in contact with the blood in the

water. He puts the *water before the blood*. And yet he dares to quote Dr. J. R. Graves to sustain such a theory! It is enough to make the old hero turn over in his grave and again utter his clarion note, which he so often uttered in life, "*The blood before the water*" (as he did in the little book, "Christian Baptism," from which I quoted in my last article). "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John 1:7.) If the blood cleanses from all sin, we do not need the water to cleanse. They cannot both cleanse in the same sense. The only explanation which will harmonize the passages is that the *blood cleanses really* and the *water figuratively*. The water simply expresses in a symbol the *inward cleansing* which has taken place in the soul *through the blood*.

"I have contended throughout this discussion that in baptism we commit ourselves to God in order that we may be saved by grace through faith." I reply:

1. If we are "saved by grace through faith," we do not need to commit ourselves to God in baptism. We have already committed ourselves to God by *faith*.

2. But Brother McQuiddy has made no such contention. He has contended that in baptism we are saved from "past sins" by baptism, and that to be saved from *future* sins we must keep on obeying the law.

"When we are saved by faith, faith goes with us to the end of the journey of life." Certainly. But we have already been saved by *faith*. The end, the result, of our faith is the salvation of our souls. (1 Pet. 1:9.) When we have faith to accept Christ as our personal Savior, we are saved. The Christian, however, continues to have faith in Christ, and that

faith expresses itself in constant works of gratitude and of love. Faith is both something *at* which a man is saved and that *by* which he walks. If a man travels by the Nashville and Chattanooga Railroad from Nashville to Chattanooga, he travels *at* as well as *by* that road. He does not need to take any other road to reach Chattanooga. That is sufficient. If he were to start on that road, stop at Wartrace, and say that he is not satisfied with the railroad as the means to carry him to Chattanooga, and he proposes to take it afoot the rest of the way—well, what would you think of such a man? That is just precisely what Brother McQuiddy proposes to do in his combination of faith and works in the plan of salvation. He is not satisfied with being saved *by* faith and *at* faith, He insists on adding works as a part of the plan. He is not satisfied with letting the Lord save him by simply trusting himself to the Lord. He wants to help save himself.

Certainly, I draw the line of salvation at faith. The I Scriptures continually do, as I have quoted over and over. But let me ask Brother McQuiddy again: Where *do you draw the line of salvation?* I insist on an answer. Mind you, it is not a question simply of salvation from "past sins," but salvation from sins—past, present, and future.

"Shallow artifice to hide his most crushing defeat" is not the language of "honorable discussion." It is rather the language of the prize ring. It sounds more like the braggadocio than the minister of the gospel. As to which of us has suffered "defeat," "crushing" or otherwise, in this discussion, I do not consider that it is becoming in us to say. I prefer to leave that to our

readers. I might quote some expressions from the on the subject, but I do not care to do that here it has nothing to do with the question in dispute as to what is the plan of salvation.

As to whether I have misrepresented Brother McQuiddy's position. I prefer to leave that also to our readers. Let me say that I would not intentionally misrepresent any one, and certainly not an opponent in a discussion. I insist that I have not misrepresented Brother McQuiddy, but that the construction I put on his language is the only logical and proper construction of it. He has repeatedly contended that faith by itself is not sufficient to save, but that something must be added to faith before the person can be saved, such as baptism, works, obedience, etc.

Brother McQuiddy says: "If I add something to faith, so does he." Yes, but in a different sense. I add baptism, works, obedience, etc., as the *fruit*, the *result* of saving faith, *because we are saved*. He adds them as a *necessary part* of the plan of salvation, *in order that we may be saved*. And there is a world of difference between the two positions. Brother McQuiddy denies that he teaches the doctrine that if a Christian sins he is lost. He calls it a "falsehood." If he can stand such language, I can. He has a number of times, however, quoted James 2:10 to substantiate that doctrine. But he says: "There is a law of forgiveness to the Christian who sins." What is that "law of forgiveness?" He says he must "confess his sins. But why the need of a "law of forgiveness," if the Christian who sins would not he lost if he is not forgiven? Why "confess" his sins? Suppose for

some reason he does not confess his sins, will he be saved?

After doing his best to get the thief on the cross baptized, Brother McQuiddy now gives him up as a hopeless case, and says: "Christian baptism was not in force at this time." He thus makes a complete surrender of his first claims that the thief was baptized. But is it true that "Christian baptism was not in force at this time?" Was not John's baptism Christian baptism? Was not the baptism of the apostles Christian baptism? Was not the baptism of Christ Christian baptism?

Brother McQuiddy denies that he teaches that there are "several ways" of salvation, but adds immediately that "these all enter into the one salvation," thus admitting in one breath what he denied in the previous one. "One salvation" and "several ways" of attaining it are different things. All admit there is only one salvation. The question in dispute is: How is it to be attained, in one way or several ways? I say in *one way*, the way of salvation by grace through faith in Christ. He says in several ways, as follows: By faith, works, baptism, hope, blood of Christ. Notice: (1) Brother McQuiddy puts the blood of Christ last in this plan—after faith, works, baptism, hope. (2) He makes not only baptism, but works, a part of the plan of salvation—that is, as he expressed it before, a person must "save himself" by his own works. Now listen to Paul: "Not of works, lest any man should boast." (Eph. 2:9.) We are saved by grace through faith. (Eph. 2:8.) Works are the fruit of faith. Baptism saves in a "figure." (1 Pet. 3:21.) It is the answer of a "good conscience." The conscience

must be good before baptism. We are saved by hope means we are saved in anticipation. We are saved by faith in the blood of Christ, the blood of Christ being the procuring cause and faith the instrumental cause of salvation. After first denying, then admitting, that he teaches "several ways" of salvation, and telling what those ways are, Editor McQuiddy turns right around and denies that he teaches "different ways of salvation."

Baptism has a spiritual significance, but it is a physical act; while repentance and faith are not physical, but are entirely in the realm of the spiritual, though their results are often physical. "Baptism as a mere bodily act is not Christian baptism." Certainly not. It is a bodily act with a spiritual significance. "I have never contended for a baptism that was not preceded by repentance toward God and faith in Christ." Brother McQuiddy is coming to a knowledge of the truth. Notice the order in which he puts repentance and faith. Baptism preceded by repentance and faith expresses in a figure, in a beautiful object lesson, the death to sin, accomplished in repentance, and the resurrection to a new life, accomplished in faith. (Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:12.)

I said that "if salvation depends on less conditions" than those named, "it will, of course, be simply *through the grace of the one who lays down the rule.*" Otherwise it cannot depend on *less* conditions, as certainly it cannot depend on *more* conditions than those named.

The second article of the *Advocate* editor can be answered briefly. The *Advocate* editor says: "Baptism is the acceptance of the provisions of the grace of



God for saving men." To prove this he then quotes Tit. 3:5: "Not by works done in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit." Either this passage does not prove the statement of the *Advocate* above, which I think is the case, or the *Advocate* means by it to claim that "washing of regeneration" is baptism, and that regeneration is a matter of "washing" or of baptism; in other words, as Alexander Campbell expressed it, that "regeneration is equivalent to immersion." The emphasis in the passage, however, is on regeneration, not on washing, and the "washing of regeneration" is *the washing which comes through the blood, not through water.*

Yes, God has "ordained good works 'that we should walk in them.'" But the *Advocate* seems to forget Paul's expression in the preceding verse, that we are "*created* in Christ Jesus unto good works." We are "*created in Christ Jesus*" before we can produce good works. We are "created" in him by repentance and faith.

"There is nothing in faith to produce salvation." But there *is* something in faith to *procure* or *receive* salvation. Faith is the *grappling hook* which lays hold on Christ, the *nexus*, the *link*, which binds us to Christ, the *means* by which we receive him into the soul. Those who believed received. "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." (John 1:12.)

"Faith and repentance are no more spiritual than baptism." Perhaps not, as Brother McQuiddy seems

to understand "faith and repentance." But repentance and faith, true repentance and true faith, saving repentance and saving faith, *repentance and faith in the plan of salvation*, are certainly *much more spiritual than baptism*. They are in the realm of the *spirit*, and so spiritual; while baptism is in the realm of the *body*, and so physical, though, as I have said, it has a spiritual significance.

"Faith and repentance are works as well as baptism." Well, that may be true of *faith and repentance*, as Brother McQuiddy understands them; but *repentance and faith* are not the works of man, as is baptism, but they are the *works of God in the heart*. (John 6:29.) Both baptism and the Lord's Supper are physical acts with spiritual significance. Repentance and faith are not physical, but spiritual.

"In all ages obedience to the commands of God has affected the physical man." Obedience to *some commands* of God—yes, but not obedience to *all the commands* of God. Take the Ten Commandments. The first, third, fifth, ninth, and tenth are distinctly in the realm of the mind or the spirit, and not of the body, while the others are also, as interpreted by Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount. The doctrine of obedience may apply to the "whole man, body, soul, and spirit," but the *essence of obedience* is in the *heart*, not in the *act*.

The *Advocate* again quotes James 2:10: "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all." (James 2 10.) James meant to show by this that it was *impossible for any one to be saved by obedience*, because if he attempted to do so, it was necessary for

him to keep the whole law in every respect, which would be impossible. The position of the *Advocate*, however, is that one must "keep the whole law" *in order to be saved*. But the *Advocate* claims that "there is absolute and relative perfection." The perfection of *God* is *absolute*, that of *man* is *relative*.

"When man repents of his sins and prays for forgiveness, God forgives." "Though a man commit many sins, if he is not willful and confesses them, God will forgive." In other words, the doctrine of the *Advocate* is, a person must keep the whole law to be saved. He must be *relatively perfect*. He may sin; but when he sins, he must repent and pray for forgiveness, and "if he is not willful and confesses his sins," God will forgive. But suppose a man does *not repent* of his sins. Suppose he should *not realize his sin* at the time, as was the case with David and with Peter. Suppose he should *not pray for forgiveness*. Suppose he should *die before he confesses his sin*. Then, what is to become of him? Would he be saved, according to this doctrine? Must not a man repent of *every sin*, confess it and pray to God for forgiveness, under penalty of damnation in case he fails to do so? Suppose a man has the habit of confessing his sins and asking for forgiveness at the close of each day; but suppose he should have *forgotten some of his sins* and he should fail to ask for forgiveness for *them*, what about it? If baptism saves one from "past sins," why should not a man be *baptized every night* in order to save him from the sins of that day? The only trouble about that, however, is that he might die some time in the middle of the day. Then what? O, to what infinitesimal conclusions the doctrine of

the *Advocate* leads! It is worse than tithing anise and cummin. How absurd, how absolutely ridiculous how hard, how difficult, how impossible, the plan of salvation it teaches! In what contrast is it to the simple gospel doctrine of "salvation by grace through faith, not of works."

"We are not under the Ten Commandments as such." *Jesus said we were.* He said that he "came not to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfill them." (Matt. 5:17.) Fulfill them in a higher, nobler sense, lifting them out of the realm of the *physical* and putting them in the realm of the *spiritual*, making obedience to them a matter, not of act alone, but of *thought, of the heart.* We are still under obligations to keep them, *all of them*, the Sabbath day as well as the others. The only difference is that the Sabbath day has been changed from Saturday to Sunday.

"The old law served its purpose, when it was done away in Christ." The law "was done away in Christ" as a *method of salvation*, but not as a *rule of life.* In the latter sense it is still as strongly in force as ever, and even more so.

"Where Moses gave us a precept, Christ has given us a better." Yes, but not a precept *contrary* to that of Moses, not a precept *abrogating* that of Moses, but a precept *fulfilling* the precept of Moses and giving to it a *new and higher meaning.* As I have said before, it is not necessary to put together the testimonies of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John in order to get the plan of salvation. Jesus expressed it in Mark when he said: "Repent ye, and believe the gospel." (Mark 1:15.)

I did not say that salvation may depend on less

than faith alone. What I said was: "Where salvation is promised to a person, or affirmed of him on certain named conditions, though it may depend on *less conditions* than those named, it can never depend *on more*. If it depends on less conditions, it will, of course, be simply *through the grace of the one who lays down the rule*." It would seem surprising that Editor McQuiddy should thus take a part of what I said entirely out of its connection and should ignore the very next clause, which explains the meaning, and thus utterly pervert my meaning. But it is not so surprising that he should do me that way when he is continually doing that very thing to the Scriptures.

## Salvation By Faith or By Works?

---

ANSWER XIV. BY E. E. FOLK, TO XII. AND XIII. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.

In saying that "repentance and faith are ever and everywhere essentially the same," of course I did not mean that *repentance* is ever and everywhere the same as *faith*, but that *repentance* is ever and everywhere *the same* and *faith* is ever and everywhere *the same*. I presume that every one except Brother McQuiddy understood my meaning. I do not charge him with intentional misrepresentation, but simply with a little obtuseness, due probably to hurried reading.

I must insist that the order of repentance and faith is *essential* to this discussion, because *on their order depends their meaning*. With their true meaning of *saving repentance* and *saving faith*, it is *impossible* for faith to come before repentance. Besides, as I have shown, wherever in the New Testament the two are mentioned together, it is *always* repentance first and faith second, *without a single exception*.

The examples which the *Advocate* gives to prove that "it is no evidence that because a thing is mentioned first it occurs first" are not analogous to repentance and faith. These are *two nouns* of equal grammatical importance. They occur repeatedly together in the New Testament, always in the same order. Both of the cases given by the *Advocate* are participial phrases, containing a participle and verb, the grammatical construction of which requires the order in which the

words come. A slight verbal change in the sentences will serve to show their meaning. "Whom ye slew, by hanging him on a tree." "He is like a man who, in building a house, digged and went deep and laid a foundation," etc.

"No man ever repented of sin before he believed he was guilty of sin." But is that what it means to "believe?" Does it not mean *far more* than that? "No man can repent toward Christ unless he first believes in Christ." "Believes" in him *how*? With an historical belief as the Saviour of the world? Does not true faith mean a *personal trust on Christ as a personal Savior*? Can any one have such faith *before* he repents of his sins? Until he does repent, the sinner is not ready to accept the Savior, and the Savior is not ready to accept the sinner. The idea, therefore, that faith in Christ precedes repentance toward God is contrary to both reason and scripture.

I have previously shown how Brother McQuiddy perverted my meaning in regard to the conditions of salvation by leaving out the essential clause in his quotation from me.

The attempt to make it appear that Dr. Jeter advocated baptism, obedience, etc., as conditions of salvation is as unworthy of any Christian minister as it is a gross misrepresentation of Dr. Jeter, as shown in his book on "Campbellism Examined," from which I might quote at length if I had space. But it is unnecessary.

And so the *Advocate* admits having made a typographical error. I am surprised. I did not know that it ever made such errors.

The facts concerning "another gospel" are simply that Paul preached to the Galatians the gospel of *salvation by faith* and some one had been preaching to them *salvation by works*. Paul denounced this teaching as "another gospel." It is just such teaching as this that Brother McQuiddy has been putting forth all through this discussion, and is, therefore, "another gospel" from the simple gospel of salvation by grace through faith.

D. L. Moody gives me no concern, except as Brother McQuiddy condemns him, and all who like him were pious unimmersed, to hell with one fell swoop because they had not been baptized. I confess that *this does* give me a good deal of concern.

It has been most conclusively shown that the plan of salvation is and must be the same in all ages.

After exhausting every expedient to prove that the thief on the cross had been baptized, without success, Brother McQuiddy now says: "It is wholly immaterial with me whether the thief was or was not baptized, since his salvation was before the death of Christ." I insist, though, that it is *very material* to the argument of Brother McQuiddy whether the thief was or was not baptized. The plan of salvation being ever and everywhere the same, if the thief was saved without baptism, *so may any and every one be saved without baptism. Baptism, therefore, is not an essential part of the plan of salvation.* There is no escaping the conclusion. When the editor of the *Advocate* gives up the thief, as he now does, he gives up everything.

Brother McQuiddy makes this remarkable declaration: "A man repents and then believes. The angels rejoice. (Luke 15:7-10.) A man repents and then



believes. God is displeased. (Heb. 11:6; Rom. 14:23.)" It seems strange that the angels should rejoice and that God should be displeased over the same thing. The first of these propositions is true. The second is untrue, and is not sustained by the scriptures quoted to prove it. As to the order of repentance and faith in the plan of salvation, I have only to repeat that wherever in the New Testament the two are mentioned together, the order *invariably* is repentance first, faith second—*without a single exception*. Was this an accident? If this fact does not settle the matter, to one who believes the Bible, I do not know what will. I have quoted these passages. I can only refer to them here: Matt. 21:32; Mark 1:15; Acts 19:4; 20:21; Heb. 6:1.

"Where faith and repentance are exercised together as principles, it has been shown there is always some faith before any repentance." "Some faith," it may be, but not *saving faith*, not faith in its *essential meaning* of a personal trust on Christ as a personal Savior.

"'Born of water' does not refer to the natural birth, for this occurred with Nicodemus and occurs with every one before Jesus says to him: 'Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' 'Of course; but because the natural birth had already occurred, that was no reason why Jesus could not refer to it, but all the more reason why he should.

I was aware that Westcott and Hort used the preposition "en" in Acts 2:38. I was aware also of the fact, which Brother McQuiddy did not seem to know, that in almost all of the other Greek Testaments the word

"epi" is used. It is used, for instance, in Tischendorff one of the best Greek Testaments ever published, and considered, at least, equal to Westcott and Hort's. It is used in Nestle's Greek Testament, the latest and probably altogether the most satisfactory Greek Testament I was aware also that "epi" occurs in most of the manuscripts, except in "B," the manuscript on which the text of Westcott and Hort is mainly founded. This was what Dr. Broadus used to call their "darling." When they found any reading in "B," they would use that, regardless of the number of other manuscripts which might contain a different reading. Tischendorff, on the contrary, founded his text mainly on "Aleph," which is of equal importance with "B," both dating back to the fourth century and being the earliest Greek manuscripts now extant.

In my interpretation of Acts 2:38 I am not alone. In defining *baptize*, Thayer says: "*Epi to onomati Jesou Christou*, relying on the name of Jesus Christ— i. e., reposing one's hope on him." (Acts 2:38.) Thayer thus gives almost identically the same interpretation of the passage which I gave.

Winer says: "*Baptism upon (in) the name of Christ is baptism founded on the acknowledgment of his name. (Acts 2:38.)*" (Winer, page 393.)

The following quotation will be of interest here: "In the name ('epi') is here used—upon, resting or relying upon the name of Jesus Christ, be baptized 'for the remission of sins.'" Now who do you suppose said that? Some Baptist? No, it was David Lipscomb, one of the editors of the *Gospel Advocate*, in his "Commentary on Acts," in discussing Acts 2:38.

"If a man may repent relying on Christ to save

him, why may he not be baptized relying on Christ to save him?" Certainly he may—if *he relies on Christ to save him*, and not on baptism, nor on anything else.

The efforts of the *Advocate* to explain away Matt. 12:41, and to show that "eis" looks forward and not backward in this passage, are futile and almost ludicrous. It is impossible to understand the verse any other way but in the sense that the preaching of Jonah occurred *before* the repentance of the men of Nineveh, and that their repentance was *on account of* the preaching of Jonah.

Here is what Prof. J. W. McGarvey, president of the College of the Bible in the Kentucky University, at Lexington, Ky., says on this point. In his "New Testament Commentary," commenting on Matt. 21:32, Professor McGarvey says: "*That ye might believe.*" In the statement, 'ye repented not afterward, that ye might believe him,' the *dependence of their belief on previous regret is clearly assumed.*" Commenting on Mark 1:15, he says: "*Repent ye, and believe.* Jesus was preaching to persons who already believed *in the true God*, and in the revelation which God had already made, and his object at this stage of his ministry, like that of John, was to bring them to repentance *as a preparation for faith in himself and his kingdom.* This accounts for the order in which repentance and faith are here mentioned. To repent toward the God in whom they already believed, but whose revealed will they were violating, *naturally and properly* took precedence over believing in *him whom God was about to reveal.* It was not a necessary order, for some who had not repented toward God might

have been induced to believe in Jesus; but it was the more practicable order, and it enabled Jesus to begin his argument on common ground with his hearers. At the same time a penitent state of heart was *the best possible state of preparation for considering favorably the claims of Jesus, and for ready faith in him.*"

Winer gives the following as one of the meanings of *eis*: "*In reference to, as regards, with reference to.*" (Page 496.) In support of this meaning he gives the following references: "And because I doubted of such manner of questions, I asked him whether he would go *to Jerusalem*, and there be judged of these matters." (Acts 25:20.) "For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful *in the knowledge* of our Lord Jesus Christ." (2 Pet. 1:8.) "He staggered not *at the promise* of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God." (Rom. 4:20.) "Let every one of us please his neighbor *for his good* to edification." (Rom. 15:2.) "As the truth of Christ is in me, no man shall *stop me of this boasting* in the regions of Achaia." (2 Cor. 11:10.) "That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit *in the inner man.*" (Eph. 3:16.) "But speaking the truth in love, may grow up *into him* in all things, which is the head, even Christ." (Eph. 4:15.) "Likewise greet the church that is in their house. Salute my well beloved Epaenetus, who is the first fruits of Achaia *unto Christ.*" (Rom. 16:5.) Winer also gives the meaning "*occasion,*" and refers to Matt. 12:41: "The men of Nineveh shall rise up in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: be-

cause they repented *at the preaching* of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here." (Page 495.) If *eis* may have this meaning in one place—and Winer, the best Greek grammarian of the world, says that it has that meaning in one place, and a similar meaning in nine other places—then it may have it in another place. It will be entirely permissible, therefore, to translate Acts 2:38: "Repent ye, and be baptized, in reference to, as regards, with respect to, the remission of your sins, or with the remission of your sins as the occasion of your baptism."

Thayer, the best New Testament Greek lexicographer, gives as one meaning of *eis*: "*B. Used metaphorically. ... d. Of reference or relation; with respect to, in reference to, as regards.*" Thayer thus gives practically the same meaning of *eis* as Winer. Both sustain the Baptist position.

Green, in his "Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament," the latest and, along with Winer, the best New Testament Greek grammarian, gives the following meaning of *eis*: "*5. 'Into,' symbolically as marking the entrance into a state or sphere. (See under "en" 4.) So we enter *eis Christen*, into Christ, *actually by faith, symbolically by baptism*, Christians being *en Christo*, in Christ." That is exactly the Baptist position.*

I asked Dr. A. T. Robertson, professor of New Testament Greek in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and one of the finest Greek scholars in the land: "What is the meaning of *eis*?" He replied "*Eis* means 'in'—i-n." "Does it not mean 'into'?" I asked. "No," he replied, "it means *in*."

But Brother McQuiddy insists that *eis* means

"into." Then take these passages: "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that *believe on [eis] his name.*" (John 1:12.) "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever *believeth on [eis] him* should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John 3:16.) "He that *believeth on [eis] the Son* hath everlasting life." (John 3:36.) "He that *believeth on [eis] him* is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not *believed in [eis]* the name of the only begotten Son of God." (John 3:18.) "And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that *believeth on [eis] me* shall never thirst." (John 6:35.) "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever *believeth in [eis] him* shall receive remission of sins." (Acts 10:43.) "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have *believed in [eis] Jesus Christ*, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." (Gal. 2:16.)

In all of these verses the preposition for "on" and "in" is *eis*. Here, then, we have the statement in all of these passages that a person *believes into* Christ. He gets *into* Christ by *believing*. We have the further statement that such a person has "power to become the son of God," that he shall "have everlasting life," "hath everlasting life," "is not condemned," "shall never thirst," "shall receive remission of sins," "is justified by faith." What more does a person need to be saved?

Now, if a person *believes* into Christ, if he gets into Christ by *believing* on him, he is already *in* Christ and does not need anything else to complete the process. He cannot *believe* into Christ and be *baptized* into Christ in the same sense. The only way possible to harmonize the "believe into Christ" of all these passages with the being "baptized into Christ" of Gal. 3:27 is to understand that we get into Christ really by belief on him and figuratively by baptism. In other words, that we are saved actually by faith and that baptism simply expresses in a symbol the salvation which has been received by faith. This, in fact, was what Paul said: "For ye are all the *children of God* by *faith* in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have *put on* Christ." (Gal. 3:26, 27.) We become the *children of God* by *faith*. After that, we formally *put on* Christ to declare outwardly our faith in him. John says: "He that hath the Son hath life; he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." (1 John 5:12.) How do you get the Son? The passages I have quoted tell: Believe on him or into (*eis*) him.

Brother McQuiddy quotes my remark that "the doctrine of the Disciples is, a person goes into the water unsaved, he comes out saved; he goes in a goat, he comes out a sheep." This he does not deny. He attempts, however, to offset this statement of his doctrine by saying: "I may add the doctrine of the Baptists is: The Spirit of God takes a live goat and kills him. He goes in a dead goat and comes out a dead goat. And worst of all, if the Spirit of God does not kill the goat, he must be lost eternally, though he was so created he could do nothing until God's Spirit killed

him. When he is killed by the Spirit, he believes, is dead to sin, is saved for time and eternity, without obedience to the law of God. He is now free from all law."

Talk about misrepresentation! A grosser perversion of Baptist doctrine could not well be imagined.

1. Baptists do not teach that the "Spirit of God takes a live goat and kills him." What Baptists teach is that the Spirit of God takes a man dead in trespasses and sins and regenerates him, makes him alive. "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." (Eph. 2:1.)

2. He does not go into the water a "dead goat and come out a dead goat." After being thus regenerated by the Spirit of God, a man goes into the water a live sheep and comes out a live sheep. The water has had no effect upon him, except that in it he has declared to the world the fact of his death to sin and his resurrection to a new life. (Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:12.)

3. The doctrine of the Baptists is that if the Spirit of God does not make alive the man, he must be lost eternally, *because* he is "dead in trespasses and in sins" (Eph. 2:1), and: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die" (Ezek. 18:4).

4. A man was so created that he could do nothing to save himself until God's Spirit quickened him. (Eph. 2:1.) When he is made alive by the Spirit, then he is dead to sin (Rom. 6:2); he believes (Acts 16:31); he is, saved for time and eternity through his repentance and faith. (Acts 20:21; John 3:36; 10:27-29), without obedience to the law of God *in order to be saved*, but obeying it, gladly, lovingly, *because he has been saved* (Eph. 2:8-10). He is now free



from the clutches of the law upon him, because he is no longer under the law, but under grace. "For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace." (Rom. 6:14.) This, in brief, is the doctrine of the Baptists, and it is the doctrine of the Bible.

About half of my last article in the last series of four articles was taken up with scriptural quotations. It became necessary to repeat them because of the fact that some typographical errors had occurred in the first publication of the passages in the paper; and as Brother McQuiddy seemed disposed to make a good deal out of these errors, I wanted to get the passages exactly correct. I published them in two versions and referred to them in others to show that they are essentially the same in all the versions. They are a thorough answer to the position taken by the *Gospel Advocate*—as much so as if Paul had been writing in direct answer to the articles of the *Advocate*—and they *completely demolish that position*. The *Advocate* editor cannot explain them away. The only way he tries to get around them is by claiming that they refer to the law of Moses. But that is absurd. They mean the law, the moral law, enunciated by Moses and indorsed by Christ.

The *Advocate* says that James 2: -10 "knocks the heart out" of my creed. I beg pardon. That passage *thoroughly sustains* my creed, as showing the *impossibility of anybody being saved by works, by keeping the law*. But, for the same reason, it most certainly "knocks the heart out" of Brother McQuiddy's creed. I am surprised that he cannot see it. I am sure that every one else does.

The Improved Edition, from which I quoted, was translated by Drs. Broadus, Weston, and Hovey, three of the ablest scholars, not only among the Baptists but in the world; while one of them, Dr. Hovey, was introduced as a special witness by Brother McQuiddy. It is not a "Baptist edition," except in the sense that the translators were Baptists and in the sense that it sustains the Baptist position. In this sense all editions are Baptist editions. But I quoted the same passages also from the Revised Version and from the Twentieth Century New Testament. A large majority of the translators of these editions were not Baptists.

If Brother McQuiddy does "accept all of these scriptures in their obvious meaning," then, as I have said before, there is no need for further discussion between us, as their "obvious meaning" is that no one can be saved by obedience to the law, or by *works*, but *only by grace through faith*. But after saying that he "accepts all of these scriptures in their obvious meaning," Brother McQuiddy turns right around and says that "they refer to the law of Moses," implying that the law of Moses is not binding upon us now, forgetting that when Jesus said he had not come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it, he was referring to the law of Moses. The law of Moses is the *moral law*, is the *law of God*. Does Editor McQuiddy repudiate the moral law?

Of course I contend that "we are under the Ten Commandments, Sabbath and all," meaning by Sabbath now Sunday, not Saturday, the day having been changed at the resurrection of Christ to commemorate that event. But Editor McQuiddy contends that we are *not* "under the Ten Commandments, Sabbath

and all." He thus abrogates the Ten Commandments, repeals the law of Moses, and nullifies the moral law, of which the Ten Commandments are the basis.

Inasmuch as Dr. Hovey, one of his witnesses, was the editor of the Improved Edition, in which the expression, "but *only* through faith in Jesus Christ," occurs in Gal. 2:16, Editor McQuiddy makes a show of accepting that translation, and then immediately enters upon a long and labored argument trying to explain it away. *But it still stands.* Here it is: "Yet knowing that a man is not justified by works of law, but **ONLY through faith in Christ Jesus**, even we believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by *faith* in Christ, and *not by works of law*; because by works of law no flesh shall be justified." (Gal. 2:16.)

When Jesus said to the ruler of the synagogue, "Fear not; only believe, and she shall be made whole," he meant, of course, what he said. It was through the ruler's *faith* that his daughter was made whole. His entering the house with Jesus was only an *incidental expression of the faith*, and had nothing in the world to do with the healing of his daughter.

The *Advocate* says with reference to my position: "The man of faith, with him, is saved without all law, is saved without obedience to any law, while giving himself over completely to his appetites and baser passions. With him the man of faith is saved, though he be guilty of adultery, lying, drunkenness, stealing, and the whole catalogue of sins." In answer to this, it will be sufficient to quote what Paul had to say with reference to the same charge made against him. After having proven the doctrine of justification by faith in the third, fourth, and fifth chapters of Ro-

mans, after having shown that justification or salvation is not a matter of obedience to the law, or of works but of faith, he closes the fifth chapter as follows: "Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." (Rom. 5; 20, 21.) He then says in the sixth chapter: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. *How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?*" "For sin shall not have dominion over you; for *ye are not under the law, but under grace.*" "Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." (Rom. 6:1,2, 14, 18.) I may simply add that the man of faith is not apt to be "guilty of adultery, lying, drunkenness, stealing, and the whole catalogue of sins." He will not *want* to sin. Sometimes, though, he *may* sin. Abraham was guilty of deception; Noah, of drunkenness; David, of adultery and murder; Peter, of lying. But the Lord saved them. They did not rely, however, for their salvation upon their own works, upon their obedience to law, but upon their *faith* in the Savior. "Abraham *believed* God, and it [his belief] was accounted unto him for righteousness." (Gal. 3:6.) As soon as Noah came out of the ark, he builded an altar unto the Lord; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar." (Gen. 8:20.) These burnt offerings typified the Lamb of God, which should be offered on Calvary, and indicated his trust in the blood of that Lamb. After his great sins, David

showed his true character in that most fervent prayer. (Ps. 51.) Peter "wept bitterly." (Matt. 26:75.)

I do not contend for a "dead faith," but for a live faith, for a faith so live that it has life-giving properties; for one so live, in fact, that the one who has that faith has life *because* and *when* he has it. "He that believeth on the Son *hath everlasting life*" (John 3:36)—has it *because* and *when* he believes. It is Editor McQuiddy who contends for a *dead faith*, for a faith which is cold and dry and dead—*until it strikes the water*. Then, and not until then, does it become live. His faith is like a *fish*. *It can live only in water*. I have "repeatedly complained of the high degree of faith taught by the *Gospel Advocate!*" Ah, indeed! As a matter of fact, what I have repeatedly complained of is the *low* degree of faith taught by the *Gospel Ad' vacate*, which, as I have just said, is a cold, dry, dead faith, which only receives warmth and life and power when it comes in contact with the water.

I again call upon the *Advocate* to give the interpretation of those passages which I asked it to give, but which it has never given.

As to Hovey and Hackett, they were introduced by Editor McQuiddy to prove his contention that baptism is a part of the plan of salvation. I showed that his own witnesses did not sustain him; that he had made them appear to do so by quoting the parts that suited him and leaving off the parts that did not suit him, and which, taken in connection with what he quoted, gave an entirely different meaning from what he tried to make them convey. He openly acknowledged this and gave as his excuse: "The part I left off was the comment they made as Baptists."

1. Brother McQuiddy thus not only confessed that he was guilty of garbling, but sought to justify himself in it.

2. Brother McQuiddy again ignores the passage I quoted from Hovey, to which I must again call attention. "*Repent, and be baptized every one of you in (or, upon) the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission (or, forgiveness) of your sins.*" (Acts 2:38, Revised Version.) Here repentance and baptism are represented as leading to the forgiveness of sins. We understand repentance to be a voluntary turning of the soul from the exercise of unbelief to the exercise of belief, and from a paramount love of self and sin to a paramount love of God and holiness; while baptism is the prescribed *symbol, sign, or expression* of that *inward change*. The two are, therefore, properly united in our thought; but one as the *essential, inward change*, and the other as a divinely required *confession or sign* of that change. This view of the relation of baptism to repentance or faith is confirmed by the 41st verse below: "*They that gladly received his word were baptised.*" But there is *no hint in these verses of any connection between baptism and regeneration by the Spirit of God*; no suggestion, even, that the change called repentance was conditioned on the rite of baptism." (Hovey, page 420.) This quotation states Hovey's position on the question of baptismal salvation clearly and unequivocally. His views and those of Dr. Hackett are also expressed in his quotation from Hackett on Acts 22:16, which I have given in full and which closes with the remark that "baptism is represented as having this impor-

tance or efficacy, because it is the *sign* of the repentance and faith *which are the conditions of salvation.*" This can have only one meaning, that, according to both Hovey and Hackett, repentance and faith are the "conditions of salvation" and that baptism is *the* "sign," or, as Hovey expressed it above, the "symbol," of these conditions. That is precisely the position I have contended for all during this discussion.

3. I quoted the whole of Hovey on Acts 22:16, in my Answer VIII., including both expressions which Brother McQuiddy charges me with leaving out. In Answer XII. I simply repeated a few sentences from several passages which had already been quoted in full. Brother McQuiddy, on the contrary, had left out entirely the passages which did not suit him, because, as he candidly admitted, they were "the comments they made as Baptists." Brother McQuiddy says I "leave out part of the quotation from Hackett which is approved by Hovey." As a matter of fact, I gave the quotation in full in Answer VIII. Brother McQuiddy, however, turns around and does the very thing he charges me with doing. He did it in his first quotation from Hovey, and he does it again three times in this connection. He "leaves out part of the quotation which is approved by Hovey. The very part left out sustains my contention and exposes the misrepresentation of his great scholars." After the expression, "submit to the rite in order to be forgiven," they add: "In both passages baptism is represented as having this importance or efficacy, because it is the sign of the repentance and faith which are the conditions of salvation."

Brother McQuiddy, however, afterwards copies

this expression, disassociating it from its connection and attempts to explain it away. He says that he "understands Hovey and Hackett and Willmarth and other noted Baptist scholars to teach" that when a person "has faith to believe that God has power to forgive sins, and that when in trust and obedience he submits himself to God that God will forgive." It is a little wearisome to be continually correcting such misrepresentations; but, as a matter of fact, Hovey and Hackett do not teach any such thing. They teach that "*repentance and faith* are the conditions of salvation," and not "*obedience.*" Are we to understand the above as indicating Editor McQuiddy's belief as to the plan of salvation?

1. A man must have faith to believe that God has power to forgive sins, not faith in Christ for the forgiveness of his sins.

2. He must have trust and obedience, trusting that God has power to forgive his sins and obedience to God's command. Is this his plan of salvation?

3. Whatever the clause, "so that henceforth the soul may be 'clean' from the guilt or stain of sin," may mean, there can be no doubt as to the meaning of the previous clause that "forgiveness of sins" "may be described *figuratively* as washing them away."

As to the Italics, I need only say that I used them to call special attention to some expressions. This is so' common a custom with writers that I am surprised that the editor of the *Advocate* should attempt to make any point on it.

As I stated, Dr. Graves took the position that John 3:5 had reference to baptism; but he contended that "born of water" is to be taken in a figurative sense,



and not literally. His real position was expressed in the quotations which I gave from him, and which most effectually and thoroughly disprove the claims of the *Gospel Advocate* editor that Dr. Graves was on his side in making baptism a part of the plan of salvation.

About Dr. Willmarth. 1. The quotations from him, taken by the *Advocate* from the *Baptist Quarterly* of thirty years ago, made it appear that he agreed with the editor of the *Advocate* in his position. Other quotations from the same article in the *Quarterly* put a rather different phase upon the extracts made by the *Advocate* editor. I have given these quotations and need not repeat them.

2. At any rate, whatever may have been the views of Dr. Willmarth thirty years ago, they have been modified with a more thorough study, which has been given to the word of God during the thirty years.

3. Whatever his views then, Dr. Willmarth did not represent the views of the Baptists in and around Philadelphia, as stated by Drs. Rowland and Pollard.

4. As I have said before, the question is not, "What do Drs. Hovey, Hackett, Graves, Willmarth, or Doctor Anybody Else say?" but "What do Jesus and Paul and John and other inspired writers say?"

## **Salvation Through Faith, Not of Works.**

---

### **REPLY XIV. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.**

If Editor Folk has stated my position a single time in this whole discussion, I fail to call it to mind. If he has ever proved anything only by his unsupported assertion, I fail to find it. He claims to state my position as follows: "In other words, salvation is a matter of obedience, not of faith. It is physical, not spiritual, because true obedience must be a physical act. It is dependent upon our own actions, not upon God's grace." The *Gospel Advocate* has said nothing to justify such a statement, and its position is as far from the position assigned to it above as truth is from falsehood. Here is what the *Gospel Advocate* says in the article which he claimed to review: "This gospel system is not without parts, and each of these parts has its own peculiar object. No one can be substituted for the other. Faith cannot be substituted for repentance, holiness, or righteousness; it is a means to these ends. It is, indeed, indispensable to each and every one of them. Blot out faith, and the others have no existence in the life. Reading, prayer, and meditation are means of sanctification. Any one without the other would be incomplete and incompetent to the end to be attained. The same is true of the positive institutions of the remedial system. Baptism, the Lord's day, and the Lord's Supper are indispensable provisions of redeeming grace. Baptism is the acceptance of the provisions of the grace of God for

saving men." In the beginning of the article I said: "The gospel plan of salvation is a system of redemption. It delivers its subjects from sin, guilt, and bondage. It contemplates a new creation—a transformation of man in body, soul, and spirit. It is, therefore, a system of physical, spiritual, and moral means for the accomplishment of its glorious end." He can as easily prove virtue is vice, truth is falsehood, and heaven is hell, as by any law of exegesis torture what the *Gospel Advocate* said into what he with so much complacency states as its position. The assumption is not only manifestly false; it is manifestly absurd and foolish and the assumption of nobody but Editor Folk. While Editor Folk attempts to separate the faith that saves from obedience, he will never be able to divorce what God has joined together. (James 2:17-26.)

What Editor Folk represents as faith is not faith at all. There is as much difference between it and the faith of the gospel as there is between a dead man and a living man. With Editor Folk, the faith that saves the soul frees a man from obedience to all law.

When he has faith, says he, his salvation is not "a matter of works, or law, or obedience, or anything of the kind." His salvation "is settled for all time and eternity." It is settled! A man may steal, lie, murder, get drunk; but if he has faith, he is saved for time and eternity. When I modestly suggest that the faith of the gospel leads and requires a man to abstain from the very appearance of evil; to live soberly, righteously, and godly; to subdue the lusts of the flesh and to keep the whole law of faith, he says: "How low a conception! How degrading to

Christianity!" He boldly avows that if a man is required to do these things, such demand "hangs over him a threatening Damocles sword." If to abstain from the very appearance of evil is degrading to Christianity, are we to understand that when the man of faith commits adultery, lies, and steals, Christianity is thereby elevated and honored? God deliver us from such a conception! I am glad that I have taught the faith of the gospel that requires the man who sins to turn away from it, confess it, and pray God's forgiveness. Abraham was not justified or saved because he never prevaricated or did wrong, but because he offered up his son—did what God commanded him to do. A man should not refuse to do one thing God commands him to do. "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all." (James 2:10.) Why is the man who keeps the whole law, except one point, guilty of all? There is a sense in which this is true. God demands an unqualified recognition of his authority, and the man who disobeys him willfully and deliberately in any matter proves himself as disobedient and rebellious as if he disobeyed in everything. That is, he obeys only when and where it suits him to obey, and that is not obedience at all. When the man who thus recognizes the authority of God blunders and sins through the weakness of the flesh, the grace of God has made provisions for his pardon. But a man must comply with these provisions in order to reach the pardon. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. (1 John 1:9.) Editor Folk differs with John as well

as James. The man who simply has faith is freed from all law, from obedience, or anything of the kind; he is saved for time and eternity! Abraham might have gone on prevaricating indefinitely, yet he was saved for time and eternity! David might have stained his hands in the blood of a thousand Uriahs, yet he was saved for time and eternity! I now understand why Editor Folk has complained so loudly and frequently of the high degree of faith and standard of life taught by the Bible and contended for by the *Gospel Advocate*.

Is it true, as argued by Editor Folk, that the Christian is free from all law, is "saved to work" and "does not work to be saved?" Whenever a Christian is commanded to do anything, he is under law. If he is to work out his salvation, he certainly works that God may save him. "So then, my beloved, even as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." (Phil. 2:12.) "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth unto his own flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth unto the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap eternal life. And let us not be weary in well-doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not." (Gal. 6:7-9.) Here the reaping of life is conditional, but Editor Folk says it is settled without conditions for time and eternity. "Beloved, imitate not that which is evil, but that which is good He that doeth good is of God: he that doeth evil hath not seen God." (3 John 11.) With Editor Folk, the man who believes is saved, is good, and there is no

such thing as doing good. Again, with him, the man who believes is righteous; but the Spirit teaches: "My little children, let no man lead you astray: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous." (1 John 3:7.) He also contradicts the Spirit's teaching in Rom. 2:6-10: "Who will render to every man according to his works: to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life: but unto them that are factious, and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that worketh evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Greek; but glory and honor and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." Editor Folk has talked much about there must be a tree before fruit, as though I had taught we could have good works without faith. Without faith there can be no good works; but where there is faith, there will be good works. Jesus had the barren fig tree cut down, and so he will cut down the man of a barren faith, even though Editor Folk says his salvation is settled for time and eternity. The contention of this journal is that the tree is worthless that bears no fruit, and that the faith that refuses to obey in the first act that belongs to faith is worthless.

It should not be overlooked that not one passage has been produced which ascribes salvation to faith alone. Nobody has questioned that it is ascribed to faith, baptism, and the blood of Christ. Faith alone is never treated in the New Testament as the condition of anything. Wherever faith is spoken of by itself, it is always to be conceived either as a principle of action

leading to obedience to Christ or as a condition jointly with other conditions of whatever blessing depends on it.

Editor Folk argues from the case of the jailer that if God were to say to us we are saved when we believe, and then require us to be baptized, and then that we must keep the law to be saved, that we would have a right to charge on him bad faith. If this means anything, it is that a man has faith who refuses or neglects to do anything God commands him to do. Yet he teaches that the man who is informed as to the scriptural teaching on baptism and refuses to be baptized would be lost because his faith was not genuine. In other words, if the jailer had refused to be baptized when he was taught the word of the Lord, he would have been lost, although his salvation was settled for time and eternity when he believed before and without baptism, and though salvation is not "a matter of works, or law, or obedience, or anything of the kind." According to Editor Folk, God acted in very bad faith with Joshua. "And Jehovah said unto Joshua, See I have given into thy hand Jericho, and the king thereof, and the mighty men of valor." "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," is no clearer than "I have given into thy hand Jericho." If the Lord had been dealing with Editor Folk, when he told him to compass the city with all the men of war, going about the city once, and thus for six days, and seven times upon the seventh day, and the seven priests should bear the seven trumpets, and the seven priests should make a long blast and all the people should shout, then shall the walls of the city fall down flat, Editor Folk would

have said: "Lord, you are acting in bad faith; for you said, 'See I have given into thy hand Jericho, and now you impose a number of new and hard conditions.'" Still by faith the wall of Jericho fell down, after they had been compassed about for seven days." (Heb. 11:30.) So may we not say the jailer was saved by faith when he was baptized? "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

Editor Folk in his last teaches the doctrine of substitution—that Christ died "in man's stead, taking man's place under the broken law." As he tasted death for every man and has perfectly satisfied the law, all are saved. Thus he has committed himself to the doctrine of universal salvation. This cannot be true. (Heb. 5:8, 9; 2 Thess. 1:7-9.) The same grace that led Jesus to die and make salvation possible to all teaches us to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts. (Tit. 2:11-14.)

In fighting the Bible doctrine of obedience, Editor Folk has clearly indicated that God will forgive the sinner while he is impenitent of sin or sins. If God can forgive a sinner who is impenitent of one sin, on the same principle he may forgive the sinner who is impenitent of all sins. If not, why not? This makes forgiveness merely arbitrary with God. God cannot save the impenitent sinner. "I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner perish." (Luke 13:3.) "For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord Jehovah; wherefore turn yourselves, and live." (Ezek. 18:32.) If God can save the sinner in his sins, then it was not necessary for Christ to die. "Apart from shedding of blood there is no remission." (Heb. 9:22.) Thus Editor



Folk's theory has denied the necessity of the death of Christ and charged upon God the cruelty of permitting his death when it was not necessary.

Editor Folk's own admission and interpretation of Acts 2:38 destroys the doctrine of "faith alone" and makes baptism unto the remission of sins. At my request, Brother J. W. Shepherd wrote the following letter to the professors of English in a number of universities: "Dear Sir: In the following passage, 'Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you, trusting on, relying upon, the name of Jesus Christ, unto remission of your sins,' is not baptism unto remission of sins just as clearly taught as repentance unto remission of sins? Or, in other words, does not this passage make remission of sins depend as much upon baptism as upon repentance? An answer to the foregoing as an English scholar, aside from any theological application, will be much appreciated." In reply to this, Isaac N. Demman, professor of English in the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., says: "In answer to your main question, I should say, 'Yes.' This rendering of Acts 2:38 seems clumsy, however. Remission is made to depend directly on trusting and relying, whereas in the original these words are not found. The Revised Version has, 'Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins,' where remission is specifically conditioned on repentance and baptism. Of course faith is implied always, and the two renderings really come to the same thing." H. B. Brown, president of Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind., replies: "The passage, 'Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you, trusting on, relying upon, the name

of Jesus Christ, unto remission of your sins,' makes the remission of sins depend upon baptism as much as upon repentance." W. O. Carver, of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., says: "Yours of August IS to hand. In reply, I beg to say; (1) The sentence you quote is not found in any translation of the New Testament with which I am acquainted, and is an interpretation rather than a translation. (2) Your construction of it as an English sentence is the natural and obvious one, though I should not say that it is necessary. (3) The passage does make remission of sins depend as truly upon baptism as upon repentance; whether in the same way is a matter which cannot be determined by the detached sentence. (4) You ask me to answer regardless of theological application. That would be a legitimate thing to do only in case my answer was not to be used for any theological purpose, of which you give me no assurance. I must, therefore, add that the interpretation of this passage is not a matter for the English scholar, but for the Greek student."

The most sacred rule in translating is this: To translate a word uniformly by its primary and current meaning, unless the sense forbids. Furthermore, it is universally accepted that the sense of a word is to be determined by its context. Editor Folk commits himself to the position that if a word means a thing in one place, it means that in the other places where it occurs, regardless of the context. This is true only of words susceptible of but one meaning. The Greek particle "kai" is rendered by "even" and "and" in Mark 4:41: "Who then is this, that *even* the wind *and* the sea obey him." As the primary meaning will

not make sense, "kai" is here rendered by a secondary meaning, "even." The fact is so well established by all standard lexicographers and grammarians that the current and primary meaning of "eis" is "to," "unto," "into," etc., that I need not take space here to quote these authorities. The law of translation requires us to use this primary sense in the translation of "eis" in Acts 2:38, unless the context forbids. The context does not forbid, as all scholars, even Baptists, translate Acts 2:38: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." I have challenged Editor Folk to produce one reputable Baptist scholar who renders "eis" in Acts 2:38 "because of." This challenge has been before him for over one year, yet he has not produced the scholar.

The casual reader must have observed that I have not quoted scholars among the disciples, of whom there are many, but have quoted Baptist authorities against Brother Folk, and have shown their high standing among Baptists by unquestioned Baptist authority, when they have been repudiated and turned out of the Baptist ranks by Editor Folk. He is like the dog in the manger; he will not agree with his authorities and does not want me to agree with them when they teach the truth.

He claims authority from Winer, "the best Greek grammarian in the world," to make this "entirely permissible" translation of Acts 2:38, which for convenience I will designate his translation No. 2, and place beside translation No. 1 of Acts 2:38: (2) "Repent ye, and be baptized,

in reference to, as regards, with respect to, the remission of your sins, or with the remission of your sins as the occasion of your baptism." (1) "Repent ye and be baptized every one of you, trusting on, relying upon, the name of Jesus Christ, unto the remission of your sins." Will he tell us which is correct? Both cannot be. He evidently means that "eis" looks *backward* in translation two, and that in translation one it looks *forward*.

He has told us before in this discussion that "eis" probably looks *forward* in Acts 2:38. He has also cited Matt. 12:41 to show that it sometimes look? *backward*. I leave to him the impossible task of reconciling his own inconsistencies.

If Winer meant that "eis" could be translated as Editor Folk claims, the words will make sense in the examples given by him. So I quote one of the examples given by Winer from the Revised Version, substituting for the English word by which "eis" is rendered the words by which Editor Folk says it is "entirely permissible" to render "eis:" "And I, being perplexed how to inquire concerning these things, asked whether he would go *to* Jerusalem and there be judged of these matters." [I have underscored "to" because "eis" is rendered by it.] "And I, being perplexed how to inquire concerning these things, asked whether he would go, *in reference to, as regards, with respect to, or with, to be judged of these matters, or as the occasion of Jerusalem.*" This is absurd. Editor Folk would not be guilty of translating a preposition by *nouns* and phrases if he were not blinded by his theory. I know Winer is guilty of no such nonsense. What is true of this passage is true of every other

one given by Winer. I understand that Winer teaches that "eis" is rendered with verbs denoting action "*in reference to, as regards, with respect to,*" by "to," "unto," "in," "into," as determined by the context.

"Eis" is translated in the examples given by Winer by the prepositions just named. Among the number we have "into" and "unto." Winer gives Acts 2:38 as an example in which "eis" is used to express a mark or aim of any kind," in which it is used to denote "the direction of the mind, feeling, or conduct *towards.*" He thus clearly makes "eis" prospective, and not retrospective. "Eis" may possibly be neutral, but never retrospective.

Editor Folk could have used "unto" and stood by his translation number one. All the examples given by Winer are under the Delta subdivision, which reads: "The direction of the mind, feeling, or conduct *towards.*" So while in loose combinations "eis" is rendered with verbs denoting action "*in reference to, etc.,*" he does not teach that it loses the meaning of *looking forward* and *looks backward*; for in every example he gives, "eis" looks *toward, or forward.*

The scholarly and talented Willmarth must have had such men as Editor Folk in mind when he wrote the following: "And as to Campbellism, that specter which haunts many good men and terrifies them into a good deal of bad interpretation, shall we gain anything by maintaining a false translation, and allowing the Campbellites to be champions of the true, with the world's scholarship on their side, as against us? Whoever carries the weight of our controversy with the Campbellites *upon the 'eis' will break through*—there is no footing

there for the evolutions of the theological skater. Shall we never learn that truth has nothing to fear from a true interpretation of any part of God's word, and nothing to gain by a false one?" (*Baptist Quarterly* July, 1877, "Baptism and Remission," page 305).

"And, lastly, the looser combinations in which 'eis' is rendered *in reference to, as regards, with respect to.*" Why did he leave out that part of the sentence, "And lastly, the looser combinations in which 'eis' is rendered," which is essential to bring out Winer's thought? Why did he not tell us that *in reference to, as regards with respect to,* were loose renderings of "eis," in which "eis" always expressed aim and direction towards? No scholar has ever rendered "eis" by the word "occasion." Instead of rendering "eis" "occasion," here is what Winer says on page 495: "'Eis' is further applied to the direction of the thought. . . . then to the occasion (Matt. 12:41)—*eis to kerugma Iona, at the preaching.*"

Winer makes "eis" in Matt. 12:41 prospective, and not retrospective, by giving it under the head to denote "the direction of the mind, feeling, or conduct *towards.*"

Because "eis" is applied *to the occasion* in Matt. 12:41, as I believe and have taught in this discussion, is far from saying that it would be entirely permissible to render it by "occasion" in Acts 2:38 or anywhere else. Such blundering is inexcusable. If Editor Folk knew no better, he is to be pitied; if he did know better, I feel sorry for him. But why does he not take the position boldly that "eis" in Acts 2:38 means "because of" the remission of sins? He represents Broadus as teaching "because of" is a possible

meaning of "eis" in Acts 2:38. This is far from saying that it means that. To show that Broadus did not teach it, I quote him here: "(Matt. 26:28.) For, or unto, the remission of sins, in order that sins may be remitted. (Heb. 9:22.) This is the natural and most probable meaning of the preposition and its case, and is here entirely appropriate." Thus we see that Broadus sustains my contention. I challenge Editor Folk to say that it means "because of."

Does "eis" look *backward* in Matt. 12:41? To refresh the reader's mind, I quote my position on "eis" in Matt. 12:41, which is in harmony with both Thayer and Winer: "'The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a greater than Jonah is here.'" (Matt. 12:41.) The preposition is 'eis,' which usually means 'into.' A few writers contend that it means here 'in consequence of,' a meaning foreign to the word. It is true, as a matter of fact, that the Ninevites repented in consequence of Jonah's preaching; but if it had been the purpose of the writer to express this thought, he would have used 'dia' instead of 'eis.' The thought and intent of the passage are very different from this. 'They repented into the preaching of Jonah.' This is not idiomatic English, but conveys the exact thought a Greek would derive from the original. Their repentance, in other words, brought them into the course of life which the preaching required. Their repentance did not stop with the internal change which they underwent, but it brought them into the condition which the preaching demanded, looking unto deliverance from the threatened destruction." Winer puts

"eis" in Matt. 12:41 as looking toward this reformation, and makes "preaching" the "occasion" that led them to repent into the course of life demanded by the preaching of Jonah. Thayer, who Editor Folk says "is the best New Testament Greek lexicographer," also upholds and sustains my position.

A few lines further down in the quotation made by Editor Folk, we find Thayer says: "Of the consideration influencing one to do anything: *metanoein eis kerugma tinos*, at the preaching of one—that is, out of regard to the substance of his preaching." This shows that the consideration that led them to repent was the threatened destruction; hence they repented into a reformation of life. Thayer uses *with respect to, in reference to, as regards*, precisely as does Winer, and gives many of the same quotations, showing that "eis" looks forward. Thus we see that both teach exactly the opposite of what Editor Folk represented them as teaching, and that they both teach that "eis" in Matt. 12:41 means that the Ninevites were to repent into the life demanded by the preaching of Jonah, and that the occasion that influenced them to do this was his preaching.

It is needless to say that I have quoted fully the teaching of all Baptist scholars on the meaning of "eis" in Acts 2:38. I could not be expected to give all that they said in their comments as Baptists—space forbids this. Of course, while I was quoting from the "Handbook on Baptism," I did not have Hovey before me. I quoted Hovey as quoted by the "Handbook on Baptism;" but be it said, to the credit of the author of the "Handbook," nothing was left out that combats the truth as taught by the disciples.



Unfortunately for Editor Folk, everything he has left out, intentionally or unintentionally, successfully antagonizes and overthrows the theory which he is seeking to establish. He has said that no Baptist ever taught of baptism, "Submit to the rite in order to be forgiven."

Why do both Hovey and Hackett say of baptism, "It is the sign of the repentance and faith which are the conditions of salvation?" Because "baptism is represented as having this importance or efficacy" in Acts 2:38 and 22:16. What importance or efficacy? Be baptized "*unto the forgiveness of sins*," or "submit to the rite in order to be forgiven." Do you believe, Brother Folk, that "baptism is represented as having this importance or efficacy," as "it answers to *unto the forgiveness of sins*, in Acts 2:38—i. e., submit to the rite in order to be forgiven," "because it is the sign of repentance and faith, which are the conditions of salvation?" If you do, we should close this discussion on the subject of baptism; for it is but another way of expressing what I have taught throughout, that baptism is represented as saving us in Mark 16:16 and in 1 Pet. 3:21 because it is an embodiment and declaration of our faith. Faith and "baptism are inseparable. Editor Folk teaches that "born of water" does not refer to baptism. Hovey teaches: "Taking the two sources separately, we may say that being 'born of water' (baptized) must signify being cleansed from sins or forgiven." (Appendix to "Commentary on John," page 422.) Editor Folk has ridiculed the teaching that men are saved by an outworking, obedient life. Hovey, his great gun, says of Titus 3:5, on page 422 of Appendix: "Hence he

teaches that men are saved by an outworking, obedient life, given and preserved by the Holy Spirit" Folk has taught that men do not work to be saved, but because they are saved. Editor Folk teaches that when people are baptized they have no sins to be forgiven; Hovey teaches that "'born of water' (baptized) must signify being cleansed from sins or forgiven." My opponent has sought to array prejudice against such teaching by incorrectly representing it as "baptismal salvation." Editor Folk is directly opposed by his great scholar. Will he impeach his witness or confess his own error? A plain statement is demanded, and no evasion and muddy statements. Both cannot be right.

J. R. Graves, in *The Baptist* of 1868, said: "No one can be properly called a Christian until he has been baptized and is an observer of Christ's commandments. . . . He cannot be considered technically a follower of Christ so long as he refuses to obey his command to be baptized—become a member of his church and do his commandments." If he cannot be considered technically a follower of Christ, he cannot really be considered one. He says also in the same article: "The willful or willing rejecter or neglecter of baptism is an unregenerated man, is at heart in rebellion against Christ's authority, and to such there is no promise of salvation . . . We think it far more safe to teach as Brother C. [Coulson], that to the willing or willful neglecter of Christian baptism there is no promise of salvation, than, as too many Baptists do, that willful or willing disobedience to the positive commands of Christ in no way jeopardizes one's salvation." Mr. Campbell himself never used language

that teaches more plainly that the unbaptized are not regenerated. Who in this country, unbaptized, can say he is not so willingly?

Mr. Graves could not always be a partisan. When he was not, he boldly testified to the truth and condemned such teachers as Editor Folk, who has been contending that man's salvation is not jeopardized by refusing to be baptized.

Hear Graves in *The Baptist* of October 14, 1871. He says: "We do hold and teach that the kingdom of heaven differs from a church of Christ, as the whole differs from a part. . . . If so, it follows that no one can be a citizen of his kingdom without being a member of some one of his local churches, and of course a member of a local church will be a member of his kingdom, as no one can be a citizen of the republic of America without being a citizen of some State. We understand that the kingdom of Christ, of heaven, when used primarily, refers to the visible church of Christ. We know nothing of Christ's invisible kingdom or church, nor do the Scriptures teach us that he has either a church or kingdom in heaven; hence the expression, we so constantly hear in prayer, "thine upper and better kingdom," "the church triumphant in heaven," etc., teach the people falsely and should be avoided.

Mr. Folk cannot say Mr. Graves does not use "the kingdom of God" and "the church" interchangeably, for he does. To be in the kingdom is to be in the church. But no man, according to the Baptist teaching, can enter the individual church without baptism; hence no man can enter the kingdom of God—enter Christ, or his body without baptism. Hence, if a

man is pardoned without baptism, he is pardoned out of Christ's kingdom, or church. This teaching would put a pardoned, justified child of God in the devil's kingdom. Will Editor Folk scour the country to find Baptists who will write to him that Dr. Graves is not a representative Baptist?

Editor Folk says A. T. Robertson told him that "eis" does not mean "into." I have in my possession a letter from A. T. Robertson, written to J. W. Shepherd in answer to a letter written to him under date of August 30, 1906, in which he says: "'Eis' in itself only means 'in,' and is merely another form of 'en.' The two words were originally used interchangeably. See Matt. 10:41 and 12:41, where 'eis' only means 'in.' The resultant idea depends on the context. In Acts 2:38 it is doubtful and one cannot be dogmatic, for the change of structure in the sentence causes obscurity. Either 'in' or 'unto' or 'into' will make sense here, though not the same sense. In this case one has to fall back on the term of the N. T." He does make it mean "into" in Acts 2:38. Even a partisan will sometimes tell the whole truth. The inconsistency I leave to him and Editor Folk, where it belongs. The letter is in the hands of Brother J. W. Shepherd and is subject to inspection. While Mr. Robertson may pose as a Greek scholar, his position that "eis" means "en" and that they are used interchangeably is denied by Winer on page 514. Here is what he says: "It was at one time supposed that, in the New Testament, the prepositions 'en' and 'eis' in particular are directly and without distinction used for each other."

He then proceeds to show this supposition untrue. It is very unpleasant, indeed, to make a Baptist con-

tradict himself, and then contradict him by the "best Greek grammarian in the world;" but duty to the truth will not permit me to allow the inconsistency to go unexposed. I am represented as insisting that "eis" means "into." Not always. I said it usually meant "into," but teach that the meaning of a word is to be determined by the context. But this seems to be about as clear as Brother Folk, in his confusion of thought, states my position. Both Thayer and Liddell and Scott represent that "eis" of a place entered means "into;" with verbs of motion it means "unto," "to," "into," 'toward." They both also teach that "eis" is used after verbs, implying rest in a place. Thayer says: "Akin to this is the very common use of 'eis' after verbs signifying rest or continuance in a place, because the idea of a previous motion into the place spoken of is involved." He gives as an example Acts 8:40: "But Philip was found *at* Azotus." He had already gone *into* Azotus, so "eis" is used here to denote rest in or continuance. Acts 18:21: "But taking his leave of them, and saying, I will return again unto you if God will, he set sail *from* Ephesus." Here it is used after a verb, showing departure from a place after rest in it. Acts 20:14: "And when he met us *at* Assos, we took him in, and came *to* Mitylene." Here "eis" is rendered "at" and "to" in the same passage. Having rested or continued in Assos, they came into Mitylene to continue there one day. So all scholars, after verbs that denote rest in Christ, translate "eis" not "into," but "in," "on," "upon," etc., as the fact that they are in Christ shows entrance into him already. This is clear from John 3:36: "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the

wrath of God abideth on him." This makes it clear that it is the obedient faith that brings one into Christ, for "he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life." Having already entered into Christ, "eis" is rendered "on" and not "into," because it here denotes rest in Christ. It is here used in an ethical sense when referring to the exercise of the mind. It is also clear that the *dead* faith that my opponent has advocated will not bring a man *into* Christ that he may rest in him. A dead faith is never represented as bringing a man into anything.

In his "Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament," Green gives it as his unsupported opinion that faith actually saves. In proof of this he renders Acts 2:38 "*into the remission of sins*, or, according to some interpreters, as (4) towards, with respect to a certain result, in order to, for." While, then, it is his opinion that faith saves actually and baptism symbolically, when he comes to translate as a scholar, he translates "*into the remission of sins*." I leave it to him and to Editor Folk to harmonize his opinion with his scholarship.

I wish to add that the Baptist scholars have felt it necessary to explain the sense in which baptism saves in order to try to reconcile their practice with the teaching of the Bible. I have never felt the necessity of explaining the sense in which baptism saves, since the Holy Spirit has done this.

Other replies could be given, all holding that Editor Folk's interpretation of Acts 2:38 does as truly make remission of sins depend on baptism as repentance. Thus I have proved by scholars—and one of them, at least, a Baptist—that Editor Folk makes remission of sins depend on baptism. With him, to do this is to

teach a water salvation; therefore I have proved by his own scholar and brother that he teaches a water salvation. Poor Haman will hang himself! Scholars say that Editor Folk's interpretation of Acts 2:38 makes baptism unto the remission of sins. Hence, according to Folk, salvation is not by faith alone.

Editor Folk cannot, it seems, write a full paragraph without contradicting himself. Read his words: "If we believed . . . that we, like the Jews, are required to offer a goat as a sin offering in order to be saved, we should certainly be hunting up one, and that pretty soon." The Jew was required to do this, but he is not. Now listen: "We believe that the plan of salvation is one in all ages of the world." Now if he means this and that the Jew was required to offer the goat, he certainly ought to be offering one. If he does not offer one, as "actions speak louder than words," we shall be forced to conclude that he does not believe the latter statement. Again, he strengthens us in this belief when he says: "The law was done away in Christ as a method of salvation, but not as a rule of life." Done away in Christ as a method of salvation! Hence in Christ there is another method of salvation. I deny that the Sabbath day has ever been changed from Saturday to Sunday, and call for the proof. It is impossible to make the seventh the first day. Freeman was deluded by the belief that God made him a special revelation and that he was free to do as he pleased and was not restrained by the law of faith. This is Editor Folk's position. My position is that in order to walk by faith we must be guided by the law of God, which prohibits murder and gives us the acts that constitute obedience to Christ.

## **Salvation By Faith or By Works?**

---

### **REPLY XV. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.**

When Editor Folk is exposed in his inconsistency, he denies meaning to say what his language says. He has taught repeatedly in this discussion we are saved by faith alone and we are saved by repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. When shown that both ways cannot be true, he says "repentance and faith are ever and everywhere essentially the same;" then he tells us repentance always goes before faith; and when I remind him if he is correct in this he has a thing going before itself, he tells us he did not mean what his language says, "but that repentance is ever and everywhere the same, and faith is ever and everywhere the same." While his language teaches exactly what I said it did, I shall let him take it back and thus give up Baptist doctrine. Now we understand Editor Folk is committed to the doctrine that repentance and faith are different. Then he is committed to the positions we are saved by "faith alone" and by "repentance and faith." In putting a construction on his language that it will not bear, he only makes himself ridiculous and foolish and plunges deeper into inconsistency, from which there is no escape. A little "obtuseness" and "hurried reading" on my part might be very helpful to our strangely inconsistent editor.

Editor Folk finds a few persons of whom it is said they believed and not they were baptized. He tells



us, however, they were probably baptized. He has told us before all believers were baptized. He has also taught us the man has not genuine faith who refuses to be baptized. It is needless to consume space on this, as the *Gospel Advocate* is contending for only believers' baptism and that the believer will be baptized. If Editor Folk says they were not baptized, then we have two plans of salvation; for the baptism of many thousands is clearly expressed, and the Savior says: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

Editor Folk must bear his own sins. He has repeatedly taught that I condemn "to hell with one fell swoop" Moody and the pious unimmersed. I say to Editor Folk: "Thou art the man." He has taught that Moody was never baptized. He has taught that Moody was pious and informed as to the scriptural duty on the subject of baptism. Will such a man be saved? Here is Editor Folk's answer: "Our reply to the question was that such a man could not be saved, not because he was not baptized, but because such a deliberate and persistent refusal upon his part, after having been thus fully informed as to his duty, would show that his heart was not right and that his conversion was not genuine." When Editor Folk charges on me his own positions, I have been forbearing with him, knowing that he is blinded by his creed.

I have never said Moody was not immersed. I have made no argument on Moody, as his action does not change God's plan of salvation. If Editor Folk had any scripture to sustain his contention, he would never refer to Moody. If Baptist testimony is to be

relied on, I am inclined to think Moody was immersed. W. B. Riley, writing in the Baptist Standard, says: "It may not be thoroughly known in the South, but for many years, when any have been admitted to the Moody Church by other forms of baptism than immersion, it has been administered by some one else than the pastor." If this be true and Moody honest, he was immersed. I simply quote this to show that my opponent makes assertions on what he assumes to be true.

I have made no argument to show the thief was baptized. I showed that no man knew he was not; and yet Editor Folk assumes he was not baptized when trying to prove people are now saved without baptism. When pressed to give his information showing the thief was not baptized, he says he does not know; and then when pressed to give an example of a man in the Christian dispensation being saved without baptism, he cites the thief, who was before the Christian dispensation and whom he says he does not know was baptized. While I did not expect the impossible of him, I did expect him to have the fairness to say he could not give a scriptural example. The first mention I made of the thief, I said: "At the time the thief was on the cross the church was not established. Christ healed and forgave sins while he was on earth." This showed clearly that with me the baptism of the thief was immaterial. But Editor Folk says it is material to my position, as the plan of salvation is "ever and everywhere the same;" and he might have added he has proved his assertion by such admissions as, "The law 'was done away in Christ' as a method of salvation," and: "If we believed . . . that we,

like the Jews, are required to offer a goat as a sin offering in order to be saved, we should certainly be hunting up one, and that pretty soon." He correctly teaches in this he is not required to do as was the Jew to be saved, and, incorrectly, that the plan of salvation is the same in all ages of the world. If I should have little enough consideration for the truth to blot out all his admissions that "the law was done away in Christ as a method of salvation" and that he is not required, as was the Jew, to offer a goat to be saved, and then let him inconsistently with his own admissions assume the plan of salvation is the same in all ages, he might possibly prove (?) the baptism of the thief material to the position taken by this journal. If the truth did not forbid, I might be tempted to concede something to help him out, for he is hopelessly floundering.

Editor Folk tells us Alexander Campbell taught that "regeneration is equivalent to immersion." If he did, it was while he was a Baptist. This doctrine was very prevalently taught by the Baptists, as is shown by Orchard's "Church History." J. R. Graves wrote an "Introductory Essay" to this history, and was one of the publishers of the book. Here is J. R. Graves' indorsement: "But the most valuable chronological history of the churches of Christ now extant, and, excepting Jones', the only one passing over eighteen centuries, that deserves the name of church history, now before the Christian world, is the one we now present to the American public for the first time, in a reprint." (Page 12, "Introductory Essay.") We now have before us the witness Editor Folk delights to use on almost all occasions. Here is teach-

ing he indorsed on baptism and regeneration: "Then we bring them to some place where there is water and they are regenerated by the same way of regeneration by which we are regenerated; for they are washed in the name of the Father," etc. (Pages 23, 24.) The same author quotes approvingly (page 44): "That the regeneration wrought in baptism ought not to be attributed to the water, but to a divine virtue; that by dipping the person under water three times, the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ is represented; that without baptism no man can be washed from sin." Many other passages might be quoted to show that the belief was prevalent among Baptists that "regeneration is equivalent to immersion." It is not a matter of surprise that Alexander Campbell held this doctrine while a Baptist; but when he learned "the way of the Lord more perfectly," he put away this with other Baptist errors. What will Editor Folk do with his idol (Graves) for indorsing such heresy?

I quote again from Orchard's History (page 34): "Others felt disposed to forego baptism, because salvation had been realized without. Tertullian rebukes the disobedience of such, and he further argues from Christ's words (John 3:5) to prove the necessity of obeying and conforming; and asserts 'that all believers from thenceforth [from the giving of the above words] were baptized.'" Orchard quotes Basil, bishop of Cesarea, as observing: "Faith and baptism are two means of salvation nearly allied and inseparable; for faith is perfected by baptism, and baptism is founded on faith; . . . and the confession which leads us to salvation goes before, and baptism, which

seals 'our covenant,' follows after." Here is Folk's "old hero" indorsing "faith and baptism are two means of salvation nearly allied and inseparable; for faith is perfected by baptism, and baptism is founded on faith;" and yet he is contending that if salvation is of faith it cannot be of baptism. He separates baptism and faith, which J. R. Graves teaches are inseparable. I might present much more from the same source, but it is needless; for if Editor Folk's old hero were to rise from the dead, he would not recognize himself in the teachings assigned to him by my opponent.

I baptize neither sheep nor goats, but believing penitents. Editor Folk introduced the goat and sheep, but as he now says that the Spirit of God takes a man, we will base our argument on a man, and not on a sheep or a goat. He says: "A grosser perversion of Baptist doctrine could not well be imagined." His explanation fully vindicates me from the charge. He says of the sinner: "When he is made alive by the Spirit, then he is dead to sin." The man who is alive to righteousness, quickened by the Spirit, is "dead to sin;" so I was not wrong in saying they "baptize a dead goat." He now says they take a live man and baptize him. After baptism he comes out a live man. He and I agree that baptism is a burial; therefore, he takes a live man and buries him, which is contrary both to the law of God and the law of the land. Here is his teaching briefly stated: Baptists teach (1) the Spirit takes a man dead in trespasses and sins and makes him alive. (2) That if the Spirit of God does not make alive, the man must be lost eternally. (3) The man is so created that he can do nothing to save himself until

he is quickened by God's Spirit. When he is quickened by God's Spirit, he is dead to sin, he believes, he is saved for time and eternity without obedience to the law of God. This makes God do all of it. The man can do nothing until he is quickened and made alive. When he is quickened, he believes, is saved, and is saved for time and eternity, without obedience to the law of God.

If the man is never quickened, never believes, whose fault is it? According to his theory, it must be the fault of God. He has God damning a man eternally, when the man could do nothing because God failed to do his work. His theory makes man no more than a machine.

In contending that a man travels *at* as well as *by* the Nashville and Chattanooga Railroad, he borders on the ridiculous. This is wholly the wrong use of the preposition "at." Let me apply his theology to this illustration. He teaches that when a man is saved *at* faith he is saved for time and eternity and has nothing more to do. So when a man gets on the train *at* Nashville, he is already in Chattanooga. Not only this, but it is impossible for him not to be in Chattanooga if he is on the train at Nashville. He can't get off at Wartrace or any other point on the road; but when he is *at* Nashville, he is already there without traveling or even staying on the train. Let us change the figure a little. A man travels on God's train from earth to heaven. He has but one station, faith only. God kills him to sin, makes him alive to righteousness, and puts him on the train. According to Editor Folk, he is already in heaven. He cannot get off the train,

and is saved for time and eternity without obedience to the law of Christ or to any other law.

I am charged with teaching that if a Christian sins "he is lost." He says: "After first denying, then admitting, that he teaches several ways of salvation," etc. This I have repeatedly denied. I will ask him here to find the language where I have ever admitted "several ways of salvation," and also where I said that "if a Christian sins he is lost." I insist that he find the quotation; and if he does not produce it in his next article, the readers are to understand that I am correct in saying that I have never used any such language. It is indeed painful to me to be repeatedly charged with teaching that which I have repudiated; but, painful as it is, if I do not call attention to such perversions, I would be a traitor to the truth. He then quotes from me, "There is a law of forgiveness to the Christian who sins." and asks the question: "Will the Christian who sins not be lost if he is not forgiven?" There is as much difference between this and what he charges me with saying as there is between life and death. All men sin, but all may repent of their sins and confess them and be forgiven. The forgiven man will enjoy salvation. The unqualified position he assigns me damns all men. Editor Folk may consider this "honorable discussion" and intimate that I cannot afford to call attention to such perversion. The sin is not in calling attention to the perversion, but the man who does the perverting is guilty of the sin. While I would not transcend the bounds of courtesy, yet I cannot be untrue to the truth by suffering such charges to go uncorrected. I have shown the fallacy of Editor Folk's reasoning

on "several ways." Try another illustration. It takes type, paper, labor, and binding to make the printed book. It takes all of these to produce the complete book. Now, according to my opponent's reasoning, we may say that a book is made by type alone, by paper alone, by labor alone, by binding alone. Every one knows this is false.

Again, take the illustration of the man who was floating down the river in a canoe and was rescued by a man on the bridge with a rope. The man on the bridge, the rope, and the man himself all had a part in his salvation. Nobody but Editor Folk can get several ways of salvation out of this. It took the man on the bridge, the rope, and the man himself to bring about the one salvation. If the man had not thrown down the rope from the bridge, there would have been none to grasp. If he had not had the rope, and the rope had not been sufficiently strong to draw the man upon the bridge, he could not have been rescued. If the man had not had faith enough to lay hold on the rope and hold on, he would never have been saved.

I shall here give no further attention to the charge that I teach "several ways of salvation," and the reader will understand that I have made no such admission unless Editor Folk quotes such admission in his next article.

Editor Folk says baptism saves "in a figure." The Bible does not say that. Noah was saved by water. His salvation is a type of which ours is the antitype.

I deny that I have perverted his meaning in regard to the conditions of salvation, and demand proof instead of assertion. I refer the reader to my former



discussion of the order of faith and repentance, for my arguments all remain unanswered. I have repeatedly shown that the scriptures quoted by the editor of the *Baptist and Reflector* do not sustain his contention.

It is now conceded that "born of water" does not refer to the natural birth. My opponent has accused me of turning the language around and making it mean, "Except a man be born of the Spirit and of water." I have never done this, and demand the proof. It is so easy to support a statement by a bald assertion! Assuming his assumption to be true, he says: "It is a flagrant twisting and gross perversion of the Scriptures. Brother McQuiddy's brethren generally take the position that the water is the mother and the Spirit the father of the plan of salvation, and we presume that he takes the same position, as he before the father, which is unnatural and impossible, and shows the absurdity of this theory." A man must be hard pressed when he assigns to his opponent a position and then seeks to meet that. The position I have taken demands his attention, and not those he "presumes" I take. But in seeking to show the absurdity of the position "we presume that he takes," he commits himself to the position that in the new birth there must be a father and mother. Now listen to him: "What, then, did he mean? In the early part of this discussion we showed that he was speaking of two births, the physical and the spiritual birth. 'Born of water,' referred to the first birth, and 'of the Spirit' to the second birth. That this is true is shown by the following verse: 'That which is born

of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.' (John 3:6.)" Thus he shows he means by the physical the fleshly or natural birth. Then his position in the early part of this discussion was that "born of water" was the natural birth. He now says: "Of course," "'born of water' does not refer to the natural birth." So "in the early part of this discussion" he taught "born of water" referred to the natural birth; but now he teaches: "Of course," "'born of water' does not refer to the natural birth." But he seriously tells us there are two births—"born of water" is one, and born "of the Spirit" is the other. In each birth he has either no father or mother. Will he tell us which he leaves out? The Savior did not say to Nicodemus: "Except a man be born again and again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." The new birth, one birth, brings a man into the kingdom of God. If there are two births, into what does each bring a man? Into what does "born of water" bring him? As it is not the natural birth, it does not bring him into this life. No, there is but one birth, and the elements of that birth are water and Spirit. "Born of water" by the teaching of the Spirit. Nicodemus had his mind on only the natural birth. He could not see how a man could be born when old. Jesus, to show that a man did not enter the kingdom of God by a natural birth and that he was not requiring him to be born again naturally in order to enter the kingdom of God, says: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." (John 3:6.) Other inconsistencies just as glaring might be pointed out, but I am

not willing to waste more ammunition on such little game.

Brother J. W. Shepherd wrote the following letter to a number of professors of Greek in the leading universities: "Please give me your translation of the preposition 'eis,' in Acts 2:38, and your opinion, as a Greek scholar, as to the relation it sustains to the predicates of the verse and the phrase 'remission of sins.'" B. Perrin, of New Haven, Conn., says: "The preposition 'eis' in Acts 2:38 expresses 'the purpose and end in view,' as I believe, and I should translate it, with the American Revised Version, 'unto.' . . . But surely repentance as well as baptism must precede the remission of sins." Mitchell Carroll, of the George Washington University, Washington, D. C., says: "It should be translated 'unto' or 'with a view to'—'Repent ye, and be baptized ... in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins.'" Andrew C. White, of Ithaca, N. Y., answers: "Undoubtedly 'unto' is the exact rendering of 'eis' in this passage; but the common translation 'for' is sufficiently accurate, inasmuch as it indicates the end or destination of the rite." M. F. Oswald, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind., replies: "I should translate 'eis' in Acts 2:38 by 'for' or 'unto.' The preposition evidently denotes the purpose and is equivalent to 'epi' (final) with the accusative. The idea of purpose is substantiated by verse 19 of the following chapter (Acts 3:19.)" Frederick L. Anderson, of the department of New Testament Interpretation of the Newton Theological Institution, Newton Center, Mass., replies: "The purpose —'eis aphesin'—depends on the two ideas—'metanoë-

sate' and baptistheto' [repent and be baptized] —taken together. The apostle had no conception of a change of heart which did not immediately result in outward obedience. Only a change which has a practical effect on the life 'looks to' forgiveness." We have the same testimony from other eminent scholars, but space forbids further publication. The position of this journal throughout this discussion has been that the faith that did not effect a change of life was worthless. That position has been abundantly sustained by the Bible, scholars, Baptist scholars, and Editor Folk's interpretation of Acts 2:38.

## **Salvation Through Faith, Not of Works.**

---

### **ANSWER XV. BY E. E. FOLK. TO XIV. AND XV. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.**

The position which I attributed to Editor McQuiddy has either been directly expressed by him or is the natural and logical conclusion from his own statements repeatedly made. I am not surprised that he should draw back from it. But he ought to have done that before he took such unscriptural positions as he has been taking all through this discussion. When a person announces false premises, he need not be surprised at the conclusion which follows logically. I call attention to the fact also that Brother McQuiddy has been talking especially about the forgiveness of "past sins," while I have been considering the question of forgiveness of *sins*, past, present, and future, which is the question at issue between us, and which is, after all, the important, the essential, question—the plan of salvation.

Looking at the matter from this standpoint, I submit to the reader if the articles of the *Gospel Advocate* do not prove the statement which I made.

This, in brief, is its plan of salvation: A man must believe that God is, and that he himself is a sinner; must repent of his sins and must be baptized for the remission of his *past* sins. He must then obey God's commandments and do his "whole duty." He must keep the "whole law" and not offend even in "one

point." If he does, he must at once "repent" and "confess" his sins, or he will be lost.

Will the editor of the *Advocate* deny that this is his position? He cannot truly do so, for he has time and again in this discussion announced each one of these points as his belief. Especially did he express them in his Replies I., II., IV., X., XI. From this follows logically the conclusion which I stated: "In other words, salvation is a matter of obedience, not of faith. It is physical, not spiritual, because (according to the contention of the *Advocate*), true obedience must be a physical act. It is dependent upon our own actions, not upon God's grace." As I have said, however, I am not surprised that Editor McQuiddy should want to draw back from the conclusions to which his position logically leads him. And yet, after vehemently denying that he ever took any such position, he turns right around in the concluding sentence of the paragraph and gives the whole thing away again by saying, "While Editor Folk attempts to separate the faith that saves from obedience, he will never be able to divorce what God has joined together," thus contending that obedience is a part of the plan of salvation. And by obedience, as he has frequently argued, he means physical obedience.

I must notice some points in the last two articles of the *Advocate*. Says the *Advocate*: "With Editor Folk, the faith that saves the soul frees a man from obedience to all law." Talk about misrepresentation! *I have never read a greater misrepresentation than this*. It was just such a position, called "antinomianism," which was attributed to the apostle Paul by those in his day who, like the editor of the *Advocate*, believed

in salvation by works, not by faith, and which he repudiated so vigorously in Romans and in Galatians. (See Rom. 6:1, 2, 6, 11-23; Gal. 2:17-21.) It is necessary to repeat that my position is, the faith that saves the soul frees man from obedience to all law *as the method of salvation*, but not or *a rule of life*. On the contrary, faith, "the faith that saves the soul," leads to obedience; but it is the obedience of a *child* and not of a *slave*, obedience *because we are saved* and not *in order to be saved*.

"A man may steal, lie, murder, get drunk; but if he has faith, he is saved for time and eternity." A man who has faith, saving faith, will not want to "steal, lie, murder, or get drunk." And as Paul expresses it, "They who practice such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." (Gal. 4:21, R. V.) "A man should not refuse to do one thing God commands him to do." Of course not. But must he do *everything* God commands him to do *in order to be saved*? Is salvation attained only at the *end of obedience* to every command of God? That is the question. Peter says that it is at the end of *faith*. (1 Pet. 1:9.) The *Advocate* again speaks of the "high degree of faith and standard of life taught by the Bible and contended for by the *Gospel Advocate*." That the Bible teaches a "high degree of faith and standard of life," goes without saying. But that the faith for which the *Gospel Advocate* contends is a high degree of faith, I deny. It is the very lowest form of faith. In his definition of faith, the *Advocate* editor says that it is "conceived either as a principle of action leading to obedience to Christ, or as a condition jointly with other conditions of whatever blessing depends on it."

How low a conception of faith! Faith, true faith *saving faith*, is a personal trust on Christ as a personal Savior. It is the sinner grasping his Savior.

"Whenever a Christian is commanded to do anything, he is under law." Yes, but it is a *different law* from that under which the sinner dwells. It is the law of the *father to the son*, not of the master to the slave. Jesus called his service a *yoke*, but it is a very different yoke from that of sin. (Matt. 11:28-30.)

"It should not be overlooked that not one passage has been produced which ascribes salvation to faith alone." This is surprising, very surprising. I have produced a number of passages which ascribe salvation to faith alone. I cannot quote them again. They are too numerous. I can only refer to them. See Matt. 9:22; Mark 5:34; Luke 10:48; Mark 10:52; Luke 7:50; John 3:14, 15, 16, 36; John 5:24; John 6:35; John 10:31; Acts 3:16; Acts 13:39; Acts 14:9, 10; Acts 15:9; Acts 16:32; Rom. 1:16; Rom. 3:23; Rom. 3:27, 28; Rom. 4:5, 13; Rom. 10:10; Heb. 11:4 (see also Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:11; Heb. 10:38); Rom. 5:1; Gal. 2:20; Gal. 3:2; Gal. 3:21; Gal. 3:26; Eph. 2:8; Eph. 3:12; Eph. 3:16; Phil. 3:9; 1 Thess. 2:12; Jude 5:1; 1 Pet. 1:5; 1 Pet. 1:9.

"Nobody has questioned that it is ascribed to faith, baptism, and the blood of Christ." This is *still more surprising*, in view of the fact that I have questioned all through this discussion that it is ascribed to baptism. I would also put the "blood of Christ" before either faith or baptism.

"Faith alone is never treated in the New Testament as the condition of anything." This is the



*most surprising of all*, in view of the passages to which I have just referred, and especially in view of Gal. 2:16: "Knowing that a man is not justified by works of law, but *only* through faith in Jesus Christ," etc. (Imp. Vers.) So also the Twentieth Century New Testament uses the words "*only through faith.*"

The faith of the jailer and of Joshua and others was the *essential thing*. The works which followed were simply the outcome, the expression, of their faith.

"Editor Folk in his last teaches the doctrine of substitution—that Christ died 'in man's stead, taking man's place under the broken law.' As he tasted death for every man and has perfectly satisfied the law, all are saved. Thus he has committed himself to the doctrine of universal salvation." If by this Editor McQuiddy means, as he seems to mean, to *deny the substitutionary atonement of Christ*, that Christ died "in man's stead, taking man's place under the broken law," it is certainly *most amazing*, and especially amazing that any *professed Christian* should take any such position. It is Unitarianism—nay, it is *rank infidelity*. The statement that Christ died "in man's stead, taking man's place under the broken law," does not mean "universal salvation." It only means 'that salvation is made possible to all. That the atonement is *sufficient* for all cannot be denied; or if denied, it can be abundantly proven. It is, however, *efficient* not for all, but for those who, by repentance and faith, *accept* the atonement which Christ has provided.

"The same grace that led Jesus to die and make salvation possible to all teaches us to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts." "Makes salvation possible

to all." Certainly, but *how*? Did he simply make it possible for each one to *save himself*? And is he to save himself by denying "ungodliness and worldly lusts?" This seems to be the teaching of the *Advocate*. Is it? Did he not "make salvation possible to all" who would *repent* of their sins and accept of him as their personal Savior by *faith* in his blood? And is not the denial of ungodliness and worldly lusts simply the *outcome*, the *expression*, of that faith? The difference between the theology of the *Advocate* as indicated in the above sentence and the theology of the Bible is world-wide.

"In fighting the Bible doctrine of obedience, Editor Folk has clearly indicated that God will forgive the sinner while he is impenitent of sin or sins." In the first place, I have not fought "the Bible doctrine of obedience." I believe in, I teach, the Bible doctrine of obedience—that it is an obedience *because we are saved* and *not in order to be saved*, the obedience of a child and not of a slave. In the second place, I have not "indicated that God will forgive the sinner while he is impenitent of sin or sins." God *will not, cannot*, forgive a person until he repents of his sins. He will not, cannot, save him *in* his sins, but *from* his sins. But when once he has repented of his sins and believed on Christ, he is *saved*. "And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous" (1 John 2:1)—and through his advocacy we shall receive forgiveness for the sin.

Dr. Carver's view of Acts 2:38 as expressed in a letter to me is as follows:

"Several interpretations are almost equally defensible, and, of course, must be in harmony with the teach-

ing of the Word as a whole. My own view of the case is that the apostle means to tell his hearers to change their attitude toward the Christ whom they had killed and now to accept him as Savior and Lord, and to profess this fact in baptism in his name." He adds: "Campbellism is a distinct reversion to Catholicism, from which Protestantism has been gradually emancipating itself these four hundred years."

Editor McQuiddy is right in saying that "the sense of a word may be determined by its context." In so saying, however, he must yield his contention as to "eis," the word at present under dispute, for its meaning then becomes simply a question of context. He is mistaken in saying that "Editor Folk commits himself to the position that if a word means a thing in one place it means that in other places where it occurs, regardless of the context." I have committed myself to no such position. On the contrary, I have contended that if "eis" may mean one thing in one place, it *may* mean that same thing in another place, provided, of course, that it does no violence to the context to give it such a meaning. If, for instance, it looks backward in Matt. 12:41, it may look backward in Acts 2:38; for it not only does no violence to the context to so translate it here, but it harmonizes most beautifully with the context. Besides, there is the larger context, the whole tenor of scripture, to be considered. To interpret this passage as meaning that baptism is the ground of the remission of sins, or that it has anything to do with their actual remission, is to bring it into hopeless conflict with all those passages which speak of salvation by faith, and which declare that salvation is not a matter of works, or of obedience, or

of law, or of anything else, but of repentance for sin and faith in Christ.

I beg Editor McQuiddy's pardon, but, as a matter of fact, I have produced "one reputable Baptist scholar who renders 'eis' in Acts 2:38 'because of.'" I produced the name of Dr. John A. Broadus, who certainly was a "reputable Baptist scholar." He used to give this before his New Testament classes as one rendering of Acts 2:38. I have heard him do so, as a student under him, and I now have the notes of his lectures, in which he gives this rendering. In his commentary on Matthew, commenting on Matt. 12:41, he says: "The preposition rendered 'at' is *eis*, usually rendered 'into' or 'unto,' and often denoting design or aim. It cannot possibly have that sense here, for certainly the Ninevites did not repent *in order that* Jonah might preach. It clearly introduces the occasion or ground of the repenting (Winer, p. 397, (495); and so it may possibly have the same force in 3:11 and Acts 2:38." But I will go further, and will produce the name of a reputable Disciple scholar who renders "eis" "because." Prof. J. W. McGarvey, in commenting on Matt. 10:41, 42, says: "'In the name.'—'In the name of a prophet' is a Hebraism for 'because he is a prophet.' (Alford). He who receives a prophet *because* he is a prophet, or a righteous man *because* he is a righteous man, or who gives a drink of water to a disciple *because* he is a disciple, distinctly recognizes the person's relation to God as the ground of the act; and to that extent God is honored by the act. Not so, however, with him who performs a similar act in the name of humanity, or because the recipient is a man. (Matt. 10:41, 42, McGarvey's Commentary on Mat-

thew and Mark.) The word which Alford and McGarvey translate "because" is, in each of the above cases, *eis*. Here then is another instance where, according to Alford and McGarvey, *eis* looks backward, and where it is to be rendered "because." If it looks backward in Matt. 10:41, 42, it may in Acts 2:38. If it may be translated "because" in Matt. 10:41, 42, as they say it should be, then it may be translated "because" in Acts 2:38. This verse would then read: "Repent ye. and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ *because of* the remission of your sins." This is an entirely possible rendering, as I have said before, though I am still inclined to prefer the rendering given by Thayer and Winer and Lipscomb: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you, trusting on, relying upon, the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins."

Editor McQuiddy says that *both* of the renderings which I gave to Acts 2:38 cannot be correct. But *either* may be correct. Either one is a possible rendering. I have the authority of Winer and Broadus for one rendering and Thayer and Lipscomb for the other.

As to Winer, I have simply to say, it makes no difference in the argument whether it is in "looser combinations" or closer combinations that "eis" is rendered "as regards," "with reference to," "with respect to." The point is that Winer says it may be so rendered. And if in some places, it may be so rendered in other places.

What Broadus said is "*here* entirely appropriate" was that "eis" in *Matt. 26:28* should be rendered "for or unto the remission of sins, in order that sins may be remitted." Jesus had just said: "This is my

blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." It was certainly "entirely appropriate" to understand the verse as meaning that the *blood of Christ* was for the remission of sins. The expression of Dr. Broadus, however, that this is "the natural and *most* probable meaning of the preposition, and its case," would imply that there was another probable meaning, and his remark that this rendering is "*here* entirely appropriate" would imply that somewhere else, as, for instance, in Acts 2:38, it would *not* be "entirely appropriate," and that another rendering would be appropriate—which, as a matter of fact, Dr. Broadus thought and taught.

What Jesus said in Matt. 12:41 was that the men of Nineveh repented at the preaching of Jonas, or, as Winer puts it, that the preaching was the *occasion of their repentance*, not as Editor McQuiddy puts it, in the most roundabout and awkward way, that his preaching was the "'occasion' that led them to repent into the course of life demanded by the preaching of Jonas."

Such an expression, as also the expression of Editor McQuiddy a little later that "'eis' in Matt. 12:41 means that the Ninevites were to repent into the life demanded by the preaching of Jonas, and that the occasion for them to do this was his preaching," is a confusion of ideas, and is simply an attempt to read into the text what is in the mind of Brother McQuiddy and to twist it to conform to his preconceived ideas. The simple statement is that "the men of Nineveh repented *at the preaching* of Jonas." The preaching of Jonas was back of their repentance and was the occasion of it. "Eis" is connected with the *preaching*

of *Jonas* and not with the *course of life* of the Ninevites, as Editor McQuiddy makes it.

I was surprised to hear Editor McQuiddy say that in quoting from the "Handbook on Baptism" "nothing was left out that combats the truth as taught by the Disciples." In my reply Number Eight I showed that some very important things were left out, and some things which directly and distinctly contravene the doctrines of the Disciples. On the contrary, as I have shown, I made full quotations, which expressed the truth as taught by the Baptists.

As to Hovey on Acts 2:38 and 22:16, let me simply say that I have quoted him in full, and I indorse his position. I again ask, however, if Editor McQuiddy indorses his statement that *repentance* and *faith are the conditions of salvation*, and that baptism is simply represented as having the importance or efficacy of the forgiveness of sins, "because it is the *sign* of the repentance and faith which are the conditions of salvation."

Why did not Editor McQuiddy give the full quotation from Hovey on Titus 3:5? It reads as follows: "As we understand the passage, it might be literally translated *through a laver of regeneration and a renewing of the Holy Ghost*—'a laver of regeneration' referring to the inception of the new life by the work of the Spirit, and 'a renewing of the Holy Ghost' referring to the preservation and development of the life, already implanted, by the same Spirit. But whether 'a laver of regeneration' means a laver which belongs to regeneration, as its prescribed *emblem and expression*, or whether regeneration itself is *figuratively* called a laver of regeneration, because in and by it the soul is

cleansed, is not perfectly clear. If this passage could be interpreted by itself, without regard to other statements, we should be ready to adopt the latter view as correct, and say that there is here no reference to baptism. But bearing in mind the other passages, we accept the former view as probably correct, and believe that Paul had in mind baptism as representing and confessing the divine change called regeneration. Hence he teaches that men are saved by air outworking, obedient life, given and preserved by the Holy Spirit."

The view which Hovey accepts as "probably correct," then, is simply that "a laver of regeneration" means "a laver which belongs to regeneration, as its *prescribed emblem and expression*." He said also that "Paul had in mind baptism as *representing* and *confessing* the *divine change* called regeneration." Regeneration is the "divine change." Baptism simply *represents* and confesses that "change," which has already occurred in regeneration. The *life* is "given and preserved by the Holy Spirit." It then becomes an "outworking, obedient life."

But whatever doubt there may be as to the position of Hovey in his Appendix—and it seems to me that he is very clear there—he leaves no room for doubt as to his position on the subject of baptism in discussing John 3:5 in the body of his commentary, where he says: "According to this view, Nicodemus probably came to Jesus by night, because he was subject to the fear of man. Half-persuaded that Jesus was the promised Messiah, and half-inclined to become his disciple, the fear of man made him seek to be so in secret. With the Pharisees generally (see Luke 7:30), he had rejected the baptism of John, who did no mira-



cle (John 10:41); and now, though looking wistfully toward Jesus, who was working miracles that must be ascribed to the presence and power of God, he was inwardly resolved not to break with the Pharisees by submitting to baptism, and thus openly professing his allegiance to Christ. With this view of his character and state of mind, Jesus might tell the prudent Pharisee now before him that no one could be a member of the Messiah's kingdom without entering it in the prescribed way, without submitting to the rite which had been appointed to *symbolise and declare the spiritual change* involved in becoming a Christian. And surely it would be natural for Jesus, when speaking of birth from Spirit, to call the rite, which *symbolises* this, birth from water. One stands at the beginning of the inward life, and the other at the beginning of the corresponding outward life. And therefore Jesus could say, with the utmost propriety: 'You must confess me openly in the prescribed way—which you are unwilling to do—and you must also be the subject of a great *spiritual change*, which is *represented by that confession*, or you cannot enter my kingdom.'

Since Editor McQuiddy attempts to make so much of Hovey, I want to ask again if he indorses the view of Hovey on Acts 2:38; Acts 22:16; Titus 3:5; and John 3:5. I have quoted Hovey on these passages in my reply Number Eight. I need not do so again here. As to Dr. Graves, I have only to say:

1. I have given the views of Dr. Graves in full as expressed in his "Christian Baptism." Any detached passages from his writings must be interpreted in harmony with those views.

2. One may be a "technical" follower of Christ

without being really so. He may be a real follower of Christ without being technically so.

3. There are many in this country who are unbaptized. Few, if any, of these are so "willfully." They are simply not fully informed on the subject.

4. It is surprising to read the remark, "Mr. Folk cannot say Mr. Graves did not use 'the kingdom of God' and 'the church' interchangeably, for he does," when just above he had quoted Dr. Graves as saying that he holds and teaches that the kingdom of heaven differs from the church of Christ as the whole differs from the part. You cannot use the whole and the part interchangeably.

If Editor McQuiddy's position that "faith and baptism are inseparable" be true, then baptism must always and necessarily follow faith. But this was not the case with the thief on the cross. It was not the case, so far as we have any record, of others of whom the Bible tells us, as I have shown. Furthermore, if "faith and baptism are inseparable," then as one cannot be saved without faith, he cannot be saved without baptism. Then as baptism is only by immersion, as Editor McQuiddy and myself both believe, no one can be saved without immersion. If no one can be saved without immersion, then all the pious unimmersed are doomed and condemned. If no one can be saved without immersion, then salvation depends upon his immersion. It becomes a matter then, not between himself and God, but between himself and God *and a third person*. This makes salvation the manipulation by the priestly hands of a third person.

Dr. Robertson's position was simply that "eis" means "in," whatever "in" may mean, which depends upon

the context. Editor McQuiddy says that "eis" does not always mean "into," but only "usually" so, and that its meaning is to be determined by the context. This leaves the question open, then, as to its meaning in the various places in which it occurs. I may only repeat that if it has a certain meaning in one place it may have that meaning in another place, unless that meaning would do a great deal of violence to the context. Editor McQuiddy gives passages to show that "eis" may mean "at," "from," "to," "in," "on," "upon," etc., showing that it may have various meanings.

The efforts of Editor McQuiddy to explain away the passages I gave, showing that we believe "eis" Christ, are quite farfetched and do not need a reply. The fact still remains that in these numerous passages it is stated that we get *into Christ* by *believing* on him. They show that when we believe, it puts us into Christ; and when we get into him, that is all we need, so far as the salvation of the soul is concerned.

In commenting on John 3:36, he says: "Having already entered into Christ, 'eis' is rendered 'in' and not 'into,' because it here denotes rest in Christ." So a person has "already entered into Christ" before he believed on Christ, has he? How has he already entered into Christ? By baptism? Does baptism, then, come before belief? When a person believes on the Son, he has entered into Christ and he has "eternal life."

Editor McQuiddy attempts to explain away the statement of Green in his "Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament," that "faith saves actually and baptism symbolically"—or, as Green expressed it: "So we enter *eis Christ on, into Christ, actually by faith*, and

*symbolically by baptism, Christians being en Christo, in Christ*"—by saying that this is his "unsupported opinion." Any disagreement from the views of Editor McQuiddy he calls an "unsupported opinion." An agreement he calls "scholarship." On the part of Baptists he calls a disagreement "partisanship." What is scholarship? Scholarship is any view which agrees with Editor McQuiddy. Who are the scholars of the world? They are those who sustain Editor McQuiddy. Every one else is simply a "partisan" or the author of an "unsupported opinion"—unsupported, that is, by Editor McQuiddy, which is sufficient to condemn it.

Editor McQuiddy very coolly says: "I wish to add that Baptist scholars have felt it necessary to explain the sense in which baptism saves, in order to try to reconcile their practice with the teaching of the Bible. I have never felt the necessity of explaining the sense in which baptism saves, since the Holy Spirit has clone this." That is to say, whatever view of the Scriptures is taken by Editor McQuiddy, that is the view intended by the Holy Spirit. In other words, Editor McQuiddy claims to be the only and original (next to Alexander Campbell) and absolute and infallible (next to the pope) interpreter of the Scriptures. No more arrogant claim was ever made by the pope of Rome or the president of *the* Mormon hierarchy.

To the quotations which I have given, I may add the following: In denning "baptize," Thayer says that "it is an immersion in water, performed as a *sign of the removal of sin*, and administered to those who, impelled by a desire for salvation, sought admission to the benefits of the Messiah's kingdom." The baptism

did not bring the removal of sin. It is only a *sign* of such removal.

Ellicott, one of the greatest scholars of the church of England, says in his "New Testament Commentary for English Readers," in commenting on Acts 2:38: "The work of the apostles is in one sense a continuation, in another a development, of that of the Baptist. There is the same indispensable condition of repentance—i. e., a change of the heart and will—the same outward rite as the *symbol* of purification, the same promise of forgiveness WHICH that change involves."

In a recent issue of the *Gospel Advocate*, David Lipscomb said: "Baptism is the act of faith; it is the act in which man embodies and *declares* his faith in God through Jesus Christ"—thus making baptism *declarative* of faith.

Brother McQuiddy says the reader will notice that he has not quoted from the Disciple scholars. The reader has probably noticed, however, *that I have* quoted from them. He may have noticed also that Brother McQuiddy has not denied either the accuracy of the quotations or their teachings. I have not "repudiated and turned out of the Baptist ranks the Baptist scholars" quoted by Editor McQuiddy. On the contrary, I have shown that he has utterly misrepresented such Baptist scholars as Drs. Hovey, Hackett, Graves, Carver, Broadus, etc. I quote from them simply to show that he had misquoted them, and to defend them against the untrue and utterly repulsive charge which he brings against them of teaching that baptism is a part of the plan of salvation. Here is what I said and meant:

"If I believed that I, like the Jews, am required to offer a goat as a sin offering, and that I am required to do so *in order to be saved*, I should certainly be hunting up one, and that pretty soon." The Jews were required to offer a goat as a sin offering. They were not, however, saved by the blood of that *goat*, but by the blood of the *Lamb of God* which was to be slain on Calvary, and the blood of the goat, or the bull, or the lamb only *indicated their belief in and dependence upon* the blood of that Lamb.

I said: "The law was done away in Christ *as a method of salvation*, but not *as a rule of life*." The law was "a method of salvation." Any one might be saved through obedience to the law. But he must obey it *perfectly*. He must obey *in every respect*. If he slipped in *one point*, he was gone, and gone forever. And so no one *ever was* or *ever can* be saved by the law. It was exactly because we *could not* obey the law perfectly that Christ came and took our place under the law, and so *did away with the law as a method of salvation*. And in Christ there is only *one way of salvation*, and that is through repentance for sin and belief in him. Here is precisely the difference between Editor McQuiddy and myself: He says one *may* and *must* be saved by *obedience to the law*. I say that *no one* can be saved by obedience to the law, but must be saved *only through repentance for his sins and faith in Christ*. The law is outside of Christ. If it will make it any plainer for Brother McQuiddy, I might put the sentence this way: The law was done away *by* Christ as a method of salvation. The law, however, still remains as a rule of life.

I send to Editor McQuiddy a copy of an editorial

which appeared recently in the *Baptist and Reflector*, proving, I believe, beyond question, that the Sabbath day was changed from Saturday to Sunday. If he wishes further proof, I would refer him to a book called "Seventh-day Adventism Renounced," by Rev. D. M. Canright. "It is impossible to make the seventh the first day," but it *is possible* to change the *Sabbath day* from the seventh day to the first. If, however, Editor McQuiddy insists that Saturday is still the Sabbath day, why does he not rest and worship on that day? He ought, in that case, either to join the Seventh-day Adventists or the Jews.

The editor of the *Advocate* says: "My position is that in order to walk by faith we must be guided by the law of God, which prohibits murder and gives us the acts that constitute obedience to Christ." This is an apparently definite statement of his position, and means, if it means anything, that in order to be saved we must "be guided by the law of God," and must do the "acts that constitute obedience to Christ." Notice the word "*acts*"—not only "act," but "acts," many "acts," numerous "acts," constant "acts," "acts" all through life, "acts that constitute obedience to Christ," which must be *absolute, perfect obedience. Who then can be saved?*

When I speak of "salvation by faith alone," I mean, of course, salvation by *faith*, without *baptism*, without *works*, without *obedience*, without *anything else* added to faith to save the person. As I have said before, repentance and faith *always go together*. Wherever repentance is mentioned separately, it is presumed that *faith will follow*. Wherever faith is mentioned separately, it is presumed that *repentance has preceded*.

Repentance, however, does not *save* a person. It only *prepares him for being saved* by faith in Christ.

Moody and the thief on the cross seem to trouble the dreams of Brother McQuiddy—and no wonder. For if they were saved without baptism, as every one including Brother McQuiddy, must admit that they were, or at least without immersion, then *any one* may be saved without baptism. The *Advocate*, however, tries to claim that Mr. Moody was immersed. That is a question. But it makes little difference to my argument whether he was or not. The question was, *What about the pious unimmersed?* Mr. Moody was given only as one instance of such a person. But take some one else, if you please. Take Dr. W. M. Anderson, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Nashville. Take *any* pious Presbyterian or pious Methodist. Editor McQuiddy shall not be allowed to get around the argument so easily by quibbling over the question as to whether Mr. Moody was immersed or not.

With regard to the pious unimmersed, Alexander Campbell said in his "Christian System:" "Infants, idiots, deaf and dumb persons, innocent pagans wherever they can be found, with all the pious pedobaptists, we commend to the mercy of God. . . . But one thing we do know, that none can rationally and with certainty enjoy the peace of God, and the hope of heaven, but they who intelligently and in full faith are born of water, or immersed for the remission of their sins." ("Christian System," page 249.) Does Editor McQuiddy indorse this?

Editor McQuiddy denies by implication that his patron saint, Alexander Campbell, ever taught baptismal regeneration, and says if he did it must have



been while he was a Baptist. In his "Christian System" he says: "This act is sometimes called immersion, regeneration, conversion." ("Christian System," page 206.) "Christian immersion, frequently called *conversion*." (Page 210.) On page 212 he lays down the following proposition: "*I now proceed to show that immersion and washing of regeneration are two Bible names for the same act contemplated in two different points of view.*" "*Washing of regeneration and immersion are, therefore, only two names for the same thing.*" (Page 213.) "For if immersion be equivalent to regeneration, and regeneration be of the same import with being born again, then being born again and being immersed are the same thing; for this plain reason, that things which are equal to the same thing are equal to one another. Persons are begotten by the Spirit of God, impregnated by the word, and born of the water." (Page 214.) "To call the receiving of any spirit or any influence, or energy, or any operation upon the heart of man, regeneration, is an abuse of all speech, as well as a departure from the diction of the Holy Spirit, *who calls nothing personal regeneration except the act of immersion.*" (Page 215.) "Regeneration or immersion—the former referring to the import of the act, and the latter term to the act itself—denote only the act of being born." (Page 221.) "But in the water you continued not. Of it you were born, and from it you came forth, raised with Jesus, and rising in his strength." (Page 253.) The Italics in the above quotations are all Mr. Campbell's.

I might give other quotations, but these will perhaps suffice. They constitute overwhelming proof that Mr. Campbell did believe in baptismal regeneration,

and that he regarded immersion as "equivalent to regeneration." Now, let me ask, does Editor McQuiddy indorse Mr. Campbell, or does he repudiate Mr. Campbell's doctrine? Was Mr. Campbell a Baptist when he wrote his "Christian System?" The book certainly does not sound like it. And, in fact, every one, including Editor McQuiddy, knows that he was not a Baptist then, if he ever was one in reality.

Orchard, in his history, simply quoted from the apostolic fathers, some of whom *scant* to teach baptismal regeneration, though most of them take the position that baptism is symbolical or figurative, or emblematic, as I could show if I had space. Dr. Graves indorsed Orchard's history *as history*. He did not indorse everything he quoted in his history. But I want to ask, does Editor McQuiddy claim that the quotations to which he refers teach baptismal regeneration? If so, does he indorse them? If they do *not* teach baptismal regeneration, then there could be no objection to their indorsement by Dr. Graves not only historically, but doctrinally—if, as claimed by the *Advocate*, he did so indorse them. If, however, they *do* teach baptismal regeneration and the editor of the *Advocate* indorses their teachings, then he *commits himself to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration*. And yet he has disclaimed believing in any such doctrine. He can take either horn of the dilemma he chooses.

This whole discussion started over the question as to whether the Disciples believe in baptismal regeneration, Editor McQuiddy denying that they do. But now we find him quoting the apostolic fathers to prove the doctrine. I have shown that Editor McQuiddy himself and also Alexander Campbell believe in it.

Editor McQuiddy again misrepresents and perverts the position of Baptists. Their position is simply that before repentance and faith a person is dead *in* sin, spiritually. (Eph. 2:1; Col. 2:13.) After repentance and faith, he is dead *to* sin. (Rom. 6:2.) He is then alive, and is baptized to express his death to sin and his resurrection to a new life. (Rom. 6:4.) When a person gets on the train at Nashville to go to Chattanooga, he trusts himself to that train. He puts himself completely in the power of the train, and it carries him safely to Chattanooga. He is not already in Chattanooga, but he will get there if the train is not wrecked. His getting to Chattanooga is a question now, not of himself, but of the train. Suppose, however, he should distrust the train and get out and walk, he would be then trusting to himself and not to the train. *The train is Christ*. When a person trusts himself to Christ, Christ will see to it that he is saved. But if he refuses to put himself completely in the hands of Christ and trusts to himself, do you not think he would be very foolish?

As to the doctrines of depravity, election, falling from grace, etc., which Editor McQuiddy attempts to raise, it is too late to discuss them now. These are not the questions before us, but, *What is the plan of salvation?*

Editor McQuiddy says: "I will ask him here to find the language where I have ever admitted 'several ways of salvation,' and also where I said that if a Christian sins he is lost." Very well. I have quoted his language a number of times, but I will do so again. In his Reply Number One, Editor McQuiddy said: "God saves when we obey. We are saved by grace."

We are justified by his blood, by faith, by baptism, by works." In his Reply Number Two he said: "The Scriptures teach baptism saves us; we are saved by the blood and life of Christ; we are saved by hope; we are saved by works; and we save ourselves." In his Reply Number Four he said that "salvation from past sins is drawn at faith and baptism," and that "the faithful man does the best he can all through life;" that we must obey in every respect, because "he that offends in one point is guilty of all;" and that we must "keep his commandments." He had previously quoted the saying of Solomon to express his position: "Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." In his Reply Number Ten he said that he teaches "salvation by grace, by faith, by works, by baptism, by hope, by the blood of Christ." In this Reply he also said: "The specific acts constituting obedience have been different in different ages." In his Reply Number Eleven, repeated in his Reply Number Fourteen, he said: "Baptism, the Lord's day, and the Lord's Supper are indispensable provisions of redeeming grace." At the close of his Reply Number Fourteen he says: "My position is that in order to walk by faith we must be guided by the law of God, which prohibits murder and gives us the acts that constitute obedience to Christ."

Putting them all together, here, then, is the plan of salvation taught by Editor McQuiddy, as expressed in his Replies I., II., IV., X., XL, XIV. We are saved "when we obey," "by grace," "by his blood," "by faith," "by baptism," "by works," "by the blood and life of Christ," "by hope," "we save ourselves," "by the Lord's day and the Lord's Supper," "the law of God," "acts

that constitute obedience," "the specific acts," "by doing the best we can," when we "keep his commandments," when we do our "whole duty." What an awkward, jumbled, complicated, impossible plan! If all of these things do not constitute "several ways of salvation," I should like to know what would constitute several ways. Some of these ways, as I have shown before, are mutually exclusive. I have called attention to the fact that Editor McQuiddy's difficulty arises from his confusion of the "one salvation" with the several ways by which he proposes we are to obtain that one salvation.

As to the second question: In his Reply Number Four, in answer to the question from me, "Where do you draw the line of salvation, at faith or at works? If at works, what works?" he said: "Salvation from past sins is drawn at faith and baptism." The person then is a Christian, is he not? I asked: "Do you limit the works (that a person must do to be saved) to one work, baptism?" He replied: "Baptism is the first act of submission to Christ which grows out of faith. It is the degree of faith at which God pardons. The faithful man *does the best he can all through life.*" I then asked: "Must a man obey in only one respect to be saved, or must he obey in every respect?" In reply he quoted James 2:10: "He that offends in one point is guilty of all." That is, a man, including, of course, one who has believed and been baptized, and so is a Christian, must obey in every respect to be saved. "If he offends in one point, he is guilty of all," and so is lost. If this does not mean if a Christian sins he is lost, I do not know how to take language. He now says: "All men sin, but all

may repent of their sins and confess them and be forgiven." The very fact that when they sin they must "repent of their sins and confess them and be forgiven" shows that they would be lost if they did *not* "repent of their sins and confess them and be forgiven." Notice, however, that Editor McQuiddy does not say all men (including Christians) *will* "repent of their sins," etc., but all *may*. This implies that some *will* and some will *not*. Now, suppose some do *not* "repent of their sins and confess them and be forgiven," will they not be lost? If so, will not their salvation depend upon their repentance and confession and forgiveness each time they sin?

"The forgiven man will enjoy salvation." True. But what about the unforgiven man? Will he "enjoy salvation?" If not, what must he do then to obtain forgiveness, *not only for his past sins*, but for his sins through life, in order that he may "enjoy salvation?"

Editor McQuiddy goes back to that rope. He seems determined to hang himself with it. He again confuses the one salvation with several ways of salvation. As I have before pointed out, *the rope is Christ*. If a man turns loose everything and trusts himself to the rope, that is salvation by the grace of God through the faith of the man in Christ, the rope. If, however, after grasping the rope, the man should distrust it, and be uncertain about its holding, and *keep on struggling to try to save himself*, that would be an effort at salvation by works. That is what Editor McQuiddy proposes to do.

The Bible says: "The like *figure* whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away

of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." (1 Pet. 3:21.) Notice that Peter says that "baptism is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh." It has no power to effect cleansing from the defilement of sin. It is simply the "answer of a good conscience toward God," the answer of a conscience which has *already been made good* through the blood of Christ and by the repentance of a person for his sins and his trust on Christ as a personal Savior. Notice also that it was not the water which saved Noah. It was the ark. Baptism corresponds to the water; Christ, to the ark.

As to the "order of faith and repentance" or repentance and faith, my arguments all remain unanswered. As I have shown, everywhere in the New Testament where repentance and faith occur together, it is always repentance *first* and faith *second*. I demand and insist that the editor of the *Advocate* shall give us *one* passage where faith comes before repentance or yield the point, which, as a matter of fact, is an important, if not a vital, one in his theology. On this question of the order of repentance and faith, I refer the reader to the quotations from McGarvey on Matt. 21:32 and Mark 1:15, as given in my Answer Number Fourteen.

Editor McQuiddy surprised me by saying, "It is now conceded that 'born of water' does not refer to the natural birth." I had to rub my eyes and look at this sentence again and again to see what in the world Editor McQuiddy meant. As proof of it, he quotes me as saying, "Of course, 'born of water' does not refer to the natural birth." Here is what I said

in the article to which the editor of the *Advocate* was replying. I quoted the *Advocate* as saying: "'Born of water' does not refer to the natural birth, for this occurred with Nicodemus and occurs with every one before Jesus says to him: 'Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.'" To this I replied: "Of course, but because the natural birth had already occurred, that was no reason why Jesus could not refer to it, but all the more reason why he should." I presume that every reader—with the exception, shall I say, of Editor McQuiddy—understood that the expression "of course" was to be taken in connection with the remark that "*this*" (the natural birth) "occurred with Nicodemus and others, and occurs with every one before Jesus says to him, 'Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God,'" and was not to be taken in connection with the remark, "Born of water does not refer to the natural birth," as Editor McQuiddy takes it. It is not very pleasant after drawing a horse to have to write under it all the time, "This is a horse," but it seems necessary that this should be done for the benefit of Editor McQuiddy.

I want to say right here that in the eighteen years I have been editor of the *Baptist and Reflector* I have had many discussions with persons of all denominations, but never before have I had a discussion with any one who quibbled so much over little things, who would take words out of their context and twist them to mean something they were never intended to mean, and that no one but Editor McQuiddy would ever suppose them to mean. I do not say that Editor McQuiddy would deliberately misrepresent me. I only



say that he continually *misunderstands*, and so *perverts* my meaning. I think, though, that in justice to me he ought to get some one else to go over my articles with him and *explain their meaning* to him before he attempts to reply to them. It would save both him and myself a great deal of trouble if he would do so.

Says the *Advocate*: "There is but one birth, and the elements of that birth are water and the Spirit." Ah, indeed! But what about the *physical birth*? And what about the *spiritual birth*? Is there no physical birth? Is there no spiritual birth? Are they really the same? If there is but "one birth," which birth does the editor of the *Advocate* deny? He can hardly deny a physical birth, because that would be to deny his own existence. Does he mean to deny that there is such a thing as a spiritual birth? There are not, of course, two kinds of *physical births*, and there are not two kinds of *spiritual births*. But there is a physical birth, which is the *first birth*, and there is a spiritual birth, which is the *second birth*. In the physical birth we are *born of water*, and in the spiritual birth we are *born of the Spirit*.

Now as to Acts 2:38: The rendering which I gave was not intended to be a literal translation, but more of an interpretation. I based it upon the preposition "epi," which, as I stated, is used in nearly all the manuscripts in the phrase "in the name" of Jesus Christ. The idea of it is "on" or "resting upon." I have, though, some good company for the rendering I gave the verse, such as Thayer and Winer and David Lipscomb, all of whom give almost exactly the same interpretation to the verse I did, as I showed in my Answer Number Fourteen. Other renderings may

also be given, as by Hovey, Hackett, Winer, etc. If however, the preposition "en" is used, as by Westcott and Hort, it makes little difference. It could then be translated "trusting in the name of Jesus Christ," which would carry with it the same idea as the other rendering. As to the views of the scholars secured by Brother McQuiddy, I have only to say that they do not differ materially from mine. I need not notice each one in detail. The scholars all translate the word "eis" by "unto." So do I. The only question is as to *what is the basis of remission of sins*. Is it baptism, or repentance and baptism together, if you choose, or is it faith in Christ? If you say it is all three, then another question would come, as Professor Carver says, as to the sense in which baptism is used, whether *literally* or *figuratively*.

The *Advocate* says:

"The position of this journal through this discussion has been that the faith that did not effect a change of life was worthless." But the question under dispute between the editor of the *Advocate* and myself has been as to whether it is "*faith*" that saves the person or the "*change of life*" that saves him, or *both together*, if you choose. Is he saved *by* faith and *at* faith, or is he only saved *by* a "change of life" and *after* a "change of life?" In other words, is salvation a matter of *faith* or of works?

And this brings me to the summary of the discussion.

I have shown that religion is a spiritual matter. "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." (John 4:24.) There is a tendency the world over to a ritualistic

religion, a religion of forms and ceremonies and outside works of some kind.

Religion is that which binds us back to God. God is a Spirit, not a body; immaterial, not material; and the only way we can come in contact with him, and so be bound back to him, is in our spirits. In other words, religion is essentially, necessarily, a matter of the heart. It is on the inside of a person. Nothing else can be true religion. These ceremonies, these works, as far as they are any part of religion at all, are only its consequences, its results, the stream flowing from the fountain, the shadow of the substance, the fruit of the tree whose roots are in the heart, in the soul of a person. The fruits do not make the tree, the tree makes the fruits. That religion is a spiritual matter, a matter of the heart, is taught in the following passages: 1 Sam. 16:7; Prov. 23:7; Jer. 31:31-33; Ezek. 36:26, 27; Ps. 51:10; Matt. 12:34, 35; Matt. 15:19; Acts 16:14; Rom. 10:10. I can only refer to these passages. I am sorry I have not space to quote them.

Salvation is by grace. It is the gift of God, the unmerited favor of God. The sinner receives this salvation by *repentance* for his sins (Matt. 3:2; Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3; Mark 1:15; Mark 6:12; Luke 13:3; Acts 3:19; Acts 17:30; Acts 20:21; Heb. 6:1) and by *faith* in Jesus Christ (Acts 19:4; John 3:16; John 3:36; Mark 1:15; Acts 20:21; Heb. 5:1; Gal. 3:11; Eph. 2:8; Acts 16:31; Heb. 6:1), etc. The essence of the plan of salvation is in these two words—*sinner*, *Savior*. To these words "repentance" and "faith" correspond—"repentance" to "sinner," "faith" to "Savior." Repentance means a sinner *turn-*

*ing from his sins*, and faith means a sinner *turning to his Savior*. Baptism simply expresses in a figure, in a beautiful object lesson, the repentance and faith which the person has already experienced in his soul—his death to sin, which means repentance, and his resurrection to a new life, which means faith. (Rom. 6-4; Col. 2:12.)

In reply to my question, "What use have you for Christ?" Editor McQuiddy simply says that "Christ died to make it possible for God to save those that obey him." Contrast with this, "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (1 John 1:7.) Editor McQuiddy, however, quotes approvingly Dr. Ditzler as saying of the Disciples: "You in the water, nowhere else, come in contact with the blood." The blood, then, becomes efficacious only in the water! Think of it! The blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, which was shed for the remission of sins, is dependent for its efficacy on—water! And the efficacy of the water is dependent on some man to apply it!

Editor McQuiddy admits that "born of water" (John 3:5) is "metaphorical." "Metaphorical" means "figurative," says Webster. A metaphor is a figure of speech. Yet in the face of his admission he denies that baptism in John 3:5 is figurative.

Editor McQuiddy contends that "in all ages obedience to the commands of God has affected the physical man." The question comes, however, must obedience to the commands of God affect the physical man *before he can be saved*? That is the question. I insist that the essence of obedience is in the heart, and that physical obedience is simply the outward expression of this essential inward obedience. I insist also that salvation is not a matter of obedience to the commands of

God on the part of the sinner, but of Christ. "By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous" (Rom. 5:19)—by accepting Christ as *his* substitute and Savior through faith.

Brother McQuiddy has been dwelling especially upon the forgiveness of "past sins," while I have been considering the question of the forgiveness of sins, past, present, and future. The question in dispute between us is, *What is the plan of salvation? What must I do to be saved?*—not simply saved from past sins, but *saved*—saved from sins, past, present, and future; saved in time and saved in eternity. It is a very low and narrow conception of the plan of salvation to confine it to the question of "past sins." *Grant all that Editor McQuiddy claims for baptism*—which, of course, I do not grant; but for the sake of argument *grant it all—then what?* Why, then you have the man saved from his "past sins;" that is all. But that is not all the man wants. He wants to know how he may be saved from sins, past, present, and future. I say that through repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ we are saved from all sins, past, present, and future. He says that baptism saves from "past sins." As to how a person may secure salvation from future sins, which is the essential question, Brother McQuiddy refuses to say definitely, though he continually implies that it comes through keeping God's commandments, obeying his law, doing his duty, or, as he expressed it in Reply Number Four, "doing the best he can." But suppose during the balance of his life he does *not* do the best he can? Suppose he does not "keep God's commandments?" Suppose he does not obey his law perfectly? What then?

How may he be saved? Does *anybody* "keep God's commandments?" Does *anybody* obey his law perfectly? Does *anybody* "do the best he can?" And if he should do the best he can, is that sufficient? Is salvation a matter simply of a man's doing the best he can? Jesus taught his disciples to say: "So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do." (Luke 17:10.) These are the issues which are involved in this discussion—issues which Editor McQuiddy has steadily refused to meet, except in an indirect way. We have been discussing the plan of salvation. I repeat that it is certainly a very low and narrow conception of the plan of salvation to confine it simply to the question of "past sins." What a sinner wants to know is how he may be saved from sins, past, present, and future; saved here and saved hereafter; saved in time and saved in eternity.

I have contended all along that salvation is *by grace through faith, not of works*. The editor of the *Advocate* has contended that salvation is *by grace through faith, and baptism, and works, and obedience, and keeping the whole law*. The plan of salvation which I teach is the plan taught by Paul—"Repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." (Acts 20:21.) This Paul called "the whole counsel of God." The plan of salvation which Editor McQuiddy teaches is: *Believe, repent, be baptized*, and you will then be saved from past sins. To be saved from *future* sins, you must do so by your *works*; you must *keep the whole law*; you must *obey in every respect*, and perform every "*specific act*" which may be required of

you. If you fail to obey in *one respect*, you are lost, unless you at once *repent*, seek and receive forgiveness for that particular sin. I have shown that the line of salvation is drawn *at faith*. Editor McQuiddy has refused to draw any definite line at which we are saved, but his whole argument goes to show that he takes the position that the line of salvation is at *baptism* for *past* sins and at *obedience* for *future* sins. I have shown that this is impossible, because if a person must obey in *one* respect to be saved, he must obey in *every* respect, as shown by Paul in Gal. 3:10, "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in *all things* which are written in the book of the law to do them," and James 2:10: "For whosoever shall keep the *whole law*, and yet offend in *one point*, he is guilty of all." I have shown that we are saved *by* faith and *at* faith. Editor McQuiddy has contended that we are saved by faith *and* by works. But I have shown that if we are saved by *faith* we *cannot* be saved by faith *and* works. Salvation must be either by faith or by works; *it cannot be by both*. I have shown that the two steps in the plan of salvation are *repentance and faith*, and that repentance always comes, *necessarily must come*, before faith. Until the sinner has repented of his sins, he is not ready for Christ, and Christ is not ready for him.

I have shown that if a person must save himself by *his own works* he must keep the law *perfectly*, which is IMPOSSIBLE, because he must obey the law, not only in *letter*, but in *spirit*, as shown by Jesus in the fifth chapter of Matthew. According to Editor McQuiddy, however, if he fails to obey in *any respect*, he is lost,

unless he *repents* for every sinful thought or word or deed. But he may not know sometimes whether the thought or word or deed was sinful, or he may fail to repent of it at once. Death may come and find him unrepentant, and so he will be lost. If he must fulfill every "specific act required of him," he may not know just *what* that act was. If he must repent of every sin, how shall he express that repentance? Why should he not express it every night by baptism? I have shown that the plan of salvation which Editor McQuiddy teaches is the plan of which Peter spoke in Acts 15:10: "*Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?*" and of which Paul spoke in Gal. 1:8: "*But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.*" I have shown that such a plan is hard, and indeed impossible.

This plan of salvation taught by Editor McQuiddy is simply a return to the yoke of Judaism thrown off by Christ and his apostles—a hard, galling yoke. It is "another gospel" from the simple gospel of salvation "by grace through faith." Of such a plan of salvation Paul said: "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage" (Gal. 5:1) —of bondage to the law. Paul adds: "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." (Gal. 5:4.) You have ceased trying to be saved by *grace*, and have gone to trying to save yourselves by obe-



dience to the law. In doing so you have made Christ of no effect. You have practically nullified his death. You have no use for him.

In what I have written in this discussion I have been fighting the battles of others—not only the battle of Baptists, whom I represent as editor of the *Baptist and Reflector*, and whose doctrine on the plan of salvation I have stated and defended, and all of whom will, of course, indorse my position, but the battle of every soul crying out, "What must I do to be saved?" —the battle for freedom from bondage to the law, for "the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free."

I have shown that if only those who have been baptized can be saved, and if baptism is only by immersion (as both Editor McQuiddy and myself contend), then the *pious unimmersed*, such as D. L. Moody, or any pious Methodist or Presbyterian, must be lost. I have shown, too, that if after one is baptized he must then save himself by his own works, *no one can be saved*. In other words, it is a *hard, impossible* plan of salvation which Editor McQuiddy teaches. I have shown that the *blood* comes *before* the *water*, whereas Editor McQuiddy puts the *water before* the *blood* and contends that you reach the blood only in the water. I have shown that in striking contrast with this impossible plan of salvation taught by Editor McQuiddy is the simple plan of salvation by grace, through faith in Jesus Christ. I have shown that we are "created in Christ Jesus unto good works. (Eph. 2:10.) But we are first *created* in him by *faith*, and the *works* then follow as the *fruit*, the *result*, the *consequent*, of the faith. Editor McQuiddy has time and time again quot-

ed Mark 16:16, but I have shown that he does not believe his own proof text, and I again challenge him to say that he does. As I have stated, what he believes is: He that believeth and repenteth of his sins and is baptized shall be saved from his past sins. And he shall be saved from his future sins, if he obeys the commandments, if he keeps the whole law, if he does his whole duty, and if he does not fall from grace, I challenge him to deny that this is his belief.

I have shown that if you interpret the passages which it is claimed teach that baptism is essential to salvation in the sense in which Editor McQuiddy takes them, you bring them into hopeless conflict with numerous other passages which teach that salvation is *by faith* and at faith. I have shown also that these few passages may be interpreted in a simple, easy, and natural way which will harmonize them with the rest of the New Testament. I have shown that the salvation of the soul is a *spiritual matter*, and that it cannot be affected by any *physical act*. To join spiritual and physical acts together as equally requisite for salvation is to coordinate *incongruous elements*, and is to make salvation ultimately a *physical* and not a *spiritual* matter. Besides, to make baptism essential to salvation is not only to make salvation dependent upon a physical act, but also upon a *third person* who must perform the ceremony, instead of simply a matter *between the soul and its God*. By refusing to perform the ceremony this third person can thus prevent the salvation of the soul. I have shown that a person gets into Christ by believing on him.

In the issue of April 5, 1906, I showed that Editor

McQuiddy had been guilty of nine inconsistencies and that then I had not exhausted them all. He neither *denied* nor *attempted to explain* these inconsistencies. In addition to having repealed the Ten Commandments and abrogated the moral law as binding on us, he now abolishes the Sabbath; but, *worst of all, he denies the substitutionary atonement of Jesus Christ*. I have repeatedly asked him the question, *What use have you for Christ?* He has never answered, and *never can answer*. *No one has any use for Christ if he must save himself by his own works*. If Christ simply died to make it possible for him to *save himself*, then what is the essential difference between having to save himself *after* Christ came and having to save himself *before* Christ came?

No, no, no. Put over against all of *this hard, difficult, intricate, complicated, impossible* plan of salvation taught by Editor McQuiddy the simple plan of salvation by grace through repentance for sin and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Hear Paul: "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the *faith* of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me. I do not frustrate the grace of God: for *if righteousness come by the law*, then Christ is dead in vain." (Gal. 2:20, 21.) "And be found in him, *not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law*, but that which is *through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith*." (Phil. 3:10.)

I want to say, and say it plainly, but say it earnestly and lovingly, that *this* is the plan of salvation. *This is the only plan*. If any one is saved in *this* way,

he is *saved*; but if he trusts to *any other plan* of salvation, *he will not, cannot, be saved*. "There is *none other name* under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved," except the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 4:12); and there is *none other plan* of salvation under heaven given among men, except the plan of salvation *by grace through faith in Jesus Christ* (Eph. 2:8, 9). Reader, if you have not accepted that plan of salvation, I beg you, in God's name, to do so now. I trust that in this series of articles there have been many who have been led to see the way plainer than ever they had seen it before, and that some may be led to see it and accept it who have never yet seen it and accepted it for themselves.

I must again ask that Editor McQuiddy shall give the interpretation of those passages of scripture whose meaning I asked him to give, but which meaning he has never yet given.

In conclusion, let me simply say that it has been my endeavor to conduct this discussion as a Christian gentleman. I have tried to make my arguments just as hard and strong as I could, but to use as mild and gentle words as possible to express my meaning. For Editor McQuiddy, personally, I have the kindest feeling; for his doctrine as to the plan of salvation, I have the utmost abhorrence.

---

PRAYER: God grant that each one who has read this discussion may be led to examine the foundations of his faith, and, if he has not already done so, to repent of his sins and accept Jesus Christ as his personal

Savior, trusting to him, *and to him alone*, for salvation.

And now may the blessings of Almighty God rest and abide upon you always. Amen.

## Salvation Through Faith, Not of Works.

---

### REPLY XVI. BY J. C. McQUIDDY.

As this discussion progresses the translations of "eis" in Acts 2:38 multiply. Here are Editor Folk's translations:

(1) "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you, trusting on, relying upon, the name of Jesus Christ, unto the remission of your sins."

(2) "Repent ye, and be baptized in reference to, as regards, with respect to the remission of your sins, or with the remission of your sins as the occasion of your baptism."

(3) "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ 'because of the remission of your sins.'"

He adds by way of explanation: "This is an entirely possible rendering, as I have said before, though I am still inclined to prefer the rendering given by Thayer and Lipscomb."

"Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you, trusting on, relying upon, the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins."

I have never objected to the first rendering of "eis" as given by Editor Folk. Certainly Editor Folk is at liberty to skate on "eis" and *break through* as much as he pleases. As we are agreed on the rendering which he prefers, and as he teaches "eis" looks forward in Acts 2:38, I can see no reason for his special effort to show that "eis" may sometimes be rendered "be-

cause of." I challenged him in my last article to take the position that "eis" may be so rendered in Acts 2:38; but, instead of this, he assures us that he still prefers the rendering "unto" or "for." While he has never taken a definite position as to the meaning of "eis" in Acts 2:38, and seems afraid to do so, he has exhibited a novel way of showing his preference. While he prefers "unto" or "for" in Acts 2:38, he has even perverted Winer and Thayer in Matt. 12:41, and has even misconstrued McGarvey on Matt. 10:41, 42, to make it appear that "eis" may be rendered "because of." He has occupied all of this space simply to show us that if "eis" may be so rendered in Matt. 12:41, it may be so rendered in Acts 2:38, though he prefers the rendering "for" or "unto" in Acts 2:38, and renders it "unto." Of course, it may be rendered by a partisan "because of" in Acts 2:38, but *falsely* so. Editor Folk being the judge, "unto" or "for" must be the correct rendering, as he would not prefer this rendering if it were not correct. I have challenged him to produce even one Baptist scholar who renders "eis" "because of" in Acts 2:38. He claims to have produced Broadus, who gives "because of" as a possible rendering. The only authority that he seems to have for this is that Broadus so taught his New Testament classes in Greek. As we have no record of what Broadus taught his classes, it is hard to overthrow this mere assertion. As to what Broadus did teach on this, I refer the reader to the *Religious Herald*, a Baptist paper, quoted in *Lard's Quarterly*, Vol. IV, No. 4, October, 1867. After referring to the passages Matt. 3:11; Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3; and Acts 2:38, Dr. Broadus says that "the

preposition 'eis' should be in all these passages translated by the same word, 'unto,' and this word comes nearer than any other to expressing the various senses which the Greek preposition (with its case) may in such phrases convey. The preposition, strictly speaking, has the same force in these expressions that it has everywhere else—viz.: that an object comes or is brought to be in, within, some other object or state." Here Dr. Broadus concedes all that I have contended for in this discussion. The party baptized is in or within the enjoyment of remission, and it is his baptism that brought him within the enjoyment of the remission of sins. He further says: "When used with some noun which does not denote a locality, but is figurative,' expressing an ideal state, relation, etc., still 'eis' has the same force, signifying that a person, or an action, is, as it were, brought and put within the limit of this noun, restricted to this state, relation, or object. From the very nature of the idea thus denoted, this form of expression will be most commonly applied to nouns expressing aim, design, result, and the like." Thus we have clearly expressed by Dr. Broadus what he considers the current meaning of "eis;" that is, in the expression, "be baptized eis remission of sins." "Remission of sins" would be most commonly understood to express the aim, design, or result of the baptism. I understand this to be the position which Editor Folk prefers; but while he prefers this position, he consumes much valuable space in trying to make it appear that if "eis" may be rendered "because of" in Matt. 12:41, that it may also be rendered "because of" in Acts 2:38. He gives no proof that "eis" means "because of" in Acts 2:38.



I might concede for the sake of argument that "eis" means "because of" in Matt. 12:41, but this would not prove anything at all in reference to its meaning in Acts 2:38 and parallel passages. It may be necessary to mention this to some editors, but it would not be to a scholar. It has already been clearly shown from Thayer and Winer that "eis" is not retrospective in Matt. 12:41. According to all laws of translation, if there were any facts connected with Peter's command, "Be baptized for the remission of sins," to compel a departure from the current meaning of "eis," then it is admitted that some other meaning should be sought. If, on the other hand, there are no such facts, it violates all laws of translation to hunt for any other meaning. This Editor Folk has done in seeking "*a maybe*" translation. All the facts in this case show clearly that "eis" must be translated by the ordinary and current meaning.

When Peter reached a certain point in his sermon, his hearers were pierced to the heart and cried out: "What shall we do?" His hearers were suffering intense agony on account of sins of which they knew themselves guilty. This is simply undeniable. Their sins had not at this moment been remitted; for when a man's sins are remitted, his heart is at ease. Their sins still being unforgiven, Peter says to them: "Repent, and be baptized [eis] unto the remission of your sins." Now it is not possible to think that "eis" here meant "in regard to remission, as the occasion" of the baptism, with the further thought that the remission preceded the baptism. This is impossible, not only for the above reason, but also for the further reason that it would make Peter command

men to repent who were already pardoned, thus placing repentance, as well as baptism, after pardon. With this clearly before us, even if we take Editor Folk's interpretation of Winer and render repent and be baptized, in reference to," remission of sins it is still in regard to a blessing contemplated as future at the time of repentance and baptism, and hence the only regard they could have to it is that of an antecedent to a subsequent event. Not one single authority quoted makes "eis" retrospective.

I am glad that Editor Folk in his last article quoted Thayer on the meaning of "baptizo." Thayer says (under 2): "In the New Testament it is used particularly of the rite of sacred ablution, first instituted by John the Baptist, afterwards by Christ's command received by Christians and adjusted to the contents and nature of their religion (see 'baptisma' 3)—viz.: An immersion in water, performed as a sign of the removal of sin, and administered to those who, impelled by a desire for salvation, sought admission to the benefits of the Messiah's kingdom." This shows beyond all doubt that he does not make "eis" retrospective. He teaches that people seek admission by baptism into the benefits of the Messiah's kingdom. Impelled by a desire for salvation, they were baptized.

When Editor Folk assigned to J. W. McGarvey a position I was sure he did not take, I wrote him as follows:

"Nashville, Tenn., July 6, 1907.

"Dear Brother McGarvey:

"E. E. Folk, editor of the *Baptist and Reflector*, quotes your comment on Matt. 10:41, 42, as it ap-

pears in your commentary on Matthew and Mark. He adds: 'The word which Alford and McGarvey translate "because," is in each of the above cases "eis." Here, then, is another instance where, according to Alford and McGarvey, "eis" looks backward, and where it is to be rendered "because." If it looks backward in Matt. 10:41, 42, it may in Acts 2:38. If it may be translated "because" in Matt. 10:41, 42, as they say it should be, then it may be translated "because" in Acts 2:38.'

"Did you mean to teach that 'eis' in this passage should be translated 'because?' Does Editor Folk correctly represent your teaching? Is 'eis' ever retrospective in meaning? A prompt answer is earnestly requested.

"Yours fraternally,

"J. C. McQUIDDY."

Here is Brother McGarvey's reply, which speaks for itself:

"Lexington, Ky., July 8, 1907.

"Dear Brother McQuiddy: I answer your favor of the 6th with reference to the statement of the editor of the *Baptist and Reflector*, that Alford and I translate the Greek word 'eis' by the English 'because' in Matt. 10:41, 42. I have not a copy of my own commentary at hand, but I have Alford's, with which, in this passage, I perfectly agree. We both follow the Common Version in the two places where this preposition occurs, rendering the expression, 'in the name of a prophet,' 'in the name of a righteous man,' 'in the name of a disciple.' It would be absurd

to substitute 'because' for 'in' in either of these expressions. The editor is mistaken if he says we do this.

"But Alford, in commenting on the expression, 'in the name of a prophet,' says that it means 'because he is a prophet;' and in this I am sure he is right.

"The Baptist editor asserts that this is an instance where, 'according to Alford and McGarvey, "eis" looks backward.' He is mistaken. If I receive a prophet because he is a prophet, I am looking neither backward nor forward; I am looking at the present fact that the man is a prophet. I receive him, not for what he was, or what he has been, or what he will be, but for what he is.

"The editor then argues from this mistaken assertion that if 'eis' 'looks backward in Matt. 10:41, 42, it may in Acts 2:38.' An editor ought to know better than this—better than to think that because a word has a certain phase of meaning in one passage, it may have the same in another. He ought to know that this depends on the connection of thought and the nature of the case. To illustrate by 'eis' itself, it is rendered in our version by the several prepositions, 'in,' 'by,' 'of,' and even 'at.'

"Would the editor argue that because in Matt. 12:42 it is rendered 'at the preaching of Jonah,' therefore, in Acts 2:68, it may be rendered 'at the remission of sins?' He knows better, and he ought to know better than to make the argument that he does.

"As to looking backward in Acts 2:38, and giving the meaning 'because your sins have been remitted,' this is impossible from the fact that the men addressed were at the time crying out in agony of soul,

'What shall we do?' and it is certain that their sins had not been remitted.

"Those who deny that baptism is for the remission of sins have been searching and struggling for a longtime to make good their denial; but they have never yet found the passage to support them, and they must either keep up the search or give it up in despair.

"Fraternally yours,

"J. W. McGARVEY."

The reader will observe that Brother McGarvey is in accord with the position I have defended in this discussion. I am also in perfect agreement with Brother Lipscomb. It is Editor Folk who repudiates the scholarship of his own scholars.

I have shown beyond all doubt that Thayer, Green, Broadus, Winer, McGarvey, and a host of other scholars all render "eis" "unto" in Acts 2:38, and that no one of them makes it retrospective. Editor Folk also prefers the rendering "unto" or "for," while he has devoted much space and has perverted Winer, Thayer, and McGarvey to show that "eis" means "because of" in Matt. 12:41 and Matt. 10:41, 42.

I must close this part of the investigation by calling attention again to the fact that he has a novel way of showing his preference. If he shows his preference for his wife and children in this way, I am certainly sorry for them. If any reader of this discussion knows Editor Folk's real position on Acts 2:38, he knows more than I. While I have challenged him to take a position, he has only told us his preferred position, and then has sought to destroy his own preference by "*a maybe*" argument.

I have stated repeatedly that I accepted the translation of Hovey and Hackett of Acts 2:38 and 22:16, etc., and yet I am asked if I believe "repentance and faith are the conditions of salvation." As I understand them to use "faith" and "repentance," I do, and have so taught throughout this discussion. The faith that they teach is the condition of salvation is that which embodies and declares baptism. The faith that does not do this is *dead* and is not a condition of anything. They both teach that the man of faith will "be baptized in the name of Christ unto the remission of his sins," that he will arise and be baptized "and wash away his sins," thus submitting to the rite in order to be forgiven.

I have endeavored in vain to get Editor Folk to say he believes this. He does teach, however, that the fully informed man who neglects or refuses to be baptized will be lost because his faith is not *genuine*. This shows that the faith that does not lead to baptism will not save the soul. The discriminating mind can see it teaches in different language the same truth that I have emphasized throughout this discussion.

This admission alone of Editor Folk is ruinous to the theory of salvation by faith alone, which he started out to prove. His language now shows he does *not* believe "we are saved by faith alone." Read his words: "Where faith is mentioned by itself, it is presumed that repentance has preceded. And so whenever salvation is predicated *on* faith, it is understood that it is the faith of a repentant man, like, for instance, the jailer." So wherever the Bible predicates salvation of faith, it is understood that repentance is present also. So Editor Folk would have us

understand that when the Spirit says, "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life," "it is the faith of a repentant man." A repentant man will obey. He can imply repentance in the case of the jailer, which is *not* even mentioned, and deny outright the necessity of baptism, when it is plainly taught he was baptized "the same hour of the night." If he believes the theory of salvation by faith alone, he does not believe other things he teaches. If he indorses Hovey, as he would have us believe, I am sure he does not believe we are saved by faith alone, for Hovey says: "Hence he teaches that men are saved by an outworking, obedient life, given and preserved by the Holy Spirit." But Editor Folk has a "novel" way of showing his belief as well as his preference, for when he comes to explain what his own Hovey means (and he must be an oracle for all his scholars), he leaves out the very part from Hovey that forever ruins faith-alone salvation. He seriously informs us: "The life is given and preserved by the Holy Spirit." Who denies this? Nobody. Why leave out "Hence he teaches that men are saved by an outworking, obedient life?" Because he knew if this is true, the theory of "faith alone" is not true; so he prefers to quote a detached phrase which might imply that somebody did not believe "the life is given and preserved by the Holy Spirit. To call such an indorsement of Hovey is to outrage truth and justice.

Let me here inform Brother Folk that the man who has already entered Christ by an obedient faith, and who is represented as believing *on* and *in* Christ, goes onward believing in Christ and being saved by "an outworking and obedient life." Am I to understand

from his question that when a man believes, that his faith stops short off? If his question means anything, it means this.

The man who believes and is baptized enters Christ. As he goes on from faith to faith, abiding in Christ, he is said to believe *on* and *in* Christ. I supported this position by both Thayer and Liddell and Scott. The position is not only not refuted, but no answer has been attempted.

While the Bible teaches that "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," it also teaches that to live the Christian life he must continue in well-doing to the end.

"Yea, and for this very cause adding on your part all diligence, in your faith supply virtue; and in your virtue knowledge; and in your knowledge self-control; and in your self-control patience; and in your patience godliness; and in your godliness brotherly kindness; and in your brotherly kindness love. For if these things are yours and abound, they make you to be not idle nor unfruitful unto the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. For he that lacketh these things is blind, seeing only what is near, having forgotten the cleansing from his old sins. Wherefore, brethren, give the more diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never stumble: for thus shall be richly supplied unto you the entrance into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." (2 Pet. 1:5-11.)

Editor Folk has done his best to make this plan of salvation ridiculous. He has talked about putting man on the rack, and cried: "It is hard and exacting." Unless he makes it more essential to obey the command to be



baptized than other commands of Christ, then all he has said may be turned with all its power against the position by which he says he stands. The fully informed believer who refuses to be baptized is lost because his faith is not genuine. Now what becomes of all his vehement anathemas against the doctrine of obedience? They are graceless things on which rest the condemnation of God which are refuted by the scholarship of his own denomination, and which the rank and file of the Baptist Church spew out of their mouths as dishonoring to God and his holy religion. But Editor Folk has used a double-barreled shotgun in this discussion, which is very unfortunate to his cause, as one barrel destroys the other. The barrel to which I have just paid attention is "faith and obedience;" the other barrel is "faith alone." The discharges from this are very noisy, but there is no lead in them. He shouts: "We are saved .by faith alone." When we get on the train in Nashville to go to Chattanooga, we are already in Chattanooga. We cannot get off the train and walk if we would. When a man is saved by faith alone on earth, he is already in heaven; he is saved for time and eternity. He is saved without obedience or anything of the kind. The doctrine of obedience is impossible, hard, and ridiculous.

Editor Folk says: "What Baptists teach is that the Spirit of God takes a man dead in trespasses and sins and regenerates him, makes him alive. . . . That if the Spirit of God does not make alive the man, he must be lost eternally. ... A man was so created that he could do nothing to save himself until God's Spirit quickened him. (Eph. 2:1.) When he is made alive by the Spirit, then he is dead to sin (Rom. 6:2),

he believes, he is saved for time and eternity through his repentance and faith (Acts 20:21; John 3:36; John 10:27, 29), without obedience to the law of God to be saved, but obeying it gladly, lovingly, because he has been saved (Eph. 2. 8, 10)." This is the position of my opponent, and it is vain to shout, "Perversion!"

The doctrine so outrages every principle of truth and justice that I have given little attention to it. It robs man of all virtue and makes him a machine. He is so created he cannot believe until God quickens him by his Spirit. When he is quickened, he believes; and when he believes, he is saved for time and eternity. "If the Spirit of God does not make alive the man, he must be lost eternally." This makes God damn a man who was tied so he could do nothing. The man is helpless, cannot even plead for mercy, yet God damns him eternally. Editor Folk is the last man that should call the doctrine of obedience revolting. The gospel of Christ gives all men an opportunity. God wills not the death of an) one, but that all come to repentance. Every man can accept the proffered mercy and live. Jesus tasted death for ever) man. If men are lost, it is because they would not have life. All have sinned, but all are not lost. Our readers must have observed that Editor Folk failed to produce anything from me where I have taught "he who sins is lost." I knew he could not. I am compared to the pope because I have said the Holy Spirit has given the sense in which baptism saves. But after all of Editor Folk's anathemas and bulls of excommunication against the doctrine of faith and obedience, it is only necessary to put him on the firing line and ask him to fire one time from

the barrel of faith and obedience. "Can a man be saved who is fully informed as to the scriptural teachings upon the subject of baptism and who knows his duty upon the subject, and yet deliberately and persistently refuses to be baptized?" Our reply to the question was that such a man could not be saved, not because he was not baptized, but because such a deliberate and persistent refusal upon his part, after having been thus fully informed as to his duty, would show that his heart was not right and that his conversion was not genuine."

In restating what he considers the position of this journal, he makes us contend that the sinner must repent "at once" or be lost. Thus he adds to "must repent" "at once," which is the same method pursued by the devil when he added "not" to God's word. He has not stated his own position the same way in two consecutive issues, so he had better learn how to state consistently his own position. He proceeds to draw the conclusion—but it is a conclusion without a premise—if a man is saved by works, he cannot be saved by faith. I am astounded that either blindness or perversity has so obscured the vision of the man that he does not see he is fighting the teaching of the Holy Spirit, who clearly teaches justification by both. "Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith." (James 2:24.) "Being therefore justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. 5:1.) His claim is like this: It is stated that a man lives by breathing and eating. He shouts: No, no! If a man lives by eating, he cannot live by breathing! We say the child is begotten of the father and born of the mother. He cries: Ab-

surd, ridiculous! If a child is born of the mother, it is not begotten of the father! He argues as though the child that is begotten of the father and born of the mother is born in two ways. There is but one way of birth, and every one who comes into the world comes in the same way. Truth demands that I expose this assumption, which is false, unreasonable, and impossible, and only a shallow artifice to cover his defeat. To a completed life, both physically and spiritually, three things are essential—(1) a begetting, (2) a birth, (3) a development. The believer is begotten of the Father. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God: and whosoever loveth him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of him." (1 John 5:1.) But as the child is not born when it is begotten, so the believer is not born when begotten. But Editor Folk's theory is that if the believer must be born to enjoy life, then the begetting has nothing to do with his birth or life. When the believer is born of the water, he must "grow in grace and in the knowledge of Christ." (2 Pet. 3:18.) How foolish the man appears as he seeks in his desperation to defend his unscriptural positions by constructing for me a foolish hypothesis and then seeking to make his readers believe that some doctrine which I hold is deducible from no other ground!

I did not misrepresent his teaching when I said he taught salvation by a faith which frees from obedience to all law. Here is what I quoted from him: "When he has faith," says he, "his salvation is not a matter of works, or law, or obedience, or anything of the kind." "Anything of the kind" frees one even from "a rule of life" to be saved. But the theory of

"faith alone" which he has so boldly affirmed frees from everything but a dead faith, he being the judge. Here is his own explanation: "When we speak of salvation by 'faith alone,' we mean, of course, salvation by faith, without baptism, without works, without anything else added to faith to save the person." If this does not teach that lying, stealing, and murdering have nothing to do with the salvation of the man who is saved by faith alone, it would be difficult to frame language to teach such a doctrine. He now recoils from his false, fearful, "faith-alone" theory and quotes, "They who practice such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:21), which forever demolishes the "faith-alone" theory. The man should know better than to try to ride at the same time two horses that are going in opposite directions.

He refers to a number of passages, claiming they teach the doctrine of "faith alone." Not one of them teaches anything of the kind. If he could find one passage that teaches "faith only," he would only succeed in making the Holy Spirit falsify himself, for the Spirit says: "Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith." (James 2:24.) The man who under the guise of friendship labors to make Revelation falsify itself is a greater foe to the Bible than an avowed infidel.

I have always taught that the son is not under the same law as the sinner, or slave to sin. So his remarks on this point are without application.

He commits himself to the doctrine of substitution. If Christ died "in man's stead, taking man's place under the broken law," then man is absolved from death. This is true of natural, spiritual, or eternal

death. But if Christ died eternally in the stead of the sinner, then he is eternally dead, and Editor Folk's doctrine leaves us without a Christ. Poor Folk! The wise thing is to teach, as the Bible teaches, that "Christ died for our sins." (1 Cor. 15:3; 1 Thess. 5:10.)

He denies that he taught God forgives the impenitent sinner. I am glad he is ashamed of some of his positions, but justice to us both and to truth demands that I requote some of his teaching on this subject. "But suppose a man does not repent of his sins. Suppose he should not realize his sin at the time, as was the case with David and with Peter. Suppose he should not pray for forgiveness. Suppose he should die before he repents of his sin. Then what is to become of him? Would he be saved according to this doctrine?" Here is the doctrine he is combating: "When a man repents of his sins and prays for forgiveness, God forgives." "Though a man commit many sins, if he is not willful and confesses them, God will forgive." He continues: "Must not man repent of every sin, confess it, and pray to God for forgiveness, under penalty of damnation in case he fails to do so? . . . O, to what infinitesimal conclusions the doctrine of the *Advocate* leads! It is worse than tithing anise and cummin. How absurd, how absolutely ridiculous, how hard, how difficult, how impossible, the plan of salvation it teaches!" He not only teaches in the strongest possible way that God will forgive the sinner while impenitent of some sins, but holds up the doctrine that the sinner must repent to be forgiven as "absurd," "absolutely ridiculous," "hard," "difficult," and "impossible." But now he says of the same doctrine: "God will not, cannot, for-

give a person until he repents of his sins. He will not, cannot, save him in his sins, but from his sins." Editor Folk says it is hard on him to draw a horse and then write under it for me, "This is a horse;" but here he has drawn two pictures, and he does not himself know which is which. Perhaps his understanding would be clearer if he would write under one, "This is a horse," and under the other, "This is a sow." But, seriously, I pray that the "sow" that is washed may never return to her wallowing in the mire.

He thinks to save him trouble I should get an interpreter to explain his articles to me. I have asked a number of wise men to do so, but they could not. His writing is like the dream of Pharaoh. The wise men cannot interpret, neither does Editor Folk interpret the same way twice. I have had an editorial experience of over twenty-two years and have had no difficulty in understanding the writing of other editors. I have not had a complaint from any one save Editor Folk, who places the cause of all the trouble on my inability to understand his profound writings.

I not only accept Mark 16:16 as true, but also every inspired word of God. He has repeatedly told us that wherever faith was mentioned as a condition of salvation, repentance was implied. He implies it in the case of the jailer. Why does he not understand it is also in Mark 16:16? Is it because he is so blinded by his creed? Of such we may say: "And unto them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall in no wise understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall in no wise perceive: for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have

closed; lest haply they should perceive with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, .and should turn again, and I should heal them." (Matt. 13:14, 15.)

Editor Folk tells us: "The law was done away in Christ as a method of salvation, but not as a rule of life." His actions show that he believes also that it was done away as "a rule of life;" for if he believed it was yet in force as "a rule of life," he would hunt up his goat and make his offering as did the Jew. As the Sabbath belonged to the law and the law was done away only as "a method of salvation," but not as "a rule of life," Editor Folk, to be consistent, must keep the Jewish Sabbath, Saturday. So by "rule of life" he is both a Jew and an Adventist. He does not believe his own interpretation; for if he did, he would close the *Baptist and Reflector* office on Saturday and do nothing. Instead, however, of doing this, he sends an editorial to me (which I have not read) to try to convince me that the Sabbath is not in force as "a rule of life," but that it has been changed to the first day of the week. Thus, both in action and in argument, he shows that he believes the law was done away in Christ as "a rule of life." I should not keep the Sabbath because I am not under the law and the law was done away in Christ. (Col. 2:14.) As Editor Folk fails to observe "a rule of life" that is not necessary to salvation, so will any man fail to observe "a rule of life" that has nothing to do with his salvation. His whole effort has been to belittle the obedience that God demands, to make obedience to his commands appear impossible, hard, difficult, and ridiculous. When



men are saved "at faith" and by "faith alone," they are saved without obedience for time and eternity. Thus his whole argument has thrown off the bridle and has made man free from "a rule of life" to be saved. Such teaching leads to lawlessness.

What does W. M. Anderson have to do with the plan of salvation? I am told that he is a fine, intelligent gentleman, well informed in the Scriptures. I do not know whether he has neglected or refused to be baptized or not. But if he has, here is what Editor Folk says of his destiny: "Our reply to the question was that such a man could not be saved, not because he was not baptized, but because such a deliberate and persistent refusal upon his part, after having been thus fully informed as to his duty, would show that his heart was not right and that his conversion was not genuine." Thus he damns all the informed pious unimmersed.

As we had under consideration to what "born of water" referred, I put the only charitable construction on his language that I could. As he now explains his meaning, he jumps "out of the frying pan into the fire." He explains: "In the physical birth we are born of water, and in the spiritual birth we are born of the Spirit." Again, he says the natural birth "occurred with Nicodemus and occurs with every one before Jesus says to him: 'Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.'" The man that must be "born of water" (natural or physical birth) had already been born naturally. Jesus did not say the man who has been born naturally must be born of the Spirit to enter the kingdom, but this natural-born man must be born of water

and the Spirit in order to enter into the kingdom of God. The birth of water and the Spirit was in the future. As no man is ever born naturally twice, according to his explanation he damns every responsible being on the face of the earth.

As he can see that the Jew who offered a goat, a lamb, or a bull did not depend on the blood of the goat to save him, it is passing strange that he cannot see that the man who by faith is baptized, relying on Christ, is not saved by the water, but by Christ. He will hardly say that the Jew who refused or neglected to offer the goat was saved by the blood of the Lamb. So he cannot say, without preaching another gospel, that the informed man who refuses or neglects to be baptized is saved by the blood of Christ. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16:16.) Only the man who obeys relies on God to save him through Jesus Christ our Lord.

I have shown repeatedly that the passages of scripture quoted by Editor Folk do not teach salvation by "faith alone." In doing this I have shown that the faith that saves is that which leads to obedience.

The reason that I did not notice inconsistencies is that none of mine have been pointed out. He assigns me positions which I have never taken, and then shows those positions inconsistent with Bible teaching. I have been repeatedly charged with teaching that the Christian must be absolutely perfect; that when one sins he must repent "at once" or be lost; and that salvation is physical, and not spiritual. As I have taught entirely different from these false charges, I have given them no attention, knowing

that such baseless charges would die of their own weight.

Neither Alexander Campbell nor any other man is my "patron saint." I quoted from a Baptist history which showed that the Baptists taught baptismal regeneration. He admits that some of them seem to teach baptismal regeneration. Then if Mr. Campbell believed in baptismal regeneration, as Mr. Folk charges, he learned it while a Baptist. He makes a number of quotations from "The Christian System," and charges that they abundantly prove that Mr. Campbell believed in baptismal regeneration. After Mr. Campbell left the Baptist ranks, he never taught baptismal regeneration in the popularly understood sense and as is charged by my opponent. As Mr. Jeter is good authority with Mr. Folk, I will have him defend Mr. Campbell against his unjust accusation. Mr. Jeter says: "Mr. Campbell has been frequently—but, I think, unfairly—charged with teaching baptismal regeneration." This is a clear acquittal. Moses E. Lard, a pupil of Mr. Campbell, wrote a "Review of 'Campbellism Examined.'" Alexander Campbell wrote an introduction to this Review and gave it his most hearty indorsement. Then what is ascribed in this book to Mr. Campbell as his belief is indorsed by him as true. On page 165 we have Mr. Campbell's position given on this subject: "What Mr. Campbell clearly maintains is (1) that regeneration and the new birth are identical; (2) that the new birth consists of two parts—to-wit, being begotten or quickened by the Spirit and being baptized; and (3) that therefore baptism is not itself regeneration—that is, the whole of it. But because baptism, as a part, and especially as the last

part, of regeneration, implies the other and preceding part, Mr. Campbell sometimes calls it regeneration, precisely as faith sometimes stands for the whole gospel, in which, however, it is merely a single item. In this sense, but in no other, does he maintain that baptism is itself regeneration." This is far from teaching baptismal regeneration. Baptismal regeneration as popularly understood denotes a moral change—that is, a change of the inner man—effected by baptism. This doctrine Mr. Campbell eschewed with his whole being. He never wrote one sentence which, except by the most dishonest artifice, can be shown even to look toward the doctrine. Mr. Folk quotes seven lines from page 214 of "The Christian System." Without indicating the omission, he omits twenty-six lines and then quotes two lines near the bottom of the page. If he read the intervening lines, he knows they teach exactly the opposite of baptismal regeneration. It is bad enough to misrepresent the living, who can defend themselves; it is worse to misrepresent the dead, who cannot speak.

As to the charge made against me, it is a slanderous statement conceived in sin, on which lies the scorn of reason and which the righteous soul spews out as a vile conception. If I am guilty of teaching a baptismal regeneration, so is he. He damns every fully informed man who neglects or refuses to be baptized, because his faith is not genuine.

As I am to introduce no new arguments in closing this discussion, I shall briefly sum up some of the arguments made by me and show that they have been scripturally maintained.

I have contended that while God saves, he saves upon certain named conditions, and that these condi-

tions must be complied with by the sinner. Many scriptures have been quoted in support of this position. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16:16.) "Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3:5.) "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." (Acts 2:38.) I have proved by both scholars and Editor Folk that baptism is unto the remission of sins. But in his last article he intimates that baptism is used figuratively. It is unto the remission of sins in the same sense as is repentance, as the scholars say, and Editor Folk tells us they do not differ materially from his view. Then, if it is figurative baptism, it is figurative repentance. Then he tells us "repentance and faith are ever and everywhere essentially the same." Then, as it is figurative repentance, it is also figurative faith. So it is figurative faith, repentance, and baptism. I am glad I do not teach a doctrine that makes me figure out every item in the plan of salvation trying to maintain it. I still think the Holy Spirit was right when he taught baptism unto the remission of sins. I have also shown that we put on Christ in baptism. (Rom. 6:4, 5; 1 Cor. 12:13; Gal. 3:26, 27; Eph. 5:25, 26; Col. 2:12.)

It has also been proved that as faith is a condition of salvation, so also is repentance and baptism. While God saves, as these are conditions to be complied with on our part, they are said sometimes to save us. So it is said of baptism: "Which also after a true likeness doth now save you, even baptism, not the

putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ." (1 Pet. 3:21.) While we are also saved by faith, we are not saved by faith alone. The faith that saves is that which expresses itself in obedience. Baptism marks the degree of faith at which God pardons. There is not an example on record where a dead or barren faith ever led to a blessing. The faith that justifies is that which acts, obeys. The faith that pulled down the walls of Jericho did not do so until the people marched around the walls as directed. Noah' was saved by faith when he built the ark, not before. Abel was justified by faith when he had made his offering, not before. There is no such thing as being saved at faith. We live by faith and walk by faith all the days of life. Editor Folk draws a line and calls it faith, saves a man at it, and then talks as though we go on beyond it. This is' foreign to Bible teaching: "For therein is revealed a righteousness of God from faith unto faith: as it is written, But the righteous shall live by faith." (Rom. 1:17.) "But now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love." (1 Cor. 13:13.) It is absurd to claim that a man has faith to save who neglects or refuses to obey God. There is not an example in the New Testament where a believer refused or neglected to be baptized. The inspired writers seem never to have conceived the possibility of a believer not being baptized. I have contended that when a man refuses to do the first act that belongs to faith and is inseparable from it, he has not faith. He cannot please God without faith. (Heb. 11:6; Rom. 14:23.)

I have also shown that man cannot repent toward Christ before he believes in him. While repentance is mentioned before faith, the repentance is toward God, in whom those to whom the language is applied had already believed. They were to repent of having sinned against God and believe in Christ. No man ever repented toward Christ before he believed in Christ. It is also impossible for a man to repent toward God before he believes in him. (Heb. 11:6; Rom. 14:23.) Not even an attempt has been made to reply to this.

I have further shown that wherever faith and repentance have been exercised as principles, that some faith was always before any repentance. In answer to the question, "What shall we do?" Peter said: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." (Acts 2:38.) If faith did not precede repentance in this case, they were saved without faith, as they were promised salvation on repentance and baptism. This is impossible. (Heb. 11:6; Mark 16:16; Rom. 14:23.) So with every case on record. Where repentance and belief are in the same person, repentance is never even mentioned before faith. This has not been denied.

While Editor Folk has contended for salvation by "faith alone," another position that he has taken, and one by which he says he stands, shows most conclusively that even with him the jailer's faith saved him in baptism. His position is, had the jailer refused or neglected to be baptized after he was informed, he would have been lost because his faith was not genuine.

As baptism, then, is the test of the genuineness of one's faith, we should preach to him the duty of baptism, so that he may be baptized in order to be saved by a genuine faith. When the children of Israel had faith to look on the brazen serpent, they were healed, not before; when Naaman had faith enough to dip the seven times, he was healed, not before; when the blind man had faith enough to go and wash in the pool of Siloam, he came seeing, not before. When a responsible informed man has faith enough to be baptized, he is saved, not before, even according to the admission of my opponent.

I have shown the gospel contemplates a new creation—a transformation of man in body, soul, and spirit. It has been abundantly proved that faith and repentance are no more spiritual than baptism. Salvation affects the body, soul, and spirit. Faith and repentance are works as well as baptism. "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." (John 6:29.) "And the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Thess. 5:23; read also Phil. 3:21; 1 Cor. 6:19, 20; Phil. 3:21; 1 Cor. 9:27; Rom. 12:1.) When a man is baptized into Christ, he is called upon to add to his faith the Christian virtues. (2. Pet. 1:5-11.) When he slips or falls through the weakness of the flesh, if he will only get up with his eyes on the cross, the grace of God is sufficient for him. God does not demand of him absolute perfection; but when he sins, he has "an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." If man is penitent, humble, and trust-



ing, all his sins will be washed away in the blood of Jesus. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (1 John 1:9.)

I close this discussion with none but the kindest feelings for Editor Folk. I have labored to elicit truth, and not for victory. I am not conscious of misrepresenting my opponent in any of his positions. While I have most sincerely and earnestly contended that the promise is to the man who obeys God in baptism, I have paid no attention to the quibble that this makes salvation depend on the third party, for this can have no weight unless an omnipotent God is not able always to have the third party present.

I rejoice that the truth has been abundantly sustained that the man who continues in well-doing shall wear a crown of life and that Editor Folk now emphasizes that the law of pardon is "repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." The man who repents of sin loathes it and turns away from it. This the law of Christ demands of him. If he practices sin and does not turn away from it, he must be lost. It is indeed gratifying that Editor Folk teaches repentance in addition to faith; and as repentance requires a turning away from sin, he is not so far from the truth. I trust our readers may be benefited by a fair and impartial reading of the discussion. May God bring good out of the discussion and overrule the errors of men to his honor and glory.

"And now I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you the inheritance among all them that are sanctified." (Acts 20:32.)