

[\(Click here for Table of Contents\)](#)

The Great Controversy

BY
ASHLEY S. JOHNSON

REVISED AND BROUGHT TO 1939

BY
M. D. BAUMER

ELEVENTH EDITION

GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 1963

Copyright, 1946
By F. L. ROWE

GOSPEL ADVOCATE CO., *Owner*
NASHVILLE, TENN.

PREFACE TO THE REVISED EDITION

More than a quarter of a century ago this little volume was one of the most popular books among the disciples of Christ in America. The original author died several years ago and the book fell into disuse. For some time the reviser and publisher have considered revising it and bringing it to date. To this end a large number of denominational books and pamphlets have been studied, three of the sects described in the original text have been discarded because they- have almost disappeared and three of the later denominations that have come into existence in the last sixty years have been substituted.

We do not know of any one text that contains so complete a statement and refutation of modern denominationalism as this one. ALL statements of beliefs have been taken from official sources and can be completely relied on.

M. D. BAUMER, *Reviser.*

F. L. ROWE, *Publisher.*

CONTENTS
(Click chapter title for chapter)

Chapter	Page
I. METHODIST SPEECH	7
II. BAPTIST SPEECH	14
III. PRESBYTERIAN SPEECH	24
IV. EPISCOPALIAN SPEECH.	32
V. LUTHERAN SPEECH.	37
VI. ROMAN CATHOLIC SPEECH	41
VII. INFIDEL SPEECH	46
VIII. ADVENTIST SPEECH	50
IX. MORMON SPEECH	52
X. CHURCH OF GOD SPEECH	57
XI. NAZARENE SPEECH	62
XII. CHRISTIAN SCIENCE SPEECH	66
XIII. INQUIRER SPEECH	70
XIV. INQUIRER SPEECH	100
XV. ICONOCLAST SPEECH	116
XVI. ICONOCLAST SPEECH	125
XVII. APOSTOLOS SPEECH	135
XVIII. BUSINESS	146
XIX. VISITOR SPEECH	151
XX. VISITOR SPEECH	156
XXI. VISITOR SPEECH	162
XXII. PEACEMAKER SPEECH	168
XXIII. PEACEMAKER SPEECH	193
XXIV. PEACEMAKER SPEECH	221
XXV. PEACEMAKER SPEECH	246

CHAPTER I.

NOTE. —Messrs. Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Lutheran, Church of God, Roman Catholic, Nazarene, Infidel, Adventist, Mormon, Inquirer, Iconoclast, Apostolos, Business, and Peacemaker meet in convention to examine the Bible and search for the true basis of Christian union. After the usual preliminaries, Methodist advances to the front and addresses the assembly as follows:

METHODIST

I am profoundly glad to meet my friends of the different religious organizations of our age, and especially as we are to investigate our respective Church peculiarities, and search for the true basis of Christian union. This is an opportunity for which we have long prayed; let us, therefore, endeavor to make the best possible use of it. I stand before you today as a representative of one of the largest, grandest, and most influential religious movements of modern times. I could give you statistics showing our educational, financial and ministerial strength; but as these are no evidence that we are right, I regard it as unnecessary. There are different parties in our Church, some of the names of which are as follows: Methodist Episcopal Church, Methodist Episcopal Church South, Reformed Methodist Church, Methodist Protestant Church, Wesleyan Methodist Church, Primitive Methodist Church, Independent Methodist Church, African Methodist Episcopal Church, and African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church; yet it rejoices my heart to feel that we are all Methodists, a grand and glorious brotherhood, engaging in the same blessed cause, and expecting the same reward for our "work of faith and labor of love." We believe in a free salvation, a free church, a free people. I am entirely satisfied with the doctrines and blessings of Methodism. I believe they are broad enough and liberal enough to meet the wants of the whole world, and judging from

the way we are increasing, it seems that others are being convinced that we stand upon a safe foundation. We are orthodox, evangelical, what more can you ask? Let it be understood that I am not denying the orthodoxy of my brethren who are present. I am no bigot. I believe there are God loving, self-sacrificing and consecrated Christians among all the Churches, represented in this assembly. We do not claim to be any better than any one else, but we do make great pretensions to doctrinal purity and simplicity of worship. Methodism is a grand power, and I feel that I shall do myself and my people a great injustice if I do not make good use of the present opportunity. I will give you a brief history of our Church and work, and leave you to decide on their merits for yourselves.

Our Church was founded in 1729 by the illustrious Christian and reformer, John Wesley. He was a clergyman in the Church of England. He viewed with an aching heart the religious degeneracy of the times, and set out with a determination to improve them. He organized societies for the promotion of personal holiness. The people were aroused from their sleep. Faith superseded formalism, the practice of religion the mere profession of it, and the influences set in motion caught from heart to heart, from city to city, from continent to continent, and from year to year, until those who are blessed by them are numbered by the million. Some unimportant changes have been introduced since Mr. Wesley's day, yet he is universally recognized as our founder. The Church has become divided on some ordinary matters, but we are still one in reference to the great principles of human redemption.

We have always been sound on the union question. Hear the testimony of our great founder: "I would to God that all party names and unscriptural phrases and forms which have divided the Christian world, were forgotten, and that we might all agree to sit down together as humble, loving disciples at the feet of our common Master, to hear His word, to imbibe His Spirit, and to transcribe His life in our own. "—Wesley's

Notes, page 5. I feel sure that this will strike a responsive chord in every Christian heart. Why should it not? We are all brethren. We have the same Bible. We love, honor, and reverence the same Saviour, and we expect to live together in the place He has gone to prepare.

Leaving this department of our inquiry, I will proceed to show further our convictions in reference to the problems of this life, and that which is to come. By turning to our Discipline, page 2, and Art. v., you will find the following fearless and comprehensive enunciation: "The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not found therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scripture, we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority there was never any doubt in the Church. " We are willing to print this in burning letters on the banner under which we march. God's revelation is complete, and we are willing to submit to its demands. Divine authority transcends all human authority, and our submission to it lifts us above confusion and the possibility of doubts and fears. I referred to our Discipline; a few words of explanation are necessary. It contains the twenty-five articles of our religion, also an exemplification of our form of church government. These twenty-five articles are fundamental principles in the Methodist Church. We look upon our Discipline as second to no book save the Bible. In its preface you will find the following address to our members: "Far from wishing you to be ignorant of any of our doctrines, or any part of our Discipline, we desire you to read, mark, learn and inwardly digest the whole. You ought, next to the word of God, to procure the articles and canons of the Church to which you belong. We regard our Discipline as being in strict harmony with the word of the Lord, and have arranged these articles of faith and suggestions as to Church government for

the sake of convenience. Our Discipline has been tried, and it works well. If it should be adopted by all the religious denominations of modern times, I feel assured that we would speedily come to the end of the sectarian peculiarities which have so long divided the people of God.

By referring to page 17, Art. xiii., you will find our definition of the Church: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same. " We hold this definition to be in strict harmony with the Testament of Jesus Christ, and that the Methodist Church contains all the constituents of the Church of the Bible. If it contains these elements, my claims to orthodoxy are no exaggeration, but are in strict harmony with the facts in case. The Church was established in the days of Abel, and has been continued through Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses and the prophets, John the Baptist, and Christ and His apostles. I freely admit that there have been many important changes and developments since Abel's day. The grandest principles revealed before Christ, were embraced in the "Abrahamic covenant. " It was to be an everlasting institution, and as the word is not yet exhausted, it must still be in force. Some have inquired with a great deal of impunity: "Where did your infant baptism and membership come from?" It came from an everlasting covenant. Infants were circumcised according to the provisions of this covenant. Baptism, in what we commonly call the New Testament, comes in the room of circumcision. Therefore infants should be admitted to baptism and Church membership. In addition to these incontrovertible facts, Jesus said: "Suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven, " (Matt. 19:14). To my mind this is enough to convince any man not blinded by sectarian bigotry that He baptized them. Surely He

would not take them in His arms and "bless them, " and deny them the privileges of His gracious institution. In the tenth chapter of John, Jesus speaks of the shepherd, the sheep and the sheepfold. Now suppose Brother Baptist was a shepherd; would he put the old sheep into the fold and leave the tender lambs outside to the mercy of the thieves and wolves? This would be exceedingly foolish, yet it is just as reasonable as to admit the adults to Church membership and protection, and leave the infants out at the mercy of Satan. We also read of the baptism of entire households, and even of nations, as indicated in the last chapter of Matthew, and it is absolutely certain that these contained myriads of infants. The membership of our Church is composed of several classes; some who are "powerfully converted, " some who are "hopefully converted, " some "probationers, " and many who are not "matured in years. " These different classes open up desirable fields for the labor of all the public and private members of the Church.

We hold to the word of God in Church organization and in Church government, and while we are devoted to our ways, we do not propose to antagonize our brethren of the other denominations. It is impossible for us all to understand the Bible alike, any way, and in this big world there is room and work enough for all, and there should be no friction. We also believe that Jesus Christ "tasted death for every man; " that He published "life and immortality through the gospel; " and that He sent the Spirit into the world to convict sinners of "sin, righteousness and judgment. " We believe that at some time in the sinner's life the Holy Spirit knocks at the door of his heart and demands entrance. He may be far away from home on the "mountains wild, " but God will certainly visit him.

Here is our opinion as to justification: "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings; wherefore that we

are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort"—Disciplines, Art ix., pages 14, 15. These are precious words. They are food for the hungry soul. But some one is ready to ask, How does the sinner get in possession of the faith which brings justification, peace and joy? We have our General Conferences, Annual Conferences, District Conferences, Quarterly Conferences, Class Meetings, Love Feasts, Sunday Schools and Revivals; also Bishops, Presiding Elders, Circuit Riders, Local Preachers, Deacons, Stewards, Class Leaders and Exhorters. These meetings and officials are all means of grace. The revivals more especially. They usually come once a year. The preacher in charge is generally assisted by some brother preacher and some godly members of the Church. The preacher delivers a soul-stirring sermon. The brethren exhort, sing, pray and shout. For convenience's sake the penitents are invited to indicate their interest in the prayers of the Church by coming forward to the anxious seat. The Spirit of God moves mightily among them. Brokenhearted, they cry aloud for mercy. They are exhorted to accept Christ, to give up everything, to throw themselves unreservedly at the foot of the cross. God answers the prayers of His people, and souls are born into the kingdom of God. This is justification, sanctification, redemption. These conversions are frequently accompanied by shouts which gladden the hearts of the children of God. These meetings sometimes continue for weeks, after which the different officials of the Church are required to employ themselves in cultivating the new converts. Some people ridicule and denounce what they are pleased to call the "mourner's bench process of conversion," but the more thoughtful and zealous of the community have adopted it, and from every quarter we hear cheering reports from those who are helping us to sustain the practice. So you perceive that Methodist principles are being felt among the other religious denominations.

The last department of my inquiry embraces an

ordinance about which some people have had much to say, and a great deal of it to no purpose. "Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian are distinguished from others that are not baptized; but it is also a sign of regeneration or the new birth. The baptism of young children is to be retained in the Church."—Discipline, Art. xxvii., page 20. What constitutes Scriptural baptism? Some are in favor of sprinkling, others of pouring, and others of immersion. We accept either. In speaking of the person to be baptized, our Discipline, on page 201, says: "The minister shall sprinkle or pour water upon him, or if he shall desire it, shall immerse him in water." We give every one his choice. The mode does not affect the validity of the ordinance. If a man's heart is right it does not matter whether you apply one drop or an ocean of water to him, he will be saved any way. God looks at the heart rather than outward ordinances. We allow plenty of latitude in reference to doctrine, and place great emphasis on righteousness, holiness and liberality. If a man has been baptized with the Holy Ghost we do not reject him, providing he is willing to submit to our Discipline. This is liberality. It is also doctrinally sound. However, if anyone has anything better to present, I am ready to consider it, but candidly, I do not expect to find anything better.

I am satisfied that any intelligent audience can see that there is something in Methodism worth contending for. I have redeemed my promise. I have given you a synopsis of our history and doctrines. Here is the true basis of Christian union. Here we can unite without the sacrifice of truth or conscience. Here is the fountain of life and peace. I must urge my brethren forward. A grand field opens for the dissemination of liberal principles and experimental religion. We will publish the Gospel of Christ from the "rivers to the end of the earth." I am happy. Beyond the existence of sectarian bigotry and strife, I see union, peace, and millennial joy. "Alleluia, the Lord omnipotent reigneth"!

CHAPTER II.

BAPTIST.

I join Brother Methodist in reference to the importance of the occasion. We will doubtless remember it with unusual gratification. If by a free exchange and discussion of views we discover a foundation on which we can unite without the sacrifice of principle, we will bless ourselves and the generations following. Jesus Christ prayed for the unity of His children. Paul commanded the Corinthians to be "perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment, " (I. Cor., 1:10). Good men of all ages have prayed for it We discuss it and confidently expect it some time in the future. There is a basis on which we can be one, but the question arises: Are we willing to build upon it? Permit me to say at the outset, that Christian union means more than simply to "agree to disagree, " and thereby preach, pray, and work together in peace and harmony. It means everything comprehended in the quotation just made from Paul. We must all be members of the "one body. "

I will now turn my attention to what was said in the previous address. I can not accept the conclusions of Brother Methodist. He mixes a little too much tradition, human authority, with his religion. The Bible is God's only book. If a man's creed contains more than the Bible, it contains too much. If less than the Bible, it does not contain enough. I have no book of my own to defend. I think I can show his arguments are unscriptural, unreasonable and absurd; that his Discipline contains more humanisms than gospel. He quotes Mr. Wesley and his creed with a manifestation of wonderful confidence, but we will see further on if he will stand by what they teach. He

quotes the fifth article of his creed, and almost in the next breath attempts to apologize for the existence of the book in which he finds it. Now, if the Old Testament and the Testament of Jesus Christ are of Divine authority, and contain all things necessary to salvation, what is the use in scattering these creeds broadcast over the country? Why not invest the same amount in Bibles and give them to the poor? But, perhaps he will say. "We want the people to know our doctrine. " To be sure, but you say your doctrine is in the Bible. If that is true your creed is a superfluous book. It is my honest opinion that he cannot justify its existence either on scriptural or logical grounds. I may appear somewhat severe, but I have no patience with these modern innovations. If Christians ever become united it will not be accomplished by the diffusion of human theories and speculation. The Methodist Church is founded on the Discipline. The Discipline is founded on the "experience of a long series of years. " Brother Methodist asserts that the Discipline is founded on the Bible, but the preface of his book disagrees with him. We conclude, therefore, that his theory is founded on "experience, " rather than upon the words of eternal truth. The Discipline contains the twenty-five articles of his religion, some of which are as far from the truth as nothing is from Omnipotence. They receive and exclude members according to its provisions. They conduct all their meetings, and in fact every work and ceremony is performed in keeping with its demands. He thinks he has found the true basis of Christian union, and I suggest that he try its merits on his own brethren, for he admits that they are divided, and if he succeed we will consider his claims. A theory or creed that will not unite the factions of the Methodist Church, will never unite the other denominations of modern times. He seems to think if we should all become Methodists, sectarianism would come to an end. I disagree with him. I do not think such steps would improve our spiritual condition, or bring us nearer the great fountain of day. We want

something better than humanisms. Something more enduring than time, that will not need to be changed almost every year to meet the wants of an advancing civilization. He affirms that the Methodist Church contains all the constituents of the Church of the Bible. Then why call it the Methodist Church? There were no Methodist Churches in apostolic times. He says the Church was established in the days of Abel, and continued through Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses and the prophets, John the Baptist, and Christ and His apostles. This is no excuse for the existence of the Methodist system. If we admit that this theory is correct, it will do him no good. There has not been a day since the smoke of Abel's sacrifice ascended to God that the Divine administration has resembled the Methodist Church. Compare the "Abrahamic covenant," the "Mosaic dispensation," or even the "Fullness of the Gospel" under Christ, and His apostles, with it, and you will be compelled, by the force of inflexible facts, to conclude with Brother Methodist that it was founded by Mr. Wesley and improved by the "experience of a long series of years." Methodism is a human institution. Proof: "As Methodism arose and progressed, when the want of a rule was felt to aid the work, it was adopted. If its practical working was found to be good, it was retained; but if not good, it was modified or abolished. Thus each, prudential regulation has been brought to the test of experience and practical utility, one page of which is worth more than a volume of theory."—Bishop T. A. Morris.

"A more wise or better arranged system of religious or moral enterprise could not have been conceived. Of course, like all other human institutions, it had its imperfections."—J. L. Inskip.

Mr. Wesley's reference to its origin is as follows: "On Monday, May 1st, our little society began in London; but it may be observed, that the first rise of Methodism, so called, was in November, 1729, when four of us met together at Oxford. The second rise of Methodism was at Savannah, Georgia, in 1736, when twenty or thirty persons met at my house. The

third rise of Methodism was in London, May 1, 1737, when forty or fifty of us agreed to meet together every evening in order to a free conversation, begun and ended with singing and prayer. "—Wesley's Works, Vol. 7, page 348.

Again Mr. Wesley says: "I am, under God, the father of the whole family."

Please do not forget that this is Methodist authority of the highest character. We have here presented to us three distinct risings of this system, and a frank admission that it is imperfect, like all other human institutions. "

My friend devises quite an ingenious argument to sustain his practice of sprinkling infants, but when we throw the pure, resplendent light of truth upon it, the deformity and unreasonableness of it can be clearly seen. If he had affirmed that infant baptism is authorized by his creed I should have remained silent, but as he attempts to make the word of God responsible for it, I unhesitatingly enter my emphatic protest He says "our authority for this practice came from an everlasting covenant. " Will he stand by this assertion? I affirm, on the authority of Divine revelation, that this "Abrahamic covenant" does not contain a single blessing for him or any other Gentile. By consulting the seventeenth chapter of Genesis, you will find that the participants in the privileges of this institution are described as "He that is born in thy house and he that is bought with thy money. " Can my friends claim membership under either of these provisions? I think not In the same connection God said to Abraham: "My covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant" Brother Methodist did not descend from Abraham according to the flesh. He is not a member of this institution, and it is too late for him to become one. Having assumed this erroneous proposition, it forces him to affirm the identity of the two covenants (Gal., 4:21-31). Two things may be similar, but they cannot be identical But where do the children come in? Hear his argument: Children were circumcised ac-

according to provisions of the "Abrahamic covenant. " Baptism conies in the room of circumcision. Therefore children should be baptized. I suggest a very wide difference between the Abrahamic covenant and Methodism. Children were circumcised because they were born in Abraham's house, in the covenant. Brother Methodist baptizes them to bring them into the Church. He may deny this, but if he does, his Discipline will rise up in judgment and sustain my affirmation. But let me state several particulars in which there is a striking dissimilarity. Circumcision was a parental duty (Gen., 17:11-14). Baptism is a personal duty (Acts, 2:37, 38). Circumcision was a permanent mark by which the Jew could always be distinguished (Gen., 17:9-11). Will he say baptism is a substitute for it in this particular? Circumcision was only for the males. (Gen., 17:14), but he baptizes both males and females. Children were circumcised on the eighth day, but my friend will baptize them on any day (Gen., 17:12). Every male child not circumcised was to be cast out (Gen., 17:14). Will he affirm the same of children that are not baptized? "Circumcision in the flesh made by hands, " was not typical of baptism, but a circumcised heart (Rom., 2:29). Circumcision was commanded (Gen., 17:9-14), but who can find a command for baptizing infants? Baptism is a burial (Rom., 6:1-4). I should like to know if it is a substitute for circumcision in this respect. The circumcised children had free access to all the privileges and blessings of the covenant, but the Methodist Church does not admit them into full membership by baptism, although its Discipline teaches that this act brings them into the Church. Finally, three thousand Jews were admitted into the Church on the day of Pentecost. They had been circumcised, but Peter, regardless of this, commanded them to "repent and be baptized, " (Acts, 2:1-41). This is the most frivolous and preposterous theory every advanced by an intelligent man. There is not an item of Scripture that favors it from Genesis to the Revelation. He next introduces the words of Jesus:

"Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of God, " and thinks it is conclusive evidence that He baptized them. But hear the inspired apostle: "Jesus Himself baptized not, " (John, 4:2). He may say His disciples did it. Not on this occasion, for they even rebuked the parents who desired to have their children blessed (Mark, 10:13, 14). He next tries his hand on the tenth chapter of John; the shepherd and the sheep-fold. He wants to know what I would do with the lambs. I will let the Great Shepherd answer. He informs us that the "sheep hear his voice. " Infants can not do this; hence we conclude that in their helpless condition they will be cared for by "Him who doeth all things well. " He next tries to sustain his practice by referring to the great commission (Matt. 28:18-20). This proves too much, and therefore proves nothing. He wants to baptize infants because they are a part of the nation. Let us try his method of interpretation on all classes of citizens; thieves, defaulters, idolaters, murderers, heathen; and does nationality qualify them for this solemn ordinance? Surely not. Then the infants must wait until they can understand, believe and obey. He makes his final struggle on the household baptisms. He is absolutely sure that he has found an unanswerable argument. Let us examine the one recorded in Acts, 16:13-15. I admit that they were all baptized, but were there any infants? Brother Methodist, to sustain his unreasonable dogma, makes the following assumption: (1) He assumes that Lydia was married. (2) That she had children. (3) That she had them with her. (4) That some of them were infants. (5) That they were baptized. The jailer's house was composed of believers. (Acts, 16:19-34), and the house of Stephanas was composed of persons who were old enough to minister to the wants of the saints (I Cor., 16:15). No infants! Not even one!

Now this is too much of a guess work for me, and I unhesitatingly pronounce it an imposition and a farce. Brother Methodist, your logic is out of joint

You take the responsibility of sprinkling a poor, unconscious infant in the sublime name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, when the word of God does not contain the slightest- authority for the practice. Why not do it in the name of the Methodist Church, or admit that it is unauthorized, and that you do it as a matter of expediency?

Brother Methodist quotes his views on Baptism from the Discipline. He believes in sprinkling and pouring, but rather than lose a "valuable member," he will immerse him. He admits our practice to be right, but endeavors to show that something else will do. Now look at his argument, and you will see that we can not unite upon such a disjointed system as this. He closed with a shout as if he felt that Methodism would revolutionize the world. Not while I live!

Doubtless you want to know by this time who I am, and what I believe. I am a representative of the Baptist Church of Christ, sometimes called the Missionary Baptist Church. I must confess, with my esteemed friend who preceded me, that there are divisions among Baptists. We are called Six Principle Baptists, Seventh-Day Baptists, Anti-Mission Baptists, Missionary Baptists, Regular Baptists, Free-Will Baptists, New Connexion Baptists, and Particular Baptists.

The party to which I belong is by far the most numerous, and the others, I am glad to say, are rapidly dying out. We call ourselves Baptists, because we adhere to and submit to the one baptism—immersion. We hear a great deal about the identity of the covenants, but Christianity is undoubtedly a new institution. It is manifestly superior to the old covenant, and the man whose religion is based upon the old is most evidently living in the dark. The Church founded by John has continued through Christ and His apostles. It has withstood the influences of Roman Catholicism during the dark ages, and it is standing upright in this age as the Church, with no creed but the Bible. We can trace the existence of our Church back to its foundation. History bears testimony to

the fact that the "gates of hell" have not prevailed against the Church. We claim succession from the apostles. We can trace our existence back to its Divine source. If we can not do it the Church is a failure. The honor, power, majesty, glory, and dominion of Jesus Christ depend upon it Jesus Christ was a Baptist, the apostles were Baptists, the martyrs were Baptists, and there have been Baptists in all ages since the Church began. Hence I feel honored to stand before you in this age of intelligence and claim to be a Baptist; to hold in my hand the chain of historical succession, apostolic succession, which reaches back to the old foundation! We are ready to meet the world on this claim. With it we stand or fall. Now this forever excludes the claims of Brother Methodist or any other modern Church. But let me emphasize my solemn conviction that there are many Christians in all the evangelical denominations. I think the charge that we are uncharitable is false. We admit that they are Christians, but we deny that they are in the Church. We believe they are unbaptized, yet many of them go to heaven every day. We agree with our Methodist brethren that the "anxious seat" is a "means of grace. " Yet I think many were converted before its introduction; it is not, therefore, indispensably, necessary to salvation. In fact many of our intelligent churches do not use it at all. This is correct, for one of our eminent ministers recently said: "Your knowledge is the measure of your religion. "

The Church was fully set up by Jesus while here on earth, This is proven by the fact that He laid down the law for its government, which could not have been done if the Church had not then been in existence. I challenge contradiction of this statement

Two of our cardinal doctrines are total depravity and salvation by "grace alone. " These propositions are worthy of your attention. You cannot be a Baptist and reject them. I do not agree with Brother Methodist's definition of the Church. If he had said "a congregation of immersed believers worshiping God

according to the New Testament, " we could indorse it without injustice to our principles. We believe in a converted membership; a membership composed of justified men and women. No one is qualified for a position in our Church until he is saved by repentance and faith. We receive persons into the fellowship of our Churches by "experience of grace, " and immersion. A preacher in our Church can not receive a member. Our rules demand that the congregation shall hear the candidate's experience and vote on his reception. If it judges him favorably, the preacher is then authorized to immerse him. We believe he is a Christian before this, but in order to Church membership it must be done by a regular Baptist preacher; hence we can not receive into our fellowship any who have been immersed by our religious neighbors. To state the matter plainly, we believe immersion is necessary to Church membership, but not to salvation. I speak of immersion; it was the invariable practice of the Church in the early ages of its existence. Brother Methodist, and those who stand with him, think it is a small matter whether a man is immersed, or has a few drops of water sprinkled or poured upon him. I think it is very important Paul says there is "one baptism. " It cannot be that the action is a matter of indifference, as our opponents try to teach. I have not the slightest doubt that we are on apostolic ground, for no scholar of eminence denies that our practice is in perfect harmony with the practice of the apostles and their immediate successors. Immersion has never been in doubt, but sprinkling and pouring as substitutes for it, have always and will ever be in dispute. A correct translation of the Scriptures will remove every difficulty and bring us back to original ground.

It is charged by our opponents that we make too much of baptism. We deny the charge. We do not make any more of it than the Bible makes of it. We stand by the book! It is a Christian duty. Hence we immerse none but the converted. We deny that it is essential to salvation, or for the remission of sins,

or that it changes the state or the relationship, and affirm with all confidence that what it does is figurative or declarative.

I confess that while the Baptist Church possesses all the characteristics of the Apostolic Church, both of a doctrinal and practical nature, it has changed somewhat in its progress through the ages. I claim to stand with Jesus, Paul, Peter, John and the long line of saints who have made their names deathless in the annals of time. There is no call for a new Church. The old is good enough. We claim to stand on the Bible. We call on all contending parties to abandon their man-made creeds, lay down their implements of ecclesiastical warfare, and stand together with us on the old foundation. There never has been any reason for the existence of so many sects. Reason, revelation and experience condemn them and encourage the hope of their early dissolution.

I present to you the gospel of Christ in its purity; its facts, its ordinances as they were delivered from heaven. We can stand together here in the one Church. Here is something on which we can rest from doubts and confusion, I present to you facts of momentous importance; the basis on which we can be one in Christ Jesus. This is important. The salvation of the world, in a great measure, depends upon it. Let us be united in heart, life and work, and the blessings of the pure gospel will be ours for time and eternity. May the presence of God abide with us all.

CHAPTER III.

PRESBYTERIAN

I was unwilling to enter this convention from the very beginning, believing it would degenerate into useless controversy and end in strife and confusion, and that the cause of Christianity would suffer rather than be benefitted by our deliberations. I hope no one will understand that my reluctance arose from fear. Quite the contrary; Presbyterianism can not possibly lose anything by honest investigation: "The eternal years of God are hers. " It has passed through the persecutions of centuries. It has withstood the assaults of sectarians, infidels, and "false brethren, " and now it stands erect amidst the storms, and bids defiance to the powers of earth and hell.

I do not feel disposed to give it up for anything beneath the sun. I do not think it can be improved by human legislation; hence, I see but little use of my presence in this August assembly. As to Christian union, what is it? Are we not united already? Are we not Christians? Do any of the evangelical denominations represented in this convention deny a single one of the essential or fundamental principles of Christianity? Not one. True, we have our differences, our denominational peculiarities, but these are unimportant, and non-essential when compared with the great facts on which we have always been one. Now, shall we lay aside our distinguishing doctrines and attempt to formulate a universal creed to gratify the whims of a few religious enthusiasts? I think not Jesus Christ justified our separate existence when He said: "He that is not against us is for us, " and "I am the vine and ye are the branches. " It is absolutely impossible for us to see alike in all things. Jesus knew this, hence the lessons just given. There is work

for us all to do. The field is unlimited and I think that we can accomplish more in our present condition than if we were all united upon one creed. As it is now, every man can be pleased. If he does not want to be a Presbyterian, let him be something else. There are many evangelical roads, but they all have the same terminus: "The everlasting city of God. " I would much rather give you my hand as a pledge that I am willing to live in peace with my denominational brethren, than to proceed further with this discussion, but as it is insisted upon, and we are commanded to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, " I can not refrain. I expect to speak my sentiments plainly, pointedly, and unequivocally; hence I ask my brethren beforehand to treat them with due consideration.

Presbyterians are slightly divided in name, but very closely united in doctrine. They are called American Presbyterians, Northern Presbyterians, Southern Presbyterians, New School Presbyterians, Old School Presbyterians, English Presbyterians, Scotch Presbyterians, Reformed Presbyterians, Associate Presbyterians, or Seceders, Associate Reformed Presbyterians, United Presbyterians, and Cumberland Presbyterians. Our doctrines are based, with a few alterations, upon the Westminster Confession of Faith. See Preface to Confession. The doctrines compiled and published by the Westminster Assembly have been somewhat modified to meet the wants of some of our branches, but these changes are unimportant, and I am glad to say that in the rudimental principles of Christianity we are substantially one.

I think we have the best creed in the world. It was originally compiled by one hundred and twenty-one divines and thirty laymen from England, and five Commissioners from Scotland. The Assembly was engaged more than five years and a half in preparing, discussing, and adopting the Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, Directory for Worship, and the form of Church Government. The distinguished Richard Baxter, who was personally

acquainted with most of the members, but was not himself one of them, says: "The divines there congregated were men of eminent learning, godliness, ministerial ability and fidelity. " Their work was soon approved by the House of Commons, and adopted by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. Now, shall he abandon the enunciations of this ancient assembly, or attempt to improve the results of their labors? I answer with an emphatic no! Pardon me, but if you want an universal creed, why do you not adopt this one? If you will insist on Church union, this is most unequivocally the foundation.

But let me give you a more explicit exhibition of our distinctive doctrines. We are willing to be governed by the word of God. It is our guide and counselor. Our Confession of Faith is in strict accordance with the Bible. You will see by referring to it that we furnish the plain words of Holy Writ to sustain every article of faith and item of practice.

Nearly all our parties are strictly Calvinistic, and that you may understand me more fully, I will give you a brief synopsis of the "five points" of "our theology. "

I. *Predestination.* —"As all men have sinned in Adam and have become exposed to the curse and eternal death, God would have done no injustice to any one if He had determined to leave the whole human race under sin and the curse, and to condemn them on the account of sin; according to those words of the apostle, 'all the world is become guilty before God. "'—Scott's Synod of Dort, pages 112-124. Predestination has reference to both angels and men. "By the decree of God for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated into everlasting life, and others foreordained into everlasting death. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished. "— Confession of Faith, pages 23 and 24. This election

did not grow out of foreseen faith, obedience, good disposition, or good qualities of the elect, but out of the sovereign will and wonderful grace of God. These purposes of God are immutable, so He softens the heart of the elect and redeems them from sin, but the others are left alone to reap the fruits of their labors.

At our Annual Convention in 1938, by a vote of 151 to 130, this doctrine was annulled, but as you will perceive, more than 46% of the delegates still considered this ancient and sacred doctrine sufficient for the present century.

II. *The Death of Christ.* —God entered into a covenant with His Son before the foundation of the world. "He willed that Christ, through the blood of the cross, should, out of every people, tribe and language, efficaciously redeem all those, and those only, who were from eternity chosen to salvation, and given to Him by the Father; that He should confer on them the gift of faith."—Scott's Synod of Dort, pages 128-130. Hence you perceive that Christ died for those who were His before the foundation of the world.

III. *Man's Corruption.* —"All men are conceived in sin and born the children of wrath, indisposed to all saving good, propense to evil, dead in sin, and the slaves of sin; without the Degenerating grace of the Holy Spirit they neither are willing nor able to return to God to correct their depraved nature, or to dispose themselves to the correction of it."—Scott's Synod, page 125, 126. "Our first parents being seduced by the subtlety and temptation of Satan, sinned in eating the forbidden fruit. This their sin, God was pleased according to His wise and holy council to permit, having proposed to order it to His glory. By this sin they fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body. They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity, descend-

ing from them by ordinary generations. "—Confession of Faith, pages 39, 40.

IV. *Grace and freewill.* —"God hath endowed the will of man with natural liberty that it is neither forced nor by absolute necessity of nature, determined to good or evil. Man, in his state of innocency, had freedom and power of will, and to do that which is good and well-pleasing to God, but yet mutably, so that he might fall from it Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able by his own strength to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto." —Confession of Faith, pages 58-60.

V. *Final Perseverance,* —"God, who is rich in mercy, from His immutable purpose of election, does not wholly take away His Holy Spirit from His own, even in lamentable falls; nor does He permit them to decline, that they should fall from the grace of adoption, and the state of justification; or to commit the sin unto death, or against the Holy Spirit; that being deserted by Him they should cast themselves into headlong destruction; therefore, it is impossible for one of God's elect to fall away and be lost" —Scott's Synod of Dort, page 141.

There are some among us who are rather moderate in their Calvinistic principles, but those who are specially so are just that far removed from the original ground. I believe several of the evangelical denominations in this assembly virtually agree with us in reference to our "five points, " though they are not always explicit in their statement. To sum up, we believe a certain portion of the race to have been predestinated to everlasting life; that this part was redeemed by the death of Christ, and that they are called, sanctified, adopted and saved through the Holy Spirit; saved from sin, saved from the possibility of ever falling, saved eternally. I listened very attentively to the addresses of the brethren who preceded me. I heard many things with which I heartily agree, and others which

I cannot conscientiously approve. Of course I do not agree with Brother Methodist's twenty-five articles of faith, and I think he is entirely mistaken as to the practicability of our uniting upon them. I agree with him in reference to the Abrahamic covenant, Infant Baptism, and Church Membership. His definition of the Church will do tolerably well, but is not so explicit as ours. See our Confession, page 124. He admits persons to membership in his Church by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion. We are not quite so liberal as that. Our Confession of Faith, page 146, says: "Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary; but baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person. " Dr. Rice, of New York, recently said in reply to Dr. Armitage, of the Baptist Church: "I do not believe immersion is Christian Baptism at all. " So you see where we stand, and if we ever unite in one brotherhood, we must not be so particular about "modes. "

As to Brother Baptist's speech, I disagree with almost everything he said. I think he is an extremist and exceedingly inconsistent also. He believes in immersion and nothing else. He says we must have a new translation and substitute "immersion" for "baptism. " Yet he persists in calling himself a Baptist According to his theory, John the Baptist must become John the Immerser. "Baptize, ", must become "immerse. " Then the Baptist Church will become the Immerser Church!

The preachers of the different Baptist denominations ridicule us for practicing sprinkling and pouring. Yet they uncompromisingly affirm that their practice is nonessential to salvation; hence, it seems shameful to set it up as a barrier between the children of God. They admit that Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Quakers, etc., are orthodox; that they are Christians, and that they will go to heaven without immersion. Why then do they raise such a confusion in reference to this custom? Immersion is the door into the Baptist Church; hence, according to their theory and practice, it is easier to get into the everlasting city of God than

to get into their Church! They denounce Disciplines, Confessions of Faith and Prayer Books with severity. Yet, if you will take the pains to look into their church books throughout the land, you will find written articles of Faith and Rules of Decorum. Also by looking into many of the libraries throughout the country, especially the old ones, you will find copies of the "New Hampshire Confession of Faith, " and the "Philadelphia Confession of Faith. " "But, " says my friend, "we deny these; they are not binding on us now. " They used to be authoritative with the Baptists, and they must acknowledge them now or deny their ancestry. Does not this at least "crack" a link in the chain of historical succession? Why do they hide their light under a bushel? I presume it is in order to enable them to raise a cry about what others do.

Brother Baptist assaulted Brother Methodist with all the power at his command. He said that "there were no Methodist Churches in Apostolic times. " This is confessedly true, but I assure him that in the next verse after the one which speaks of a Baptist Church, he will find a full history of the origin, progress and victories of Methodism.

The Baptist method of receiving members is contrary to Scripture and common sense. A man makes a profession of faith in Christ He goes before a Baptist Church and tells his experience. The members of the Church compare his experience with theirs, and express by their vote that he has religion, that he is saved, and, therefore, saved eternally. They accept him as a brother, baptize him and admit him to their table. In a few months he falls away. They withdraw their fellowship from him by vote, and by this act declare that he was never converted.

They unite with other religious organizations in revivals, treat them as brethren, Christians, and at the end exclude them from what they call the Lord's table! If I am good enough to work in revivals and go to heaven, I am good enough to go to the Lord's table! But why do they exclude us? Simply because their hands have not conducted us through what they call a

"figure, and only a figure, " immersion! Let this convention take notice that the Baptist Church makes a test of fellowship of that which they universally and unanimously designate a nonessential.

Brother Baptist professes to be able to trace his existence back to John in the wilderness. I think from the speech he made he has never been out of the wilderness! He enumerated about nine kinds of Baptists. I do not think this is very complimentary to his theory of apostolic succession. I should like to know which branch of his Church can claim historical descent from John. If he can find any distinct order known as the Baptist Church beyond the sixteenth century, I should like to see his evidence. I think he is mistaken, and for his edification I volunteer a little advice: "Those who live in glass houses would do well not to throw stones, " and "happy is he that condemneth not himself in the things which he alloweth. "

Now, my dear brethren, I have given you a brief outline of our history and principles, but it is sufficient, and when you come to make up your final decision, give them the consideration which their importance and antiquity demand, I feel sure that the results will be satisfactory and beneficial. May the grace of God abide with us all. Amen.

CHAPTER IV.

EPISCOPALIAN.

I stand before you today, not as a representative of a "sect, " or a "branch of the Church, " but as a minister of the only true and Apostolic Church. It has long been considered as incompatible with the character and dignity of a clergyman in our Church to participate in deliberations of this kind. We know we are right; on the only true foundation, hence, we endeavor to pursue the even tenor of our way, and let other people alone. We have always been ready, however, to disseminate the pure doctrine, to direct inquirers to the right way, to contend earnestly for the primitive gospel, and to give a "reason for the hope that is in us, " In compliance with the combined requests of the eminent clergymen of the "religious sects, " I am here to direct them to what I consider the fountain of truth, life and. peace. First of all, those who are in our Church are one. The true faith and practice destroy sectarianism. We all believe and practice the same doctrines, hence we cannot be divided into factions. I have listened very attentively to the addresses already made. I feel that you have manifested too much of the carnal or partisan spirit. Lay aside these encumbrances and listen, calmly and impartially to the exposition of divine truth which I shall endeavor to make. There are some true propositions on which we all agree. We all believe in the existence of the One Supreme Ruler of heaven and earth; the divinity, mission, death, resurrection and glorious ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that the word of God contains all things necessary to salvation. But you disagree in reference to what constitutes the true Church and the best creed. Do you ask for the true Church? Do you inquire which is the best creed? In answer to the first, I direct your attention to the Protestant Episcopal Church. In answer to the

second, I direct your attention to the Book of Common Prayer. Here you find the true Church and the true creed. Here you can find rest from sectarianism and strife. Here you can build and be infallibly safe. Here you can find the true foundation for Christian union and co-operation.

By turning to the third page of our Book of Common Prayer, you will find that it was ratified by the bishops, clergy and laity of our church in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty-nine, or one hundred and fifty years ago. You will further see that it was not only recommended, but absolutely established, as the liturgy of the Church. So you readily perceive that it bears the stamp of age and authority. It is in incessant use in all of our Churches, and is universally acknowledged to be the very foundation of our faith and worship.

Our Church had its origin in England, where it is called the Church of England, and we remember with deep gratitude the long nursing and protection which our English brethren have bestowed upon us. In this country there is no relation between Church and State, and as this is true, some unimportant changes have been introduced to meet the demands of local circumstances.

Our Book of Common Prayer contains the fundamental articles of our religion; thirty-nine in number. I have neither time nor disposition to quote them in full, but I will give you an abridgment of what they contain. The first five articles contain a profession of faith in the Trinity, the incarnation of Jesus Christ; His descent into hell, and His resurrection, the divinity of the Holy Ghost. The three following relate to the canon of Scripture. The eighth article declares a belief in the Apostles' and the Nicene creeds. The ninth and following articles contain the doctrine of original sin, of justification by faith alone, of predestination, etc. The nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-first declare the Church to be the assembly of the faithful; that it can decide nothing except by the Scriptures, The twenty-second rejects the doctrine of

purgatory, indulgences, the adoration of images, and the invocation of saints. The twenty-third decides that only those lawfully called shall preach or administer the sacraments. The twenty-fourth requires the liturgy to be in English. The twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth declare the sacraments effectual signs of grace (though administered by evil men) by which God confirms our faith. They are two: Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Baptism, according to the twenty-seventh article, is a sign of regeneration, the seal of our adoption by which faith is confirmed and grace increased. In the Lord's Supper, according to article twenty-eight, the bread is the communion of the body of Christ, the wine the communion of His blood, but only through faith, (Art. xxix); and the communion must be administered in both kinds (Art. xxx). The twenty-eighth article condemns the doctrine of transubstantiation; the thirty-first rejects the sacrifice of mass as blasphemous; the thirty-second permits the marriage of the clergy; the thirty-third maintains the efficacy of excommunication. The remaining articles relate to the authority of the King, the traditions of the church, and the condemnation of Anabaptists, etc.

In addition to these thirty-nine articles, our book gives full, clear and explicit directions for making, ordaining and consecrating bishops, priests and deacons, baptizing infants, baptizing those of riper years, the order of confirmation, the solemnization of matrimony, visiting the sick, the burial of the dead, the forms of morning and evening prayers, administering the holy communion, the litany and suffrages, a selection of psalms and hymns, the order of worship, a catechism, etc.

On page 296 we find a full and Scriptural exposition of infant baptism. "There shall be for every male child to be baptized, when they can be had, two Godfathers and one Godmother: and for every female, one Godfather and two Godmothers; and parents shall be admitted as Sponsors, if desired. "

This, I think, is an improvement on the Methodist and Presbyterian plan. The children can not answer

for themselves, hence those of mature years do it for them. The entire ceremony is fully described By this act of the child by its Sponsors, it is brought into the congregation of the Lord—Page 299. The minister closes with the following prayer, and charge to the Godfathers and Godmothers:

"We yield Thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it has pleased Thee to regenerate *this Infant* with Thy Holy Spirit, to receive *him* for Thine own *Child* by adoption, and to incorporate *him* into Thy holy Church. And humbly we beseech Thee to grant that *he*, being dead unto sin and living unto righteousness, and being buried with Christ in His death, may crucify the old man, and utterly abolish the whole body of sin; and that he is made *partaker* of the death of Thy Son, *he* may also be *partaker* of His resurrection; so that finally, with the residue of Thy holy Church, he may be an *inheritor* of Thine everlasting kingdom; through Christ our Lord *Amen.* "

"Forasmuch as *this Child hath* promised by you *his* sureties to renounce the devil and all his works, to believe in God and to serve Him, ye must remember that it is your parts and duties to see that *this Infant* be taught so soon as he shall be able to learn, what a solemn vow, promise and profession he *hath* here made by you. And that he may know these things the better, ye shall call upon him to hear sermons; and chiefly ye shall provide that he may learn the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and all other things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health; and that *this Child* may be virtuously brought up to lead a godly and a Christian life; remembering always that Baptism doth represent unto us our profession; which is, to follow the example of our Saviour Christ and to be made like unto Him; that, as He died and rose again for us, so should we, who are baptized, die from sin and rise again unto righteousness; continually mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living. "

"Ye are to take care that *this Child* be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed by him, so soon as he can say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and is sufficiently instructed in the other parts of the Church Catechism set forth for that purpose. "

The Protestant Episcopal Church stands or falls with the principles here enumerated. They cannot fall, for they are in strict harmony with the Testament of Jesus Christ And His holy apostle says: "The word of the Lord endureth forever. " Our Church has a grand record, and it is destined to become the admiration of mankind It will live when your "Disciplines, " "Confession of Faith, " and the "Articles of Faith, " and "Rules of Decorum," shall have gone to the dark shades of relentless oblivion. If you are really searching for the "old paths, " here you can find them and be at rest It rejoices my heart to offer you a Church and a Creed which will be as enduring as time. Will you abandon tile doubtful and accept that which is infallibly sure? Will you renounce the transient and accept the eternal? It so, may the great Head of the Church bless you, strengthen you and bring you to His everlasting kingdom.

CHAPTER V.

LUTHERAN.

I have something better to present to your consideration than the twenty-five articles of Methodism, the fanciful assertions of my friend, Brother Baptist, the Confession of Presbyterianism, or the thirty-nine articles of Episcopalianism. It is the primitive gospel, the pure faith and the true Church wrenched from the grasp of Roman Catholicism by the great Martin Luther. The truth has withstood the trials of ages, and it cannot possibly lose anything by being submitted to the examination of this assembly. I am happy to stand before you as a friend and brother to the great reformer. It matters not how lightly you may esteem it, you are in a great measure indebted to him for the word of God and the great religious privileges you now enjoy. He was born on the 10th of November, 1483, consequently at the time in which the Pope of Rome exercised almost unlimited ecclesiastical and political power. He was taught the Roman Catholic religion from infancy. He became in many respects a sincere and zealous advocate of his religion. He was a great student. In 1508 he became a teacher in the University at Wittenberg. In addition to the duty of hearing his class and preaching, he occasionally heard confessions. Different occurrences led him to a more serious contemplation of the teachings of Romanism. He became involved in a controversy with its authorized representatives. They threatened him and his followers with the horrors of the Inquisition. This did not discourage him, so on the 31st day of October, 1517, he published ninety-five propositions, discussing copiously the doctrines of penance, charity, indulgences, purgatory, etc. A long and tedious discussion followed, in which error suffered and truth triumphed. His enemies burned his books. He retaliated, and as he

committed some of the standard Catholic works to the flames, he exclaimed in a loud and triumphant voice: "Because ye have troubled the saints of the Lord, therefore let eternal fire trouble you." He was excommunicated from the Church by the Pope of Rome. He treated him with unreserved contempt, and committed his "Bull of Excommunication" to the fire. His zeal was boundless, his determination unconquerable. In all his mighty contests he came out victor. In April, 1521, he appeared before the Diet at Worms. Several charges were made against him. In reply he emphatically refused to retract anything he had said or written. He closed his defense with these immortal words: "Let me be convinced by the testimony of the Scriptures, or by the clearest arguments; otherwise I can not and will not retract, for it is neither safe nor expedient to act against conscience. Here I take my stand. I can not do otherwise. God help me. Amen." These noble words flashed like lightning through the German and surrounding nations, and Popery trembled from center to circumference. This Reformation has rolled from country to country, and from age to age, and we are enjoying its benefits today. Luther was no ordinary man. He did not labor for self-aggrandizement, but for the good of his fellowmen. He died as he lived, in full confidence of the truth which he preached. These words were among the last he ever uttered: "Oh, my heavenly Father, eternal and merciful God, Thou hast revealed to me Thy Son, - our Lord Jesus Christ! I have preached Him. I have confessed Him. I love Him, and I worship Him as my dearest Saviour and Redeemer; Him whom the wicked persecute, accuse and blaspheme."

His words live after him, and eternity alone can give an adequate conception of his life and its results.

I have given you a brief statement of the rise and progress of the Reformation. I will now present a synopsis of our distinctive doctrines. I hold in my hand a little book called the Augsburg Confession of Faith. It contains an invincible system of doctrine. The learned men of Europe have never been able to over-

throw it. It was drawn by Luther and Melancthon, and presented to the Emperor Charles V., in 1530, at the Diet of Augsburg. It is divided into two parts, of which the former, containing twenty-one articles, was designed to represent with truth and perspicuity the religious opinions of the reformers, and the latter, containing seven articles, is employed in pointing out and confuting the seven capital errors which occasioned their separation from the Church of Rome. These were communion in one kind, the forced celibacy of the clergy, private masses, auricular confession, legendary traditions, monastic vows, and the excessive power of the Church. We submit these articles for your investigation. We stand or fall with them.

Martin Luther restored the Bible to the world, and we take it as our guide. We acknowledge that Christ died for all who are partakers of Adam's transgressions, but those only who believe in Him and persevere in their faith to the end will be saved. We do not believe that good works are in anywise meritorious with regard to salvation. As to free will, we deny its power before conversion. We maintain that none are converted but by the prevailing efficacy of grace alone. We acknowledge but two sacraments: the Lord's Supper and Baptism. We deny transubstantiation, the mass, elevation and adoration of the host, the ceremonies and all external worship which the Church of Rome observes with respect to the body and blood of Jesus Christ. We reject the adoration of saints and relics. We endeavor to imitate every good example, but nothing further. We condemn all acts of penance and human expiation, such as solemn vows and pilgrimages, and depend alone on Christ for salvation.

We heartily agree with many things which have been said in this convention. We join the brethren in every expression of reverence for God and the adaptability, simplicity and all-sufficiency of His Word. We believe in the perpetuity of the Abrahamic Covenant, and the baptism of children. It is useless to deny the reasonableness and practicability of this custom. We believe that baptism is necessary to salvation, and

that the Church is a permanent institution. Now, my dear friends, do you not feel satisfied that we can harmonize on these principles? I close with the words of an inspired Apostle: "Be perfect; be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace, and the God of love and peace shall be with you. "

CHAPTER VI.

ROMAN CATHOLIC.

I propose to exhibit for your examination the doctrine of the only true, united and Apostolic Church. I expect to contradict almost everything advanced by this convention. I have heard a wonderful variety of theories, but when we throw the pure and luminous words of God's eternal truth upon them, they appear deformed, out of joint, unreasonable and absurd. The chosen representatives of the Protestant Episcopal and Baptist Churches even have the effrontery to lay claim to an uninterrupted and continuous existence from the apostles down to the present. Admitting that they are each worthy of confidence and respect, how shall we decide which one is right? They both pretend to quote history and Scripture. They seem entirely satisfied, and pretend to be resting on the truth. Can they be right and hold theories so much at variance? I think not. Hence their pretensions amount to nothing. There were no sects in apostolic times. The true Church has never been divided. True, some have become dissatisfied with it and departed from its instruction and protection, but they have generally carried with them enough of the true doctrine to indicate to an absolute certainty their primitive home. Every preacher in this assembly has made positive assertions in reference to his relations to the word of God and the Church of Jesus Christ. These are not Churches of Christ, they are sects originated to gratify the ambitions of men. Some of them are ignorant and erring children, and whenever they renounce their traditions and return home, we will receive them with open arms.

I have said the true Church is and always has been one. By this I mean its members have been united in the belief of the same doctrines of revelation, and in the acknowledgment of the same divinely constituted

pastors. Heresy and schism have always been opposed to Christian unity. By heresy a man rejects one or more articles of the Christian faith. By schism he spurns the authority of his spiritual superiors. That the Church has always been one is evident from the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, and from unbroken tradition of the Fathers. The types employed by our Saviour and His inspired Apostles to indicate the distinctive character of His Church, clearly denote the necessity of this unity of faith. Thus it is compared to the human body, and it is even declared to be the body of Christ. 'For as the body is one, ' says St. Paul (I. Cor., 13:12), 'and hath many members, and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet one body, so is Christ. ' The same Apostle says; 'You are the body of Christ, and members one of another. ' Now all the members of the human body, must be animated by the same principle of life and joined together so as to feel and move and act together; therefore the members of this Church must be animated by the same principle of life and be so joined together that they may feel, move and act in perfect harmony. Yet how would this be possible, if they were not animated by the same faith, if they were not united in the belief of the same doctrines of revelation, if they were in con-tradition among themselves, one believing what another rejects? Our Lord prayed for this unity to be like that which exists between the Father and Himself, that it might be an argument to the world of His Divine mission (John, 17:20-21)"

"In what did this unity consist? St. Cyril, of Alexandria, answers: *In* the common attainment of unity by a mutual consent in all things and an indivisible concord of hearts. ' But if the members of Christ's mystical body were not united in the belief of the same revealed truths, but were at war among themselves concerning some of them, could their unity be compared to the one that exists between the Eternal Father and His Divine Son, and could this unity be an argument to the world of the divinity of Jesus Christ? St. Cyprian assures us that 'he who holds not this unity holds not

the faith of the Father and the Son; holds not life and salvation. There is one God and one Christ, and His Church one, and the faith one, and the people one, joined into the solid unity of one body by the cement of concord. The great, the good and the learned admit that. ' When all hold one faith there is unity. "

"Is this unity of faith to be found among our separated brethren? No one who values the truth will dare to assert that it is. In support of this statement we invoke the testimony of one whom his own people consider a Doctor in Israel; he is a professor in a Protestant College, and evidently a man of deep research and thoughtful study; we allude to Dr. Philip Schaff, professor of Biblical literature in the Union Theological Seminary of New York, His work on the '*Creeds of the Evangelical Protestant Churches*', (N. Y., Harper, 1877), is a striking truth of the painful and conspicuous absence of that perfect unity in faith, intended by our Lord as a mark of His Church. They do not profess one Creed, but have different Creed's. Hence they do not constitute one Church, but different Churches. This is the reason why Dr. Schaff had to entitle his volume the '*Creeds of the Protestant Evangelical Churches*. ' In order to form a tolerably accurate idea of their many Creeds, with the numberless variations which they underwent, we refer the reader to Bossuet's '*History of the Protestant Variations*.' There he may trace distinctly the truth of the censure contained in Bishop Dudith's letter to Beza: 'What beings are we Protestants, wandering to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine, sometimes to this side, sometimes to that! You may perhaps guess what we believe today; but you will never be able to ascertain what we shall profess tomorrow. In what point of religion do the Churches agree among themselves which have rejected the authority of the See of Rome? Examine them from first to last, you will scarce find any one tenet affirmed or believed by one sect, which is not immediately condemned by another. '—Fletcher's '*Guide to the True Religion*, ' page 153. London, 1836. "

"An English Protestant writer, the learned Dr. Walton, in the preface to his Polyglot (London, 1657), acknowledging this want of unity among Protestants, points out one of the causes to which it may be traced. 'Aristarchus, ' he says, 'heretofore could scarcely find seven wise men in Greece; but among us so many idiots can without difficulty be found. For all are Doctors, all are divinely learned, there is not so much as the meanest fanatic, or jackpudding, who does not give his *own dreams* for the word of God..... These have filled our cities, villages, camps, houses, nay our Churches and pulpits too, and lead the poor deluded people with them to the pit of perdition. ' Rather remarkable testimony considering the source from which it comes. "

"In these words the true reason of this want of unity in faith is but faintly outlined. Their rule of faith is the principal cause why Protestants generally 'give their own dreams for the word of God. ' It is the true reason for the different beliefs that exist among the various Protestant denominations. So long as every one is told that 'he not only has the right, but that it is his duty to interpret the Scriptures for himself, ' so long as the private interpretation of the Bible is to settle all religious controversy, so long will religious division be perpetuated, not only among the different sects, but even among the members of the same denomination. "

I will now proceed to present a further statement of our origin, doctrines and practice. You perceive from the foregoing that we have no confidence in sectarianism. We are for the primitive plan. The Church was established in the city of Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, and has continued uninterruptedly to the present time.

Christ appointed Peter as the visible head or supreme ruler of His Church. The Church did not die with Peter, but was destined to continue to the end of time. Consequently whatever official prerogatives were conferred on him, were not to cease at his death, but were to be handed down to his successors from generation to generation. We believe in the infallibility

of the Pope and the Church. We regard the infallibility of the Pope as the guiding star of our work and destiny. "The infallibility of the Church is an extraordinary gift of the Holy Ghost It is not a new revelation, and is not to be confounded with the gift of inspiration. It is rather a special providence of God, and a particular assistance of the Holy Ghost by which the Church of Christ is preserved from error when believing in a revealed truth, or when explaining the doctrine received from Christ and His Apostles. Hence, Catholic theologians make a distinction between active and passive infallibility—the former being the infallibility of the Church in teaching; the latter her infallibility in believing. "—True Faith of our Forefathers, page 88. It is affirmed, therefore, by one of our eminent men, that "the Church has authority from God to teach regarding faith and morals, and in her teaching the special assistance of the Holy Ghost" The Church is, therefore one, Catholic and Apostolic. We believe in the holiness of the Church, as will be seen from our writings. It is also held as an inviolable principle of the Church, that "it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke the saints and to fly to their prayers, aid and assistance, in order to obtain favor from God through His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Savior. " We believe in the "immaculate conception of Mary, the Mother of God, " the use of images in sacred worship, and the seven sacraments, viz.: Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders and Matrimony.

I now submit these. unimpeachable facts to your consideration. They are unchangeable—eternal. We are one. Protestantism is divided and is becoming more so every year. Remember your obligations to God and the people with whom you live, forsake your sectarianism, and cast your lot with the only true Church.

CHAPTER VII.

INFIDEL.

I appear in this convention because the announcement indicated that it would afford an opportunity for every man, religious and irreligious, to express his sentiments fully and freely. I came because I had a right to do so, and not because I am interested in the Bible or the advancement of the cause of any religious body. I am making the best of this life, and as to the "life to come, " of which we hear so much, I shall let it take care of itself. I call myself a free thinker. I am not bound by the chains of legendary "theology, " nor the petty prejudices which characterize many of the religious thinkers of the age. I feel that I am infinitely above superstition; that I am in the bright sunlight of independence, enjoying the high privilege of thinking and acting for myself. In other words, I do not believe the Bible, not a word of it. It is a fable from Genesis to Revelation. These declarations seem rather sweeping, nevertheless they are my honest convictions; and perhaps it will entertain some of you to hear my "experience; " the influences which led me to regard religion a myth and the practice of it a farce. I had religious parents. They were pious and devoted to what they believed to be right They taught me to read the Bible, go to Church, and look with deep reverence upon religious ceremonies. When I grew up to manhood they died and left me alone in the world. Soon after these sad events, I concluded to "change my life, " as our "orthodox" brethren term it, but notwithstanding my early training, I had no positive convictions. I felt troubled, and resolved to consult some of the "spiritual counselors" of our city. Accordingly I presented myself at the study of Father Apostolic, of the Catholic Church. He treated me with great kindness, spoke of the Pope, the "visible head of

the Church, " his infallibility, the infallibility of the Church, the seven sacraments, priestly absolution; gave me some literature and bade me call again. I left without any special feelings of relief. I read the literature, and felt that it was "confusion worse confounded. " Soon after this I made a visit to Dr. Decrees, of the Presbyterian Church. He was a ripe scholar and a most excellent man. I had a long interview with him, which for a short time seemed to be satisfactory. He spoke of the rich provision made for my "salvation and eternal welfare. " He exhorted me to trust Christ This I tried to do, but I had little evidence on which to base a trust When I departed, I requested the privilege of reading some standard work of the Church. He gave me the "Confession of Faith. " I read it with the greatest interest imaginable until I came across this passage: "By the decree of God for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated to everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death, and their number is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished. " I was amazed. I thought of what the Doctor had told me, and I concluded that if I were elected I was all right. If not; I was all wrong. I resolved to try again, but not until I had wept and prayed over what I considered my awful condition. Tears did not relieve an aching heart

Very soon after this I met Mr. Earnest, the successful and popular pastor of the Methodist Church. I laid my case before him. He said I should pray more, and quoted for my consolation, "Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted. " I told him I had prayed. He referred me to his brother, Mr. Junius, who had been a mourner for ten years before the Lord "blessed him. " He invited me to attend his services and join his Church on six months' probation. During all this time the old passage of Scripture, "Now is the accepted time, and now is the day of salvation, " was ringing in my confused and excited brain.

I had often attended the Baptist Church, and a revival was in progress under the ministration of Mr.

Strictly, the pastor. He was a gentleman of fine educational attainments, and one of the most acceptable pulpit orators in the city. There was a large audience assembled when I went. I determined to hear everything he said, so I took my place on one of the front seats. His text was I. Cor., 1:23. He spoke of the awful condition into which sin has plunged the human race. He taught us that man is totally depraved, that he can do nothing to save himself, that a sinner's tears and prayers do no good, that it is impossible for him to do anything unaided by the "Spirit from on high. " At last he brought his remarks to a close by fervently exhorting us to amend our ways. He then invited us to a front seat to engage in an effort to "get religion. " He said "God is here. He is ready; ready now. " I went. They sang and exhorted. At last they knelt and prayed for God to come. I found no relief. I departed with a thousand conflicting thoughts running through my mind. I did not return. I decided that I could find no consolation in such contradictory statements.

Mr. Historicus, the pastor of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was a man of good reputation, both as a scholar and as a preacher. I had an interview with him. He politely informed me that he represented the true Church, and that the other religious orders with which I had been associated were sects—human organizations. I was encouraged. I thought that surely a preacher would tell the truth! I became interested, and requested the use of one of his standard theological works, and he presented me with the "Book of Common Prayer. " I said: "Who wrote this book?" He replied: "Our great men" I then inquired: "What do you mean by our great men; Peter, Paul and the other apostles?" He answered: "I mean our great men who lived over two hundred years ago. " I asked, "Were they inspired?" He, of course, admitted that they were not. I then put this question to him: "Can a man be an Episcopalian and disbelieve this creed?" He answered in the negative. I finally inquired: "Were there any Protestant Episcopal Churches in New Testament times, if so, will you please tell me where to

find the proof?" He became confused, excited and abrupt, and I left him to his thoughts.

I interviewed nearly all the preachers in the city with similar results. I found they took the Bible for their guide. Yet they differed on the material points of its teaching. They had one book and one destiny, so they said, but they did not fellowship each other on account of some peculiarity. In my extremity I wandered into book-store and incidentally picked up Tom Paine's Age of Reason. I read it. I found my fears were unfounded. My tears ceased to flow. I ceased to interview preachers, and now it is my solemn conviction that your systems are all impositions on the credulity of mankind. Two of my greatest objections to your systems are your divisions and a want of practice of what little good you preach. I close by saying: Lay aside your theories, shake off your traditions, ascend above your superstitions, and be free and untrammelled in the exercise of your private judgment. As for me, let me be free while I live, and when the end comes, "Environ me with music, sprinkle me with incense and crown me with flowers, that I may pass to my eternal sleep. "

CHAPTER VIII.

ADVENTIST.

It is with almost inexpressible joy that I appear today in this great convention with the unrestricted privilege of participating in its deliberations. I recognize this day's work, as a grand forward step toward the fulfillment of prophecy, the evangelization of the race, and the inauguration of the millennium by the personal return of Jesus Christ to earth. For many years we have contemplated the contention of rival sects, and the irresistible conclusion comes down upon us that as long as there are sects there will be sectarians, and as long as there is sectarianism the work of Christ will be hindered and obstructed. Men of learning, character and eloquence have stood before us, and we have listened honestly and patiently, and what is the result? Each man presents his own creed, endorses his own sect, promulgates his own doctrine, and leaves the great question of the hour where he found it. I present no creed, I advance no confession of faith, but simply call you back to the fundamental principles of Christianity. I will mention a few of our cardinal doctrines, and ask you to profoundly consider them: (1) The Divine origin, perpetuity and universal obligation of the Sabbath day. Amen. I see that this proposition strikes a responsive chord, for the majority of the organizations represented in these deliberations teach that the decalogue is still binding on the Church of God, notwithstanding they observe the heathen "first day of the week. " Why should it not? The suggestion of Christian union without a return to the observance of the primitive day of rest is the very essence of absurdity and contradiction. (2) The establishment of the Kingdom of Christ, and the inauguration of the millennium at His second coming (3) The utter unconsciousness of both the sainted and wicked dead

from death to the resurrection. (4) The resurrection of all the dead. (5) The destruction, the complete annihilation, of the wicked after judgment. I will not elaborate these propositions. You know they cannot be overthrown, and you also know that to combine them with the truths on which we are all agreed nothing can hinder us in our onward march. I stand pledged to the truths of the sacred scriptures, and to this cause I give my life, looking for the coming of the Lord from heaven. Amen.

CHAPTER IX.

MORMON.

Great opportunities do not come often in this short life. Hence, I esteem it a great privilege to stand in the presence of this August assembly and present for your investigation the doctrines of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. I shall not waste my valuable time by discussing the theological medley that has been presented for your entertainment, but proceed at once to the presentation for our doctrines and also our history. Our founder was Joseph Smith, who was born in Sharon, Vt., on the 23rd day of December, 1805. When he was fourteen years old, he began to reflect on the importance of preparing for the future state. He attended the Churches around him with most unsatisfactory results; he found nothing but a great clashing of sentiment. At length, disappointed and disgusted with what he saw and heard, he began to withdraw to secret places for meditation and prayer. During these times of retirement he received a visit from an angel of the Lord. On the 21st of September, 1823, he received the second supernatural visitation. It seemed to him that the house was filled with "consuming fire, " and a personage stood before him "with a countenance like lightning, " and visible to the extremities of the body, proclaiming himself to be an angel of God. He distinctly told him that his prayers were heard, that his sins were forgiven, that the ancient covenant which God made with Israel was at hand to be fulfilled, and that the preparatory work for the second coming of the Messiah must be speedily inaugurated; further, that the time was at hand for the proclamation of the gospel in its power and fullness to all nations, and that he was the instrument in the hands of God to bring about these glorious

ends. The angel also gave him a brief sketch of the origin, progress, civilization, laws, and government of the original inhabitants of America. The angel appeared to him many times, and after due disciplinary probation, he placed in the hands of the prophet the wonderful plates containing the records of the ancient people that had lived on the American continent. This was September 22nd, 1827. I will describe these plates. They were eight inches long by seven inches wide, a little thinner than tin, and bound together by three strings running through the whole. The entire volume thus formed was about six inches thick, a part of which was sealed. The characters of the unsealed part were beautifully engraved. They were translated by Joseph Smith, the prophet. The angel, in order to enable him to do this, had given him the Urim and Thummim, consisting of two transparent stones. The prophet sat behind a blanket hung across the room to keep the sacred record from profane eyes, and as he translated, Oliver Cowdery wrote it down. The Book of Mormon appeared in the year 1830, with the names of Oliver Cowdery, Martin Harris and David Whitmer appended to a certificate that an angel of heaven had come down. Three competent witnesses to any question of fact ought to be enough, but humanity is prone to hesitate, hence the statement of these three noted saints was subsequently backed up by the testimony of the prophet himself and seven others who had seen the wonderful plates. I pause long enough to propound to this assembly two questions, and demand answers: What object could these men have had in knowingly testifying to a lie? Why can we not believe them as well as Moses, Isaiah and Paul?

Indulge me while I tell you something about the ancient history of this continent. It was originally settled by a colony that came from the Tower of Babel. They were Jaredites, and were a bloody race, and following their warlike instincts they destroyed each other until, at the beginning of the fifth century of the Christian era, silence settled down upon America. In the beginning of the sixth century, how-

ever, a new race came to these shores directly from Jerusalem. These people were the ancestors of the North American Indians. The continent was the scene of a constant warfare and unbelief, and darkness prevailed; but before the final night of absolute apostasy set in, God commissioned the prophet Mormon to prepare an abridgment of all their prophecies and histories and hide it in the earth until God should see fit to bring it forth, and unite it with the Bible for the accomplishment of His purposes in the last days of the Christian dispensation. This is the book dug from the earth by our founder under the instruction of the angel of God. We accept it as a Divine revelation, and equal in authority with the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. We stand by Jesus Christ. It is recorded that in the time of Nephi the Second, an awful earthquake announced the crucifixion of the Messiah. Three days subsequent to this, He came down from heaven and showed the Nephites the wounds in His body. He also instructed them for forty days in the truths of Christianity, healed the sick, blessed the children, administered the sacrament, and planted churches, with apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, evangelists, the same order, the same priesthood, the same ordinances, gifts, powers and blessings that were enjoyed on the eastern continent. I have given you only a brief sketch, for I am admonished that my time is growing short

In organization, Mormonism is a pure theocracy. Its priesthood, which rules in matters temporal and ecclesiastical, is divided into the various orders, beginning with President. The second office is Patriarch. The third is the Council of the Twelve. The fourth is the Seventies. The fifth is the High Priests. The sixth is the Bishop. The seventh is the Elders. The eighth is the Priests. The ninth is the Teachers and Deacons.

We believe in God, in Jesus Christ and in the Holy Spirit, and hence accept the Old and New Testaments: we believe that men will be punished on account of their personal transgressions, and not for the sins of Adam; we believe that through the atonement of Christ all mankind may be saved by obedience to the laws

and ordinances of the gospel; we believe these ordinances to be: first, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; second, repentance; third, baptism; fourth, imposition of hands and the gift of the Holy Spirit; fifth, the Lord's Supper, administered kneeling; we believe that men must be called to the work of God by inspiration; ' we believe that the same organization must exist now that existed in the primitive Churches; we believe that miraculous gifts—"discerning of Spirits, prophecy, revelations, visions, healing, tongues"—have not ceased; we believe that the word of God is recorded in the Bible, in the book of Mormon, and all other good books; we believe in all that God has revealed, is revealing or will reveal; we believe in the gathering of Israel, the restoration of the ten lost tribes—the North American Indians—and the establishment of the New Zion on the western continent, the millennial reign of Christ on earth and the transformation of earth into a paradise; we believe in the literal resurrection' of the body; we believe in the absolute liberty of private judgment in matters of religion; we believe it is our duty to submit to the laws of the country in which we live, whether it be monarchical or republican; we believe in being honest, true, chaste, temperate, benevolent, virtuous, and upright; and in doing good to all men, and that an idle or lazy person cannot be a Christian or have salvation.

Our doctrines have stood the test of fiery persecution and of time, and have come out of the fire untouched. Our illustrious founder, Joseph Smith, the prophet of last days, was mercilessly ridiculed, bitterly persecuted and malignantly opposed on every side, but he persevered. We have caught his spirit and we are growing in numbers and power, and insist that the saints shall gather on this fair continent. As to our moral influence at home, I quote one who is not of us: "Their streets are clean, their houses bright, their gardens fruitful. Peace reigns in their cities. Harlots and drunkards are unknown among them. They keep up more common schools than any other sect in the United States. "

I propose as a foundation for our union, the Bible, the book of Mormon as translated by Joseph Smith, all that God has revealed, all that He is revealing, and all that He may reveal hereafter. Will you accept my proposition?

CHAPTER X.

CHURCH OF GOD.

I am pleased to be able to appear before this assembly to-day. And I am pleased to learn that you are all anxious to bring about the unity of God's people; for this is the purpose of the church to which I belong. I think we all agree that Christian unity is badly needed at the present time and is increasingly desired by devout Christians everywhere. That this desire is inspired by the Holy Spirit is my honest belief. And that there is no organic unity of the whole church of Christ to-day is so patent a fact that it needs no proof. However, God's true people everywhere are looking for light on this church question. Honest Christians will think, and are now thinking, in terms of a universal Christianity. If I therefore can be of service in pointing out Christ's plan and purpose to gather together in one the children of God who are scattered abroad, and also to be instrumental in helping to accomplish this grand work, I shall feel abundantly repaid. Because of this I am pleased to come before this assembly to-day to present the earnest plea of the last and final reformation that God is now using to bring about the restoration of the original church to its apostolic glory.

The Church of God reformation movement is an outgrowth of the holiness agitation of the last century. It had its inception about the year 1880, when Daniel S. Warner and other ministers severed their connection with humanly-organized churches and maintained that the Scriptural, all-sufficient standard for Christians is membership in the body of Christ alone. On this account Brother Warner and his associates made no attempt to organize a church along denominational lines, but made direct appeal to the teaching of Scrip-

ture instead, contending that spiritual fellowship with Christ and with each other and devotion to Scriptural ideals constitute a sufficient bond for the followers of Christ

It may be appropriate at this time to state that the Church of God reformation movement is not to be confused with the Winebrennarian church of God, with Mormonism, Adventism nor with the Pentecostal, or the "tongues movement, " whose congregations are sometimes known by the name of "church of God. "

We believe that the Bible is the inspired word of God, and the writings therein teach us that it is the express purpose of God to call out of the world a saved people who shall constitute the body or church of God which was built and established upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone. Therefore we assemble ourselves together for worship, fellowship, counsel and instruction in the word of God and for the exercise of those spiritual gifts and offices provided for in the New Testament

There are many religious bodies in the world today who are holding aloft a name and a doctrine that have been instituted by man. Thus their origin can only be traced as far back as their uninspired founders. For instance: the Methodists, a religious group that was founded by John Wesley; the Lutheran group originated by Martin Luther; the Presbyterians and others. We who identify ourselves with the church of God do not accept Christianity as taught by John Wesley, John Calvin, John Huss or the Pope of Rome. We accept the Christian teachings as taught by Christ and his apostles. For this reason we rightfully bear the name of the church that was born on the day of Pentecost. "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus. " I. Corinthians, 1:2; 10:32. The inspired writings describe the New Testament church as the church of God eleven times. Therefore the church that began on Pentecost can only be known as the church of God.

Now let us analyze the Bible and find the principal

doctrines that were taught by the apostles and which should be our only rule of faith and practice,

Man is in a lost condition and must therefore be born again in order to see the Kingdom of God. "Verily, verily I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. " John, 3:3. But one will say, How can we be born again? We know that inasmuch as we are inclined to evil, and evil only; we must seek forgiveness or pardon for our sins. "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts. " Isaiah, 55:7. "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the time of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord. " Acts, 3:19.

Man must be born again, and when he prays through to victory and is accepted by God he is a new creature in Christ Jesus. Every person knows whether he is saved or not, for the saved person was there when the change transpired. The church of God does not teach a guess so salvation or a hope so salvation, but a know so salvation.

Sanctification and baptism with the Holy Ghost is another great Bible doctrine. Sanctification or cleansing is a second work of grace for those who have become brethren. "This is the will of God, even your Sanctification. " I. Thessalonians, 4:3. The early disciples were commanded to tarry for the Holy Ghost in Jerusalem. "And behold I send the promise of the Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high. " Luke, 24:49. Jesus promised the disciples when the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, is come he would testify of him when they received him. "But when the Comforter is come.... he shall testify of me. " John, 15:26. In I. Corinthians, second chapter, we are taught that no one can understand the scriptures without the aid of the Holy Ghost

Another great Bible doctrine is water baptism. This is a gospel ordinance which shows forth the death, burial and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. There is only one mode that commemorates this; viz.

baptism by immersion. This is the mode followed by Jesus and the church of God in the beginning. In baptism public testimony is given that we have been crucified with Christ, buried with him and raised with him to walk in newness of life by the answer of a good conscience toward God. I. Peter, 3:21.

A baptism with the Holy Ghost is a grand and glorious possibility provided for every man and woman. It is an experience that our great, loving God has planned and provided. No greater gift is possible than the gift of the Holy Ghost

There are two other ordinances that should be practiced by all Christians. They are the Lord's Supper and Washing the Saint's Feet We are taught to observe all things that Jesus has taught us in his word. Washing the saints' feet was instituted by the Lord who said, "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet"

The Church of God supports their ministry and missions by paying tithes. Abraham who is our father, paid tithes under the priesthood of Melchisedec and Christ was made a priest after the order of Melchisedec. Thus it is only logical to conclude that God's people should pay tithes to Jesus.

Divine Healing is another Bible teaching that must be accepted by all followers of Christ because there is nothing in the Bible to indicate that the spiritual gifts mentioned in First Corinthians are not for the church to-day as well as then.

We believe in living a life of holiness, for the Bible teaches us to "Follow after peace and holiness without which no man shall see the Lord. "

We do not "join the church" because that term is not in the Bible. They were added to the church daily as they would be saved, Acts, 2:47.

There are certain forms of government set forth in the New Testament that the church as a whole is to be governed by through the local congregations or assemblies. Bishops, or elders, were provided for to act as overseers of the flock. (These are also called pastors) Evangelists were sent out to preach the gospel

to the unsaved. But in no case have the officers a right to become a legislative group. All the officers are for is to see that God's will is carried out

The church is a spiritual creation. It includes all of the redeemed in heaven and earth; and Christ is head of the body, the church. It is true that the Bible mentions various local churches, but they were not denominations. They were all parts of the same body.

No man can open or shut the door of the church. "He that openeth, and no man shutteth, and shutteth, and no man openeth. " Revelation, 3:7.

The final reformation is on. "Final", I say because it leaves nothing to be restored as regards either doctrine, practice or spirit. Will you not come with us in this movement of God?

CHAPTER XI.

NAZARENE

It is always a pleasure for me to appear before an appreciative audience and present the great truths of the church of the Nazarene. We are not a schism or branch from any other denomination. We are not raised up to advocate any particular ordinance or to propagate any special form of church government, but we do exist in response to a demand for an organization to conserve the work done by holiness pastors and evangelists in preaching the doctrine and experience of entire sanctification.

Our beginnings are of interest to every child of God. Toward the close of the nineteenth century there was a revival of the preaching of the doctrine of entire sanctification as taught by John Wesley. Between 1885 and 1901 a number of missions and churches were organized with this doctrine in view. During this time several of these groups united under various names. In response to memorials from thirty-five District assemblies the name was finally changed to Church of the Nazarene, a name which belongs first and pre-eminently to One who came and dwelt at Nazareth. From a small number of congregations this church has spread until now there are organizations in every state of the Union, in Canada, the British isles and foreign fields.

Our Manual has been formed by representative bodies of consecrated men and women, elected by the people, sitting in general assembly, who have carefully and prayerfully sought to promote the kingdom of God without personal interests. Our people are urged sincerely to read and study this Manual because it contains a brief history of the church and the doctrines and laws of the church. We urge loyalty to our principles, interests and institutions, and consider it

important that our members acquaint themselves thoroughly with the laws of their church.

We believe in the Triune God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit

We believe in the plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures and that whatever is not contained therein is not to be enjoined as an article of faith.

We believe that believers are to be sanctified wholly, subsequent to conversion, through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ!

We believe that the Holy Spirit bears witness to the new birth and also to the entire sanctification of believers

Our distinguishing doctrine is the tenet of entire sanctification as a second work of grace wrought in the hearts of believers by faith.

The church of the Nazarene practices, in common with most Protestant churches, the two ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper. Baptism is administered either by affusion or immersion, according to the election of the candidate.

The ecclesiastical organization of our church is representative throughout, having a General Assembly which meets every four years, forty-four district assemblies which meet annually, and local congregations in charge of regularly elected pastors. There are General Superintendants, District Superintendants, Pastors, Evangelists, Young People's Societies, Junior Societies, Women's Missionary Societies, etc.

Justification, regeneration and adoption are gracious acts of God and are simultaneous in the experience of seekers after God and are obtained upon the condition of faith, preceded by repentance, and to this work and state of grace the Holy Spirit bears witness.

Entire sanctification is that act of God, subsequent to regeneration, by which believers are made free from original sin, or depravity, and brought into a state of entire devotement to God, and the holy obedience of love made perfect. It is wrought by the baptism with the Holy Spirit and comprehends in one experience the cleansing of the heart from sin and the abiding, in-

dwelling presence of the Holy Spirit, empowering the believer for life and service.

Entire sanctification is provided by the blood of Jesus, is wrought instantaneously by faith, preceded by entire consecration; and to this work and state of grace the Holy Spirit bears witness.

We believe in prevailing prayer, or the prayer that goes clear through. To be able to pray through is mote to be desired than wealth, knowledge or eloquence.

Three things are necessary to praying through:

First, a burden.

Second, persistence.

Third, a witness of faith.

He who would pray through must first familiarize himself with the word of God.

We have the assurance already and when we pray through, we have the seal of the Spirit in our hearts.

We believe in the Bible doctrine of divine healing and urge our people to offer the prayer of faith for the healing of the sick. Providential means and agencies when deemed necessary should not be refused.

We believe that the Holy Spirit bears witness to the new birth, and also to the entire sanctification of believers.

The Baptism with the Holy Spirit is emphasized by Jesus as the most needful experience for this age. It is interesting to note the terms used in the Acts of the Apostles relative to this work of grace. They are: "baptized, " "filled", "poured out", "gifts of, "received", etc. John Wesley used at least twenty-five phrases to indicate this state of grace. The one hundred and twenty who had tarried for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit were on the day of Pentecost "filled" with the Holy Ghost Pentecost, or the experience of the baptism with the Holy Spirit, "purified their hearts by faith". The experience described in the second chapter of Acts is the sanctifying and energizing baptism with the Holy Spirit and fire which is the heritage of alt believers.

The provisions of our Constitution may be repealed

or amended when concurred in by a two-thirds vote of all the members of the General Assembly.

The Church of the Nazarene has an evident and well Defined commission from God, namely, to propogate the gospel throughout the world, seeking the conversion of sinners, the reclamation of backsliders and the sanctification of believers. I therefore respectfully ask you 'to consider our work and faith and join in with us in our great objects.

CHAPTER XII.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

It is with pleasure that I appear before this August assembly to present the claims of our organization. The clarity of Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy's teachings leaves one in no doubt as to the availability of an armor of protection from the evils of mortal existence. In perfect consonance with the lessons in Holy Writ she describes this armor, and spiritually illumines and reinforces the teachings of the Bible.

Mrs. Eddy, the founder, or if you prefer, the discoverer of Christian Science, was a remarkable woman. From a very early age her striking character and endowments showed themselves. When she was about eight years old, a strange incident occurred, which repeated itself again and again during the space of a year. The child would hear a voice calling her distinctly by name, three times in an ascending scale. One evening in November of the same year, little Mary begged her mother to let her go out to comfort the pigs which she heard squealing in their sty. At first her mother refused, but later she consented, *] Little Mary ran out of the house to the pigsty and sang a lullaby to the pigs who responded to her kind thought and settled down comfortably to sleep.

In Mrs. Eddy's Message to the Mother Church in 1901 she writes: "What I have given to the world on the subject of metaphysical or Christian Science is the result of my own observation, experience and final discovery quite independent of all other authors except the Bible. " The discovery of Christian Science was made in 1886 so the experiments to which she refers must have begun about 1846.

Homoeopathy was first brought to her notice by her cousin when she was eighteen years old. As she had

been benefitted by it she determined to study the subject. As it is known, homoeopathy attenuates or dilutes the drug to be used. High attenuations were in great favor. The making of these occupied much time and attention. The preparation was shaken 30 times at each attenuation, and every time it was shaken the thought naturally presented itself that by this process the remedy was being made more powerful. Thus it was plainly mind action and not matter which affected the cure. After her experiments with homoeopathy she became interested in spiritualism. After her first investigation of spiritualism, though she did not attribute the phenomena in every case to tricks, she became convinced that there was nothing scientific about it and nothing spiritual. It was not till after her discovery of Christian Science that the matter became clear to her. "When I learned how mind produces disease on the body, I learned how it produces the manifestations ignorantly imputed to spirits." she wrote. Why is it more difficult to see a thought than to feel one? Education alone determines the difference.

It is not yet eighty years since the discovery of Christian Science, yet during this time it has gained adherents in every quarter of the globe and has produced a profound and ever-increasing effect on the medical and religious views of large numbers of those outside the movement.

In Mrs. Eddy's own words, "God is infinite, the only Life substance, Spirit, or Soul, the only intelligence of the universe, including man." "Jesus," she defines as "The highest human corporeal concept of the divine idea, rebuking and destroying error and bringing to light man's immortality." By the autumn of 1866. Mrs. Eddy had gained the conviction that "all causation was Mind, and every effect a mental phenomenon." God, the first cause or Principle of the universe, is Mind, and this Mind expresses itself in ideas which naturally partake of the nature of Mind and are made in God's image. In the second chapter of Genesis we are presented with an account of the creation which is

at all points the antithesis of that set forth in the first chapter. Christian Science explains this as an allegory. It begins with a mist, a dream; everything is represented as evolved from lower forms of matter; a sense of evil appears, a delusion, disobedience, fear follows, a sense of separation from God, toil, pain, difficulty, and finally the deluge. This Adam dream lasted down the ages till our Lord came and proved the reality of Spirit and the unreality of matter.

Christian Science teaches that God is the only cause. He is therefore the source of all supply; man is his image and reflection; he therefore reflects the abundance of God. Thus the disease called poverty can be healed by the "renewing of mind".

Shortly before her marriage to Mr. Eddy in 1877 she saw that the church of Christ, Scientist, must be founded in Boston. This accordingly was accomplished and a charter received from the state. The constitution and by-laws of this church were formed by Mrs. Eddy and adopted by her followers, Christian Scientists regard the Manual of The Mother Church, the volume which contains the Church by-laws, as a divinely inspired guide by which they can safely navigate the stormy waters of human experience.

Christian Science teaches that death is a part of the belief in material life and therefore as unreal in the strict meaning of the word. It maintains that there is a probationary and progressive state beyond the grave, but that eventually every prodigal will find his way home, every wandering sheep find the fold, and man be satisfied, when he awakes from these dreams, with God's likeness.

At tile time the church was organized, its rules and by-laws were adopted, three years later personal preaching was abolished and the Bible and Science *and Health* ordained as Pastor. Lesson-sermons which consist entirely of passages from the Bible and Science and *Health* are read. The lesson-sermon is read by the first and second readers, one of whom shall be a man and the other a woman.

Christian Science accepts as actual facts the virgin

birth, the resurrection and ascension, but it does not regard them as miraculous occurrences. It holds them to be manifestations of spiritual laws which eventually will be understood by all. The communion which we hold, commemorates the morning meal which our Lord prepared for his disciples on the shores of the Lake of Galilee during those wonderful forty days between the resurrection and the ascension. Baptism, according to Christian Science, is nothing less than a purification from all error. It is not, therefore, a brief ceremony to be performed; it is an object to the attainment of which the whole energy of man must be devoted. If people to whom we mention the subject of Christian Science show no interest in it, we leave them lovingly alone, we never enter into controversy.

As Christian Science satisfies our intelligence and reason, so too, it satisfies the heart. It opens the door of expectation and receptivity and brings us in touch with the inexpressible tenderness of the divine Mind. The practical living consciousness of God's nearness, of his infinite care, of the beauty and radiance of his Love, embracing, supporting, with more' than a mother's tenderness or rather a father's strength, makes the waste places of the heart blossom as the rose.

CHAPTER XIII.

INQUIRER.

I stand before you not as a preacher, or as a representative of an "Apostolic Church, " but as a representative of a large class in every community who are inclined to be religious, but have never been able to find a resting place. When I heard of this convention I was very highly gratified, as it Seemed to me that such an August assembly of divines as this could direct an inquiring and troubled sinner to the fountain of life and peace, I have listened attentively, prayerfully and honestly to every address which has been made, and now, instead of hope and joy, I find myself disappointed, confused and disgusted. All the speakers professed to believe in the all-sufficiency of the word of God. Each one believes he is guided by the special direction of the Holy Spirit. I should like to know if the word of God is responsible for the contradictions to which I have listened. Is the Holy Spirit the author of confusion and speculation? I had almost come to Mr. Infidel's conclusion, and this convention would have confirmed me, had I not appealed to the Bible instead of the modern preachers who set themselves up as its interpreters. Jesus Christ said, "Search the Scriptures. " This I have done sufficiently to believe that they are of Divine origin, but I am not sure that I know my duty. I came here expecting to get some additional light, but I am further away than when I came. I am an inquirer. I am in deep earnest. I am searching for the "old paths. " I want to know what I must do to be saved from my past sins. Here is what perplexes me: Brother Methodist proposes to take me through his theological process and bring me out a Methodist; Brother Baptist proposes to take me through his theological process and bring me out a Baptist; Brother Presbyterian proposes to take me

through his theological process and bring me out a Presbyterian; Brother Episcopalian proposes to take me through his theological process and bring me out an Episcopalian; Brother Lutheran proposes to take me through his theological process and bring me out a Lutheran, and so on through the entire catalogue. If there are no divisions among you, if all of you are orthodox, why am I not a Baptist when I pass through the Methodist theological process, or a Methodist when I pass through the Baptist theological process? If there are many ways to heaven and one is as good as another, why is a Baptist offended if called an Episcopalian, or an Episcopalian if called a Baptist? It appears, from my point of vision, that each order entertains something peculiar to itself indicated by its name and creed, and that this is what makes denominations, and therefore sectarians. I have a question that I desire, in all respect, to submit to this convention, and I demand an answer. Is there not a process revealed in the Scriptures through which, if I pass, I may become a Christian, live a Christian and die a Christian, and will the process make me anything but a Christian, and will any deviations from this process justify the hope of infallible safety and security for this life or the next, and will the New Testament, "as it is written, " make a Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Nazarene, Christian Scientist, or Mormon? If so, proof! I pause for reply.

Again, if a man may be a Christian in spite of the existence of organization utterly unknown to the New Testament, why may not all denominational Christianity be relegated to oblivion so that Christianity may run and be glorified without hindrance? I want to be a Christian only; only a Christian.

I hold in my hand a little book called the New Testament. I read from its pages the following from the lips of Jesus: "If any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not. For there shall arise false Christ's, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders, insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect Behold,

I have told you before. Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not" (Matt., 24:23-26). I lift my eyes and behold this convention: Nine kinds of Methodists are each saying: "Lo, here is Christ" Nine kinds of Baptists are each saying: "Here is the true and living way. " Twelve kinds of Presbyterians are each saying: "Here is the truth in its purity. " The Protestant Episcopal Church opens wide its portals and says: "Behold the only true, the Apostolic Church. " The Lutheran Church offers me instruction and consolation. The Roman Catholic, with hands dripping with the blood of martyrs, says: "I represent the true Church, all others are miserable sects. " Mr. Infidel says: "Religion is a myth, and the practice of it a farce. " I turn again to the word of God, and I find that, "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling" (Eph., 4:4). Do all the sects represented in this assembly constitute one body? Is the Bible responsible for all these contradictions and the confusion which they produce? Does it authorize the multiplication of sects and creeds to gratify the whims of ungrateful men? These questions, as professed ministers of Jesus Christ, you are bound to answer. I desire to be a Christian, but I can never be until these discrepancies are satisfactorily explained. If you refuse to do it, you will be held accountable in the judgment of the great day. I have read the Bible, and if you will hear me patiently, I will present some of my observations and conclusions. I turn to the pages of inspired prophecy: "Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls" (Jer., 6:16). The prophet doubtless had an eye on this convention! Here are nine Methodist ways, nine Baptists ways, twelve Presbyterian ways, the Protestant Episcopal way, the Lutheran way, the Roman Catholic way, and the Infidel way, I turn to the revelation and I find this is called "Babylon, " confusion, and God's people are invited

to come out (Rev., 17:2). I thank God that I have never been in it I propose a further examination, so I lay down a rule, the justice of which can not be denied by the most extreme sectarian.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works" (II. Tim., 3:16, 17). "The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord. Is not my word like as a fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces" (Jer., 23:28, 29)?

These passages indicate the character of my remarks. I intend to try you by the "Bible and the Bible alone. " Human creeds and speculations will be rejected. It does not matter who taught you, nor how much you hate a "turn-coat, " your opinion will be unconditionally excluded. Our constant inquiry will be, "What saith the Lord?"

I will refer to the addresses in the order they were made:

I do not read in the word of God of the Methodist Episcopal Church, or of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, or of any other kind of a Methodist Church. This, to my mind, is a sufficient reason to condemn the entire system. I do not read anything of General Conferences, Annual Conferences, Quarterly Conferences, Love Feasts or Class Meetings. I do not read of Bishops of the Methodist character, Presiding Elders, Circuit riders or Class leaders. I do not read of the twenty-five articles of the Discipline, and as to the baptism of unconscious babes in the sublime name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the Bible is as silent as the grave. The General Conference of 1808 declared the twenty-five articles of the Discipline infallible; that is to say, no change could be made by any General Conference in the future. This seems to me like an echo from Rome. The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South in 1882, found

it necessary to revise the Discipline. It seems that they get things a little mixed. In the advertisement of the new work, I find these words: "Let every preacher see to it that his Church is supplied. A copy should be placed in every family. How can our membership be expected to know our doctrines or keep our rules without the Discipline?" This is a clear admission that the doctrines of Methodism are not in the Bible. I do not read of the "anxious seat, " or "mourner's bench, " process of conversion in New Testament times. I do not find where the early ministers of Jesus Christ prayed for God to baptize "mourners" with the "Holy Ghost and with fire. " I do not read where any of the apostles ever encouraged inquirers by quoting, "Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted. " I do not find a single instance where any one went away mourning, seeking or inquiring; but under the Methodist system mourners go away mourning, seekers go away seeking, and inquirers go away inquiring. There were no failures in apostolic times, and there will be none in our times, it seems to me, if men will preach and practice no more, nor no less, than what is found in the Holy Scriptures. Methodism affirms that baptism is a substitute for circumcision. The Bible does not intimate this. It is merely an opinion. Methodists advocate many things which are clearly taught in the word of God, but this does not prove the divinity of the system that makes Methodists. John Wesley was the author of it, and not a vestige of it is sustained by the volume of inspiration. Methodism was born of the apostasy. It is the grand-daughter of the church of Rome. It has many features of its maternal ancestor. I prefer it to Romanism, both in faith and practice, yet that which is distinctly Methodistic had its origin in Rome, and not in Jerusalem. I do not find where water was carried into the house and sprinkled or poured upon the people, but I do read of "baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there" (John, 3:23), Baptizing in the Jordan (Mark, 1:5). Buried in Baptism (Rom., 6:4). Going down into the water and coming up out of it (Acts, 8:38,

39). How does this correspond with the doctrines and practices of Methodism?

I do not read of justification by "faith only, " but I read that men are justified by many things. I will enumerate: (1) By grace (Rom., 3:24). (2) By the blood of Christ (Rom., 5:9). (3) By the resurrection of Christ (Rom., 4:25). (4) By knowledge (Isa., 53:11). (5) By faith (Rom., 5:1). (6) In the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God (I. Cor, 6:11). (7) By works (Jas., 2:24). (8) By the Lord (Rom., 8:33). Who will affirm that any item in this list may be omitted or compromised? As long as these mighty truths stand in the word of God, as long as the authority is maintained in the heavens that placed them there, the fundamental doctrines of Methodism will be undeniably, unexceptionally, and delusively false.

One argument introduced by Brother Methodist was simply astounding. In an attempt to justify divisions among the people of God he declared that we can not all understand the Bible in the same way. I beg permission to disagree with him. I should say, we can not all *misunderstand* the Bible alike, but as there is only one way to *understand* it, all who understand it must, in the very nature of things, understand it the same way. Demonstrate to me, by incontestible facts, that two men can *understand* one proposition differently, and I will take pleasure in withdrawing this argument. Where is the man who will undertake the task?

I am glad to say things are improving among Methodists. Some of their advanced thinkers are crying in the great wilderness of confusion and doubt for a return to the doctrines of the apostles. One of their great evangelists recently said: "The world will never be saved by the preachers, and God is powerless to have a person from hell without some man or woman to help Him to save the poor fellow. How many heathen were saved before we sent our missionaries to India or China? I am not saying God could not have fixed it up in some other way, but I am talking about how He has fixed it up. "

My objections to Methodism may be summed up in a few words: (1) Its name is unknown to the New Testament (2) Its Discipline virtually implies the insufficiency of the word of God as a rule of faith and practice. (3) Its officers and offices are not authorized by the word of God. (4) It teaches that the two covenants are identical. (5) It teaches that baptism comes in the room of circumcision. (6) It teaches that pouring and sprinkling may be substituted for the apostolic "buried in baptism. " (7) It advocates the baptism of unbelievers—infants. (8) It accepts members on "six months' probation, " in positive opposition to the New Testament. (9) It introduced and perpetuates the "mourner's bench" process of conversion. (10) Its doctrine of justification by "faith only" contradicts the teaching of the inspired apostles. (11) It is divided into contending factions. (12) It began too late in the gospel dispensation, 1729. (13) It began at Oxford, and not at Jerusalem. (14) It was founded by John Wesley, and not by Jesus Christ. (15) It justifies divisions, and therefore retards the union of God's people upon the "Bible and the Bible alone. "

Brother Baptist was the next speaker. When I turn to the Scriptures, I am forced to put him in the same category with Brother Methodist, for I do not read anything of a Baptist Church, or of a Baptist Church of Christ; yet my friend makes very positive claims to "apostolic succession; " proposing to trace his existence back to John, the forerunner of Christ. Mr. Webster defines "apostolic succession in theology, " as "the regular and uninterrupted transmission of ministerial authority by a succession of bishops, from the apostles to any subsequent period. " The Protestant Episcopal and Roman Catholic Church make similar pretensions. Someone is wrong. Who is it? Suppose either one of these institutions could trace its existence back to the death of the last surviving apostle, would this afford the least ground imaginable that it is right, if its teachings are not in harmony with the preaching of the apostles? Surely not. The Church of Christ was established in the city of Jerusalem immediately after

the ascension of Christ Nearly two thousand years have rolled away into the dark past, and if the aforesaid parties attempt to verify their assertions, for part of the distance, I fear they, at least some of them, will have to travel the same road. They will wander back through the winding streams and mists of ecclesiastical tradition, through the dark ages, and when the task is done, each will think he has an unanswerable argument that he represents the Church of Christ; and that the other two are miserable sects. Here are three organizations claiming descent from the apostles, and not one of them can find its name in the Bible! Is it not time for intelligent men to begin to think and act? There is a much shorter and clearer route to the apostles. The chain which binds the Church of the twentieth century to the primitive Church is not an unbroken succession in ministry; it is not the uninterrupted administration of an ordinance; it is not merely a succession of regenerate souls. It is the acknowledgment of the same divine authority. Paul says, 'Be followers of me, even as I am of Christ' The New Testament contains the creed, laws, organization, discipline and order of worship in the primitive Church. Now if a religious body is governed exclusively by the same authority, accepts the same creed, obeys the same laws, is called by the same name, has the same officers with the same powers, practices the same ordinances, uses the same means for the conversion of the world, receives members in the same way and adopts the same worship, it is the same organism, the same Church. But neither of the orders referred to can do this, hence their claims are failures. I do not read in the Bible that the Church of Christ ever borrowed its ordinances from human institutions. Brother Baptist will not deny that his brethren borrowed the "mourner's bench" from the Methodists.

On this practice J. R. Graves testifies as follows: "As to the special 'mourning-bench' in protracted meetings, about which the Campbellite make so much ado, because they have no mourning for sin in their

religion, we have no defense to offer. Every bench in the meeting house should be a true mourning-bench and place of prayer. We think as they have been used since borrowed from the Methodists, they have worked an immense injury to our Church and Christianity. They have been exalted by revivalists into sacraments of religion—almost essential means of getting religion. Sinners have almost come to believe that they cannot get religion without the revival and 'mourner's-bench, ' or 'altar of prayer, " with the loud and confused praying and singing and shouting all together, that usually accompany the successful use of the 'bench' or the 'altar' or 'straw-pen. ' Multitudes are tremendously excited, mentally excited, nervously excited, mesmerically excited, and made to profess a change of feeling, and in this state hurried into the Church; but the vast majority of these cases, when they cool off, find themselves back just where they were before the excitement and profession, and, after going through this process once or twice more, they become thoroughly disgusted with what has been palmed off on them for religion, and are thus prepared to become obstinate infidels. We are satisfied that nine-tenths of all the infidels and Universalists of this country have become so through the influence of those 'benches' and 'altars' and 'straw-pens, ' having passed through them, or witnessed the workings, and result in the lives of the converts made by them. We should think Baptists had seen enough of their bitter fruit—that they bear little else than the apples of Sodom—to adjure them altogether. "

Still the Baptist church continues the practice and affirms that Methodism is a human institution, from beginning to end!

Brother Baptist and his brethren are very severe in their denunciations of creeds, "human innovations. " I hold in my hand a little book, on the title page of which I find the following: "A Confession of Faith put forth by the elders and brethren of many congregations of Christians (baptized upon profession of their faith), in London and in the country. Adopted by the

Baptist Association met at Philadelphia, Sept. 25, 1724. " These lines occur in the preface: "Which Confession we own, as containing the doctrine of our faith and practice; and do desire that the members of our Churches respectively do furnish themselves therewith. " Brother Baptist says this creed is not authoritative with his brethren now. Then they have changed! This breaks one link in their chain of apostolic succession. This creed is Calvinistic to the core. It declares on the seventh page that the elect and the nonelect "are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number so certain and definite that it cannot be increased or diminished. " This work contains a full exposition of the Baptist faith in the eighteenth century. It contains thirty-four chapters, discussing copiously the propositions usually discussed in works of similar character. It is explicit in reference to the acceptance of new members. It positively says on page ten, that the Church is to judge the applicants. I am glad to see the Baptists improving, but I am sorry to hear them denying their ancestry. I do not read that converts to Christ, in apostolic times, were required to give a "Christian experience, " or an "experience of grace" before baptism, but upon an open confession of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ they were admitted to this solemn ordinance, and consequently "translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son. " But the Baptist Church examines its converts and admits them to baptism by a vote of the Church. This experience-telling was born of the great apostasy. Did each of the three thousand converts on the day of Pentecost give a "Christian experience" before they were baptized? There is not a precept or an example in the New Testament sustaining this practice. A farmer can give a farmer's experience. A mechanic can give a mechanic's experience. A Jew can give a Jew's experience. An infidel can give an infidel's experience. A Christian can give a Christian's experience. The experience grows out of the life. To require a man to relate a Christian experience who is just starting in the Christian race is as absurd as to require a man

to give a preacher's experience who has never delivered a sermon; or to require a man to give a soldier's experience who has never been in war; or to require a man to give a farmer's experience who has never been out of a city. I do not read of baptism as a "Christian duty, " but as an obligation resting alone upon the penitent believer. Jesus said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark, 16:15, 16). Brother Baptist baptizes him because he is saved. A slight discrepancy!

Brother Baptist said "that Jesus Christ was a Baptist, the apostles were Baptists, the martyrs were Baptists. " Talk is cheap, gratuitous assertions are worthless; if they were, let him take the New Testament and turn to the place where it is so stated. I have been laboring under the impression that the apostles and early Christians were followers of Christ, and not of John the Baptist!

John the Baptist did not found the Church. After his head was cut off (Matt., 14:1-12), Jesus said: "I will build my Church (Matt. 16:18). " John the Baptist was only a voice crying in the wilderness (Isaiah, 40:1-8; Matt. 3:1-7), " "Voice, " unquestionably signifies that his ministry was temporary. He was not in the kingdom; he died before it began (Matt., 11:11). He came in the spirit and power of Elijah (Luke, 1:17). He preached a coming Redeemer (Matt., 3:11). He decreased as Jesus increased (John, 3:30). His light shone but for a season (John, 6:33-35). His work was confined to the Jews, Abraham's descendants (Matt., 3:1-9; Acts, 13:46).

Brother Baptist affirms that men are "totally depraved, " and that salvation is by "grace alone. " He can not find either of these expressions in the Bible. Will he affirm that the thought is there, when the words are not? If so, he must also affirm that the New Testament was not written in as forcible language as he is now able to command! Both of these phrases contradict the word of God! The fact that men are exhorted to save themselves (Acts, 2:40), is an eternal contradiction of the first, and the New Testament

teaches that men are saved by twelve different things, thus forever destroying the second. Do you ask for the proof? Listen: (1) By grace (Eph., 2:4-8). (2) By Jesus Christ (Mat, 1:21; Luke, 19:10). (3) By His blood (Rom., 5:9). (4) By His resurrection (Rom., 4:25). (5) By His life (Rom., 5:10). (6) By the gospel (Rom., 1:16; I. Cor., 15:1-5). (7) By Faith (Acts, 16:31). (8) By repentance (Luke, 13:1-5; Acts, 17:30, 31; II. Pet., 3:9). (9) By confessing Christ (Matt. 10:32; Rom., 10:9, 10). (10) By calling on the name of the Lord (Acts, 22:16; Rom., 10:13). (11) By baptism (Mark, 16:15, 16; I. Pet, 3:20, 21). By works (Phil., 2:12; Jas., 2:24). Will my friend affirm that any one of them in this list may be omitted? Will he affirm that one item is non-essential? Will he affirm that one item is more important than another? Will he affirm that each one of these items does not have a place, an important place, in the salvation of every sinner? Have I not as good a right to claim that men are saved by "faith alone, " or "baptism alone, " as he has to declare that it is done by "grace alone?" The fact is, this "alone" business is the most consummate fraud ever perpetrated by man!

Brother Baptist said that in view of the fact that the Lord Jesus gave a rule for the government of His Church (Matt. 18:15-17) the Church was already set up. Not necessarily. God gave a law for the government of the kings of Israel three hundred and fifty years before Saul was crowned king (Deut. 17:14-20; I. Sam., 10:17-25).

Brother Baptist denies the "identity" of the two covenants, but shows his inconsistency by placing the Church in the wilderness with John the Baptist before the death of Christ, and before the abolishment of the "first covenant, " and before Jesus purchased the Church with His blood (I. Cor., 6:20; Eph., 5:23-25; Heb., 8:1-13).

I submit the following questions to Brother Baptist, and through him to all the other denominations represented here. I take the liberty to say that to

correctly and honestly answer these questions is to undermine the whole denominational fabric and let it down to eternal ruin! If you doubt my word, try it.

1. Where is the proof that Jesus established a Baptist Church, or the Baptist Church?
2. Where is the proof that the apostles were members of a Baptist Church?
3. Where is the proof that the Church began before Jesus died?
4. Where is the proof that the apostles taught that men are totally depraved?
5. Where is the proof that the apostles taught that men are saved by grace alone?
6. Where is the proof that the apostles set out a mourner's-bench and invited men to it?
7. Where is the proof that converts had to tell an experience before baptism?
8. Where is the proof that the apostles required the Church to vote on the reception of new members?
9. Where is the proof that the early Christians celebrated the Lord's supper once a month, once a quarter, twice a year?
10. Where is the proof that the early Christians said at the Lord's table: "We invite those of like faith and order?"
11. Where is the proof that any apostle called himself a Baptist?
12. Where is the proof that any apostle called the Church a Baptist Church?
13. Where is the proof that any apostle called the Church the Baptist Church of Christ?
14. Where is the proof that the apostles taught that a sinner cannot do anything to save himself?
15. Where is the proof that the apostles baptized men because they were saved?
16. Where did any apostle ever ask a convert how he felt; and what convert described his feelings?
17. If a man whom you knew to be sincere, were to come to you and confess his faith in Christ, and ask you to baptize him on that confession, assuring you

that he would wear no name but Christian, would you baptize him?

18. Why do you refuse to affiliate with immersed believers outside of your organization, when their lives prove that they have the spirit of Christ and are therefore the children of *your* Father, particularly as you assert that baptism is non-essential to salvation?

19. If you were preaching Christ, and people were to cry out as on Pentecost, would you give them Peter's answer (Acts, 2:1-42)?

20. If you were preaching to a man on the highway and he were to confess his faith and demand baptism of you as the Eunuch did under the preaching of Philip, would you baptize him (Acts, 8:26-39)?

21. If you had been called to a man who had been praying three days like Saul, would you give him the answer Ananias gave (Acts, 22:1-16)?

22. If a man were to ask you, under such circumstances as the jailer addressed Paul and Silas, what to do, would you tell him to *believe* first, or *repent* first (Acts, 16:23-40)?

23. Will you define Christian unity (John, 17:20, 21)?

24. Are we married to Christ (Rom., 7:4)? If so, whose name should we wear? When is the marriage ceremony complete? When does the bride lose her identity in the bridegroom and take his name?

25. What process makes man a Christian? What process makes man a Baptist? Is the process the same? If you answer yes, you affirm that a man can not be a Christian without baptism, for he cannot be a Baptist without it. If you answer *no*, you make the Church higher and better than heaven.

26. Would you accept a Six-Principle, Primitive, Free will, Seventh Day, Old Connexion, New Connexion, Regular or Particular Baptist without re-baptizing him?

27. Did Jesus have a people in reality before He purchased them with His death? If yes, why was it necessary that He should die? If no, why do you set up the Church before His death?

28. Is prayer limited to God's promises? If yes, where has He promised to save sinners at the mourner's bench? If no, to what shall we appeal?

29. Is God willing to save the sinner? If you answer yes, how do you account for the large number of persons who go away from your revivals mourning, seeking, inquiring, seeing all are equally dead according to your theory? If you answer no, what will make Him willing?

30. What is heartfelt religion? If a man will believe in Christ with all his heart and obey Him, will he have it?

31. Is the plan of salvation revealed in the New Testament? If yes, why have the mourner's bench? If *no*, where is the plan of salvation?

32. Is salvation conditional? If you answer yes, what are the conditions, and how can a helpless, dead sinner perform them? If you answer no, who is responsible for the damned?

33. At what point is the penitent pardoned, and what are his evidences of it?

34. Would you accept a man into your fellowship who persistently teaches that baptism is for the remission of sins? If no, on what ground do you claim to be apostolic, seeing Peter preached it with the approval of all the other apostles on Pentecost? If yes, why do you not preach it?

35. What part of redemption is the work of the Lord? What part is the work of the sinner? If you say the sinner has nothing to do, I have driven you to Universalism. If you say he can and must do what is commanded and trust God for the result, I have driven you to baptism for the remission of sins.

36. Do hearing, faith and repentance merit anything on the part of the sinner? If not, why not take the same view of baptism, seeing faith, repentance and baptism are all found in the Great Commission and in the apostolic answers, and say that all derive their strength from the fact, and that alone, that they are the appointments of the King?

37. Do you believe that the prayers of the Church

can in any way influence the Lord to save a man who has not obeyed the gospel as laid down by the twelve on the day of Pentecost? If yes, why can not the Church, by prayer, save the whole world, seeing all are equally dead according to your theory? If *no*, why do you have the mourner's bench?

38. Is the command to be baptized the word of God? If yes, baptism is a part of the new birth, for we are born of the word of God. If no, why do you practice it (I. Pet., 1:23)?

39. How do you explain Peter's statement that those to whom he wrote had purified their souls in obeying the truth (I. Pet, 1:22)? When did this process of purification begin? If not with the sinner's first step toward God, please locate the time?

40. In view of the fact that man lost all by sin, that he could not without Divine aid reinstate himself in the favor of God, and in view of the fact that salvation is the act and gift of God, is it any less salvation by grace if He sees fit to impose conditions in order to obtain it? If *no*, how do you account for the damnation of a large part of the human race?

41. How do you explain Paul's statement to the Romans that they had obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine delivered them at which time they were made free from sin (Rom., 6:17, 18)?

42. When does the sinner become totally depraved? Either he is born so, or he becomes so. If he becomes so at the commission of his first sin, how do you explain Paul's statement that evil men and seducers wax worse and worse (II. Tim., 3:13)? If not when he commits his first sin, there are sinners who are not totally depraved, and your favorite doctrine, the mudsill of your denominational fabric, is broken into a thousand pieces.

43. Is there any salvation out of Christ? Is it not a fact that we believe into, repent into, confess into and are baptized into Christ (Mark, 16:15, 16; Acts, 2:38; Rom., 10:9, 10)?

44. How do you explain John's statement that the Spirit, water and blood agree in one, in view of the fact

that you claim to "receive the Spirit" and to have "the blood applied" before baptism (I. John, 5:8)?

45. How do you, in view of your doctrine that apostasy is impossible, explain the two hundred passages in the epistolary writings that make the Christian's eternal salvation conditional, to say nothing about the great number of passages in the Gospels and Acts that do the same?

46. In view of the facts; (a) That the Divine side of redemption was finished when Jesus sent the Holy Spirit down (John, 14:26); (b) that faith comes by hearing (Rom., 10:17); (c) that faith purifies the heart (Acts, 15:9); (d) that obedience purifies the soul (I. Pet, 1:22); is it not true that the sinner must place himself in such a relation to the Divine government that he may be forgiven without violence to the same?

47. Admitting for argument's sake that the Baptist Church is the true Church of Christ, how is the inquirer to decide between the great number of organizations claiming to be the true Baptist Church, seeing that not one of them is mentioned in the Book?

48. What is the washing of regeneration mentioned by Paul in his letter to Titus (Titus, 3:5)? If not baptism and its antecedents, what is it?

49. If a man believes in Christ, repents of his sins and is baptized in obedience to the law of Christ, will he be regenerated or born again? If not, what shall we say of those whose conversion is recorded in Acts, seeing this book does not mention directly either the new birth or regeneration? If yes, why do you pray for outside power?

50. How do you account for Paul's action in bursting up the Baptist Church that he found at Ephesus, seeing it is the only one of which we have any account in the Book (Acts, 19:1-7)

51. Can a man be a Christian without being a Baptist? If yes, on what ground do you claim that it is necessary to be a Baptist? If no, bring the proof!

52. If, after a convert gives his experience and is received as a candidate for baptism, he should *refuse*

to be baptized, do you think he could be saved? What would you do with him? You could not turn him out because he was not a member, and you could not baptize him because he would not let you!

53. What is the first step in the salvation of a sinner, and who must take it?

54. Do you not think that baptism for the remission of sins is much more attractive to a man of intelligence than the mourner's bench, with its confusion, for the remission of sins? What is there in one of your revivals to attract a man who reads and thinks?

55. Will sinners be damned on the account of personal neglect of the requirements of the Gospel? If yes, what becomes of the mudsill of your doctrine— total depravity and helplessness? If no, on what ground will they be damned?

56. Did the three thousand converts on Pentecost each give an experience similar to what is required by Baptist churches now? If yes, how did the apostles succeed in accomplishing so much in one day, and where is the proof? If no, on what ground do you claim that the custom is apostolic?

57. Why do you vote persons into the church? You hear their experiences, compare their experiences with yours instead of the word of God, and vote them in, declaring by this act that they are saved eternally, and in a short time vote them out for sin, thus declaring that they were never saved!

58. Does not the experience grow out of the life— the storms, cares and duties that confront us? If yes, why do you ask a person just beginning a Christian life to give a "Christian experience?" If no, bring the proof that the apostles require it.

59. If baptism, with its antecedents, is not "for the remission of sins, " what is it for? Everything has its design. What is the design of baptism? Explain the Commission in the light of your answer.

60. What constitutes baptism? It is not simply an immersion, for one might fall into the water and thus be "buried. " Is it not a fact that the action, person and design all play a part? If yes, on what ground do

you criticize sprinklers for abandoning the apostolic action, seeing you abandon the design? If no, why not leave out the person, or the action?

61. Do you endorse the Philadelphia Confession of Faith? If not, do you endorse the Baptists who endorse it? Which is worse, to have a creed, or endorse your ancestors and their creeds? Is it not a fact that nothing, however small in heaven, earth or hell can be identified in fact, in truth, in history, without a name? If yes, how do you establish the fact that the Baptist Church is apostolic, seeing it is not named in the New Testament? If no, please identify something that has no name!!!

62. If a man can be a Christian only, only a Christian, on what ground do you claim that it is necessary to be anything else? In other words, if he can be a Christian without being a Baptist, is it not a fact that Baptistism is sectarianism of the most malignant type? Why are you not content with Christianity unmixed with tradition? Is it not time for a reformation even in the Baptist Church?

My objections to the doctrine and practice of the Baptist Church are: (1) It has an unscriptural name. No institution that wears a name unknown to the apostles can be "apostolic in doctrine and practice. " (2) It has a human creed. In proof of this declaration I present to the Convention the "Philadelphia Confession of Faith, " adopted by the Baptists in 1724. (3) It is unscriptural in organization. In apostolic times the Churches of Christ had each a plurality of elders (Acts, 20:17; Titus, 1:5). These Churches were not *Baptist* Churches, for Baptist Churches have usually one elder to four congregations. (4) It has an unscriptural language. In the Baptist Church they use such expressions as "get religion, " "get through, " "regenerated and born again, " and "mourners, " and they call their preachers "Reverends" and "Doctors of Divinity. " (5) It teaches that salvation comes by praying—prayers of the Church. This is the only legitimate explanation of the mourner's bench system in all its variations. (6) It teaches that sinners can

please God without faith by placing repentance first There are only two motives that lead men to repentance: (a) The fear of Judgment (Acts, 17:30, 31). (b) The goodness of God (Rom., 2:4). Compare Rom, 1:16; Heb., 11:6. The Baptists place repentance before faith and therefore before godly sorrow. (7) It teaches that men can repent without Christ by affirming that faith in Him follows repentance, thus making the Cross of Christ of none effect Repentance is "toward"—in the direction of God (Acts, 20:21). Jesus declares that He is the way and the truth and the life, and that men can only approach the Father through Him (John, 14:6), and Paul affirms that He is the Mediator—"one who stands between parties at variance"—between God and man (I. Tim., 2:5). Now if a man can repent toward God without faith in Jesus as the only Saviour and intercessor, we might as well go back to Judaism and worship Jehovah without reference to His only begotten Son. The Cross of Christ stands between the sinner and his God (I. Cor., 1:18), and to deny the power of the Cross is to nullify the gospel and make repentance a farce or an impossibility. (8) It calls upon its converts to confess their feelings instead of Christ Every applicant for Church membership must tell how he feels (Matt. 10:32, 33; Acts, 8:35-38; 19:18; Rom., 10:9, 10; I. Tim., 6:12, 13). (9) It votes upon the reception of new members. Bring the chapter and verse where any apostle ever practiced this or commanded this to be done! If you cannot do it you must acknowledge your defeat (10) It preaches salvation by works—the mourner's bench. Not one word of Scripture can be introduced to sustain this practice, but if the Church has the keys of the kingdom, it is infallible and can change the ordinances! (11) It neglects the weekly observance of the Lord's Supper (Acts, 20:7). (12) It neglects the weekly contribution (I. Cor., 16:1, 2). (13) It teaches the impossibility of apostasy. I introduce one million, one hundred and ninety-nine thousand, nine hundred and ninety-eight arguments against this assumption. They are the graves of those who fell in the wilderness

(600,000 men and a woman for every man), between the Red Sea and Canaan (Ex., 12:37; Num., 13:1-33; 14:1-35; 26:63-65; I. Cor., 10:1-12). (14) Its theory of conversion tends to produce unbelief in the word of God. As long as men are taught that they must do what God says and yet wait for a power they cannot control or influence to enable them to do it, infidelity will walk triumphantly through the land. (15) It baptizes dead sinners after they come to life! In Paul's day they were baptized and "raised up" in order to walk in newness of life" (Rom., 6:1-5). (16) It excludes part of those whom it recognizes as God's children from the Lord's table on the ground that they have not been baptized, and then designates baptism a non-essential and only a figure. It sets up a "figure" as a "wall of separation" between the children of God! It *works* with Methodists, Presbyterians and others, many of whom have been immersed, but it will not *eat* with them because, and for no other reason, it has not "figured" on them! (17) It sets the Church up at the wrong place. They set it upon the banks of the Jordan or at Caesarea Philippi, and all this simply to avoid the necessity of fellowshiping Simon Peter in his teaching that baptism is for the remission of sins. (18) It makes too much of baptism. It makes baptism its standard; calls itself for it, and rallies around it. It is baptism from Dan to Beer-sheba, and baptism in the mountains of Lebanon north of Dan, further than any one has ever gone, and baptism south of Beer-sheba in the land of Idumea, further than any one has ever penetrated. (19) It makes too little of baptism. At the vital point: "*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*" (Mark, 16:15, 16), it throws it overboard as a non-essential. (20) It sets up one plan for salvation and another for Church membership. In apostolic times the *Lord* added to the Church those that "were being saved" (Acts, 2:47; Rom., 15:7; L. Cor., 12:18), but the Baptists have one process to make a man a Christian and another to get him into the Church. They get a man into Christ by preaching Christ, mixed with predestination, total depravity and

regeneration as the result of the prayers of the Church. They get him into the Church by experience, vote of the Church and baptism. (21) It teaches that men are saved out of Christ. In other words, before they are in the body (I. Con, 12:13; Gal., 3:26, 27). (22) It teaches that men are saved outside of the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit They are saved according to Baptist theology before baptism (Matt 28:18-20). (23) It perverts the Great Commission in teaching that men have the promise of salvation without obedience to the command of Christ to be baptized (Mark, 16:15, 16). (24) It teaches the total depravity of the human race (Luke, 8:15). (25) It makes God a tyrant—responsible for the damned. The Baptist theory in brief is: (a) All men are totally depraved and therefore unable to do anything to save themselves. (6) Regeneration is the first step in the sinner's return to God, and it must be taken by the Holy Spirit Now if He never comes it is because the Lord does not send Him, and the sinner is damned for failing to do that which he cannot do. (26) It teaches that baptism is because of remission: "Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, *SOT the remission of sins*, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts, 2:38). (27) It will not give the apostolic answer to inquirers (Acts, 2:38; 8:37; 22:16). (28) It teaches that baptism is the answer instead of the *seeking* of a good conscience, as the best scholars agree (I. Pet, 3:21). (29) Its teachings tend to confusion— Missionary Baptists, Primitive Baptists, Seventh Day Baptists, Regular Baptists, Free-will Baptists, Old Connexion Baptists, New Connexion Baptists, Particular Baptists, Six-Principle Baptists, Two seed Baptists, no two kinds alike and no fellowship among them. (30) It makes *non-essential* the institution of Christ (Matt., 28:18-20; Mark, 16:15, 16; Acts, 2:38). (31) It teaches that salvation is by grace alone. (32) It teaches that salvation is a dry-land matter (John, 3:5). (33) It denies the doctrine of James the Apostle (Jas., 2:1-26). (34) It misuses the name Baptist A

Baptist is one who baptizes, and no one else can appropriately wear the name. (35) It requires converts to give an experience. There is absolutely no proof of this custom in the apostolic writings, and no Church requiring it is apostolic either in doctrine or practice. (36) It perverts the gospel by teaching that sinners are converted outside of it.

I do not read of any kind of a Presbyterian Church in the word of God, and I am surprised that men of such culture fail to see that they are propagating human institutions. Brother Presbyterian endeavored to apologize for the existence of modern denominations. Let him examine the names worn by the different orders, their creeds, their infant sprinkling, their controversies, and the general character of their work, and decide if they constitute the "one body of Christ." I do not read in the Scriptures of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, either for the uncompromising Calvinist or the more liberally disposed. But the speaker says it is in harmony with the word of God, and that the proof texts are submitted along with the articles of faith. So all the creed-makers affirm. They can not all be right, for they contradict each other, I think many of the quotations are palpable misapplications of the truth. For example, certain passages are quoted to sustain the practice of sprinkling infants, but not one of them intimates this practice in apostolic times. My friend gives us a full exposition of Calvinism. He presents his "five points" with a grace worthy of a better cause. Now, suppose these "five points" are true, it is immaterial whether I believe them or not. If I am predestinated unto everlasting life I will be saved whether I believe in Presbyterianism or not. If I am a reprobate or a non-elect, my efforts will be unavailing. The first proposition of Calvinism makes the number of the saved and the lost so definite that they can neither be increased nor diminished. If any man in this convention ever read such a statement in the Bible as this, let him arise and make it known. How could it be affirmed by an inspired apostle that "God is no respecter of persons" (Acts, 10:34) if He

is willing to *save* some and unwilling to save others? How could He have said to Abraham, that in him should all families of the earth be blessed (Gen., 12:1-3), if a part were foreordained from all eternity to be saved and a part to be lost? How could the angel sing and shout to the shepherds on the hills of Judea: "I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be unto all people" (Luke, 2:10) if this fundamental principle of Presbyterianism is true? How could God be just, holy and merciful if He predestinated me to an eternal hell centuries before I was born? I begin to have a good idea why the different sects do not fellowship each other. It is to a great extent attributable to dogmatic assertions in their creeds. He passes on to the death of Christ and affirms that He died only for those who were His from all eternity. This is a positive and unequivocal contradiction of the word of God, for Paul says that He tasted death for every man (Heb., 2:9). According to the word of God a very large part of the human race, on account of disobedience, will be lost. Satan will get these. A small portion, through faith and obedience will be saved. Jesus will get these. Now, according to Presbyterianism, God virtually said: "Son, I will make man, he will sin, and with an innumerable host of his descendants plunge into condemnation. If you will depart from heaven and become a missionary among the lost and die upon the cross to purchase them, I will give you a small portion of the race, but the remainder I will give to the devil. " Bible reader, what do you think of this? Is it consistent? Is it reasonable? Is it in harmony with the word of God? Is it not enough to drive thinking men into doubts, and even into positive infidelity?

Man's corruption is taught in the word of God, but not to the degree which Presbyterianism affirms, for Jesus taught that notwithstanding man's alienation from God, there are still *honest and good hearts* (Luke, 8:15). Presbyterianism teaches that absolute corruption of the human race. Please behold the contrast! Presbyterianism teaches that by the fall man lost "all

ability or will, " hence regeneration must be a work of naked omnipotence. Is man "wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of the soul and body?" Is he "utterly disposed, disabled and opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to evil?" I know I am a sinner— out of Christ—without hope, but I have inclinations— strong yearnings to know God and obey His holy will. My experience may not be considered applicable, so I will turn to the word of God. Can a sinner do anything to save himself? An inspired apostle teaches that he can: "Save yourselves" (Acts, 2:40). The Presbyterian creed teaches that he cannot Can a sinner accept the call of Jesus? The New Testament teaches that he can: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest" (Matt. 11:28-30). The Presbyterian creed teaches that he can not Can the sinner believe the gospel when he hears it? Jesus Christ teaches that he can: "If ye believe not that I am He, ye shall die in your sins" (John, 8:24). The Presbyterian creed teaches that he can not. Can a sinner repent when he hears the gospel? Jesus teaches that he can: "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke, 13:3). The Presbyterian creed teaches that he can not. Presbyterianism is not alone in this. The Baptists hold to the dogma of "total depravity, " hence they must bear the same criticism. This theory has been an impediment to the advancement of the cause of Christ. Convince a man that he can not do anything to save himself and he will sit down, fold his arms and wait for "power from on high. " The gospel is an unlovely exhibition when its obligations are made binding, and the sinner is boldly informed that he can not move in obedience to its requirements. The gospel has its facts to be believed, and its commandments to be obeyed. The sinner is left to choose for himself. It offers eternal life to the obedient, and eternal death of the disobedient. "Choose you this day whom ye will serve. " Every theory to the contrary is a delusion, a deception, a cheat. "Final perseverance" is a phrase not found in the New Testament, hence I conclude that the

thought which it contains is not there. Paul says: "Let him that thinketh that he standeth take heed lest he fall (I. Cor., 10:12). It therefore behooves us to "watch and pray" and "continue steadfast unto the end. "

Brother Presbyterian attempted to defend Brother Methodist. He said concerning the remarks of Brother Baptist: "I assure him that in the next verse after the one that speaks of a Baptist Church you will find a full history of the rise, progress and victories of Methodism. " I presume that in the next verse he will find a history of the rise and progress of Presbyterian-ism! Consistency must indeed be a jewel!

My objections to Presbyterianism are: (1) Its name is not mentioned in the New Testament. (2) Its creed was compiled by uninspired men. (3) They are divided among themselves; it is affirmed that there are forty-two kinds in all! (4) Their Calvinism is contrary to Scripture. (5) They teach the identity of the two covenants. (6) They teach that Baptism comes in the room of circumcision. (7) They substitute sprinkling and pouring for immersion, contrary to the voices of history and revelation. (8) They sprinkle unconscious infants without finding authority for it in the Bible, either by precept or example. (9) It began too far this side of Jerusalem. (10) They teach that the gospel of Christ is a "dead letter. " (11) They teach that the conversion of sinners is miraculous. (12) They prevent the union of God's people in "one body" by justifying divisions.

The Protestant Episcopal preacher does not entertain a single doubt that he represents the true Apostolic Church, and that the Book of Common Prayer, with its thirty-nine articles of faith, is the best basis for Christian union that can be found. I turn to the Scriptures, and I do not find anything said about this institution, or the creed upon which its founded. I do not find where any were commanded to present their children at the "font, " nor where older persons were required to present themselves there to have water sprinkled upon them. I do not read anything about

"God-fathers, " or "God-mothers. " Of this custom in the Church of England the Bishop of Salisbury said: "I must candidly and broadly state my conviction that there is no one passage nor word in Scripture which directly proves it; not one word, the undeniable and logical power of which can be adduced to prove, either in any way of fact, that, in the scriptural age, infants were baptized, or of doctrine that they ought to be baptized. Nor, I believe, is there any such direct statement to be found in any writings of the fathers of the Church before the latter end of the second century after Christ. "

In the face of this frank and unequivocal admission, the Protestant Episcopal Church continues its practice! They take the unconscious infants and bind them to a human creed before they know good from evil. They then bind themselves to bring them up in this creed, and bring them to the bishop for confirmation as soon as they can repeat a human catechism and a creed. This reverses the Divine order. In fact it completely nullifies it. Children are brought into this institution by wafer *alone*, and precious little water at that! I do not find where any of the converts to Christ in primitive times were confirmed by the imposition of the bishop's hands, but I do read that they were confirmed by Paul and Barnabas, who exhorted them to continue in the faith (Acts, 14:21, 22). Hence I affirm that Episcopal confirmation is a relic of the superstitions of ages gone by. But where did this so-called "Apostolic Church" come from? My friend says from the New Testament. If this is true, why does not the New Testament say something about it? The first Episcopal Church ever in existence was not organized until about fourteen hundred years after the death of the last surviving apostle, That Church is the English Episcopal Church. How can an institution, the origin of which is known to be fourteen hundred years after the apostolic age, claim an uninterrupted succession of bishops from the apostles down to this day? How did this sect originate? Henry VIII. was king of England. He was a devout Roman Catholic. He defended his religion against the assaults

of the illustrious Martin Luther, The Pope gave him the title, "Defender of the Faith. " He wanted a divorce from one of his wives. The Pope refused to grant it. He withdrew from the Church of Rome on this account, with the Catholic Churches of his country, and became head of what is now known as the Church of England, or the Protestant Episcopal Church. This looks like apostolic succession, does it not? Henry VIII. was a corrupt tyrant, and the chief business of his life seemed to be selecting and marrying new queens, making room for each succeeding one by discarding, divorcing or beheading her predecessor. There were six of them in all, and with one exception the history *of each* one is a distinct, separate and dreadful tragedy. This man originated the Episcopal Church. How' unlike the character of an apostle! They may trace their existence back to King Henry, but for the balance of the journey they must travel the same line with the Roman Catholics. Yet they profess to be Protestants!

Brother Episcopalian said: "First of all, those who are in our Church are one. The true faith destroys sectarianism. " If this is true, what is meant by "High Church, " and "Low Church?" Do not these appellations show that one faction of the Protestant Episcopal Church leans a little more toward Roman Catholicism than the other? Does not one love the pomp and ceremony of Rome more than the other? If not this, will he please tell us what they do mean? When he answers this we will be ready to hear him preach on the unity of the Church.

My objections to the Episcopal Church are: (1) Its name can not be found in the Bible. (2) Their creed is a human production. (3) It began fourteen hundred years after apostolic times. (4) It was founded by Henry VIII. and not by Christ. (5) It is a daughter of Roman Catholicism. (6) It borrowed sprinkling from the apostasy. (7) It teaches justification by "faith only. " (8) It binds infants to a human creed before they know good from evil. (9) It binds parents to teach their children tradition. (10) Its creed, containing thirty-nine articles, implies the insufficiency of the Bible *as a*

rule of faith and practice. (11) Its system of confirmation is not found in the New Testament. (12) It calls the Lord's supper and Baptism sacraments, thus perpetuating the language of Rome. (13) It hinders the progress of Christian union by making its creed a test of fellowship.

Brother Lutheran comes before us with a great deal of confidence in the righteousness of his cause, and I entertain a high degree of admiration for the reformatory work of Martin Luther, but God never commissioned him to found a Church. He gave Roman Catholicism many blows, from which it has never recovered: For this I shall ever cherish a grateful remembrance of his name. But did he fully shake off the chains of the papacy and return to the old foundation? Let the word of God decide. I turn to its pages and I do not find anything concerning art "Evangelical Lutheran Church. " I do not find anything concerning the Augsburg Confession of Faith, on which it is established. I do not find in the Scriptures that baptism is necessary to the salvation of infants, yet Lutheranism teaches this (Confession, Article 9). They deny the Roman Catholic dogma of transubstantiation, but teach that the "body and blood of Christ are truly present and are communicated to those who eat the Lord's Supper. " What is the difference? Will my friend rise up and explain? The Confession, Article 11 contains the following: "Concerning confession, they teach that private absolution be retained in the Church, though enumeration is not necessary. " Who ever read such a statement in the word of God? How far is it from priestly forgiveness in the Roman Catholic Church? The word of God says nothing about the mass, but Brother Lutheran says: "It is retained among us and celebrated with great reverence. " Martin Luther did not, in my humble opinion, intend to establish an institution to perpetuate his name. I think he was actuated by higher and purer motives. When his friends said "Luther forever, " he said: "No, no! Christ forever. Do not call yourselves Lutherans, call yourselves Christians. " My objections to Lutheranism are: (1) Its name can not be

found in the word of God. (2) Its confession of faith was formulated by human hands. (3) It began at Wittenburg and not at Jerusalem. (4) It teaches the identity of the two covenants. (5) It practices sprinkling and pouring. (6) It sprinkles infants. (7) It borders too near transubstantiation in reference to the loaf and the cup. (8) It echoes some of the principles of Catholicism. (9) They call themselves Lutherans contrary to the wishes of Luther. (10) Its doctrine of justification by faith only is not true. (11) They are divided among themselves. (12) They prevent real union among the people of God by exalting human standards into tests of fellowship.

CHAPTER XIV.

INQUIRER.

I am continuing my inquiries into the things I have heard here to-day. I am still an inquirer seeking for light and truth, but so far I have been unable to find either.

Roman Catholic conies before the convention with characteristic audacity, attempting to convince us that he is an exponent of the truth. I propose to try "the rule" on his pretensions. I acknowledge all he says about the Church in apostolic times, but let him remember that it was called the Church of Christ. It had neither Roman nor Catholic attached to it. He misrepresents the apostles Paul and Peter when he makes them responsible for the establishment of his system. I do not think he can show, ' by reliable authority, that Peter was ever in the city of Rome; and Paul says concerning this corrupt and deceptive institution, that it is the "mystery of iniquity; " "the man of sin, " "the son of perdition. " He describes it more fully in the following language: "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God" (II. These., 2:1-2). This gives a good idea of Paul's opinion of this abomination. True to this prediction, the Pope styles himself the "Vicar of Christ, " the "visible Head of the Church. " John says: "He is anti-Christ, that denieth the Father and the Son" (I. John, 2:22). Does not the papacy virtually deny the authority of Jesus Christ in substituting human legislation and tradition for divine revelation? This institution is called the beast with seven heads and ten horns (Rev., 13:1-18). Again this description is given by the Spirit of inspiration centuries before Roman Catholicism reached the zenith of its power: "I saw a woman

sit upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of the names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication; and upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH" (Rev., 17:3-5). And still Mr. Catholic claims to represent the Church of Christ! I do not read anything in the word of God of Popes nor their infallibility. Neither is there a single intimation as to infallibility of the Church. This may do for Romanism, but is incompatible with the teachings of the New Testament. The speaker made very strong pretensions as to the holiness of his Church, but look at the Christians they have burned at the stake, the Bibles they have destroyed, and the corruptions they have perpetrated in the name of religion; and decide how these comport with Roman Catholic holiness! He makes Rome his beginning point, but I assure him that the Church of Christ began at Jerusalem (Isaiah, 2:1-3; Luke, 24:47; Acts, 8:1, 2) He tells us that the "official prerogatives conferred upon Peter were to be transmitted to his successors through all ages. The Bible says nothing about transmitting any power or authority from an Apostle to a Pope; hence I conclude that this is another imposition. He says we must "invoke the saints, " thus denying the words of Paul, in which he commands us to do all things in the name of Jesus Christ (Col., 3:17). The Bible says nothing about the "immaculate conception of Mary, the mother of God, " the use of images, or of "seven sacraments. " It does not intimate such a thing as priestly absolution, but teaches us to consider our personal relation to Jesus Christ our Lord. Roman Catholicism is an engine of destruction, the center of universal corruption, and the culmination of Satan's scheme to deceive a dying race.

While the entire system is false, I will sum up a few of the worst features:
(1) Its name is unknown in

the New Testament (2) It makes tradition equal to revelation. (3) It makes a sinful man its head (4) It teaches the infallibility of the Pope. (5) It teaches infallibility of the Church. (6) It teaches priestly forgiveness. (7) It originated sprinkling as a substitute for immersion. (8) It opposes private investigation of the Scriptures. (9) It has burned Bibles to prevent the people from reading them. (10) It combines itself with human government—anything for power. (11) It has slain thousands for protesting against its corruptions. (12) Its officials, from the Pope down, are unknown to the word of God. (13) It is "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth. "

As to Mr. Infidel's criticism, I have but little to say. He virtually acknowledges that he has never investigated the evidences of Christianity. I think he has formed his opinion from the divided state of the religious denominations of the age, rather than from the fountain—the pure word of God. There is a wide difference between Christianity traditionized and sectarianized, and Christianity in its primitive purity. The Bible is a consistent, harmonious and reasonable book. Sectarianism is contradictory and inconsistent in its teaching. Mr. Infidel wants to destroy the Bible and the Christian hope, because some professors are not as true as they should be. If the Bible is true, he will lose everything; if it is false, the Christian will not lose anything by practicing its great demands; for it makes a better husband, a better wife, a better son, a better daughter, a better neighbor, a better citizen. The whole question can be summed up in a few words: Mr. Infidel wants to destroy the Bible, the Church, the hope, without giving anything in their stead. Until something better can be offered, it would be foolish-preposterous—to throw them away. Christianity, pure and unmixed with tradition, has withstood the bitter persecutions of the Jews; the superstitions of idolatry; the degeneracy of political governments; the missiles of infidelity; the contradictions of sectarianism; the glowing eloquence of human philosophy; the glittering periods of "science, falsely so called; " and though it

has gone through many battles, its Author still lives, stands erect amidst the storms and bids defiance to all opposition. I hope Mr. Infidel will change his "creed" accept the only book which throws any light upon the problem of human life here and hereafter. I think this convention may learn a lesson from Mr. Infidel's speech. Who can answer it? Who can deny that sectarianism makes infidels?

Brother Adventist has a plaster to cover all theological ailments, but I noticed that it is not large enough to cover several Biblical truths that seem to have entirely escaped his attention; however, I must confess that the part of his speech referring to the keeping of the Sabbath affected part of his audience in a way that is utterly astonishing to me. Why did not Brother Methodist arise in his place and reply to this energetic speech? Manifestly because he, too, is under the law of Moses in doctrine, and he can not do it without completely overturning his position that the Church was established in the days of Abel, enlarged in the days of Moses, and continued uninterrupted through the old dispensation. Why did that fervent "Amen" arise from the Presbyterian delegation and meet such an emphatic reverberation from the Episcopal representation? Undeniably because Presbyterians and Episcopalians are, doctrinally, under the law just as much as Brother Adventist—or any other Jew! Why did not Brother Baptist, earnest; aggressive and apostolic in pretensions, arise, start his theological mill and grind this doctrine to powder? Unquestionably because he, too, is a Jew in doctrine; he can not distinguish between the Law of Moses and the Gospel of Christ, and he can not do it without forever abandoning his position that the Church was established on the banks of the Jordan or at Caesarea Philippi, before the Law was nailed to the cross?

I desire to ask Brother Adventist a few questions, and if he will answer them fully, honestly and Scripturally, I will accept his position and join my destiny with his. He must be aware of the fact that nothing but Scripture will move me. I must be convinced by

the word of God or I will be an "inquirer" until I die.

1. Where is the proof that any man ever kept the seventh day, except by special commandment, prior to the proclamation of the ten commandments at Mt. Sinai (Gen., 2:2, 3; Ex., 16:1-30; 19:1-25; 20:1-17)?

2. If Christians are required to keep the seventh day, why do you depart from your dwelling on that day, seeing those to whom the law was given were plainly commanded not to do so (Ex., 16:29)?

3. If you keep one Sabbath—the seventh day—why not keep them all, the seventh year and the year of Jubilee? Who authorized you to make distinction in favor of the seventh day (Lev., 25:1-22)?

4. If Christians are required to keep the Sabbath, how are they to live in cold climates (Ex., 35:1-3)?

5. Is it the duty of Christians to put to death those who desecrate the seventh day (Num., 15:32-36)? If yes, who will be the public executioner? If no, what will you do with the law (Ex., 35:2)? If you say the penalties are abolished, I answer that the same passages that you use to prove this, establish beyond the shadow of a doubt that the law, too, is abolished. If you admit that the penalties are still in force, and the proof that they are is unanswerable and invincible, if the law is in force, there is not an Adventist on top of the green earth who can escape the vengeance of the broken law! It seems, from my point of view, in contemplating the great question of Christian union, that you have only to carry out the principles of Adventism to their legitimate conclusion to eliminate one troublesome element from the earth!

6. If Christians are under obligations to observe the seventh day, why did Jesus declare that all law and prophecy hang on *love* instead of the Sabbath, seeing the command to keep it is the one on which *you hang* your everlasting all (Matt. 22:34-40; Rom., 13:8-10)?

7. Why did Jesus not require the young ruler to keep the Sabbath, when enumerating the commandments (Matt. 19:16-20; Mark, 10:17-22; Luke, 18:18-24)?

8. If Christians are to keep the law of Moses—the Sabbath, why did the apostles and elders who met at

Jerusalem leave it out of their address to the churches (Acts, 15:1-29)? This case finds, in some respects, a parallel in your theorizing. Judaizing teachers had gone forth declaring to the brethren that unless they would submit to circumcision and keep the law of Moses, they could not be saved. The apostles said. "We gave no such commandment. "

9. If Christians are required to keep the Sabbath, how are we to account for the open violation of the law by Jesus Christ, who is our example, unless by saying that the power that made the law can take it away, and that He did it (Matt. 12:1-8; John, 7:22, 23)?

10. If you keep the Sabbath because, as you think, it was kept before the law of Moses, why do you not practice circumcision, seeing it is plainly commanded in these ages (Gen., 17:1-14; Gal., 5:1-6)?

11. When did patriarch, prophet or apostle, or anybody else, command any Gentile to keep the law of Moses? No dodging here. Proof! Proof!! Proof!!!

12. Paul says the ministration of death written and engraven in stone (Ex., 20:1-17; 31:18; 32:15, 16; 34:1-28) was done away (II. Con, 3:1-18). When, where and by whom was it brought back into force? Name the day, the age, the authority, and give proof from the book! If your doctrine is true, the great apostle of the Gentiles stands convicted of a mistake!

13. If the early Christians kept the Sabbath day, why did they break bread on the first day of the week (Acts, 20:7)?

14. If Christians are to keep the Sabbath day, how do you account for the fact that the apostles preached the gospel in Jerusalem, Samaria, to Cornelius the Gentile, and to many others without commanding a single individual to keep it? Did they, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, fail to properly instruct their converts (Acts, 2:1-47; 8:1-40; 10:1-48; 16:1-40)?

15. Is it not a fact, according to the book of Acts, that the thing done was of more importance than the day (Acts, 20:7)?

16. Can you demonstrate that the day you keep is

really the seventh day or Sabbath coming down in regular succession from the day on which God rested? If not, your day is no better than any other day? Admitting for argument's sake that the Law of Moses is still in force, and that the fourth commandment is binding on the whole human race, will you affirm that it is possible for all men to keep the same day? If so, how do you explain the fact that the traveler who starts out to go around the earth, gains, say, if going east, one hour for every thousand miles traveled, or if going west loses an hour for every thousand miles traveled? How far would he go before he lost the count? Do you not see how he would inevitably be behind or in advance? Further, how do you explain the fact that far away toward the extremes of the earth, traveling from the equator, there are periods of six months night and six months day from age to age? Do you not see that it is a geographical impossibility for all men to keep the same day, and that the Law was only intended for one people, one country and one age?

17. Do *you* keep the Sabbath day? No dodging; do you? Do you rear, or put in the day promulgating your doctrines? Do you not eat food on that day prepared by work on a fire kindled in violation of the Law (Ex., 20:8-11; 35:1-3)? Do you offer the burnt offering required by law (Num., 28:3-10)? Do you remain in your house during the day? If you do not keep the day according to the Law, you do not keep it at all. If you admit that any part of the Law concerning the Sabbath is done away, you are driven to the inevitable and irresistible conclusion that it is all done away! If you deny that any part of it is done away, you condemn yourself, for you do not keep it! Which way will you take?

18. If the kingdom of Christ is now not an established institution, or if it will not be set up until after the millennium, how do you explain: (a) the declaration of John the Baptist that the kingdom was, in his day, at hand (Matt. 3:2); (fa) Paul's statement to the Colossians that they had been translated into the king-

dom (Col., 1:13); or his statement that he and his contemporaries had received a kingdom that could not be moved (Heb., 12:28); and (c) John's statement that he was in the kingdom (Rev., 1:9)?

19. If all men are unconscious between death and the resurrection, on what ground do you claim that man is superior to the brute, or that there will be a resurrection? What will be raised up? Is it not really a new creation from your point of vision?

20. If Jesus Christ is to come at the beginning of the millennium, and reign in person over the children of men, who will be the priest before the Father's throne?

21. If hell is not eternal, how long will heaven last (Matt. 25:46)?

When these questions are answered by the Book, I will consider Brother Adventist's claims. Until then I shall look upon him as an adventurer and a deceiver.

Brother Mormon's modesty is phenomenal. In the face of the record of his predecessors for nearly seventy-five years, written in blood and prostitution, he asks us to accept him as a real representative of the real Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints. I propose to put his claims to a severe test, by turning on them the light of history, Scripture and reason, and in order to help you to follow me successful, I will number my propositions and discuss them separately.

I. *The Character of the Founder of Mormonism.* Who founded Mormonism? I answer, Joseph Smith, of the United States of America. What kind of a man was he? I answer that he was both an ignoramus and a scoundrel. He and his family were noted for avoiding honest labor; they were intemperate, untruthful, and accused by their neighbors of stealing sheep. While the Mormons try to deny these accusations, it is a fact that Joe Smith himself partly admitted them, and in extenuation claimed that he had never done anything as bad as was reported of King David, who was a man after God's own heart. If you will compare Smith's character with the character of Jesus Christ, Peter, Paul, John, Polycarp, Wycliffe, Luther, Wesley,

Spurgeon, or Campbell, you can easily decide that a pure revelation or a genuine reformation could not proceed out of such a source. I wish to propound to Brother Mormon a question in reference to Joe Smith's character in the words of the Scripture: "Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter? Can a fig tree, my brethren, bear olive berries? either a vine, figs? So can no fountain both yield salt water and fresh" (Jas., 3:11, 12).

II. *The Book of Mormon*. Smith claims to have discovered this book, by the help of an angel of God. In what language was the book written? They claim that it was the "reformed Egyptian; " probably the "language in which Adam courted Eve!" How did the false prophet translate these wonderful hieroglyphics? That is easy to answer. Along with the records he found the Urim and Thummim, consisting of two transparent stones set in the rim of a bow fastened to a breastplate. By these stone spectacles God helped him to translate the book of Mormon into the humble English that he used, it being his vernacular. Smith hung a blanket across the room to keep the sacred record from the gaze of profane eyes, and as he read, Oliver Cowdery wrote it down. What became of these plates? Let Mormons answer. Who saw these plates? Only Joe Smith and eleven of his followers. This stamps the whole thing a fraud. If Joe Smith had made such a discovery no sane man doubts that those plates would have been preserved. The book appeared from the press in the year 1830. I should like to know why the world, with eyes profane, could look upon the printed translation and not upon the original copy! The work attracted some attention, and as a matter of course controversy followed. It was proven that excepting certain illiterate and ungrammatical interpolations, the whole thing was stolen from a MS, of romancer Solomon Spaulding, who died in 1816. The contents of the book present strong evidence of this. It has the flavor of the New World and not of the Old. While it does not name Calvinism, Universalism, Methodism, Millenarianism and Roman Catholicism, it discusses

them, thus showing that the man who wrote it was but an echo of the prevailing controversies in the villages of western New York in those days. The book condemns polygamy, free-masonry and infant baptism!

HI. *The Doctrines of Mormonism.* Mormons claim to have restored or reorganized the Church of Jesus as it was in the days of the apostles. Have they done it? Take his speech and read his list of officials, and then ask him to find their names in the New Testament. If he cannot do it, and you know he cannot, I brand the whole scheme as a fraud.

IV. *The Fruits of Mormonism.* Jesus Christ gives one infallible, universal and unchangeable test: "Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them" (Matt., 7:20). I propose to try Mormonism by this rule. In the first place, I affirm that the system tends to fanaticism. They began early in their history to proclaim that the Millennium was near at hand, that the Indians would soon be converted, and that the new Jerusalem—the final gathering place of the saints—was to be somewhere in the heart of the American continent. Not only this, but they openly proclaimed that the more wives and children a man has in this world, the purer, higher and grander he will be in the next; that wives, children and property will not only be restored, but doubled, at the resurrection of the dead. They claim the power to speak with tongues, cast out devils, cure the sick and heal the lame and the halt. They claim that they have a Prophet and Revelator who holds the keys of the Kingdom, and that through him alone can access be had. They hold to the Bible, but explain it to suit themselves, and hold it subject to new revelation, which they claim, takes the place of the old. They claim that God was once a man, who was gradually developed into His present power, and that in the future, good Mormons will become gods. They teach the shedding of blood for the remission of sins; in other words, if a Mormon departs from the faith, they believe in cutting his throat. Proof? Here it is the words of Brigham Young himself: "I could refer you to plenty of instances where men have been righte-

ously slain in order to atone for their sins. " In the next place, their distinguished leaders were dishonest. In about the year 1837 or 1838, the bank at Kirkland, Ohio, suspended, and action was taken against the prophet and his associates for swindling. How did he answer the charge? Did he pay up like a real prophet, or even an ordinary man of God? No. He received a "revelation" to depart for the State of Missouri, which he did immediately, to the great chagrin of his creditors and the great replenishment of his exchequer, no doubt. In the next place, the system is responsible for some of the most atrocious murders in the annals of savagery and crime. If any man doubts this, let me remind him of Mountain Meadows and Jno. D. Lee. A contemporary historian describes that terrible butchery in the following language: "The Mountain Meadows massacre stands without a parallel amongst the crimes that stain the pages of American history. It was a crime committed without cause or justification of any kind to relieve it of its fearful character. Over one hundred and twenty men, women and children were surrounded by Indians, and more cruel whites, and kept under constant *fire* from hundreds of unerring rifles, for five days and nights, during all of which time the emigrants were famishing for water. When nearly exhausted from fatigue and thirst, they were approached by white men with a flag of truce, and induced to surrender their arms, under the most solemn promises of protection. They were then murdered in cold blood, and left nude and mangled upon the plain. All this was done by a band of fanatics, who had no cause of complaint against the emigrant, except that the authorities of the Mormon church had decided that all the emigrants who were old enough to talk, should die—revenge for alleged insults to Brigham Young, and the booty of the train being the inciting cause of the massacre. " John D. Lee was arrested, tried and executed for this crime, and beyond a doubt Brigham Young was as bad as he. Hence there is no ground on which to deny this charge, or to assert that the Mormons were not the guilty party' In the next place.

the system of polygamy inaugurated by Mormons is, for deep-dyed corruption, beastly passion, unbridled and satanic cunning, without a parallel, or even an imitation in the history of civilization. Think of a man with twenty wives, or a man, under the guise of piety and in the name of religion raising children by two sisters, or a mother and her daughter at the same time! It is enough to bring a blush to the cheek of the devil himself. But Mormons will say polygamy has been abolished. Certainly it has, but by whom? By the Mormons? No indeed. It was done by the government of the United States. Hence it turns out that the Mormons have more fear of the law than they have respect for the new revelations about which they have so much to say. You may think I am bitter in the denunciation of polygamy. I am bitter. I have no language sufficient to express my contempt for a people who practiced it for years, and who would be doing it yet if it were not for the laws of the country. What have the leaders of Mormonism to say concerning woman: Let them speak for themselves. President J. M. Grant, in a sermon delivered September 21, 1856, reported in the *Deseret News* (Vol. 6, p. 235), said:

"And we have women here who like anything but the celestial law of God; and, if they could, would break asunder the cable of the Church of Christ; there is scarcely a mother in Israel but would do it this day. And they talk it to their husbands, to their daughters, and to their neighbors, and say that they have not seen a week's happiness since they became acquainted with that law, or since then- husbands took a second wife. They want to break up the Church of God, and to break it from their husbands and from their family connections.
"

President Brigham Young, in a sermon delivered the same day, reported in the same paper, said:

"Now for my proposition; it is more particularly for my sisters, as it is frequently happening that women say that they are unhappy. Men will say, 'My wife, though a most excellent woman, has not seen a happy

day since I took my second wife; no, not a happy day for a year!' It is said that women are tied down and abused; that they are misused, and have not the liberty they ought to have; that many of them are wading through a perfect flood of tears, " because of the conduct of some men, together with their own folly.

"I wish my women to understand that what I am going to say is for them as well as all others, and I want those who are here to tell their sisters, yes, all the women of this community, and then write it back to the States, and do as you please with it. I am going to give you from this time to the 6th day of October next for reflection, that you may determine whether you wish to stay with your husbands or not, and then I am going to set every woman at liberty, and say to them, 'Now go your own way, my women with the rest; go your way. ' And my wives have got to do one of two things; either round up their shoulders to endure the afflictions of this world, and live their religion, or they may leave, for I will not have them about me. I will go into Heaven alone, rather than have scratching and fighting around me. I will set all at liberty. 'What, first wife, too?' Yes, I will liberate you all.

"I know what my women will say; they will say, 'you can have as many women as you please, 'Brigham. ' But I want to go somewhere and do something to get rid of the whiners; I do not want them to receive a part of the truth and spurn the rest out of doors.

"Let every man thus treat his wives, keeping raiment enough to clothe his body; and say to your wives, take all that I have and be set at liberty; but if you stay with me you shall comply with the law of God, and that, too, without any murmuring and whining. You must fulfill the law of God in every respect, and round up your shoulders to walk up to the mark without any grunting.

"Now, recollect, that two weeks from tomorrow I am going to set you all at liberty. But the first wife will say, 'it is hard, for I have lived with my husband twenty years, or thirty, and have raised a family of

children for him, and it is a great trial to me for him to have more women that will bear children. ' If my wife had borne me all the children that she ever would bear, the celestial law would teach me to take young women that would have children. Sisters, I am not joking; I do not throw out my proposition to banter your feelings, or to see whether you will leave your husbands, all or any of you. But, I do know that there is no cessation to the everlasting winnings of many of the women of this Territory. And if the women will turn from the commandments of God and continue to despise the order of Heaven, I will pray that the curse of the Almighty may be close to their heels, and that it may be following them all the day long. And those that enter into and are faithful, I will promise them that they shall be queens in heaven and rulers for all eternity. "

President Heber C. Kimball, in a discourse delivered in the Tabernacle, November 9, 1856 (*Deseret News*, Vol. 6, p. 291), said:

"I have no wife or child that has any right to rebel against me. If they violate my laws and rebel against me, they will get into trouble just as quickly as though they transgressed the counsels and teachings of Brother Brigham. Does it give a woman a right to sin against me because she is my wife? No, but it is her duty to do my will as I do the will of my Father and my God. It is the duty of a woman to be obedient to her husband, and unless she is, I would not give a damn for all her queenly right and authority, nor for her either, if she will quarrel and lie about the works of God, and the principles for plurality. A disregard of plain and correct teachings is the reason why so many are dead and damned, and twice plucked up by the roots, and I would as soon baptize the devil as some of you. "

In the language of Caiaphas: "What further need have we of witnesses?"

My address up to the present moment will give you a good idea of modern Christianity as beheld by an inquiring outsider. The more I look into its contradic-

tions and absurdities, the more fully I am convinced that the world can never be brought to Christ until there are some radical changes.

"Why are many good people so much divided in their views of Scripture, seeing they have but one Bible, and all read it in the same language? Because they belong to different sects and have different systems, and they rather make the Bible bow to their system, than make their system bow to the Bible; or in other words, each man too generally views the Bible through the medium of his system; and of course, it will appear to him to favor it. Just as if A., B. and C should each put on different-colored glasses; A. puts on green spectacles, B. yellow, and C. blue. Each of them, through his own glasses, looks at the Bible. To A. it appears green, B. yellow, and C. blue. They begin to debate on its color. It is impossible for any one of them to convince another that he is wrong. Each one feels a conviction, next to absolute certainty, that his opinion is right. But D., who has no spectacles, and who is standing by during the contest, very well knows that they are all wrong. He sees the spectacles on each man's nose and easily accounts for the difference. "

Thus, it seems that one man reads the Bible to get proof to sustain Methodist doctrine; another to sustain Baptist doctrine, and so on throughout the entire catalogue of contending sects. This is wrong. The Bible is divine, and was given to be obeyed, and not to be "spiritualized, " mutilated, warped or interpreted to gratify the preferences of men.

I feel that I have been benefitted by this investigation. As I have advanced in the study of the Scriptures, my mind has been enlightened, and now I think I see my way clearly. A man may be a Christian and repudiate every human creed in Christendom. Christ is supreme. If a man obeys him, every sect represented in this assembly will admit his infallible safety. If he does not obey Christ, every sect in this convention, will admit the impossibility of his salvation. Human creeds do no good. They do harm by keeping good people in continual strife. Let every man purge the

sectarian spirit from his heart, tongue and life, and bury it in the dust of oblivion, and mark upon its tomb in undying colors: "NO RESURRECTION. " After this, nothing remains to be done but to unite the zeal of the Methodists, the independence of the Baptists, the order of the Presbyterians, the devotion of the Episcopalians, the steadfastness of the Lutherans, the determination of the Roman Catholics, the aggressiveness of the Mormons, the activity of the Nazarenes and the Church of God with the name of Jesus Christ and the pure gospel, and go forward to conquer the world!

CHAPTER XV.

ICONOCLAST.

I am interested in the great subject of Christian Union. Hence I appear in this convention, for it is impossible for the people of God to become one until the Baals, Ashtoreths, Chemoshes, Molechs, and Milcoms now dividing them are broken to pieces and ground to dust. I shall direct my attention to the mourner's bench, or anxious seat, process of conversion, and I ask your attention, and challenge you to meet my arguments. I declare my unfaltering and uncompromising enmity to the whole system, I propose to submit incontestable facts in justification of my position- I am aware of the fact that I have been adversely criticised by some of the members of this convention on account of my antagonism to this custom. I now take pleasure in looking you in the face and declaring war on this idol and all others. I am aware of the fact that I would be more popular, and the apparent results of my preaching greater, if I would use the anxious seat in my work. I can readily understand how you feel about it, but reflecting that you believe in it and that you think that I am not doing my duty as a preacher in refusing to adopt a custom that to your minds is right, and the use of which you think would result in the glory of God. I give you credit for sincerity in this matter, and claim that much for myself. You do not know my reasons for not having an anxious seat; therefore, in self-defense I propose to give them, and then if you do not modify your feelings and criticisms you will at least know my reasons for my failure to do that which you consider my Christian duty. But to the reasons. Here is the first one: When I started out to preach years ago, I made up my mind that God helping me I never would believe, preach, or practice

anything for which I could not find plain and full authority in the word of God. When I began to preach I began to "search the Scriptures" (John, 5:39). I have been searching ever since. It is my business; it is my daily occupation; it is my life-work. I have never yet found where Jesus Christ, Peter, Paul, James, John, or any other apostles or prophet ever used an anxious seat or mourner's bench as a means of advancing the salvation of men. If it is taught in the Book, some one ought to know where it is. If it is there and you can not find it, I will furnish the money to pay for the telegram, and go with you, and you can telegraph to any preacher, editor, or member in the world, and if any one can show ten words, five words, yea, one word in favor of the practice, I will inaugurate it immediately, abandon my life-work and hold revivals to the end of my life. There is only one question to ask: Is it authorized by the Bible? If it is, show it. If it is not, stop criticising me for not practicing it. The responsibility lies upon you; the gauntlet lies at your feet. You can not ask me to forsake what I have done in the past without proof, indisputable, invincible proof that I am not doing my duty. "Here I stand, my conscience is bound in God's word, I can not do otherwise, so help me God, amen. " If there is no Scripture for the mourner's bench; if Jesus did not authorize it; if the apostles did not use, it; if the New Testament does not approve it, it is clearly an invention of men. What does God say about the inventions of men? "Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions" (Ecc., 7:29). What does He say about the prophet who presumes to speak in His name? "But the prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die" (Deut., 18:20). What does He say about adding to His words? "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command

you" (Deut, 4:2). "Add thou not unto his words lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar" (Prov, 30:6). "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: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book" (Rev., 22:18, 19). "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).

The anxious seat or mourner's bench system of conversion proceeds upon the supposition that the plan of salvation is not revealed in the Scriptures. If it is revealed in the Scriptures, and the mourner's bench must be added, what became of the thousands, millions, who lived and died before the system was first thought of over one hundred years ago? Is the gospel the power of God unto salvation (Rom., 1:16)? If so, what is the use of doing something that is not taught either by precept, example or allusion in the gospel? Is the way of salvation plainly and fully revealed in the New Testament (Matt., 28:19, 20; Mark, 16:15, 16; Luke, 24:46, 47; John, 20:21-23)? If so, why ask people to do something that is not revealed? Is the New Testament a complete revelation of God's will? If so, why inaugurate an unauthorized practice and try to add to its completeness?

If the Bible does not tell us, all, everything to the smallest detail, that we must do in order to salvation, then it is not the will of God, the complete will, the way to heaven. If it does, the anxious seat and its attendant excitement are not required, are not of God, are not of heaven, are not necessary to salvation, and they are hindrances to truth and to the obedience it requires. Here are your alternatives, which will you take? Here is where I stand: The Bible contains the will of God concerning us; what it requires we must do or be lost; what it does not require we must not

place between the sinner and his salvation, his God, the Church, the hope of heaven. I make you a fair proposition: Find the authority for the mourner's bench and I will use it. If you can not find it, you can afford to give it up and quit criticising me. Do you believe the Bible contains the full revelation of the will of God? If you answer yes, you must abandon the mourner's bench. If you answer *no*, you must forsake the Bible. Which will you take? Do you believe the man who hears, believes, obeys and lives up to the requirements of the New Testament is pardoned, is a Christian, is a member of the body of Christ, is an heir of heaven? If you answer yes, you must give up the anxious seat; if you answer *no*, you must give up the Bible. Which will you do?

The anxious seat and its attendant exercises are based upon the supposition that salvation comes in answer to prayer alone. I believe in praying; but not in prayer alone. Why do people come to the anxious seat? Because they are taught that salvation, forgiveness, or the gift of the Holy Spirit comes in answer to the prayers of the Church. What is the difference between this custom and the confessional, and priestly absolution in the Catholic Church? I confess that I can not see any. The priest does not forgive sin. No good Catholic claims this so far as I know. Here is what they claim: The priest is a holy man; they confess their sins to him, and in answer to his prayer God forgives. Here is what the anxious seat business amounts to: Men and women come forward, bound hand and foot, utterly unable to do anything, and in answer to the prayers of the Church, God forgives. What is the difference? There is only one redeeming feature, and the Catholics have it; they teach that the sinner can confess his sins and that he must do it in order to salvation. The other makes salvation come in answer to prayer alone. The sinner, it is affirmed, can do nothing in order to salvation. Nothing means nothing! He can not possibly do anything. He can not believe. He can not repent. He can not be penitent. He can not pray an acceptable prayer. He can not

think. He can not obey. He is utterly dead and helpless. If he can not do anything he is dependent upon prayer, and prayer only, and the prayers of others at that! Admit that the sinner can do one thing, however small; if he can think one good thought, pray one good prayer, accept one fact of the gospel, obey one command or be penitent for one sin, the entire mourner's bench system falls to the ground, for all the advocates of the process claim that the sinner can not do anything pleasing to God in obedience to His word, and we can only suppose that the mourner's bench is set up so that the prayers of the Church may come to the rescue in his awful and lost condition! But does salvation come in answer to the prayers of the priest or Church member, however good? Now do not misunderstand me. I believe God hears the prayers of His people when they ask for what He has promised to give. Mark this declaration. Now a question: Where has God promised to save the alien in answer to the prayers of the Church? If that is His law of pardon, what is the use of the gospel? Again, if the Church can pray salvation down, and the evidence of it for one sinner, why can not it do it for all the world, Why delay? Why not pray it down on all the world, and let all nations awake in the light of God at the rising of the morning sun? You say that it is impossible because all the world is not willing. Listen; that makes no difference, for according to the advocates of the mourner's bench and its attendant practices, the sinner can not do anything! I hold you to your theory. If he can not do anything, he can not do one thing, and that is the end of it. If he can do even the smallest thing, the theory is false, all false. If he can not do anything, his salvation is dependent on prayer alone, and the prayer that will save one will save the world! Which will you take? The two ways are before you. You must choose. If the sinner can do one thing, he can do anything, if he can not do one thing, he can not do anything, and if you are consistent you must consider yourself responsible for the world's damnation. I put you to the test. If you can pray salvation

down on one mourner who can not do anything, according to your theory, you can pray it down on the whole world, for your theory is that all are helpless, and one can not be more helpless than another; that all are dead, and one can not be more dead than another! If you can not pray pardon down on the helpless, dead world, you can not pray it down on one helpless, dead mourner. Come to judgment, the facts are before you. How are you going to meet them? If you can not meet them you can not afford to practice that which you can not prove or successfully defend. Brother, do not criticize me until you can answer this argument and show that you are consistent in your claim.

The anxious seat process of conversion makes feelings an evidence of pardon. "But, " you say, "we do not think there is anything meritorious, or any other special good about the bench. " I know you do not. I am not talking simply about the bench or seat; I am talking about the practice. The plan is all contrary to the word of God, whether at a special bench or elsewhere. The whole system is based upon the supposition that God has not fully told the sinner what to do in the Bible. Do you deny it? If so, produce the passage that says that there should be an anxious seat, or that a man must feel that he is pardoned, or that the Church must pray for salvation. If you do not deny it you are bound to abandon the practice, and return to the practice of the primitive church. But you insist that feelings are an evidence of pardon. Let us put it to the test Here is a man who claims that he is pardoned, and that he knows it because he feels it. Let us interrogate him. Question: "Are you pardoned?" Answer: "I am pardoned. " Question: "How do you know that you are pardoned?" Answer: "I know that I am pardoned because I feel it in my soul. " Question: "Where you ever pardoned before?" Answer: "I never was pardoned before. " Question: "If you were never pardoned before and you take your feelings as an evidence, how do you know how a man ought to feel when he is pardoned; by what standard are you to

judge yourself, seeing you never experienced this feeling before?" He answers not. There is not a man beneath the circle of the sun who adheres to the theory of conversion outside of the gospel, who can answer it There is not a promise in the word of God based on feelings. It is do! do!! do!!! from the beginning to the end. Do not misunderstand me. I have good feelings always when I do good, and in no other way. Do you know any better way than this? If so, give me the book, chapter and verse, and I am ready to accept it! I am looking for the truth. If you have it and I have it not, I am ready to go along with you.

The anxious seat is a positive hindrance to the gospel. It sets up a man-made custom between the penitent believer and his salvation. This is a fact. Do you deny it? Bring your proof that the anxious seat is of God? Why do men and women go to the anxious seat? Because they are believers in Christ; because they are penitent on account of sin; because they are ready, if properly instructed, to obey the gospel of Christ. My sympathies are all with the mourners. I believe they are honest; I believe they are sincere. I believe they are tired of sin; I believe they trust Christ I believe they are ready to obey the Lord. If not, why do they come up to the anxious seat? Why not tell them what Peter told the Jews on the day of Pentecost (Acts, 2:37, 38)? Why teach them to tarry? Why teach them to wait? What is in the way? Nothing under the sun but the unauthorized agonies at the mourner's bench and a preacher, who on the account of prejudice, pelf or ignorance, will not give the apostolic answer. The anxious-seat plan of salvation makes God a respecter of persons (Acts, 10:34, 35). Do you deny it? Well, here is the proof: You first tell the sinner he can not do anything to save himself and you do your best to prove it When the sinner cries for mercy you invite him forward. Thirty persons come. You must admit that all are equally earnest and honest, and according to your theory, equally dead. Songs are sung; prayers are offered. Some profess to be converted, and some do not. If all are equally sinful,

helpless, dead, how do you account for the conversion of some while others are not converted, except on the ground that God is a respecter of persons? Perish the thought! It is not on account of the prayers, for the same prayers are offered for all. How can we account for it? Simply on the ground that the impressible, the excitable ones, are persuaded under the excitement that they have experienced pardon, while the cold, calculating, thinking ones do not, and that is the end of it. We often read of revivals in which twenty were converted and fifteen went away inquiring. How do you account for this? Did you ever read in the New Testament that seekers went away seeking, or mourners went away mourning? No, a thousand times no! Why not! The simple reason is they had no mourner's bench, the preachers of those blessed days knew what to tell inquirers and they did it, and every one who mourned was made glad, and every one who sought the Lord found Him in peace. The Lord revealed the way, and the apostles preached it, and the people accepted it, and that was all there was of it. The way is open. God invites. The gospel invites. There is no difference. ALL have the same chance. The Lord Jesus Christ is ready, and if you are tired of sin you can have the promise of salvation, the gift of the Holy Spirit, by yielding to Him and doing what He says, no more, no less (Mark, 16:16, 17; Acts, 2:38; 5:32). I sum up my reasons and leave the subject with you and your God.

1. The anxious seat is not once mentioned in the Bible, and if the Bible is a complete revelation of the will of God, the system is purely an invention of man.

2. It nullifies the gospel and practically says that what is written in the Bible will not save without something else.

3. It puts Protestantism on the same basis with Roman Catholicism, and makes the salvation of the world dependent upon the prayers of others.

4. It makes uncertain and delusive feelings the evidence of pardon, and exalts human experience above the law of pardon laid down in the New Testament

5. It keeps honest, sincere and anxious persons from obedience to the gospel by leading them to believe that conversion is a miracle, and that they must wait for evidence of pardon utterly unknown in the Book of God.

6. It is salvation by works in the very worst sense. It is an attempt to "work" the way to heaven on a purely human plan. It is not of faith, for faith comes by hearing (Rom., 10:17), and the word of God says nothing whatever about it; and whatever is not of faith is sin (Rom, 14:23).

CHAPTER XVI.

ICONOCLAST.

I appear again before this convention for the purpose of breaking idols.

"And such trust have we through Christ to Godward; not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life" (II. Cor., 3:4-6).

"And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance; for where a testament is, there must, also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead; otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth" (Heb., 11:15-17).

When I survey the vast assemblage before me, and my ear catches the echo of the confusion that exists throughout the world, my indignation rises, and I feel that the time has come to break all the idols worshiped by the people of God, bury them by the wayside, and then march on with the triumphant hosts to the conquest of the world. The great idol, the father of all the smaller ones, is compounded of equal parts of the law of Moses, human tradition and the gospel of Christ. It is generally "called the identity of the two covenants," but the name is changed and varied according to the temple in which it is worshiped, and the high priest who presides over the homage that is paid to it. It is an easy task to break this idol. Paul speaks in unmistakable terms of the two covenants (Gal., 4:24), and no process of logic or ecclesiastical legerdemain can make them one! He also declares that the *first* has been abolished or done away (II. Cor., 3:1-8; Heb., 8:1-13), and no power in the universe

can bring it back into force! Where now are the scattered fragments of your beloved idol? Echo, borne upon the cold and pulseless wind, answers, "Where!"

It being settled by incontestable testimony that there is only one covenant or testament in existence, and that it is a new covenant, we can proceed to the examination of it. We may legitimately ask, Who is the author of this testament? What does it embrace? When and where did it begin?

Before proceeding to answer these questions, I propose to settle another important point It is this: What is the meaning of the word testament, or covenant? Many people speak of the New Testament without comprehending what it is or what it offers. A testament is simply a will; the words will and testament may be used interchangeably. This is easy enough for any one to understand. The New Testament is, therefore, the will of God concerning men. You will notice that Paul declares that in order to enforce the provisions of a will or testament, the death of the testator must be brought in or declared. There are some peculiarities about wills or testaments with which all intelligent persons are familiar. It is a fact that I wish to state with all possible emphasis, that every important characteristic of a human will or testament may, also, be seen in the divine will. God adapts Himself to us, and speaks to us in language suited to our comprehension. There are many things we know concerning testaments, testators and administrators, for they touch us in every day business life. Our constitution, our laws and our customs unite in guaranteeing to every man the right to make a will or testament, and thus determine what shall be done with his earthly possessions after he shall have gone to the grave. They guarantee to him the incontestable and inalienable right to begin at the age of twenty-one and make as many wills or testaments as his fancy or judgment may suggest. They guarantee to him, in spite of this, the right to use his possessions as he pleases after making his will. They guarantee him the right to make any changes in his will, or to supplement it

in any way he chooses. They guarantee to him the right to make his will conditional or unconditional. They decree that a testament cannot be enforced until the death of the person who makes it, and that after this only, can it be probated and executed according to his desire. They further guarantee that no power can make any changes in a will after the death of its author. If he places conditions between the legacy and the legatee, no earthly power can legitimately remove them. If he does not place conditions in his will, no earthly power can legally introduce them and require submission to them. You know these statements to be true in the affairs of this life. Why may they not be true in reference to the things that pertain to the life beyond the grave? It is a fact that you can not and will not deny, that a testament may be changed repeatedly during life. Neither can you deny that after death it must stand without change, supplement, amendment, and must be executed to the letter!

In order to make a testament that will stand in law, certain things are absolutely necessary. I will name them: (1) The testator must be of proper age. (2) He must be in his right mind. (3) He must have something to give. (4) He must be explicit; leaving no room for doubt; making it conditional or unconditional as his desire may dictate. (5) There must be competent witnesses. (6) It must, after his death, be admitted to probate. (7) If there are conditions they must be performed in the precise manner required. A person of improper age can not make a will or testament. A person of an unsound mind can not make a will or testament. A testament without a consideration is not worth the paper on which it is written. A will that is obscure can not stand the fire of antagonism, and therefore can not be executed. A will without a sufficient number of competent witnesses is null and void. A testament is prophetic; it relates to what shall be after the death of the person making it. He can therefore, at pleasure, make changes in it, or make gifts entirely independent of it; or if

he chooses, make an entirely new one. The right to make gifts independent of the will lasts until death, but the moment the testator dies the will is forever sealed, and must therefore stand. A will can not be probated without witnesses, and when once probated it can not be changed or abolished: it must stand forever! All these things are true in reference to the testaments of men. They are equally true in reference to the testament of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

I affirmed that a testament must stand, after the testator's death, just as it is written, and that if there are conditions added to its provisions they must be performed without addition or subtraction. Allow me to illustrate: I own ten acres of land. Law says it is mine. Custom says it is mine. I have the power to control it during my natural life, and also to say to whom it shall go at my death. I sit down in the presence of competent witnesses to write my will. I have the power to make it conditional or unconditional. I choose to make it conditional. I decide what the conditions shall be: (1) A wire fence six feet high on the north side. (2) An iron picket fence six feet high on the west side. (3) An oak plank fence six feet high on the south side. (4) A common rail fence six feet high on the east side. (5) At the completion of the fence according to the specifications, the legatee is to take possession, and it is specified that he shall have, own and control the land as long as he keeps the fence in good repair and the land in a good state of cultivation. Now, who will affirm that the legatee can be brought into possession and control of the land without the exact performance of the conditions? Who will affirm that he could complete three sides of the fence according to the requirements, and then take possession of the land? Who will affirm that he can maintain his right to the land without the performance of all the conditions laid down in the will through his entire life?

It is an established fact that Jesus, while making His will, lived under the "first covenant, " and that it continued in force until the ratification of the New Testa-

ment by His death on the cross (Col., 2:11-14; Heb., 8:1-13).

Jesus was of proper age to make a testament (Luke 3:23). He also had the power to do whatever He desired (John, 10:17, 18). Did he have anything to give? If so, what? Did He have enough to meet the wants of all men in all ages? Let Him speak for Himself: "Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28). Again, "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life" (John, 5:40). "The thief cometh not, but for to steal and to kill, and to destroy; I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly" (John, 10:10). He came with the riches of heaven to the poor and needy of earth. Hear the triumphant refrain of the great Apostle to the Gentiles: "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich" (II. Cor., 8:9). Hear him again: "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief" (I. Tim., 1:15). Jesus Christ brought these things for you; they are incorporated in His will; He calls on you to accept and perform the conditions today; will you do it? He is plain, full and explicit in His requirements, and there is absolutely no excuse. There are competent witnesses to the will or testament of Jesus Christ. Both the Old and New records unite in declaring that the testimony of two or three witnesses is sufficient to establish any question of fact (Deut., 17:6; II. Cor., 13:1). Jesus, the Christ, came as the last, yea, the final remedy for sin, hence in order to make His testimony overwhelmingly convincing, He chose twelve competent witnesses (Matt., 10:1-15). Hear His word concerning them: "Ye have not chosen me. but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain; that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you" (John, 15:16). Again: "As

thou has sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world" (John, 17:18). After His resurrection He said to them, after having given them their commission: "And ye are witnesses of these things" (Luke, 24:45-48). On the day of Pentecost, after having preached to the people, they triumphantly proclaimed: "This Jesus hath God raised up whereof we are all witnesses" (Acts, 2:1-32). Again, at Solomon's porch, Peter declared that God had raised up Jesus: "Whereof we are witnesses" (Acts, 3:15). It is a fact that can not be successfully contradicted that after the death of the testator everything depends on the witnesses. Human law recognizes this, universally. Jesus also recognized it. He called the twelve apostles. He taught them during His entire life. They knew His will. They knew His manner of life, but He did not leave them alone. He sent power from God upon them that they might be inspired, illuminated, taught, until it was absolutely impossible for them to make a mistake. Their words were truly, undeniably, incontestable the words of God, of Christ, of the Holy Spirit! Who will deny it? Who will dare to tread so close to the great loving heart of Divinity and even doubt or question? Away with your doubts! Away with your questions! Away with the crumbling remains of your idols! God has spoken, Jesus Christ, the Great Testator, has spoken, the witnesses have spoken, let human kind listen, believe and obey! Do you call for proof? Listen: "For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you" (Matt. 10:20). Again: "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you" (John, 14:26). Again: "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me: and ye also shall bear witness because ye have been with me from the beginning" (John, 15:26, 27). Again: "But ye shall receive power,

after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts, 1:8). Again: "And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance" (Acts, 2:4). In the face of this testimony who will affirm that the twelve witnesses made any mistake? Who will affirm that they failed to unfold the provisions of the will or testament of Jesus Christ? Who will affirm that it is safe to disregard their testimony and seek elsewhere for the way of salvation? Did Jesus put conditions in His will? If not, and God is no respecter of persons, it is a decree and not a will! If it has no conditions, what necessity was there for the apostles? If there were no conditions, what necessity was there for the Church? In order to settle the matter beyond dispute I appeal to the record. Let the Master speak: "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 which is in heaven" (Matt. 7:21). Hear the apostle Peter: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him" (Acts, 10:34, 35). Hear the apostle Paul: "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him" (Heb., 5:8, 9). Hear the apostle John: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city" (Rev., 22:14). This settles, settles fully, settles forever, the question of conditions in the will of Christ No man can deny it without denying the plain and unequivocal statements of the record.

What were the conditions? This is an important question. Indeed it transcends all others, and when compared to it, they are as nothing. Before proceeding with the answer, I wish to submit a few preliminary considerations that will assist in properly understand-

ing it. Returning to our fence illustration, I remark that many different parts or pieces enter into the different sides, and many details enter into it in order to its completion according to the specifications, but when it is completed, it, in brief, comprehends the four sides designated. It is so with the plan of redemption developed in the testament of Jesus Christ. Many things enter into it; the goodness and love of God, the gift of Jesus Christ, preaching penitence, the fear of punishment; yet it can all be successfully summed up in four conditions. What are they? Let the Bible answer! What is the first condition? "I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I am he ye shall die in your sins" (John, 8:21-24). What is the second condition? "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke, 13:1-5). What is the third condition? "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 10:32, 33). What is the fourth condition? "Jesus answered, Verily, verily I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God" (John, 3:5). Who is the author of these statements? Jesus the Christ. Who were the witnesses that He made them? The twelve apostles. Where are they found? In the will or testament of the Son of God recorded by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. Is one condition more important than another? Is one side of the fence more important than another? Where is the man who will affirm it? Bring him out, I want to look him in the face!

When did Jesus Christ make His will? During His life on earth. He began with His ministry and continued unto His death. During His public ministry He dispensed rich gifts, as He clearly had a right to do. He also imposed such conditions as the immediate circumstances required. He said to the impotent man: "Rise, take up thy bed and walk" (John, 5:1-8). He said to the man sick of the palsy: "Son, be of good

cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee" (Matt. 9:1, 2). He said to the sinful woman: "Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace" (Luke, 7:36-50). He said to the penitent thief on the cross: "Today shalt thou be with me in paradise" (Luke, 23:39-43). Who will affirm that these incidents are precedents for us, seeing they were never so used by the apostles? Who will affirm that Jesus intended to have us consider these as examples of conversion recorded for our guidance? If I begin to write my will today and continue to write for three years, I will have a perfect right to make any gifts that I desire to make, and this would form no precedent for my executors to bestow similar gifts under similar circumstances. What the testator does himself, and what he directs his executors to do, are absolutely and unalterably different. We must not appeal simply to what Jesus did, but what He commanded the witnesses to do. The testator personally controls everything until his death. The moment he expires his personal acts sink into insignificance, and the executors must deal only with what is expressed as his will. This will or testament of Jesus was not and could not be executed during His life. This is stated as plainly as language can make it: "For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator" (Heb., 9:16).

Jesus continued His work through His life, gradually unfolding the provisions of His will to His chosen witnesses. He was constantly engaged in preparing them to take charge of His work after His departure from them. At last those whom He came to save nailed Him to the cross, and He yielded up His life in order to the world's redemption. The moment He expired His testament was sealed and could only be opened by His chosen representatives. They were confined to what He had commanded them to do. The conditions were in the testament when the testator expired; they were so recognized by His executors, and they must remain until the end of time. There is no power on earth or in heaven that will remove the obligations and bring the man into his legacy who has never done his part.

The testator is king, and he demands *a* strict compliance with all the requirements. The person to whom I gave the land, on the conditions, knew when he had completed the fence according to the requirements that the property was his, and that no earthly power could deprive him of it so long as he kept the fence in good repair and the land in a good state of cultivation, and we know that when we comply with the requirements of the gospel we receive the remission of sins, and if we continue in the faith there is no power that can separate us from the love of God.

The apostles were the witnesses of the testament of Jesus Christ. They began in Jerusalem and carried out its provisions. This you can find by reading the record of their labors in the book of Acts. Their works sustain me in all I have proclaimed. Search and see!

My task is done. My promise is fulfilled. I am ready to bid you adieu. Truth is prevailing. Idols are crumbling. Time-honored customs are passing away. Creeds are losing their grasp on the minds of intelligent people, and soon they will be remembered as the Shibboleths of others days. The world is moving toward Christ. The Bible is cutting its way. Light is breaking. The morning is approaching, and faith is chasing away the dark clouds that have so long hung their black drapery over the straight and narrow way. I am glad to be able to bear some part in this mighty revolution, and I join you in a fervent prayer to Almighty God to hasten the day when the knowledge and glory of God shall cover the whole earth, and His will be done on earth as it is done in the courts of heaven!

CHAPTER XVII.

APOSTOLOS.

I appear in this convention in order to uphold and represent the apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ. At first thought it appears that in a Christian assemblage like this, they would not need such support, but I think by your indulgent attention I can abundantly prove that they do. Their call, mission and authority are woefully misunderstood. Each speaker has suggested a remedy for the alarming and widespread denominational difficulties and contradictions that afflict us. I have a remedy. Indeed it is a panacea. Do you ask what it is? I answer, Restore the apostles of Jesus, not their successors in office, for they have none, to their rightful places as proclaimers and interpreters of the terms of salvation made known by the Lord of earth and sky. Allow me to state and emphasize a few elementary facts. It took God four thousand years to prepare the children of men for the full revelation of His will. The complete revelation of the way of salvation, therefore, did not come with Adam. It did not come with Abraham. It did not come with Moses. It did not come with Elijah. It did not come with the prophets. It did not come with John the Baptizer. It did not come with Jesus of Nazareth. It came—it came fully—with the glorious descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost in the city of Jerusalem after Jesus became Lord, King and Priest. We may refer to Adam, to Abraham, to Moses, to Elijah, to the prophets, to John, to Jesus of Nazareth, but our last appeal must be made to the apostles as they sit upon thrones proclaiming the gospel as the Holy Spirit gave them utterance. Every act and word from Adam forward looked to apostolic times. From this there can no appeal. Adam, and the saints and prophets

who have made themselves illustrious in the annals of time, looked for something to come. To them the gospel was an unrevealed and inexplicable mystery. Not so with the apostles. They saw and revealed the truth as God intended that it should be known to the end of time. I verily believe that Christianity, as interpreted by the orders represented here, in a large measure dethrones the apostles who testified of Jesus, and forever established their claims to sincerity by sealing their testimony with their blood. I am aware that this is a grave charge, but who will dare arise and put it to the test by the word of God? If I can not sustain it, let it fall. If I can, denominationalism must adjust itself to the truth. In order to enable you to follow me with care, I shall state my points distinctly and clearly:

I. *The meaning of the word apostle.* Open your lexicons and dictionaries. What does it mean? Brother Baptist, you may answer: "Literally: one sent forth, a messenger. Specifically, one of the twelve disciples of Christ, specially chosen as His companions and witnesses, and sent forth to preach the gospel." That is sufficient. The fact that Jesus sent them is all important. He always acts wisely, always for the best, always in the interest of mankind. He manifestly had an object in sending them. Can we find out what this object was?

II. *The sanctity of their mission.* I can not be too emphatic on this point. He not only sent them to do a great and enduring work, but He forever made their mission sacred by putting it on the same basis as His own. In that wondrous prayer that has so greatly stirred this convention, He said to them, addressing His Father: "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world" (John, 17:18). The only possible interpretation of this declaration is that the work of the apostles had the endorsement of Jesus, just as His work had the sanction of the Father. Whoever therefore rejects the word, work and authority of the twelve apostles, disregards the authority of Jesus Christ who sent them.

III. *Their selection and education.* Jesus selected His witnesses from among His own countrymen, men who were the best product of the Jewish religion and civilization. Allow me to digress long enough here to remark that if the modern theory of the identity of the two covenants is true, Jesus would doubtless have confined His selections to the priests, for they were by Divine legislation and hoary tradition, the only safe and lawful interpreters of the law of Moses (Dent, 17:8-13), but He turned to the people, the plain people, thus proclaiming that priestly caste and function among men would play no part in the day that He should become King. The men chosen doubtless knew both the Hebrew and Greek languages. They had also been taught the law of Moses from their childhood. Jesus immediately began their new education. He spoke to them as one who had come from God. He spoke with authority. He assured them that He would supersede Moses in all things (Matt., 5:17-19). He secretly confided to them the wonders of His coming kingdom (Matt. 10:26, 27), but charged them to keep them secret until after He should rise from the dead (Matt., 16:20). The fact that He led them, tolerated their follies, met their unbelief, made them His personal friends for three years, places additional emphasis on the fact that He had something important for them to do.

IV. *Their ordination.* The word ordain is significant. Jesus used it in connection with the sending forth of the apostles. "Hear ye Him. " "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain, that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you" (John, 15:16). Note these truths and let their emphasis startle you. Their "fruit" was to remain. God was to hear and answer them. Such things are not affirmed of any one else "from the beginning" to the close of God's revelation.

V. *Their authority.* Jesus Christ sent them. This should be enough to satisfy us. They had His authority

and power back of them. Does this not make them practically irresistible? Who can appeal from their decision? Who can despise their mission? Do you ask for proof of their authority? Here it is: "Then answered Peter and said unto him, Behold, we have forsaken all and followed thee; what shall we have therefore? And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Matt. 19:27, 28). This is unquestionably a reference to the time that the apostles should begin to preach in the name of the glorified Redeemer. Brother Methodist, why did Jesus come to earth? Answer: "In order to set up His kingdom. " Correct Brother Presbyterian, did the Lord provide for the translation of men and women into His kingdom? Answer: "He did. " Correct Brother Episcopalian, to whom did Jesus give the keys of His kingdom—the authority to make known the conditions of pardon? Answer: "To the apostles. " Correct. See Matt. 16:18; 18:18. Now a question to the whole convention: If Jesus gave the keys of His kingdom to His apostles, if they made known the terms or conditions of pardon, and if the New Testament contains the record of these things, who has a right to offer pardon on fewer, or on other terms? I re-emphasize the authority and perpetuity of the Lord's apostles.

VI. *The Lord's promise to them.* Jesus not only gave His apostles personal instructions, but He promised them the miraculous guidance and infallible direction of the Holy Spirit. They doubtless had good memories, but the work was too important to be trusted to the treacherous and uncertain memory of mortal man, hence He said to them: "For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you" (Matt., 10:20). Again: "But tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high" (Luke, 24:49). Again: "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and

bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you" (John, 14:26). This promise was literally fulfilled (Acts, 2:1-15). Who will dare affirm now that the apostles were not authorized to expound the gospel for all generations?

VII. *Their commission.* Jesus taught the apostles personally, and in order to prevent mistakes promised them the guidance of the "Spirit of truth. " He also gave them a world-wide and age-lasting commission. See Matt. 28:18-20; Mark, 16:15, 16; Luke, 24:45, 49; John, 20:22, 23. This was a new commission, new in every respect. This commission limited the twelve apostles to what it embraced. They could not go back of it. They -could not go beyond it They could not abrogate any of its conditions. Indeed they could not change it or deviate from it in the least Let all the preachers in this assemblage take this commission and follow it out as developed in the book of Acts, and proclaim it without change, and a revolution would inevitably follow. Whenever a man goes back to this commission, or attempts to find salvation save in the provisions it contains, he disregards Jesus who gave it, because "all authority" in heaven and in earth had been given unto Him.

VIII. *Their beginning and guidance.* The apostles were divinely commanded to begin at Jerusalem (Acts, 1:1-8). If the kingdom of heaven had been fully set up, if the gospel had been fully preached, if the Church of Christ had been started on its way to victory previously, why this commission, why the descent of the Holy Spirit, why make a new beginning at Jerusalem? Let me emphasize the fact that they were to begin something, not to resume something previously begun, but something new! Brother Baptist, please tell this convention what they began from the standpoint of your theory, of the inauguration or establishment of the Church on the banks of the Jordan, or at Caesarea Philippi. "Daniel, come to judgment!" They began *a* new work. I ask this August assembly what it was. No one answers, and no wonder! Let me answer: They began to unfold the provisions

of the Great Commission and proclaim terms of pardon hitherto unknown because unrevealed, and in order that they might give an infallible interpretation of all that had gone before, the power of God came upon them and they "began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance" (Acts, 2:1-4). Surely this ought to bring us to the knowledge of the conditions of pardon, and a sure haven where we shall be tossed by the storms of doubt and uncertainty no more. Are you in doubt on any question of faith or practice? Ask the apostles—turn to the book of Acts, and to their epistles—for they are the last, the final, the only authorized interpreters of Moses, of the prophets, of John the Baptizer, of Jesus the Christ, for Jesus called them, taught them, commissioned them and inspired them for this purpose, and this purpose only. Brother Methodist objects. That is his privilege. He asks: "Are not the other books good, inspired, and profitable?" Certainly, who said they were not? Genesis had its place, Isaiah had his place, John had his place, Jesus had His place, but they all looked to the future and talked of the good time to come; Jesus declaring of Himself, looking to His glorification at God's right hand: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me" (John, 12:32). But the apostles in a few words gave the essence of the transactions of four thousand years of the world's history, and thus began a new work in the history of time—the proclamation of the completed and universal plan of redemption. I would not under any circumstances decrease your respect and admiration for the Old Testament and the men who have made the world's history worth reading, but I greatly desire to drive away the mists, uncertainties and traditions with which the eyes of many have been blinded, so we may find "the beginning" and learn to respect the apostles as the real and only representatives of Jesus Christ our Saviour, since His ascension.

IX. *Their doctrine.* The apostles had clear conceptions of the person of Jesus, and the burden of their preaching was that He is God's only begotten and

well-beloved Son, and the only Saviour of sinful men. Christ was the center of all apostolic thought and preaching. The things they required of men were in the nature of tests of faith and means of bringing them to Him, where they might know Him and the power of His resurrection, the forgiveness of sins, and the glory of His coming in the clouds of heaven.

X. *The emphasis they placed on their work.* Jesus repeatedly told the apostles that they would bear witness of Him (Luke, 24:48; John, 15:27; Acts, 1:4-8). This they proclaimed everywhere; in Jerusalem, in Samaria, and among the Gentiles (Acts, 2:32; 8:1-12; 10:1-48), without fear, without hesitancy, and in the face of stripes, stones, prisons and death, and it is a fact that their most malignant enemies conceded that they spoke for Christ, in His name, by His authority, even when they spurned them and the message they brought (Acts, 4:13-22). Paul boldly affirms that "the ministry of reconciliation, " or "word of reconciliation, " had been delivered unto them, that they were the ambassadors of Christ, and that they besought men in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God (II. Cor, 5:18-20). I can not see how language could be any stronger than this. Hear ye the apostles, "the sent" of Jesus!

XI. *The perpetuity of their work.* In closing the great commission, Jesus promised to be with the apostles to the end of the world (Matt. 28:18-20). This was in perfect harmony with the assurance that they had previously received from Him that whatever they bound on earth should be bound in heaven, and whatever they loosed on earth should be loosed in heaven (Matt. 16:19; 18:18; John, 20:22, 23). If Jesus is still with the apostles—and who doubts or denies it?—if their interpretations, decisions and proclamations have never been repealed, I am bold to affirm that whoever wilfully and knowingly rejects their authority does it at his present and everlasting peril. The apostles are still preaching and judging, and they will continue *to* do so until "the end. "

XII. *The greatness of their work.* Moses did a great

work in bringing Israel out of bondage and in receiving and making known God's law. The prophets did a great work in calling their countrymen back to the law from which they had departed, in waking the harp to Jehovah's praise during the long night of Israel's apostasy and rebellion, and climbing to the mountain tops and shouting to the multitudes below that the "Son of Righteousness, " "the light of the world, " was rising beyond them. John did a great work by announcing to his fellow-citizens that the reign of Heaven was at hand. Jesus did a great work by teaching men how to live, how to die, and how *to* break the chains of death's cruel bondage, but His apostles, in doing His work, in honoring His name, in proclaiming His authority and glory, did a work that is without parallel in the annals of the world. Addressing them He said: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father" (John, 14:12). It was a great work to redeem the human race; it was a greater work to make known the terms of pardon for all time.

XIII. *Our dependence upon them.* The apostles saw the Lord after He arose again. They handled Him (I. John, 1:1-4). They went forth to preach, backed by all authority or power in heaven and in earth (Matt. 28:11-20). They were absolutely confined to this commission. No one else was authorized to open its provisions, and there is no escape from the conclusion that we must hear them and obey the Lord as they preached Him or perish. Lord, help this convention!

XIV. *Some startling facts.* God sent Jesus. Whoever received Him or His word received His Father. Whoever rejects Him or His word rejects His Father. Jesus sent the twelve. Whoever receives them and their message receives Him. Whoever rejects them and their message rejects Him. This is indeed startling. Do you desire the proof? It is abundant and irresistible. Jesus said to them: "He that receiveth you receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me"

(Matt. 10:40). Again: "He that heareth you heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me; and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me" (Luke, 10:16). Jesus, the Father, and the Apostles, so far as authority is concerned, are absolutely upon the same basis—if you reject the one you thereby reject the others.

In view of these weighty considerations I desire to propound some questions to this convention. A proper answer to them, will, I am sure, help greatly toward the solution of the mighty problems that come down upon us, and in attempting to answer them I earnestly ask you to keep in mind the arguments previously adduced:

1. Where did the apostles express any doubt as to the Mosaic authority of the books usually attributed to him?
2. Where did the apostles preach on or attempt to establish the theory of the identity of the "two covenants?"
3. Where did the apostles declare that baptism comes in the room of circumcision, or anything from which this can be inferred?
4. Where did the apostles preach that we are required to keep the Sabbath as required by the law of Moses?
5. Where did the apostles place Moses and his authority on an equal footing with Jesus and His authority?
6. Where did the apostles refer to the Church as having begun in the days of Abel or Moses?
7. Where did the apostles refer to the establishment of the Church by John, or during the life of Jesus?
8. Where did the apostles teach the doctrine of the universal hereditary total depravity of the human race?
9. Where did the apostles teach predestination as taught by the Presbyterian and Baptist creeds?
10. Where did the apostles teach a limited atonement, that is, that Jesus died only for the elect?
11. Where did the apostles teach the doctrine of "effectual calling"—the calling only of the elect?

12. Where did the apostles teach the doctrine of "final perseverance of the saints, " as taught in modern times?
13. Where did the apostles teach that a sinner can not do anything to save himself from sin and its consequences?
14. Where did the apostles teach that regeneration is a miracle accomplished without the sinner's co-operation?
15. Where did the apostles teach that salvation comes in answer to the sinner's prayer before obedience?
16. Where did the apostles teach that salvation comes, in answer to the prayers of the Church, upon disobedient sinners?
17. Where did the apostles set up a mourners bench and invite sinners to it, and sing and pray and shout over them?
18. Where did the apostles exhort sinners to "accept Christ" and then let them go without requiring them to obey Him?
19. Where did the apostles hold "revival services" and mutually agree to let the "converts" join "whatever church they preferred?"
20. Where did the apostles proclaim that the gospel of Jesus Christ was a "dead letter, " thus making it appear that it is without inherent power?
21. Where did the apostles declare that the gospel of Jesus is "the mere word, " and that it is powerless unless "accompanied by the Spirit?"
22. Where did the apostles preach that there must be a direct and therefore irresistible work of the Holy Spirit in conversion?
23. Where did the apostles pray for God to baptize sinners in the Holy Spirit, or teach that this baptism of the Holy Spirit was given to change the moral character or to convert men?
24. Where did the apostles teach that men are saved by faith alone, grace alone, or anything else alone?
25. Where did the apostles baptize infants, or do

anything from which it can be logically inferred that this was and is the will of God?

26. Where did the apostles have water carried into a house and use it in sprinkling it upon men in the name of Jesus Christ?

27. Where did the apostles teach that one command of the gospel is more essential or necessary than another, or that baptism is because of remission of sins?

28. Where did the apostles preach that one church is as good as another, or thank God for denominational divisions in order to suit every one's taste?

29. Where did the apostles give the Church a sectarian name, or authorize any one else to do it?

30. Where did the apostles set up the office of Pope, Cardinal, Archbishop, Bishop, or Priest, or hint that they were to have successors in office?

31. Where did the apostles authorize men to compile a creed as a test of fellowship among Christians, or to substitute sprinkling for baptism, or any other humanism for the command of the Lord?

CHAPTER XVIII.

BUSINESS.

I appear in this convention because I was invited to come as a business man and give my opinion of Christian union, simply as a matter of practical every-day business. In doing this, I shall not enter into the merits or demerits of the Biblical historical and theological distinctions to which you have so long and patiently listened I want to make an effort to find out if the ideas that prevail in the world of commerce would, if carried into practical use in the domain of the religious, tend to its betterment. The writers of the Bible certainly had some business ideas. Hear Solomon the Wise: "Seest thou a man diligent in his business? he shall stand before kings; he shall not stand before mean men" (Prov., 22:29). Hear Paul the Apostle: "Not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord" (Rom, 12:11). Men do business on account of the money there is in it. With them it is a practical thing. A new firm proposing to enter upon a commercial career must first decide on a name under which to do business; second, invest money without stint; third, have a plan of business on which all the members can and do agree; fourth, be permeated with the feeling of the necessity for economy of time and money; fifth, locate in a place where there is, or where there can be created, a demand for that which they propose to sell. It is impossible to do business without a firm name on which all the members fully agree. James Jones, Thos. Johnson, and John Smith form a copartnership with the design of selling dry goods, and it is decided that the firm shall be known as the Union Dry Goods Company. The business opens auspiciously. Customers pour in from every direction. The newspapers and the people unite in commending the enterprise of the new house. Things

move on successfully for a time, but after awhile it is noted that things have changed about the store. Customers are scarce, and there is an air of dilapidation about everything. What is the cause of it? The members of the firm have disagreed as to the firm name. Jones insisted that the firm name should be changed to James Jones & Co. Johnson contended that the style of the firm should be Thos. Johnson Company. Smith declared that he would never be satisfied until the name read Smith, Jones & Johnson. While this contention was going on, their competitors across the street were pushing ahead and getting the trade. The firm lost time, money and public confidence, and finally reached a state of absolute bankruptcy. This is no fanciful picture. It might become a reality in any school, store, bank, or railroad office in the country. You will please note that the contention arose about a matter of no importance whatever, and also that personal pride and personal preference played the chief part in this serio-comedy.

I was born sixty-four years ago in eastern New York, near what was then a small but promising village. My parents were moral people, but not church members, although they were frequent attendants on the services of the neighborhood church. When I was a small boy there was no church in the village, but as it began to grow quite rapidly, a young man came from a Presbyterian theological seminary and announced his desire to start a school and organize a church, and the people showed a willingness that was commendable, with the result that a flourishing school was started, which was followed by the organization of a Presbyterian Church. It prospered in many directions. A comfortable and commodious meeting-house was soon erected. The following year an earnest and successful Methodist preacher came and rented a hall and began to preach. The Presbyterians did not like it. They thought that they owned the town. The beginning of the new church was the cause of much neighborhood talk. Both churches grew, but I observed that the two did not gain as fast as the one had

previously done. However, there was but little rivalry. Things continued in this way for three or four years, when a young Baptist preacher came to the town and began to preach in the court-house. Then the war began in earnest. The Methodist and Presbyterian Churches each began, or tried to begin a revival. Finally they united, and the attractions they offered just about balanced those at the court-house. Much excitement prevailed. Much bitterness was engendered. Many friends were alienated. Many sinners were hardened. Religion was misused, yea, murdered in the house of its friends. The revivals closed, and a Baptist Church was organized with about fifty members. They at once proceeded to build a meetinghouse. They were not able to do it, and the Methodists and Presbyterians would not help them, hence they sent out solicitors who, by extraordinary persistence, succeeded in raising money enough in cash and promises, to build the finest meeting-house in the place. The population of the village at this time was seven hundred. I tried to figure out the matter according to ordinary business principles. I was working in a store at the time, and had excellent opportunities for observations. The Presbyterian Church had cost two thousand five hundred dollars, and at the time off which I speak, had a membership of one hundred and eighty. The church-house, however, had a seating capacity of fully three hundred and fifty, and a regular weekly attendance of about ninety, including outsiders. The Methodist Church had cost a little less than the Presbyterian Church, but it furnished accommodation for over four hundred, and had a weekly attendance of not less than one hundred and twenty-five, including outsiders. The membership numbered nearly one hundred. The Baptist Church was more costly than either of the others, although the membership was much smaller. The house was large enough to accommodate every church member in town, and leave ample room for outsiders. I looked upon this rivalry as a waste of money. Each Church kept and supported, in a way, its own pastor, when one man could easily

have done all of the work if it had been delivered from its denominational peculiarities and reduced to the simple proclamation and practice of Christian precepts. Denominationalism built the houses, employed the preachers, took the glory, and Christianity had to foot the bill. This state of affairs continued for several years. In the meantime our village grew into a city. The Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, and Jews erected costly houses. The so-called Free Thinkers also erected a costly temple. The simple preaching of the gospel gave way to the modern Sunday show. The Churches do not co-operate to any extent in any work. Occasionally some of them unite in what is supposed to be "a revival, " but after the expiration of a few months things move on just as before the "union revival" began. Today there are in that city, by actual count, thirty-nine churches and one hundred and ninety-five saloons. Do the churches stand together even on moral questions? It pains me to say they do not. What about the saloons? They stand together, for it is a matter of business with them. On the question of policy there is only one saloon in the town! But there are thirty-nine churches!! This is a sad commentary on humanity as revealed through denominational peculiarities, and it is costly experiment But it is only one of ten thousand, for the same farce has, in some degree, been enacted in every village, town and city where denominationalism is known. Millions multiplied over and over again have been squandered by men who think they are doing the Lord's work. If a dollar possessed by a Christian is a Christian dollar, what right has he to spend it save for Christianity alone? The money spent in the last century to build churches, colleges, seminaries, print books and papers, and support men to propagate and defend Methodism, Baptistism, Presbyterianism, Episcopalianism, Lutheranism, Roman Catholicism and other sects would, if turned into the simple work of propagating Christianity, "turn the world upside down. " Oh! the carelessness, Oh! the waste, Oh! the fearful responsibility of those who have thus wasted the

money that was the Lord's while millions of those for whom He died have gone down to death without one ray of hope to cheer their closing hours! These are cold facts. Say what you will it still remains true that money must and does play an important part in the extension of the kingdom of Christ, and money spent to build up rival sects is worse than wasted. It may be said in reply that rivalry is a good thing in business and religion, too. I deny this most emphatically. It is, so far as the facts show, good for neither. The business house, the railroad, the manufactory that makes an extraordinary success, does it on the union principle. The tendency is more and more, in business circles, toward the confederation and co-operation of firms that do the same kind of business. This you can not deny. Does it pay? Ask the big merchant, the big railroader, the big ship company, the big mining company, or the big farmer. I will not stop here, I assert that if the time, energy and money that have been spent during *the* last century to 'maintain denominational peculiarities, and foster sectarian rivalry, had been turned into non-sectarian channels, it would have dotted the whole earth—"the continents and the islands beyond them"—with hospitals and orphanages, and the churches, running simply along Christian lines, would have done infinitely more for themselves and the territory adjacent to them. Sectarianism is a failure in every respect. It has and does waste an astounding amount of the Lord's money. I suggest no remedy. I write no prescription. I attempt no further diagnosis. The facts are before you. Treated simply as a matter of dollars and cents, denominationalism is a failure. Yes, it is worse than a failure; it is an imposition, a delusion, an insatiable monster that swallows up millions annually that should go to the cause of uncorrupted—New Testament—Christianity!

CHAPTER XIX.

VISITOR.

I endorse most heartily the speeches of Apostolos and Business Man. I am appearing before you to-day only as a visitor. I am not a clergyman, but I am one of a large company who are vitally concerned about the great question of religion as it exists in our day. And I have been very much interested in the different phases of the subject as presented by the several speakers on this occasion. Therefore the criticisms I offer are my honest views and can in no wise be interpreted as prejudice or mere opposition.

My friend of the Church of God brought out quite a few splendid thoughts in regard to the attitude of his church, but so have all the other speakers. And while I agree with most of his remarks, I must dissent with others. Consequently I cannot recognize his denomination as the church described in the Bible. He uses the name Church of God in a sectarian sense, that is, he uses it to distinguish his church group from all others. The name Church of God is not the only Biblical name for the people of God, and it is never used to distinguish one denomination from another; in fact, there were no denominations in the days of the earliest church. If you will consult your Bibles you will read of "My church", Matthew, 16:18; "The church, " Matthew, 18:17; Acts, 2:47; 5:11; and more than a dozen other places; "Church of the Lord", Acts, 20:28; (Revised version); "Churches of Christ", Romans, 16:16; and "Church of the firstborn", Hebrews, 12:23.

My friend's stricture about the time and place of the beginnings of other denominations is just as true about the Church of God as it is about the other

churches. According to his statements his denomination began about the year 1880, and was started by Daniel S. Warner and other ministers of that day. This is centuries later than the beginning on the Pentecost after the resurrection of the Lord.

Your assembling yourselves together for worship fellowship, counsel and instructions in the "word of God is not like that of the New Testament. In those days the singing was with the spirit and the understanding, I. Corinthians, 14:15; by those who offered up a sacrifice of praise to God, that is, the fruit of the lips which make confession of his name, Hebrews, 13:15. And they made melody with their hearts to the Lord. Ephesians, 5:19. I have attended a number of your meetings and you not only made melody on musical instruments when they accompanied your voices, but frequently the instrument was used alone. There is no warrant in the New Testament for the use of instrumental music in the assemblies of the saints. It is supposed that at Alexandria some accompanied the singing with a flute, but Clement of Alexandria in 190 A. D. forbade this as too worldly. It (instrumental music) could not have been used in the fourth century or Ambrose, Basil or Chrysostom, 330-407 A. D. would have mentioned it in their description of church music. Your prayers, especially during a revival, were noisy and confusing. Sometimes several were praying at once and the "Amens" seldom fitted the petitions. Many of the shouts and other confusion had but little to do with the wording of the prayers. And I never saw "the breaking of bread" which was a weekly custom of the New Testament church. See Acts, 20:7.

It is certainly true that a man must be born again, but it is nowhere taught that he must pray through to be reborn. Your methods of conversion and sanctification are merely the old mourners' bench or anxious seat method of bygone years. You call penitents to the "Altar" and when they have prayed through, as you call it, you claim that they are converted. Then

at a later date you call them up again and go through the same process; now you claim they have been sanctified or received the second blessing. One of your church publications advertises a pamphlet for those seeking holiness with the statement "anyone *who feels the need* of a spirit-filled life should read the book. " It plainly teaches that it is a matter of feeling instead of faith and that it is something to be sought at the mourners' bench. Nothing was known of this practice before 1795. I quote from *The Life And Labors Of James Quin* by John Wright: "The first I ever saw or heard of it was in 1795 or 1796 at a meeting held at the home of that mother in our Israel, the widow Henthorn, near Uniontown, Pennsylvania. The person who conducted the meeting was Reverend Valentine Cook.... The sermon closed with an almost overwhelming exhortation which appeared as if it would carry all before it Then came the invitation to the mourners to come to the vacated seats to be prayed with and for. I think this was perfectly new, for the people seemed panic stricken. "

If you will carefully read Luke 24:49 and its accompanying verses, 45 to 53, and Acts 1:1-5, 12, 13; you will learn that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was promised only to the eleven who were with him and who would be witnesses of his teaching. People to-day can only testify to what they believe; those who were baptized in the Holy Ghost were to testify of the things they saw and knew. You demand more than the word of God for your evidence of conversion and sanctification. You are demanding an assurance of feeling and knowledge instead of an assurance of faith. Hebrews, 10:22. These early disciples always testified of Christ. I have heard a number of your so-called testimonies, and I do not recollect a single one that did this or that agreed with the word of God. And may I suggest that neither myself nor you or any one else in this century has heard those who claim Holy Ghost baptism speak in other tongues—languages— unless he has learned them some where by natural methods. When you can address an audience in such

a manner that people speaking fourteen or fifteen different languages can hear everyone in his own language wherein he was born (Acts, 2:7, 8); or if you will speak in foreign languages without being educated in them as occurred in the house of Cornelius, Acts, 10:45, 46, then we will accept your statement, but until you can do that we will be compelled to relegate your remarks to the realm of human opinion.

Footwashing is not mentioned in the New Testament as a church ordinance. The inspired writers certainly knew the teaching of Jesus, and they have no record of footwashing after the beginning of the church on Pentecost except as an act of humility and kindness among brethren, I. Timothy, 5:10.

Paying tithes is a Jewish custom that was never officially used in the early church. Even when the early church was wholly Jewish, there is no record of using tithes. It is part of the first covenant which was done away in Christ. If your church demands paying of tithes because Abraham gave tithes, then to be consistent, you should also circumcise because Abraham also circumcised, Genesis, 17:10, 11. There were three sorts of tithes to be paid; 1. To the Levites, Numbers, 18:21, 24. 2. For the Lord's feasts and sacrifices, Deuteronomy, 14:22-24, 3. Every third year a tithe for the poor, Deuteronomy, 14:28, 29, Your church does not follow these commands. In fact, like other denominations, you accept such parts of the scriptures as attract you and neglect the remainder.

Another thing I have noticed in the statements concerning the Church of God—and may I say, it is common among denominational expressions. You all use the words teachings, doctrines, truths in the plural number, this is never done by the inspired writers when they discuss the Lord's work. They do use the plural when they mention men's and demon's works.

People are frequently misled in regard to churches as well as to other things. If a large number of doctrines or practices of a certain church resemble the New Testament teaching or practice, many jump to the conclusion that that church is apostolic. They

usually miss important discrepancies because they do not carefully examine every point of doctrine or practice. To illustrate: A young man leaves his home on an extended visit. After some time both the mother and the father die. A search is then made for the missing heir that the estate may be settled. After some days a young man appears in the community and claims to be the missing son. He bears the correct name, is of the right height and has a number of the same characteristics of the missing son. The resemblance is so close that the neighbors decide that he is the heir and advise the executor to give him the estate. About this time an old friend of the family appears and after studying the young man a little while says: This is not the son. The neighbors begin to explain the resemblances, but the old friend persists, This is not the son; he has brown eyes, this man has gray eyes. So it is with the church of God; it has a number of resemblances, but there are also a number of differences.

I am concluding because of these discrepancies between the Church of God and the New Testament church that we must look elsewhere for a church in which all can worship the Lord in spirit and in truth, John, 4:24.

CHAPTER XX.

VISITOR.

It is interesting to notice the similarities and dissimilarities among the different denominations. Many of their doctrines are based on the Bible, and in these they invariably agree. Others are based on the opinions of their leading men, and in these they invariably disagree. You will notice therefore that their disagreements are not about what the Bible teaches, but about the opinions of their leaders who tell them what they think the Bible teaches.

My friend of the Church of the Nazarene tells us that they are not a schism or a branch of any other denomination. The fact that *he* says, any other denomination, shows plainly that he considers his church one of them. Webster defines schism: Formal division or separation in the Christian church. The history of the Church of the Nazarene as given in their Manual shows plainly that most of them left other denominations for this one. My friend's opening statement also hints this.

This church, like all other denominations, began centuries too late to be the original church of the Lord. It began in America instead of Jerusalem; in 1885 instead of 33 A. D. and instead of one beginning it had several beginnings and is a combination of several "Holiness" sects.

I would like to ask a few questions:

Why do you consider it important that your members acquaint themselves thoroughly with the laws of their church unless it is to uphold another division in modern Christianity?

If the scriptures contain all things necessary to our salvation, of what use is your Manual or church constitution?

What do you mean by "original sin, " and where in the Bible is it taught?

The scriptures nowhere mention a Church of the Nazarene. Your Bible will tell you that the name is not "that worthy name by which ye are called", James, 2:7. Again, if the word was translated into English, you would not wear it. The prophecy mentioned in Matthew, 2:23 cannot be found in either the English or American Bibles. The Hebrew word *Netzer* from which the words *Nazarene* and *Nazareth* are obtained is the word *branch*. Isaiah, 11:1; Jeremiah, 23:5.

You believe that conversion depends on faith preceded by repentance and that sanctification comes to the believer through faith.

Is this latter a second faith or a different kind of faith?

If a sinner accepts the Lord Jesus Christ as his Savior why is he not justified and made holy in doing so?

How can one repent without faith when the scripture says, without faith it is impossible to please God, Hebrews, 11:6?

Where in the Bible is your doctrine of entire sanctification, subsequent) to conversion, through faith, taught?

Your doctrine of conversion or as you like to call it, regeneration, is contrary to the scriptures which nowhere tell you that if any one prays through to victory and is accepted of God he is a new creature. Your very expression contains a doubt. If one prays through is he or is he not accepted by God?

How can you know when one has prayed through?

Where does the Bible say anything about praying through?

What evidence have you that any one praying through is accepted of God? Is this evidence feeling or faith? If faith, then tell us: faith in what?

You say, the Holy Spirit is witness to the new birth and also *to* the sanctification of believers. I do not read anything like that in the Bible.

In what manner does the Holy Spirit bear witness to your converts?

Does the Spirit have a different testimony for the new birth than it does for entire sanctification?

What evidence have you that it is the witness of the Holy Spirit?

Have you tried the spirits whether they be of God, I. John, 4:1; and what method did you use?

The only way I can tell whether a person has the Holy Spirit or not is to learn if he has obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered to the early Christians, Romans, 6:17, and shows the fruit of the Spirit in his life, Galatians, 5:22. Self-boasting without scriptural reasons is worthless. Jesus said. If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true, John, 5:31. Nothing like this witness theory appears in the Bible. But it is recorded that the Spirit is given to all who become Christians and that the world cannot receive him, John, 14:16, 17; Galatians, 4:6. It is also recorded that the Spirit is not given until we have been baptized, Acts, 2:38; 5:32.

If you mean by your "distinguishing doctrine" that your doctrine of entire sanctification is peculiar to your denomination, you are badly mistaken. That doctrine is common to all Holiness sects and to others who use the mourners' bench. You preach the gospel of holiness whereas the early preachers preached the! gospel of God and of the kingdom, the everlasting gospel.

Your ordinance of baptism differs very much from the New Testament ordinance. There was no affusion in those days and, so far as I can learn, there was none taught till about 120 A. D. *The Didache* or *Teaching Of The Apostles*, a series of tracts of about 120 A. D. has the following: "And touching baptism, thus baptize; having first declared all these things, baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, in living (that is running) water. But if thou have not living water, baptize in other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm. But if thou have neither, pour on the head water thrice. " Please notice

that the writer uses the word *pour* instead of *baptize* when he can't find any water. Also, your baptism is according to the wishes of the candidate and not to the honor of the Lord. You also teach and practice "The baptism of infants" which is nowhere found in the scriptures. When you do this, it becomes an ordinance without faith and therefore not pleasing to God, Hebrews, 11:6.

The early disciples met every first day of the week to break bread, that is, to observe the Lord's Supper. The scriptures say, For as *often as* ye eat this bread and drink this cup. You say, *As seldom as* you eat and drink.

Your ecclesiastical organization is based on the old Methodist organization, not on the New Testament. I do not read in my Bible of General Superintendants, District Superintendants, District assemblies, Young people's Societies, etc. You also have female elders—the very opposite of the New Testament which expressly states that an elder, or bishop, must be the husband of one wife. Female elders and female evangelists are no part of New Testament teaching.

You connect the baptism with the Holy Spirit with several things that are not so taught in the scriptures. Baptism in the Holy Spirit was a special gift to prove the plea of the apostles and was never given after apostolic days. It was accompanied by signs and wonders that are entirely missing to-day. You who claim to be baptized with the Holy Spirit never give any evidence of your baptism. In fact, it has been my experience through a number of years that those who claimed this baptism never follow the New Testament teaching on a number of subjects. The Bible nowhere suggests that the baptism with the Holy Spirit is emphasized by Jesus as the most needful experience for this age. You cannot find any such expression in the gospels. Jesus never promised the baptism in the Holy Spirit to the multitude of Christians during this age. The terms you mention are not synonyms of the baptism, and John Wesley's many phrases are only his opinions and not Bible teaching.

Your instances of "Divine Healing" can be duplicated by Silent Unity, New Thought, Christian Science, and other cults. The New Testament nowhere presents an account of sick or injured persons being brought to the platform in an annual campmeeting to be prayed for by a group of men and women, and the Testament nowhere presents an account of men and women meeting in a sick or injured person's home to pray him to health. Again, your method of healing is not a success. Your pamphlet, "*Why Some Are Not Healed*", gives thirty-eight reasons why some are not healed, and not one of these is a satisfactory Bible reason or reply.

The whole structure of the Church of the Nazarene fails because it is not permanent. Your Manual, and you also, say that the provisions of your Constitution can be amended. No one can amend the teaching of God's word.

In your teaching of "Divine Healing" you admit that it is wise to obey the law of vaccination and that broken bones should be set. Also diet, change of climate, sanitation and surgery are recommended.

Before I close my remarks I want to ask my friend some questions which, I hope he will be able to answer.

Why do those who claim the Baptism and witness of the Spirit not know how to rightly divide the word?

Is there no life or service in Christ without your method of sanctification? If there is, of what use is your theory, if not, where is the Bible proof?

The scriptures say that he who has the Son has life, I. John, 5:12. If one accepts Christ and obeys him does he have life seeing he has accepted the Son? What part of God's word should one familiarize himself with in order to seek sanctification seeing the scriptures say nothing about such seeking?

Where is there any evidence that you have a seal of God different than the one mentioned by Paul in II. Timothy, 2:19?

How can anyone consecrate himself to anything in which he does not believe, or if you please, in which he has no faith?

If all Christians are to be baptized, that is, immersed in fire, why does the New Testament not clearly say so?

If baptism is immersion, how can tongues *like as of fire* appearing on the heads of people be a baptism? How can the Spirit give to all who repent the gracious help of penitence of heart that they may believe, seeing that without faith we cannot please God?

What is the difference between repentance and penitence? (Penitence is a Roman Catholic word, not a Bible word).

If repentance is a change of mind in regard to sin, an *is Demanded of all sinners*, how can the Holy Spirit give it seeing that it is a demand, not a gift?

Is believing unto pardon and spiritual life different than believing in Christ; if different is it not a faith based on human opinions?

What is a witness of faith? Is it a witness by someone about faith or does faith in some manner witness to something? Where do the scriptures say anything about it?

In conclusion let me say to all: Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey. Do you serve Luther, or Calvin, or Wesley, or Bresee, or Warner, or any other human leader in your distinguishing doctrines or do you serve Christ No man can serve two masters, therefore I beg of you to leave all and follow the Lord.

CHAPTER XXI.

VISITOR.

The nineteenth century saw the rise of a philosophy and religion that has attracted considerable attention. Mrs. Christian Science has told this assembly something about it and its discoverer. Like all other modern sects, it has many things against it. It began in New England instead of Jerusalem, and it began in the nineteenth century instead of the first. According to the speaker's statement, the experiments which led to its discovery began about 1846, but the discovery came several years later. Christianity is divine, Christian Science is human. Again and again in their journals you will find the expression, "Mary Baker Eddy, the Discoverer and Founder of Christian Science. "

Christian Science was founded by a divorced and remarried woman. This is contrary to the very essence of Christianity. Mrs. Mary Baker Glover Patterson Eddy cannot be the founder of an inspired organization even though her followers regard the Manual of the Mother church as a divinely inspired guide. There are too many foolish things in their religion to mark it anything but human. No book on earth can equal the Bible. The inspired writer of Revelation says: 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. Revelation, 22:18.

Mrs. Eddy added a whole book to what she claims is God's message when, in 1876, she published the first edition of *Science And Health*. On page 453 of the edition which I possess, Mrs. Eddy says: "A Christian Scientist requires my work on Science and Health for his text book, and so do all his students and patients."

I think all who are here to-day know that a Christian needs only the Bible to learn God's will.

Her definition of God and Jesus do not in any way agree with the Holy Scriptures. Jesus is not man only, but the only begotten Son of God. If God is Good, and God or Good is Mind, then Jesus did not exist. The speaker's statement about the Adam dream stultifies the Bible statement of creation and the reference of Jesus to Genesis: Matthew, 19:4, 5; Mark, 10:8. And her references to Mary Baker's childhood days are puerile. Did those pigs have unusual intelligence or was it just natural for them to quiet down at the sound of a human voice? Surely the speaker does not want us to believe that they were Christian Scientifically healed of some ailment!

Christian Scientists continually mention Mrs. Eddy's fine spirit, but they seldom tell that one of her husbands, Dr. Patterson "would have liked to resume life with his wife, but she could not consent, and later obtained a divorce.

Like other female founders of sects, Mrs. Eddy became a pastor. She accepted the call from her students and was ordained in 1881. Now a pastor in New Testament usage is a bishop or elder and must be the husband of one wife. I think I need not comment on this.

In Mrs. Eddy's Message to the Mother Church in 1901 she writes: "What I have given to the world on the subject of metaphysical healing or Christian Science is the result of my own observation." Metaphysics is that division of Philosophy which includes the science of being, and the theory of knowledge. I leave it to you, my friends; Is that any kind of a definition or description of Christianity?

Mrs. Christian Science told us that if people show no interest in their theories, they leave them lovingly alone, they never enter into controversy. I have written several articles against this philosophy, and invariably the day the paper was put into the mails, a

member of their organization was in the office demanding that we publish a long reply.

Our speaker told us that their communion commemorated the morning meal which our Lord prepared for his disciples on the shore of Lake Galilee during his forty days sojourn on earth after his resurrection. Matthew, Mark and Luke tell us that it originated at the last passover before his crucifixion, and that he took bread and wine and gave them to his disciples telling them do partake in memory of him. The morning meal referred to was fish and bread. See John, 21:9. Paul, in I Corinthians, 11:20, says; When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper. It is the Lord's Supper, not the Lord's breakfast

Let me ask a few questions:

If death is only a part of the belief in material life and is but a dream, as unreal as the dreams we have in sleep, where is Mrs. Eddy and why don't she awake? She passed away in December, 1910, thus making it a rather long dream.

If the disease of poverty can be healed by the renewing of the mind, why are there so many poor Christian Scientists?

If God is the one and only mind, and men do not possess private separate minds of their own, why do men do so much thinking contrary to God's will?

If sin punishes itself and as we get rid of sin we get rid of the suffering it brings, why is it that so many rich rascals are healthy and so many good Christians physically ill and financially poor?

If from mortal mind comes reproduction of the species and that union of the sexes is not necessary for procreation, and that gender is mental, not material, why was Mrs. Eddy's son, George Glover, not born that way?

A moment ago, I remarked that some things in Christian Science sounded foolish to me. Well, here ere some of them. "Divide the name Adam into two

syllables and it reads A-dam or obstruction. This suggests the thought of something fluid, of mortal mind in solution." Discord is the nothingness named error; harmony is the somethingness named truth." "Burial. — Corporeality and Physical sense put out of sight and hearing." But let me ask this: If there is no such thing as corporeality or physical sense, and I understand you so teach, how can nothing get into sight or hearing or be put out of it? "The recognition of the fact that God is mind, and that the real and spiritual man lives within this mind, leaves no room for a mortal, material, sick and sinful man, yet we have the problem of materiality with its sickness and woes to deal with." In other words Christian Scientists must deal with things that *do not exist* because they *do exist*. "Man is neither young nor old. He has neither birth nor death. He is not a beast, a vegetable, or a migratory mind." Yet all Christian Scientists must admit that man is here and they should tell us how they came. Every tottering gray haired old gentleman or lady shouts opposition to this statement

Now please notice these statements from "*Science And Health* published in 1875, and revised in 1905. "Sin, sickness, death, is a belief only. Death is an illusion, for there is no death." But in another place Mrs. Eddy says, "Salvation is life, truth and love understood and demonstrated as supreme over all sin, sickness and death destroyed." May I ask again, There being none of these things, how can they be destroyed?

In *Science And Health* (1875) Mrs. Eddy says, "The Holy Ghost is divine science." In (1905) "The Comforter, I understand to be divine science." Again, "Holy Ghost, divine science, the developement of eternal life, truth and love." And again, "The spiritual essence of blood is sacrifice. The material blood, of Jesus was no more efficacious to cleanse from sin when it was shed upon the accursed tree than when it was flowing in his veins as he went about his Father's business." "Devil: a lie, error, neither corporeality nor mind;

the opposite of truth; a belief in sin, sickness and death, animal magnetism, lust of the flesh." "Angels are pure thoughts, not messengers. Angels—God's thoughts passing to man. Spiritual intuitions, pure and perfect. "

If Christian Science is the teaching of Jesus, how could Mrs. Eddy be the founder centuries later?

If Christian Science is true, why did Mrs. Eddy's sister-in-law suffer from cancer for seven years and die from that disease? Why did not Mrs. Eddy heal her own husband who died of heart-disease in her home?

I might continue thus for a long time, but I think I have shown you that we cannot accept this philosophy or metaphysics as the basis of the unity of all Christians. There is no truth but God's truth that we can follow and be safe. Let us then prayerfully turn unto Jehovah who will abundantly pardon.

Our task is done. Our appeal has been, is, and evermore will be, to the word of God as it is translated by the unbiased, unsectarian and unprejudiced scholar-ship of the world. Who will affirm that this is not the key that will unlock the hearts of the people of God and lead to the solution of the problem of the world's evangelization? Who will affirm that there is any other solution of the mighty problems that come rushing down upon us? Who will affirm that there is any other answer to the innumerable voices that come from around us and beyond the seas asking for the bread of life? Who will affirm that there is any other remedy for the sins that have left their foul blots upon every land beneath the circle of the sun? Who will affirm that anything less will satisfy the demands of the King: Men of Israel, to the work! Sons of the living God, arise! Reapers of the harvest of the world, thrust the sickle into the golden grain! Army of the living God, unfurl the banner of peace, and march on to victory!

The world still waits for His law. Forward, ye conquering host! The King
in tenderness still calls, for

"Large are the mansions in thy Father's dwelling,
Glad are the homes that sorrows never dim:
Sweet are the harps in holy music swelling.
Soft are the tones which raise the heavenly hymn,
Come unto Him, all ye who droop in sadness,
Come unto Him, and he will give you rest. "

CHAPTER XXII.

PEACEMAKER

"Is Christ divided" (I. Cor., 1:13).

"Can two walk together, except they be agreed" (Amos, 3:3)?

"Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity" (Ps., 133:1)!

"Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they may all be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me" (John, 17:20, 21).

"He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me" (John, 14:21).

"We have the mind of Christ" (I. Cor., 2:16).

I am very glad to have heard the three short talks by Visitor, who confined his criticism to the people known as the Church of God, also the Church of the Nazarene, and I am glad he gave vigorous attention to the Christian Science people. This latter group I consider least entitled to the term "Christian" of any sect in the world, and I know them to be the most unreasonable. If you try to talk to them and give them a chance to defend their doctrine, they will leave you with the remark, "I can do you more good by praying for you".

But in my Bible I find we are urged to "contend earnestly for the faith, once for all delivered to the saints," and I also find the apostle Peter says we should "be ready to give a reason of the hope that is in us," but you cannot get these Christian Scientists to discuss anything Bible with you. The other two groups Visitor handled in very nice style and with courtesy. I will now confine my speech to the other groups, and so I appear in this con-

vention as a Peacemaker, using the words of Jesus: "Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called the children of God" (Matt., 5:9). I am amazed at the divisions which exist among those who profess to follow in the footprints of Jesus Christ, and His chosen apostles. One speaker professed to see ample authority in the word of God for the existence of the Methodist system. Another regards the Baptist system as being in strict harmony with the Divine model, and is, therefore, led to condemn all other religious orders as sects, and their devotees as heretics. Another plants himself down upon the Presbyterian system, and announces to the world that he has found the truth. Another advances to the front with the Episcopalian system, claiming to represent "the only Apostolic Church." Another advocates the Lutheran system, because he thinks Martin Luther restored the principles of Christianity in practice when he renounced Popery and restored the Bible to the world. Another finds abundant reason for being an infidel because, he says forsooth, the preachers of "modern orthodoxy" teach contradictory doctrines, yet professing to be guided by the Bible. Glancing over what I have heard, and giving each of you credit for integrity and truthfulness, I conclude that all the religious denominations believe every word of the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, and practice it in spots—at long intervals! Christian union is the grandest theme that ever demanded the attention of religious people. It is universally admitted to be right; positively demanded by the gospel of Christ, but there seems to be a difference of opinion as to what it is. Some think there is no need of a more intimate union than now exists. They even thank God that there are divisions, so that sinners may be without excuse. This is poor logic. There are more sects now than in any other age of the world. Still, there is more unbelief, more sin, more rebellion against God. Surely, "the legs of the lame are not equal." In order to justify sectarianism, Brother Presbyterian referred to the oft-quoted passages: "He that is not against us is for us" (Luke, 9:50), and "I am the vine, ye are the

branches" (John, 15:5). He should remember that Jesus also said: "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathered not with me scattereth abroad" (Matt., 12:30), and "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up" (Matt., 15:13). It can not be shown from the Scriptures that God planted the numberless institutions now in existence, claiming to be the Church of Christ, or branches of it "With me," evidently means in the "one body," the Church. When Jesus spoke of the vine and the branches there were no denominations; hence, He must have been speaking to His individual followers. "We are already united!" is echoed from hill to hill by many modern preachers. Each one feels absolutely certain, however, that if a more intimate relation is to be established, his creed is the only reliable basis. One thing, if no more, has been developed by this investigation, viz.: the partisan spirit growing out of human creeds, and the utter impossibility of uniting upon them. For example: The Episcopalians and Methodists do not recognize or affiliate with each other. Why is this? Do they not worship the same God, and accept the same Bible? Certainly. What then keeps them apart? The Episcopal creed, containing thirty-nine articles, is an addition to the Bible, and the Methodists do not believe it. The Methodist creed, containing twenty-five articles, is an addition to the Bible, and the Episcopalians do not believe it. The warfare is not so much about the Bible as their respective creeds. These institutions are built upon their creed. Their existence will be parallel with their creeds. Abolish the creed, and you abolish the sect. Perpetuate the creed and you perpetuate sect. The union characteristic of the Church in apostolic times will never be restored until creeds are buried in the dust of eternal forgetfulness, and every good man becomes willing to comply with all the requirements of the word of God, and take it as his only rule of faith and practice. Again, Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Lutherans frequently combine their efforts in what they call a "union meeting." It is generally con-

sidered a success until the participants begin to divide the converts!

Brother Methodist preaches a sermon in which he endeavors to show the practicability of his system. Brother Baptist proves that baptism is an immersion of the whole body, and that pouring and sprinkling are human inventions to gratify the whims of those who are too proud to be "buried in baptism." Brother Presbyterian replies to it, and convinces his brethren that "the mode does not affect the validity of the ordinance." Brother Lutheran preaches a glowing sermon, presenting his plea in a manner which is very convincing to his own brethren, but no one else. The excitement becomes intense. Men are seen upon the public highways, disputing about some proposition advanced during the controversy. When the excitement dies away it is found that the real cause of Christianity has suffered immeasurably by the contest, that many of the most intelligent people in the community have become doubters, and that many of the "converts" are worse than before the meeting began. These denominations profess to recognize each other as Christians, but they will not work together in peace and harmony. They agree to preach Christ together for awhile, and at last they return to their old theories without benefitting themselves or any one else. Is this Christian union? With an open Bible before me, I am bound to declare that there is absolutely no union in it. Jesus said: "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another" John, 13:35). Do such meetings as these manifest brotherly love, indicate that those who engage in them are one as Christ and His Father are one, or prove the divinity of the Saviour's mission? Let this convention answer. An anxious world is waiting for the response.

Divisions among people professing to be Christians have been a greater disadvantage to the cause of Christ than Judaism, Roman Catholicism and infidelity combined. Is there any remedy? There must be, for Jesus Christ would not have prayed so fervently for the oneness of His people without furnishing a basis

on which it can be accomplished. Whatever makes a man a sectarian is useless, and may, therefore, be laid aside. Can a man be saved and not believe in Methodism? Methodists themselves admit that he can. Methodism is not the gospel, for "He that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark, 16:16). Can a man be saved and not believe in Baptist doctrine? Baptists themselves admit that he can. Baptist doctrine is not the gospel, for "He that believeth not shall be damned." Can a man be saved and not believe in Presbyterianism? Presbyterians themselves admit that he can. Presbyterianism is not the gospel, for "He that believeth not shall be damned." The same argument may be applied to many of the religious orders in Christendom with the same results in every particular, hence I conclude that a man may be a Christian—be a follower of Christ—be saved and reject all systems of human opinion. In order to be a Christian a man must believe in Christ and obey the gospel. In order to be a sectarian—a Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian— a man must accept something in addition to the divine system.

"The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of the Protestants."
—*Chillingworth*.

"In my judgment, it is about time for the truly Christian people to begin to look the matter of denominationalism square in the face, as being themselves morally wrong before God, and to cease from expecting real Christian union without Church oneness."—*Dorus Clarke, D. D.*

"The gospel can not accomplish its great triumphs and collect the redeemed from every land until the law of Christ be fulfilled by these Protestant sects— until they become one."—*Richard Baxter*.

"If the Protestant world were as zealous and faithful in giving the gospel to Italy as Rome in spreading her religion over the earth, the victory might be ours. O! for a union among Protestants, spiritual, visible, cordial union in effort to give the simple gospel to all who are perishing for want of it I would rejoice

to hear of another Luther, or Savonarola, or Calvin, or Wesley, or Whitfield, to call for the wind to blow on the bones in this great plain; but far more would I rejoice to know that party names in the Church of God had been forgotten, and Christ's people *were*, and were called *only Christians*, as at Antioch. "— *Dr. Prime*.

"That they, and all that believe through their word, may be one body, united by one Spirit to me their living head. The union which Christ recommends here, and prays for, is so complete and glorious, as to be fitly represented by that union which subsists between the Father and the Son. "—*Dr. Adam Clarke, on John, 17:21*.

"This prayer (that they all may be one) was literally answered in the *first* believers, who were all of one *heart* and of one soul. And why is it that believers are not in the same spirit now? Because they neither attend to the example, nor to the truth of Christ. "— *Adam Clarke*.

"The members of the Church of God should labor to be of the same mind, and speak the same thing, in order to prevent divisions, which may hinder the work of God. "—*Adam Clarke, on I. Cor., 1:10*.

"Christian union, what is it? All! that is a delightful question. There were no sects in the Apostolic Church; therefore, we want no union of sects, for that would be the sum total of sectarianism. But we want a union of Christians. The prayer of Jesus is that those who 'believe on me may be one, as thou Father are in me and I in thee, that they may also be one in us. ' Not 'one' as men may be one in one ecclesiastical body, but 'one in us. ' Jesus says to the Father, 'one, ' "as we are one. ' Now, who would speak of the Trinity as a union, yet all may speak of the Godhead as unity. Then for what does Jesus pray? That all His followers may be one precisely as He and His Father are one—not that they form a union, but that they constitute a unity. Then His prayer contemplates that believers attain a oneness of mind in faith, and not

merely a oneness of feeling—a oneness of heart in the obedience which they offer, and a oneness of effort in the work which they do.

And then Jesus measures this Christian unity by the standard of the Divine nature: 'One as we are one.' If this unity among Christians consists in mere heart-kindness, there is no visible appositeness in this tremendous petition. The Father and the Son are one in feeling, action, counsel, name. Therefore, the prayer means that Christians are to be one in the same sense—that is, one in feeling, action, counsel, name. So completely are the Father and the Son one, that the same acts are ascribed to both, and the same purposes are formed by both. Such is their identity in these respects, that the eye of the keenest archangel can not see a shade of variation. This is the real picture of Christian unity, as Jesus hung it upon the supper chamber. Perfect unity must subsist among the people of God, and their unity must agree in agreeing, and not in differing, just as the unity of the Father and the Son agrees. We are told to hold the same affections, the same doctrines, and the same ordinances, and we are to hold to them as Jesus held to them, or else our union is a counterfeit and a pretension. This is Christian unity, as Jesus prays for it, and it seems to me, with the open Bible before me, that nothing else is. Who would suppose that the Father holds one form of truth, and the Son another, but for the sake of peace they 'agree to disagree'—that is, they mutually agree to suppress the varying expressions of their mind, and they call this being at one? The very thought is offensive. Christ was exclusively one with the Father in doing His will, and our unity must be like the unity of the Father and the Son. In other words, Christian unity must be Scriptural, or it is unreal, it is nothing. Therefore, nothing but a return of all those who love the Savior to the naked teachings of the Bible, as the Father and the Son avowed those teachings, can ever result in Christian unity. Christian bodies may declare an armistice and be peaceable, but it is one thing to be

peaceable and another to be united. It is a shame that one man should denounce another as exclusive, because that other more literally and fully obeys the word of God than himself. God has expressed His will in the broadness of infinite thought, and that man who does not scruple to obey every part of it, is the most catholic believer. His exclusiveness is exclusive oneness with Christ in obeying His will, and therefore he partakes of the catholicity of God. But no man can obey that will without sympathy with the catholic God. Hence David prays, not when thou shalt contract, but 'when thou shalt enlarge my heart, I will run in the way of thy commandments. '

I take it, then, that the only way in which we Christians can be united, is to agree that we will mutually obey whatever is positively enjoined in the New Testament, and to insist upon nothing beyond that. Let each man appeal to the Bible only, and he will need to ask for no concession from his brethren. Opinion will then give place to faith; convenience, and preference, and expediency to Divine authority. How common it is for Christians to retain their distinct peculiarities, because they are not forbidden in the word of God. This is a dangerous principle—it is one of the rocks on which Christian sects split. The things that are especially required are the things that are to be done, and not the things that are especially forbidden. Luther fell into this trap. Carstadt demanded of him, 'Where has Christ commanded us to elevate the host?' 'Where has He forbidden it?' Luther retorted. Our trouble springs largely from this false position. We should only ask that each other's tastes and preferences should yield to God's word, and we shall soon begin to respect each other's views of it, and begin to grow in real unity. Do you wonder that when a man asserts, for instance, that my views of baptism are Scriptural and Apostolic, and adds that, for some reason aside from their Scripturalness, he prefers something else, and then requires me to give up my views in order to accommodate him, that he may unite with me—do you wonder that I resent it as an insult to my convictions?

I am tempted to say: 'Rather give up what is a matter of indifference to you, be baptized with what you confess to be Bible baptism, and we are one in a moment'

These are my views of Christian union, and the method of attaining it. I can see no other in harmony with the word of God. And if this be Christian union, its profound sanctity overwhelms me, its infinite tenderness moves my whole being. The delicious conception of its purity, and preciousness, and power, makes me tremble with holy awe from head to foot. I remember that when my Redeemer bowed beneath the ponderous load of my sin, this holy thought soothed His bleeding heart, and just before the purple blood-drops forced their passage through every pore of His body) He breathed out this intercession for every ransomed disciple and for me—"That they all may be one, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."—*Dr. T. Armitage.*

"Unless you have investigated for yourself, you have no idea into what a multitude of fragments the Church is split. The Baptists divided into, first, regular; second, Disciples; third, Dunkards; fourth, Free Will; fifth, Anti-Mission; sixth, Winnebrennarian; seventh, Seventh Day; eighth, Six Principle; ninth, General; tenth, Mennonites. The Methodist Church is divided into, first, Methodist Episcopal Church; second, Methodist Episcopal Church South; third, African Methodist Episcopal Church; fourth, Methodist Episcopal Zion Church; fifth, Colored Methodist Church; sixth, African Methodist Church; seventh, Union American Methodist Episcopal Church; eighth, Congregational Methodist; ninth, Primitive Methodists; tenth, Independent Methodists; eleventh, Free Methodists; twelfth, Welsh Calvinistic Methodists; thirteenth, Wesleyan Methodist Connection; fourteenth, Methodist Evangelical Association; fifteenth, Methodist Protestant; sixteenth, United Brethren of Christ The Adventists are divided into, first, Second Adventists; second, Seventh Day Adventists; third, Evangelical Adventists; fourth, Non-Resurrection Adventists; fifth, Age to Come Adventists. The Quakers are divided into, first, Orthodox;; second,

Hicksite; third, Wilbur, or Friends on Original Principle; fourth, Kingsites; fifth, Lambornites; sixth, Progressives. The Presbyterians are divided into the Northern Presbyterians, Southern Presbyterians, Cumberland Presbyterians, United Presbyterians, Reformed Presbyterians, Associate Reformed Presbyterians, and many other denominations, more in number than I have mentioned, are more or less absurdly cut up into a great ecclesiastical hash, with enough salt of real grace to keep it, and enough pepper of biting controversy to spice it, but, nevertheless, hash. With some it is a question of robes; ' with some, a question of days; with some, a question about non-essentials, so small that the theologian has to get his dictionary to find them. The mere recital of their names shows the necessity that something be done for their combination. If this world is ever taken for God, and its sins overthrown, it will be by forgetfulness of unimportant differences and the marching of all the hosts of God in solid column to attack it. The sixteen kinds of Methodists will come under one wing, the ten kinds of Baptists must come under still another wing, and the seven kinds of Presbyterians under still another wing. After all the branches of each denomination have united, then the great denominations nearest akin will unite, and this absorption shall go on until there shall be one great millennial Church, divided only for convenience into geographical Sections, and as of old it was the Church of Laodicea, the Church of Philadelphia, and the Church of Thyatira, so it shall be the Church of America, and the Church of Africa, and the Church of Australia. Of the world-wide Church there will be only one article of creed—Christ, first, Christ last, and Christ forever. "—*T. De Wit Talmage in the Christian Herald and Signs of Our Times.*

These extracts give a good idea of Christian union as viewed by prominent Methodist, Baptist and Presbyterian theologians. They emphasize the necessity of forsaking "party names and unscriptural phrases," and returning to the "naked teachings" of the New Testament. This, I think, is the only reliable solution of

the greatest question that ever demanded the attention of students of the sacred oracles. If each denomination will ask no more and accept no less than the full authority of Christ, the work can be accomplished without further delay. But if each one continues to make its creed a test of fellowship, divisions will be multiplied, and the salvation of the world impeded. Oh, for a full appreciation of the maxim of immortal Chillingworth: "The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of the Protestants!" There was a day in which there were no "Christian sects." The followers of Jesus were all members of one Church; one in mind, sentiment, aim, judgment and destiny. Jesus prayed for this just before He suffered (John, 17:20-26). Luke describes this unity: "The multitude of them that believed were of one heart and one soul" (Acts, 4:32). Do the religious organizations represented in this assembly manifest this oneness? Paul wrote to the Church of God at Corinth: "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment" (I. Cor., 1:10). Do all the preachers in this convention "speak the same thing?" Are there no divisions among them? Are they "perfectly joined together in the same mind and the same judgment?" Listen: "Now the God of patience and consolation grant you to be like-minded one toward another according to (literally, after the example of) Jesus Christ. That ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom., 15:5, 6). Do the denominations of modern times glorify God with "one mind and one mouth after the example of Jesus Christ?" "I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love, endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace; there is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one

baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all" (Eph., 4:1-6). Here are seven units. Do the religious denominations of this age endeavor to "keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace?" Do they constitute but "one body?" Do they have the same faith? Do they practice the "one baptism?" Does Paul reason correctly? Did God hear the prayer of Jesus? Will it ever be answered? "As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith" (Gal., 6:10). In all candor, I desire to know if the sects represented in this convention constitute "the household of faith?" "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish" (Eph., 5:25-27). Do such battles as this controversy exhibit a Church without blemish, spot or wrinkle? Can Christ be the head of all these institutions? He is represented as the bridegroom, the Church as the bride (Matt., 25:1-15). "Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honor to him; for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready; and to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints" (Rev., 19:7, 8). Do the denominations of this age, representing an inexhaustible variety of opinions, constitute the bride of Christ? Bible reader, answer the question! Many are running "to and fro" and asking for the "old paths." There is so much controversy about human standards that men are saying, "Where is the Church of Christ? How may I enter it? How may I know that I am a member of it?" Let us forget the condition of religious society at present, and go back beyond nineteen centuries to Jerusalem, take our position at the old beginning corner and survey the world. The founder of the Church put unchangeable marks upon it, by which it is to be known during all the ages. But before

presenting the cardinal principles of the institution, I will endeavor to show what it is not:

I. *It is not a political institution.* "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever" (Dan., 2:44). Jesus answered, "My kingdom is not of this world" (John, 18:36). "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ: and he shall reign forever and ever" (Rev., 11:15).

II. *It is not the "old covenant."* There are two covenants (Gal., 4:24). Human argument can never make them one. When Paul went to Rome, the people said, "We desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest: for as concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against" (Acts, 28:22). The Jews were all members of the old covenant, born in it (Gen., 17:5-14). They were the enemies of the Church of Christ. They persecuted its members with burning bitterness. If the old covenant and the Church of Christ are identical, the Jews persecuted their own interests. Paul was born a Jew, in the covenant, yet he wrote: "Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note among the apostles, who also were in Christ before me" (Rom., 16:7). If the old covenant and the Church of Christ are identical, there never was a time in Paul's life in which he was not "in Christ." Nicodemus was a Jew, born in the covenant. Jesus informed him that in order to enter the kingdom of heaven, the Church, he must be born again (John, 3:1-12). If the covenant and the Church of Christ are identical, Christ taught him to be "born again," to enter an institution of which he had always been a member. The prophet Jeremiah, long after the death of Abraham and Moses, predicted the establishment of "a new covenant" (Jer., 33:31-34). If the old covenant and Church of Christ are identical, it is strange that such language as this should be used by the Lord's representative! Jesus said: "There be some

of them that stand here, which shall not taste death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power" (Mark, 9:1). The kingdom and the Church are the same (Matt., 16:18, 19). If the old covenant and the Church of Christ are identical, he would have said: "The kingdom came in the days of Abraham, over nineteen hundred years ago, or it came in the days of Moses, over fifteen hundred years ago." Paul said: "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second" (Heb., 10:9). If the old covenant and the Church of Christ are identical, he would have said: "There is but one covenant It began in the days of Abraham. Christ confirmed it." Paul says: "Cast out the bond-woman and her son; for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman" (Gal., 4:30). Three thousand members of the Abrahamic covenant were brought into the Church on the day of Pentecost in the city of Jerusalem. If the old covenant and the Church of Christ are identical, the apostles misapplied their time and talent. They should have preached to some who were born outside of the covenant.

Now, brethren of the convention, by your permission I will take the Bible in my hand and "Walk about Zion and go around about her." I will "mark well her bulwarks" and "consider her palaces," that we may "tell it to the generations following." Please bear in mind that the distinctive principles which are here presented are not recent discoveries. They have lived upon the pages of Divine history for more than eighteen centuries. They will live until our Redeemer comes again. I proceed to submit the following propositions to your impartial investigation. Examine them in the light of *God's* eternal truth, with unprejudiced minds, and I shall be satisfied. Examine them at once, for our union and co-operation are absolutely dependent upon them:

I. *The Founder of the Church was born at Bethlehem:* "And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, are not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of

thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel" (Mic., 5:2; Matt., 2:6). A person born at any other place could not found the Church of Christ, or a branch of it.

II. *Jesus of Nazareth is the Founder of the Church* "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell (hades) shall not prevail against it" (Matt., 16:18). "Let no man glory in men" (I. Cor., 3:21). John Wesley founded Methodism; Henry VIII., Episcopalianism; John Knox, Presbyterianism; John Calvin, Calvinism; Martin Luther, Lutheranism.

III. *Jesus Christ is the Foundation of the Church* "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (I. Cor., 3:11). An institution built upon any other foundation is not the Church of Christ. Methodism is built upon the twenty-five articles of the Discipline; Baptism is built upon Baptism; Presbyterianism is built on the Confession of Faith; Episcopalianism is built upon the thirty-nine articles of the Prayer Book; Lutheranism is built upon the twenty-eight articles of the Augusburg Confession of Faith; Roman Catholicism is built upon tradition; The Church of God was started by Daniel S. Warner. The Church of the Nazarene began in 1885, and Christian Science is a product of Mary Baker Eddy's fertile mind.

IV. *Jesus Christ is the Only Head of the Church'* "He is the Head of the Body, the church: who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence" (Col., 1:18). An institution having any other head is not the Church of Christ. The Pope of Rome is the head of Roman Catholicism.

V. *Jerusalem is the beginning corner* "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain

of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem" (Isaiah, 2:1-3). This prediction was made seven hundred and sixty years before the advent of the Messiah. Just before He returned to his Father He commanded His apostles to begin at Jerusalem, and preach repentance and remission of sins in His name (Luke, 24:47). Paul says: "Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all" (Gal., 4:26). An institution which began at any other place is not the Church of Christ. Methodism began at Oxford. Baptistism, as a distinct institution, is little more than three hundred years old. Presbyterianism began in Scotland. Episcopalianism began in London. Lutheranism began in Wittenberg. Roman Catholicism began at Rome. Calvinism began at Geneva. The Church of Christ began in the year 33. Methodism began about the year 1729. Baptistism about the year 1611. Presbyterianism about the year 1587. Episcopalianism about the year 1521. Lutheran-ism about the year 1521. Cumberland Presbyterianism about the year 1815. I can not given the exact date of the beginning of Romanism, but it is certain it did not assume an organic form until several centuries after the inauguration of the Christian era.

VI. The *primitive Church* was one *body* "There is one body and one Spirit" (Eph, 4:4). "For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office: so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another" (Rom., 12:4, 5). "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones" (Eph., 5:30). "The Churches of Christ salute you" (Rom., 16:16). Paul sent his salutations to the saints at Rome from the Churches of Christ. He gave Christ the glory. This is in harmony with all Divine revelation. He is the founder, foundation, head and life of this institution, hence it must bear His name, and it alone. He purchased it (Eph., 5:25). Do not endeavor to rob Him of His well-earned honor!

An institution composed of many bodies or sects is not the Church of Christ; Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalian, and Lutherans are divided among themselves.

VII. *There was a well-defined law of admission into the Church:* "He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber" (John, 10:1). "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in 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 alway, even unto the end of *the* world" (Matt., 28:19, 20). Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts, 2:38). For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (Rom., 8:2). "But Whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed" (Jas., 1:25). The great commission unfolds "the law of the Spirit." "The perfect law of liberty" demands of those who desire to enter the Church, faith in Christ and obedience to His demands. Every denomination in modern times has a law of admission peculiar to itself. The Methodists admit members according to the Discipline. The Baptists admit them by an experience of grace, which generally contradicts the apostolic answer to the convicted Pentecostans, a vote of the Church and immersion. The Presbyterians admit them according to the Confession of Faith. The Episcopalians admit them according to the Prayer Book. The Lutherans admit them according to the Augsburg Confession of Faith. The Methodists will not admit people into membership who deny the twenty-five articles of the Discipline, even if they believe every other creed in Christendom. The Episcopalians will not admit a member who denies the thirty-nine articles of the Prayer Book, it matters not how great his pretensions to "orthodoxy" may be. The

Baptists will not admit a member from the Methodists even if he has been immersed. These orders do not believe each other's creeds, recognize each other's members or meet together and worship the Lord in peace and harmony. Yet they profess to recognize each other as Christians, and many of them profess to belong to "branches of the same Church," but what Church is that? Not the Church of Christ, I am sure, for it is not composed of branch institutions. It is one body. It is safe to affirm that an order which has a law of admission unknown to the New Testament is not the Church of Christ.

VIII. *The followers of Christ were distinguished by a divinely-given name*
"The Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory; and thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name" (Isaiah, 62:2). Soon after the Gentiles were brought into the kingdom of Christ, Luke informs us that "the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch" (Acts, 11:26). "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian" (Acts, 26:28). "Yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf (literally in this name)" (I. Pet, 4:16). "A name which is above every name" (Phil., 2:9). "Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake" (Matt., 10:22). "Thou boldest fast my name" (Rev., 2:13). "Do they not blaspheme that worthy name by which ye 'are called" (Jas., 2:7). "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts, 4:12). "It seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men who have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts, 15:25, 26). "And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him" (Col., 3:17). "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named" (Eph., 3:14, 15). "Justified in the name of the Lord

Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God" (I. Cor., 6:11). "I write unto you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you for his name's sake" (I. John, 2:12). "The name of the Lord is a strong tower: the righteous runneth into it and is safe" (Prov., 18:10). "We will walk in the name of the Lord our God forever and ever" (Mic., 4:5). "And the Lord shall be long over all the Dearth: in that day there shall be one Lord, and his name one" (Zech, 14:9). "We will rejoice in thy salvation, and in the name of our God we will set up our banners" (Ps, 20:5). "And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen: for the Lord God, shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name" (Isa., 65:15).

In the face of this testimony, this convention has decided that there is nothing in a name. Is there anything in the great names of history? What name is sufficient to awaken the deepest emotions in every believer's heart? The name of Paul the apostle! What name rekindles the fires of patriotism in the heart of every true American? The name of George Washington! To what name does Protestantism pay the tribute of a grateful remembrance? The name of the unconquerable hero, Martin Luther! To what name does Methodism bow in holy awe? The name of the illustrious John Wesley! To what name will all the nations of the earth and the angels in heaven bow in humble reverence? The name of our Lord Jesus Christ (Phil. 2:10)! There is something in the names recognized by the denominations of modern times, for Methodists are not Baptists, and Baptists are not Methodists; Presbyterians are not Episcopalians, and Episcopalians are not Presbyterians. The name of Christ—Christian—is the grandest name known among the children of men. It identifies those who wear it without any explanation. Not so with sectarian names. They imply historical associations which the generality of mankind know but little about Paul informs us that Christians are married to Christ (Rom., 7:4). Brides, to be respected, must wear their husband's name. When the same apostle wrote to the Church

at Ephesus, in the year 64, he informed them that the "whole family in heaven and in earth," recognized and honored the name of Christ Peter declares that there is salvation in the name of our King, and John endorses it by informing us that our sins are forgiven "for His name's sake." Every blessing of the new institution comes through the name of Jesus Christ When the apostles began their labors, immediately after the ascension, their first answer to penitent inquirers embraced this name, and whatever is done in this or any other age, in the name of Him, by His authority, as He directs, will be recognized in heaven. It is dangerous to be anything more or less than a Christian. True, the followers of Christ in primitive times, were known as disciples, saints, or brethren, but the term Christian embraces all of these. At the roll-call of Eternity, it will not be asked whether I am a Methodist, Baptist Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Lutheran, or a Roman Catholic, but whether I am a Christian: "a follower of the Lamb." If God cursed the Jews who refused to wear the name which He gave them, what; think you, will be the destiny of those who wear the names of men in preference to the name of His Son?

"But" says Brother Methodist "there is nothing in a name!" If not why do you wear the name Methodist in preference to the name Baptist or Presbyterian, or Roman Catholic, or Infidel, or Mormon, or Know-Nothing, or Beelzebub?

We can harmonize on the name Christian, for it expresses our highest conception of what every man desires to be, but we can never unite on any human name. If a man is a Christian, why should he hide his light under a bushel of human titles or names? Let him look to Christ He "leadeth them out;" out of fog, doubt, ignorance, into the light of life!

IX. *The primitive Churches or congregations had but one system of government* "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the

saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ" (Eph., 4:11, 12). The apostles and prophets had no successors. The Bishops, Pastors, Elders or Overseers, had no jurisdiction outside of the congregations to which they belonged. Peter informs us that they were required to "feed the flock of God" (L Pet, 5:1, 2). The deacons were servants of the Church (Acts, 6:1-5; I. Tim., 3:8-13). The evangelists were the public proclaimers of the word of life (II. Tim., 4:5). An institution having any other system of Church organization or government is not apostolic. The Scriptures do not say anything about Popes, Archbishops, Presiding Elders, Class Leaders, Rt. Reverends or Doctors of Divinity, nor of Bishops possessing the authority now claimed by officials of that name among Methodists, Episcopalians and Roman Catholics.

X. The members of the Churches of Christ in primitive times, assembled regularly on the "first day of the week" to "break bread;" to remember the Lord in the institution which he ordained- "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is, but exhorting one another, and so much the more as ye see the day approaching" (Heb., 10:25). "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them" (Acts, 20:7). That weekly communion was the custom in ancient times is sustained by the testimony of history and the acknowledgments of the leading orders represented in this convention. An institution, however pure in teaching, which fails in this particular, is not apostolic. Do the denominations represented in the speeches made before this convention, with all their pretensions to "apostolic succession," and purity of doctrine, respect the example of the first followers of the Lord Jesus Christ?

XI. The primitive Christians had but one bond of union, faith in Christ and obedience to his law; one tie of affiliation, love to God and one another; one mission, the conversion of the world to Christ; one destiny, the everlasting city of our God. Lift up your eyes and survey

the religious field. Every religious order in Christendom has a system or doctrine peculiar to itself. Whatever is taught and held sacred by one is immediately denied by another. I hope I shall not be misunderstood. I am not endeavoring to unchristianize any one. I am simply applying the invincible "logic of facts" to sectarians and sectarianism. Whatever truth any man holds and practices, I endorse and practice, too. I am trying to show the God-loving and God-fearing of all religious orders, that there is a foundation on which we can unite without sacrificing truth or conscience. Christ made the triumphs of His cause dependent upon the efforts of His people. There are efforts, but they are in a great measure failures, because professing people are exhausting their means in fighting among themselves, while attempting to evangelize the world. This is contrary to the spirit of Christianity, and it can not succeed.

"But," says Brother Presbyterian, "we can not all see the same way." If not, why did Jesus pray for it, and compare it with the oneness which subsists between the Father and Himself? Why did He establish but one Church and why did the apostles consecrate their lives to this work? In what way is this unity to be produced? Not by formulating a new creed, for they have long since proven themselves to be insufficient. Not by justifying divisions, for this would be sinful. Not by a new revelation, for the one we have is universally acknowledged to be sufficient, as a rule of faith and practice. Not by adopting what is known in modern times as "liberal Christianity," for this would be an insult to the wisdom of our King. Not by forsaking the plain ordinances of the gospel, for this would pave the way to the abandonment of the entire system. Not by attempting to justify ourselves in following the dictates of our imaginations, for this would imply that opinion is equal to revelation. Not by agreeing to disagree; for this would imply that we are unwilling to concede the wisdom of that for which our Redeemer prayed, and for which His apostles labored. Not by giving up the Bible altogether, for

this would involve the destruction of our brightest hopes. Not by casting our lot with the Church of Rome, for this would involve the endorsement of a system which is unknown to the New Testament Not by forsaking the right of private investigation, for this would be disobedience to the command of Jesus: "Search the scriptures" (John, 5:39). Not by interpreting the Bible so as to make it appear to favor our opinions, for this would be treason. Not by bending the word of God to our professions, for this would encourage the introduction of new creeds and sects. Not by expecting the Holy Spirit to guide us independently of the Word of God, for this would deny its authority and concede that sectarianism is encouraged by the great Head of the Church. Not by folding our hands and waiting for the Lord to come, for "woe to them which are at ease in Zion." What then must be done? Simply abandon sectarianism and go back to original ground. There was but one foundation in the olden time: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt., 16:16). There was but one Church, the Church of God, of Christ (Rom., 16:16; L Cor, 1:2). The Church had but one head, Jesus the Christ (Col., 1:18). There was but one beginning place, Jerusalem (Acts, 1:8). There was but one law of admission into the Church, the gospel of Christ (Rom., 1:16). There was but one Spirit, the Spirit of truth (John, 14:17). There was a divinely given name by which the followers of Christ were known; the name of Christ (Acts, 11:26). There was but one hope, the hope of everlasting life (Rom., 8:24). There was but one Lord, the King of kings, and the Lord of lords (Eph., 4:5). There was but one faith, trust in God through the Son of His love (Heb., 11:1). There was but one baptism, immersion (Rom., 6:1-4; Eph., 4:5). There was recognized but one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (Eph., 4:6). There was but one bond of union, the authority of Jesus Christ (Matt., 28:16-20). There was but one destiny for the people of God, the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (II. Peter, 1:11). The early Christians labored to-

gether in peace and with constant success. They were "fitly framed together;" builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit; "joined together and compacted" (Eph, 2:19-22; 4:15, 16). The world could not stand before the united Church of the early ages. The opposition of the Jews and Romans melted away before it as the snow dissolves before the rays of the morning sun. They did not waste their time, talent, energies and money in fighting among themselves or in chasing imaginary enemies. In obedience to the command of Jesus they "went everywhere preaching the word," We can harmonize on the same principles, labor in the same cause, and enjoy the same results. No opposition will be sufficiently strong to confuse our triumphant army. Before our undivided host, infidelity in all its forms will bow its head in shame and disappear forever. Divided as we are, we can never successfully combat it, but united as Jesus demands, it will die of its own accord. Divided as we are, we can never convert the world, but united as the early Christians were, our victory will be sure. Of one thing I am fully satisfied, we can never have Christian union without Church oneness! When I survey this convention, its talents, its divisions, its creeds, I am amazed. There are divisions, but thanks to our heavenly Father, there is an unfailing remedy. We can give up everything for Christ. We can substitute faith for speculation, love for variance, and devotion for formalism. We can find and walk in the "old paths." We can live for Christ and the publication of the pure gospel. Nothing short of "one body," "one spirit," "one hope," "one Lord," "one faith," "one baptism," "one God and Father," and one name, will settle us on the old foundation. The signs of the times are full of encouragement, for sectarianism is slowly but surely dying. The Lord is preparing His army for the coming triumph. I unfurl His banner today. Upon its shining folds are written letters of fire: "THE BIBLE, AND THE BIBLE ALONE." Good men everywhere are rallying to this infallible standard, and as the light rolls in beauty across the storm, I catch

the inspiration and shout: "On to victory!"

Our union will be the herald of the brighter day. Missionary work, home and foreign, will be increased a thousand fold. The "glad tidings" of peace will flow like a gentle river to "earth's remotest bounds." The race will accept Jesus Christ as its last and greatest hope. Darkness will flee away into "uncreated night," and the "millennial trumpet" will announce the universal brotherhood of man. Asia, for centuries under the reign of heathen darkness, will shake off its slumber and proclaim in triumphant tones: "There is no king but Jesus!" Africa, long under the reign of an unbroken night, will break its chains and respond: "Glory to God in the highest!" Europe, long under the reign of formalism, will awake and say: "Alleluia, for the Lord omnipotent reigneth!" America, "the land of the free and the home of the brave," long under the reign of sectarianism, will rise to see the better day, and shout as it rises: "Glory, honor and power to Him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the lamb forever!" The far-off isles of the sea will join the chorus of "Peace on earth and good will to men," and the angels around the eternal throne will take up the immortal strain and shout it back to earth again, and the universe will be thrilled with unusual joy.

"Party names then lay aside,
And cast away your broken cistern;
Christ the Lamb, the Church, the Bride;
Then take no other name but Christian.

"Brides, they take the husband's name;
Nor would he sanction any other;
Why should we not do the same?
What do you say, contending brother?"

CHAPTER XXIII.

PEACEMAKER

"Glorious things are spoken of thee, O city of God" (Ps., 87:3).

"Walk about Zion, and go around about her: tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces, that ye may tell it to the generation following" (Ps., 48:12, 13).

"For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem" (Isa., 2:3).

"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Matt. 16:18).

"The church which was at Jerusalem" (Acts, 8:1).

"Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all" (Gal., 4:26).

"They shall ask the way to Zion, with their faces thitherward, saying, Come, and let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten" (Jer., 50:5).

"And the ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away" (Isa., 35:10).

It is absolutely impossible to overestimate the importance of beginning at the right place and in the right way. The surveyor must find the *beginning* corner before he can make a survey. The child must learn the twenty-six letters of the alphabet before it can go to college and study the higher branches. We must find the beginning *place* and *time* of the "dispensation of grace" before we can understand the demands of Jesus Christ. Where did the gospel, in fact, begin? When did the Church of Christ assume an organic form? When did Christ inaugurate His reign on earth? These are interesting questions, and I propose to answer them in the light of divine truth. My answer

to them will contradict some of the theories advanced during this convention, but I ask for my arguments a calm and impartial examination. If they are based upon the truth, no opposition will be sufficient to crush them. If they are not, they will come to nought (Acts, 5:33-39). The Church of Christ is presented to us in different places in the New Testament, under various descriptive terms. It is called a testament, or covenant (Heb., 8:1-13). It is called the Church of God (I. Cor, 1:2). It is called the Church of the first born (Heb., 12:23). It is called one body (Rom, 12:4, 5; Eph, 4:4). It is called one *new* man (Eph, 2:15). It is called the kingdom of heaven (Matt., 3:2). It is called the kingdom of God (John, 3:5). It is called the kingdom of God's dear Son (Col, 1:13). It is called a fold (John, 10:16). It is called the household of God (Eph, 2:19). It is called the habitation of God (Eph, 2:22). It is called the household of faith (Gal., 6:10). It is called the temple of God (I. Cor, 3:16). It is called the pillar and support of the truth (I. Tim, 3:45). It is called the house of Christ (Heb., 3:6). It is called the new and the living way (Heb., 10:20). It is never called the Methodist Church, Baptist Church, Presbyterian Church, Episcopal Church, Lutheran Church, Roman Catholic Church, or Church of the Latter Day Saints.

It is evident from the testimony of both the Old and New Testaments that the Church was not established immediately after first disobedience. The plan of salvation was gradually unfolded from man's banishment from the garden of Eden to the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ; thence to the day of Pentecost at Jerusalem. Jesus taught this in His parables: "For the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself, first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear" (Mark, 4:28). "And he said, Whereunto shall we liken the kingdom of God? or with what comparison shall we compare it? It is like a grain of mustard seed, which, when it is sown in the earth, is less than all the seeds that be in the earth; but when it is sown, it groweth up, and becometh greater than all herbs, and shooteth

out great branches; so that the fowls of the air may lodge under the shadow of it" (Mark, 4:30-32). God revealed His will as man was able to understand and obey it. I find several departments in the gradual development of the scheme of redemption, under each of which man was held responsible for the performance of such duties as were made binding upon him. Duties increased with the light, until he became able to understand the fullness of the gospel. We have

I. The *Gospel in Purpose*. "According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Eph., 3:11), This purpose looked down the ages to the "better testament," the authority of Christ in heaven and earth and the salvation of men through His name.

II. The *Gospel in Intimation and Promise*. The first intimation of redemption was embraced in the sentence which the Lord pronounced upon Satan: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel" (Gen., 3:14, 15). An apostle informs us that "the Son of God was manifested to destroy the works of the devil" (I. John, 3:8). The same idea was subsequently embodied in the promise made to Abraham, afterwards renewed to Isaac, then to Jacob (Gen., 12:1-3; 26:1-5; 28:10-14). Paul says: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ" (Gal., 3:16).

III. The *Gospel in Prophecy*, This includes a long period of time. Hear Jacob: "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be" (Gen., 49:10). This was entirely prophetic. Paul says: "It is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah" (Heb., 7:14). Hear Peter: "Of which salvation the prophets' have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you; searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of

Christ, and the glory that should follow" (I. Pet, 1:10, 11).

IV. The *Gospel in Preparation*. This department embraces the period of time from the beginning of John's work to the day of Pentecost. You can not grasp the great truths of the gospel without comprehending the mighty principles embraced in this proposition. Now, in order to bring the matter fully before you, I will be very specific: (1) The mission of John. There are some things which John did, and some things he did not and could not do. Let us look at the things recorded concerning him. The prophets of the Lord had predicted his coming. They saw the necessity for his reformation in the almost helpless condition of their countrymen. Hear Isaiah: "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain; and the glory of God shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it" (Isa., 40:3-5). Hear Malachi: "Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold he shall come saith the Lord of hosts" (Mal., 3:1). Again: "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord; and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse" (Mal., 4:5, 6). Hear the New Testament concerning John: "And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to their children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord" (Luke, 1:17). John the Baptist was "sent from God," as a messenger to His people; the children of Israel (John, 1:6). Take a view of the history of these people from Solomon's apostasy, down

the ages through the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, and their history is the history of continual apostasy. They forgot God. They departed from the law of Moses, their schoolmaster (Gal., 3:24). Hence they were not ready for the messenger of "the covenant" to come to His people, and it was necessary for the voice to "cry in the wilderness" for the people to prepare for the coming Lord. It is a notable fact that John came in the "spirit and power of Elijah?" What was the spirit of Elijah? Manifestly the spirit of a reformer. His countrymen had departed from the law of Moses. Idolatry held high carnival over the crumbling remains of the altar of God. The nation had descended into the lowest depths of degradation and shame. Elijah's voice broke the silence and stirred the conscience of the people. He was the most distinguished reformer of his generation (I. Kings, 17:1-24; 18:1-46). He inaugurated no new covenant. He proclaimed no new law. He simply called the people back to their covenant with God, and "repaired the altar of the Lord that was broken down" (I. Kings, 18:30). John found the people in a similar condition. He was a reformer. He, like Elijah, lived and died under the law of Moses. John was the harbinger of Jesus Christ. He introduced Jesus to the people of Israel, saying: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world" (John, 1:29). Immediately John's sun began to decline (John, 3:27-30), indeed, his work was done. The word of God is clear in reference to John, and it may all be summed up in the brief sentence: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord." It is well for you to note that during the life of John, the law of Moses was in full force, and that he did not attempt to inaugurate a new institution, but he called the Jews back to their Law, their Lord, and their King! (2) The mission of Jesus Christ. He was sent by His Father to do His will (John, 17:18). Hear His own words: "Thy will be done" (Matt., 6:10). "I am come in my Father's name" (John, 5:43). These passages indicate the design of His mission. Follow Him through His earth-life, even down to the last, and

the great burden upon His great and loving heart was: "Nevertheless, not my wilt, but thine, be done" (Luke, 22:42). His personal ministry was limited. Do you ask for proof? Hear His own words: "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt., 15:24). (3) The work of the apostles under the first commission (Matt., 10:1-7), Their work may be summed up in a few sentences. It was confined to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel." They were simply and only to announce that the kingdom of heaven was at hand. After this, when the powers of darkness were gathering about the Lord, He charged His disciples to keep His divinity a secret (Matt., 16:20)! Do you call this a full and complete gospel? If so, on what ground? It is safe to affirm that during this period the apostles of Jesus, His most intimate friends, did not understand His doctrine or the design and scope of His approaching reign. The resurrection of the dead is the foundation on which everything must rest. If the dead rise not, Jesus did not rise; if He did not rise the apostles were false teachers, the disciples believed a lie and the "dead in Christ" have perished (I. Cor., 15:1-21). Yet the apostles, while carrying out their first commission, did not know "what the rising from the dead should mean" (Mark, 9:1-10). They "disputed among themselves, who should be the greatest" (Mark, 9:34), They did not believe that Jesus would rise from the dead, and the reports to that effect after His resurrection "seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not" (Luke, 24:11). Thomas declared: "Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe" (John, 20:24, 25). He was with "the twelve" after the resurrection forty days (Acts, 1:3). Notwithstanding His instructions, they were still ignorant, and just before He departed they asked Him to restore again the kingdom of Israel (Acts, 1:6). Where is the man who will risk his reputation as a scholar on the affirmation that these men understood their mission, and that they were competent to preach the gospel in its fullness? Where is the man

who will affirm that during this period the followers of Jesus did not expect Him to enter Jerusalem and reestablish the throne of David, or that the apostles had any higher conception of their work than the occupancy of exalted positions in the new government. If any man is disposed to doubt this argument, let him consider: (a) Their spiritual condition (Luke, 9:54, 55). (b) They tried by force to make him a king (John, 6:15). (c) His entrance into Jerusalem (Mark, 11:1-11). (d) The necessity for the coming of the Holy Spirit upon them (John, 14:26; Acts, 1:8).

V. *The Gospel in its Fullness.* The promise of redemption embraced "all families of the earth" (Gen., 12:1-3). But the promise could not be fulfilled until Jesus broke down the middle wall of partition and abolished the law of Moses by nailing it to His cross (Eph, 2:14-16; Col., 2:14-17). After the resurrection of Jesus and just before His ascension, He gave the apostles a world-wide and age-lasting commission. I challenge the world to produce any law or commission before this that comprehends all nations and all ages. We can not go back of this commission and find the way of salvation fully revealed. We can not appeal from it, for it is the highest court in the revelation of God to man. This commission embraced in brief all that came before it. It is the accumulated and concentrated wisdom and power of forty centuries. It is fire from the burning altar of God. It is the final, the culminating message of Jesus the Christ to the perishing race. Behold the circumstances under which it was given. Give wings to thy imagination. Stand with Jesus and His apostles upon the sacred mountain in the land of His nativity. The hour for His departure has come. The pain of separation shows itself in every face. There is silence on earth. Hark! The same voice that awoke sleeping Lazarus and stilled the turbulent waves of the sea, sounds again. See Him move His hand! He draws the veil that enwraps the unborn ages; see the mighty hosts of men pass in solemn review before Him! There is silence in Heaven. Angels, cherubim and seraphim, crowd toward the gates of the city, and

to the tops of its turrets, and towers, and battlements. In heaven all eyes are turned toward earth; on earth all eyes are turned toward heaven. The universe with its innumerable hosts, stops to listen. The chariot of fire, drawn by fleet-footed steeds, rolls down the sky. The time has come to say farewell. Listen, oh ye saints. Listen, oh ye dying sinners. Listen, oh ye angels of God. But He is going, listen to His farewell: "All power *is* given unto me in heaven and in earth: Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, 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., 28:18-20). "And He said unto them: Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark, 16:15, 16). "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem, and ye are witnesses of these things, and, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high" (Luke, 24:46-49).

The sum of this commission is, "go teach," or "preach the gospel," "believeth," "repentance," "baptism," "remission of sins, beginning at Jerusalem" It will be observed that this is all based upon the death of Christ and His authority. The development of this commission, under the apostles, embraces the law of remission for all men and all ages. This, to us, is very significant It is the completion of God's plan to save. It is the "full corn in the ear" (Mark, 4:28). It is the "faith which was once," once for all time and all men, "delivered unto the saints" (Jude, 3). "The faith" the divine system of government, was delivered by Jesus Christ to the apostles, and they afterward unfolded it as the "Spirit gave them utterance" (Acts, 2:1-47). This is the law that Jeremiah predicted would be

written in the hearts or minds of men (Jer., 31:31-34). It is the law that Isaiah and Micah predicted would go forth out of Zion (Isaiah, 2:2, 3; Micah, 4:1, 2). It is the law of which Isaiah said: "He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law" (Isaiah, 42:4). Paul calls it, "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" (Rom., 8:2). James calls it "The perfect law of liberty" (Jas., 1:25).

Paul said: "I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified" (I. Cor., 2:2). He also teaches that the gospel is the death, burial and resurrection of Christ (I. Cor., 15:1-5). The patriarchs and prophets believed in a coming Redeemer. No man ever announced authoritatively His death, burial and resurrection, from the first disobedience to the day of Pentecost. If these propositions constitute the gospel, it was never preached in its fullness until that day. If a man prefers the "full corn in the ear" to "the blade" he must accept the injunction of Jesus to His disciples just before He left them, "tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem." That is to say, "walk about Zion, go around about her," and "mark well" the transactions of the first Pentecost after the ascension.

I will now turn to the leading feature of this investigation; the time and place of the establishment of the Church of Jesus Christ. "When Jesus came into the coasts of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man, am? And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell (hades) shall not prevail against it And I will give

unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matt., 16:13-19). This interview is the foundation of my present discourse. It should be remembered that Jesus was on earth with His disciples. He desired to know what opinions were entertained by the people concerning Himself and His mission. Opinion said He was John the Baptist; opinion said He was Jeremias; opinion said He was Elias; opinion said He was one of the prophets. Peter said, by faith: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Please observe the vast distinction between opinions and faith. On which foundation did Jesus build the Church, the opinions of men or the truth? Unquestionably upon the truth. Mark you, He said, "I will build." If the Church had been built before this time, is it not remarkably strange that He did not say "the Church was built in Abraham's day," or "John set up the Church in the wilderness," or "I have built my Church," or "I am building my Church?" What of the foundation on which this institution rests? . Some people assert that it is built upon Peter, a mortal man. Let us see: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church." "Thou," refers to the apostle. "This," refers to Christ, or the truth which Peter had just confessed. To settle this matter beyond doubt or controversy, I turn to the testimony of the prophet: "Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation; he that believeth shall not make haste" (Isa., 28:16). Paul and Peter refer to this stone and teach that it is Christ (Rom, 9:33; I. Pet, 2:5-8). If Peter were the foundation of the Church, he did not leave anything in his sermons or writings indicating that he knew it, for in every word he spoke, and in every line he wrote, the supreme authority of Christ is the leading idea. Paul settles the question, once for all, when he says: "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (I. Cor, 3:11). The Church is not built upon

human opinions, frail man or the prejudices of men, but alone on the divinity and Lordship of the Son of God. The prophet declared that the foundation laid in Zion would be a "tried stone." When was this done? What does it mean? Jesus said of this foundation, "the gates of hell (hades)—the unseen world—shall not prevail against it" Death was victorious in his conquests for over forty centuries. Now, if Jesus died and rose again, He demonstrated His supreme power over death and the grave. If He died and revived not, the "gates of hell" prevailed. He arose triumphantly. By this act the foundation stone was tried. There are conflicting opinions in reference to the time and place of the actual organization of the Church. It is asserted that the Church was organized in the days of Abel. If it can be shown by the word of God that the foundation was tried at this particular period in man's history, it will be admitted that the Church was then and there established. It is asserted by others that the Church of Christ dates from the patriarch Abraham, and that he was one of its first members. If the foundation were tried when God made a covenant with Abraham, it will be admitted that the Church of Christ was then and there established. It is asserted by others that John the Baptist organized the Church in the wilderness of Judea. If it can be shown from *the* testimony of John or any other messenger from God that the foundation was tried when John began to call the Jews to repentance, it will be admitted that the Church of Christ was there established. But who can show it? This is not a question of power, but of fact The word of God is the only tribunal to which we may safely appeal. Jesus asserted that He was superior to death: "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I may take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again" (John, 10:17, 18). Jesus was recognized by His Father when He was immersed by John in Jordan (Matt., 3:13-17); also upon the mount of transfiguration (Mark, 9:1-7). He went about doing

good. God proved Him by "miracles, wonders and signs." He finished His earthly ministry. He was betrayed and denied. He made the "good confession" before Pontius Pilate. He was mocked, condemned and crucified. He died upon the cross, and His friends took His body down and buried it in the rock tomb in the garden. His disciples were disappointed and turned sorrowfully away. Their brightest hopes went down in tears and gloom when he dropped His head upon His blood-stained and heaving breast, and said: "It is finished." The grave, to the doubting disciple, enveloped everything, with no ray of light beyond it. All is disappointment. Not a friendly star rolled in view from the thunder's home to guide the weary pilgrims of earth. Not a word of hope came from the home beyond the river, to bring consolation to the broken-hearted. Not a being on earth could wipe away the falling tear, or say to the troubled spirit: "Peace, be still." Wicked men rejoiced, believing that the "gates of hell" were victorious. He rested in the grave until the dawn of the first day of the week. An angel descended from heaven and rolled back the mighty stone from the door of the sepulcher, saying by his radiant face: "Roll back, roll back, ye mighty clouds of sin, death and darkness, and let the conquering one arise." The earth trembled. The soldiers became as dead men. Death yielded up her prey. The "gates of hell" were overcome. Satan was vanquished—conquered—on his own battlefield. Life was purchased for a dying race!

Joy to the world, the Lord revived! Joy to the poor, for He brings them "unsearchable riches;" joy to the rich, for He teaches them to use their riches for His glory; joy to the suffering, for He whispers "Peace, be still;" joy to the thirsty, for the "water of life" flows in beauty from the summit of Calvary; joy to the hungry, for He brings them the "bread of life;" joy to the captives, for He offers liberty; joy to the dying, for He has abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel; joy to the homeless, for He promises an eternal home beyond the shadows; joy to

the heathens, for the wilderness shall blossom as the rose; joy to the "desert places" in human life, for His love is as boundless as His mercy, and its crystal tides will flow on forever; joy to the whole earth, for the sun will never set on the advancing columns of His victorious army; joy to all nations, tribes and tongues, for the scheme finished by His resurrection is as deep as the stains of sin, as wide as the demands of our sinful condition, and as high as the eternal throne; joy to the angels of heaven, for they shall worship Him in the presence of the Father; joy to us, for He shall come again and bring an eternal benediction to those who love and serve Him!

The Christian foundation has stood the test. It is stronger than death, Satan or the grave. The claims of Jesus are now established. He is all that He claimed to be. Paul teaches that Christ was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom., 1:4). When he arose again He assumed "all power in heaven and in earth" (Matt., 28:18). After this event He said to John: "Fear not, I am the first and the last; I am he that liveth and was dead; and behold I am alive forevermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death" (Rev., 1:17, 18). Jesus is the foundation of the Church. This foundation was tried when He arose from the dead. The foundation was laid in Zion, the city of Jerusalem, Wherever the foundation is laid the building must begin and go forward to completion. It would be a mistake, to say the least of it, to lay the foundation in Zion, which is Jerusalem, and erect the building on "the banks of the Jordan," in Rome, in London, in Oxford, or anywhere else. Jesus said: "I will build my Church." This was before His death. After His glorification, Luke says: "Great fear came upon all the Church" (Acts, 5:11). Jesus referred to the Church as something in the future. Luke spoke of it as an actual institution. Taking the Savior's promise and the testimony of Luke, we naturally conclude that the Church was established between the two given points. But where was the Church first built in fulfill-

ment of the promise of Jesus? Let inspiration answer and mortal man be silent: "The Church which was at Jerusalem" (Acts, 8:1). If the Church were established in Jerusalem, it was not established in the days of Abel, Abraham or John the Baptist, nor in Rome, London, Oxford, Geneva or Wittenburg.

The scheme of redemption, as we have seen, was unfolded as man was able to comprehend it. God proceeded with reference to His will and man's condition. The beginning, time and place, was announced centuries before the advent of Christ, "It shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob: and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion (Zion is another name for Jerusalem) shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem" (Isa., 2:1-3; Mic., 4:1-3). This prediction was made by Isaiah 760 years before Christ Micah repeated it 710 years before Christ Hear David: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies" (Ps., 110:1, 2). Hear Zechariah: "And it shall be in that day, that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the former sea, and half of them toward the hinder sea; in summer and winter it shall be, and the Lord shall be King over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one" (Zech., 14:8, °).

After Jesus arose from the dead He appeared unto His disciples frequently. Just before He ascended to the Father He gave them authority to "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." One of the disciples who had every opportunity to see, hear and know, gives us the following report of what He did and said just before He departed: "Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand

the Scriptures, and said unto them: Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem, And ye are witnesses of these things, and, behold, I send the promises of My Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high" (Luke, 24:45-49). In obedience to His word they "returned to Jerusalem." Here Jesus marks Jerusalem as the "beginning corner." He commanded His apostles to remain in Jerusalem, promising to send the Holy Spirit to guide them; after which they were to testify of Him "in Jerusalem and in all Judea and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth" (Acts, 1:1-8). Peter, the apostle, recognized Jerusalem as the beginning of his official labors (Acts, 2:1-10; 11:15). Paul says: "Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us air (Gal., 4:26). How many of the religious orders represented in this assembly acknowledge this? Again he says: "Ye are come unto Mount Sion (Jerusalem), and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant (testament), and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel" (Heb., 12:22-24).

The fact that the day of Pentecost is the birthday of the Church has always been recognized. "—*Lechler*, in *Lange's Com. on Acts*, 2:4, p. 53.

The history of the distinctively *Christian Church* commences with the first great act of the risen and glorified Redeemer; the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. "—*Guericke's Ch. Hist.*, p. 43.

"The first of all the Christian Churches founded by the apostles was that of Jerusalem; and after the form and model of this, all the others of that age were constituted. "—*Mosheim EC. Hist.*, *Harper's ed.*, 1 p. 46.

"On this day the new festival of Pentecost (the joyful, happy, and blessed kingdom of Christ, which is full of gladness, courage, and security) was founded." —*Lechler, in Lange's Com. on Acts, 2:4.*

"This book (Acts) is, therefore, a witness of apostolic doctrine and primitive Christianity; a rule and guide for the government, discipline, and the order of the Church; an army which furnishes the Church with weapons in its conflict with antichrist; a repository that offers a remedy for every soul-destroying disease engendered by errors in the faith and offences in the life and conduct of men; a storehouse which abundantly nourishes faith, patience and hope; a mirror and a stimulus, promoting love and its appropriate works; a treasury abounding in learning and sound doctrine." —*Starke, quoted in Lange's Acts, Int., p. 2.*

"This Church at Jerusalem was composed of those only who "gladly received the word and were baptized." Their *unity of spirit* was their *beauty of holiness*. This Church, so constituted, is the acknowledged pattern or model by which other Christian Churches were formed (I. These., 2:14), since the law was to go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, This community of Christians was also the arbitrator in spiritual affairs during apostolic days, and must be allowed still to be the standard of doctrine and practice of every Christian Church, aided as it was by all the wisdom of inspired teachers; and particularly since no promise is found in the Scriptures allowing us to expect those extraordinary aids to qualify any man in forming any other Church than the New Testament presents. This Christian assembly, as it was the first, so is it the mother-church in the Christian dispensation. "—*Orchard's Hist. Baptist, 1:6, 7.*

"That the heralds of Divine grace should begin at Jerusalem, was appointed both graciously and wisely; graciously, as it encouraged the greatest sinners to repent, when they saw that even the murderers of Christ were not excepted from mercy; and wisely, as hereby Christianity was more abundantly attested, the facts being published first on the very spot where they

happened. "—Benson's Commentaries on *Luke*, 24:47.

In the Book of Acts we see how the Church of Christ was formed and settled. * * * As far as any Church can show that it has followed this model, so far it is *holy* and *apostolic*. And when *all* churches or congregations of people, professing Christianity, shall be founded and regulated according to the *doctrines* and *discipline* laid down in the Book of Acts of the Apostles, then the aggregate body may be justly called *the Holy Apostolic and Catholic Church*. "—Adam Clark, *Preface to Commentary on Acts*.

"*Beginning at Jerusalem.* ' This was the dwelling of His murderers, and it shows His readiness to forgive the vilest sinners. It was the holy place of the temple, the habitation of God, the place of the solemnities of the ancient dispensation, to which the Messiah came, and it was proper that pardon should first be proclaimed there." See Acts 2. —Barnes' Notes on *Luke*, 24:47.

Before proceeding further with my argument, allow me for a few moments to contrast the two institutions. It is only by contrast that the glory of the latter can be seen. Therefore I indulge the hope that you follow me honestly and criticize me unsparingly.

The Bible naturally divides itself into two distinct parts, the Old Testament and the New Testament. What is the difference between them? Is the New Testament a continuation of the Old Testament, or is it a new and separate institution? A Scriptural answer to these questions will help us to reach satisfactory conclusions in reference to our duty under the mediation of Christ and the authority of the apostles. Both Testaments came by Divine authority, and one is just as perfect as the other for the accomplishment of the purpose of the Lord. The moon is as perfect as the sun, yet it can not be denied that the sun is the source of light and heat. The Old Testament was limited in its application. It was intended for only a very small part of the world, Abraham and his descendants. If you will read the seventeenth chapter of Genesis, you will find a full description of the

covenant and the people who are to receive and enjoy its blessings. Two classes of people were to participate in its privileges and honors. (1) Those who were born in Abraham's house, (2) Those who were bought with his money. You can not claim membership under either of these provisions; hence you can never become a member of the Abrahamic covenants. This institution was not developed until the days of Moses. Indeed, it extended from the promise made to Abraham unto the death of Christ. You have observed that God gave him two promises (Gen., 12:1-3). The development and fulfillment of the first included the Jews as a nation, the Levitical priesthood, and the most remarkable people in the world. The unfolding and accomplishment of the second embraces the gospel of Jesus Christ, or the good news of God manifested to all the world. The development of the first promise belonged to the administration of the law of Moses, The development of the second was "through the blood of the everlasting covenant;" in other words, the New Testament dedicated or sealed by the blood of Christ (Heb., 13:20). The old covenant was intended for one nation, the Jews (Gen., 17:1-13); the new covenant is intended for all nations and all ages (Matt., 28:18-20). The old covenant was dedicated by the blood of animals (Heb., 9:19); the gospel is sanctified by the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot (I. Pet, 1:19). The old covenant was administered by a priesthood composed of frail men (Heb., 7:11); the new covenant is administered by the everlasting priest, Jesus the Christ (Heb., 7:28). The old covenant sacrifices were offered "year by year continually" (Heb., 10:1); the new covenant sacrifice was offered when Jesus gave Himself "a ransom for all" (I. Tim., 2:5, 6). Circumcision in the flesh and made by hands (Eph., 2:11) was the distinctive feature of the first covenant; circumcision in the heart and character are distinctive features of the second covenant (Rom., 2:29; Col., 2:11). The Bible answers all legitimate questions concerning our deliverance from the thralldom of sin. It is the word of God.

It separates God's methods of revealing Himself into the two Testaments, and you can not confound them unless you do it at your peril. It is a dangerous thing to interfere with the book of God, or to mix things which He has made distinct.

Looking backward to that which was accomplished through the old covenant or the law of Moses, the apostle Paul, with the gospel in his heart and the light of heaven shining around his path, made a number of declarations concerning the first covenant that ought to attract the attention of every man who desires to be saved: (1) The law was only a shadow of the good things to come: "Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle; for see, saith He, that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount" (Heb., 8:5). (2) It could not produce righteousness: "I do not frustrate the grace of God; for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain" (Gal., 2:21). (3) It could not produce perfection: "For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God" (Heb., 7:19). (4) It could not produce life: "Is the law then against the promise of God? God forbid; if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law" (Gal., 3:21). (5) It could not give a good conscience: "Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, *as* pertaining to the conscience" (Heb., 9:9). (6) It could not justify the people: "By him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts, 13:39). (7) The law was ended when Christ died upon the cross: "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth" (Rom., 10:4). (8) It is abolished or done away: "But if the ministration of death, written and engraved in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold

the *face* of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which was done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious" (II. Cor., 3:7-11). (9) It has been taken away: "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second" (Heb., 10:9). (10) It was fulfilled by Jesus Christ: "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill" (Matt., 5:17). (11) It was nailed to the cross: "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us; which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross" (Col, 2:14). (12) We are not under the law: "For sin shall not have dominion over you, for ye are not under the law but under grace" (Rom., 6:14). You can not seek for or obtain pardon under the law, for it is abolished. Therefore in your attempts to divide the word of truth, and find the beginning corner, you should make a careful discrimination between the law of Moses and the gospel of Christ.

What is the new testament or covenant? Where did it begin? What does it embrace? The Bible answers: "For finding fault with them, He saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I shall make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people; and they shall not teach every man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest

For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away" (Jer., 31:31-34; Heb., 8:8-13). This is a significant passage. Observe: (1) That God found fault with the old covenant. (2) He declared that He would make another. (3) That it was to be unlike the old one. (4) That He would write His law in the minds and hearts of the people, and not upon tables of stone. (5) That all should know the Lord, from the least unto the greatest (6) That sins should be forgiven, and therefore remembered no more. (7) The first covenant waxed old and passed away. If there is a doubt lingering in your minds in reference to the new covenant, this plain and comprehensive statement ought to destroy it forever: "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises" (Heb., 8:6). ;

Jesus Christ is the testator of the new testament, the apostles are the witnesses, and the patrimony is eternal life: "For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth" (Heb., 9:16, 17). A testament is no more nor no less than a will. The New Testament is the will of Christ. No will or testament can be enforced before the death of the testator. Therefore, the new testament was not enforced during the natural life of Jesus. The cross of Jesus is the dividing line. The law of Moses was in full force until "the veil of the temple was rent in twain from top to bottom" (Mark, 15:38). Jesus Christ observed the law and commanded His disciples to do likewise (Matt., 23:1-3). During the three years of His ministry He was submitting the principles of His will to His chosen witnesses. When He died upon the cross He sealed forever the lessons He taught them. When did they bear witness to His life, works and

words? Not until the day of Pentecost It was impossible for them to begin before that time. The law began at Mount Sinai, and the gospel in the city of Jerusalem after Jesus went up on high (Ex, 20:1-17; Isa., 2:1-3).

The gospel of Christ is deeper, more positive and more extensive in its demands than the law of Moses was. Do you ask for proof? Here it is. The law of Moses said: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain" (Ex., 20:7). The New Testament says: "Let your communications be, Yea, yea; nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil" (Matt., 5:37). The law of Moses said: "Thou shalt not kill" (Ex., 20:13). The New Testament says: "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him" (I. John, 3:15). The law of Moses said: "Thou shalt not steal" (Ex., 20:15). The New Testament says: "Let him that stole steal no more; but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth" (Eph., 4:28), The law of Moses said: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor" (Ex., 20:61). The New Testament says: "But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ" (Eph, 4:15). The law of Moses said: "Thou shalt not covet" (Ex., 20:17). The New Testament says: "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor, therefore love is the fulfilling of the law" (Rom., 13:10).

It is assumed by this convention that the Church was established before the day of Pentecost. Let us see:

1. If it were established before the death of Christ and the authoritative announcement of it on Pentecost, it was established under the law of Moses; *Jesus took away the first that He might establish the second* (Heb., 10:9). See Matt., 23:1-3; Rom., 1:4; Eph. 2:14, 15; Col., 2:14.

2. If it were established before the death of Christ and the authoritative announcement of it on Pentecost,

it was established before the foundation was *tried* (Isa., 28:16; I. Cor., 3:10, 11; Rev., 1:17, 18).

3. If it were established before the death of Christ and the authoritative announcement of it on Pentecost, it was established before the death of the testator, which is contrary to custom, law and reason (Heb., 9:15, 17).

4. If it were established before the death of Christ and the authoritative announcement of it on Pentecost, it was established under a limited commission (Matt., 10:2-7).

5. If it were established before the death of Christ and the authoritative announcement of it on Pentecost, it was established before the resurrection of the dead became a settled fact, and therefore before its members had any certain knowledge of the future life (Mark, 9:1-9; I. Cor., 15:12-19).

6. If it were established before the death of Christ and the authoritative announcement of it on Pentecost, it was established before the atonement (Matt., 20; 28; 26:28; John, 10:11; Rom., 5:8-11; I. Cor., 6:20; Heb., 9:12).

7. If it were established before the death of Christ and the authoritative announcement of it on Pentecost, it was established before Jesus became the head of the Church (Eph., 18:1-23; Cot, 1:18).

8. If it were established before the death of Christ and the authoritative announcement of it on Pentecost, it was established before Jesus was recognized as King (John, 6:15; Acts, 2:36).

9. If it were established before the death of Christ and the authoritative announcement of it on Pentecost, it was established before the gift of the Holy Spirit, and was therefore a dead body (John, 7:38, 39; Jas., 2:26).

10. If it were established before the death of Christ and the authoritative announcement of it on Pentecost, it was established before Jesus became Priest, and therefore its members, having no Mediator, could not approach the Father (Heb., 7:28; 8:4).

11. If it were established before the death of Christ and the authoritative announcement of it on Pentecost, it was established before Jesus became the Intercessor (Heb., 7:25, 26).

12. If it were established before the death of Christ and the authoritative announcement of it on Pentecost, it was established before the Gospel could be preached in full, and it did not have any Cross in it (I. Cor, 15:1-4; Gal., 6:14).

13. If it were established before the death of Christ and the authoritative announcement of it on Pentecost, it was established before the completion of the Divine side of Redemption (John, 19:30).

14. If it were established before the death of Christ and the authoritative announcement of it on Pentecost, it was established before His friends understood and believed Him (Matt., 18:1-3; Mark, 9:31, 32; Luke, 24:11; John, 20:24, 25).

15. If it were established before the death of Christ and the authoritative announcement of it on Pentecost, it was established before they were at liberty to proclaim Christ (Matt., 16:20).

Beginning with the first flickering uncertain ray of hope that fell athwart the crumbling walls of Eden lost, we have traced its unfolding through the majestic march of forty centuries, listening as we advance to the heartrending wail of the dying sinner, the triumphant acclaim of the dying saint, the joyous notes of prophet's lyre ringing in harmony with the higher hopes of man, until at last, upon Golgotha's rugged heights, the cross, with its arms outstretched to embrace the world, the dying Saviour burst upon our enraptured vision!

Calvary passed, on to Pentecost! The first Pentecost after the ascension of Jesus was the highest, brightest, grandest day in the world's history. All lines of history, past and present, converge there.

I. *It was the first time the disciples heard from Jesus after He bade them farewell at Bethany* (Luke, 24:45-53; Acts, 2:1-21). He was condemned as unworthy to

live among men, and crucified by those whom He came to save. He told His disciples to tarry at Jerusalem. He wafted to them a farewell benediction, and appealed His cause to the righteous Judge on high. They returned to the place appointed and waited patiently for about a week. "When the day of Pentecost was fully come," they learned that Jesus had been received in heaven as the "mediator between God and man. "

II. *The Holy Spirit came into the world to abide forever.* Jesus promised this comforter to His disciples before He left them (John, 16:7-11; Acts, 2:1-21). The Spirit's mission was two-fold: (1) He was to comfort the disciples during the absence of their Teacher and Friend. (2) He was to convict the world of sin, righteousness and judgment. They could not preach until the Holy Spirit brought to their remembrance the things spoken and commanded by the Lord (John, 14:26; I. Pet, 1:12).

III. *The prophecies of David, Isaiah, Micah, Joel and Zechariah were fulfilled* (Ps., 110:1-5; Isa., 2:1-3; Micah, 4:1-2; Joel, 2:28-32; Zech., 14:1-9; Acts, 2:1-41). Centuries before, these "holy men of God" had looked down the dusty pathway of time to the coronation of the Christ as the King of heaven and earth, and predicted the beginning and triumphs of His succeeding reign. If their predictions were not fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, they remain unfulfilled to this day.

IV. *The apostles, for the first time, used the keys of the Kingdom* (Matt., 16:19; 18:18, 19; John, 20:21-23; Acts, 2:1-41). They began on this day to unfold the Great Commission. Their words and actions were ratified in heaven. They spoke as Christ's representatives, and if we desire to know His will, we have only to appeal to the record. Every transaction in apostolic times corresponds with the facts, commandments and promises here submitted. Every religious transaction in this age which deviates from the teaching of Peter and his associates is wrong in proportion to its distance from what they taught.

V. *The first law of remission was proclaimed in the*

name of *Jesus Christ*. He had previously preached and worked in His Father's name (John, 5:43; Heb., 10:7). To the believing Jews, Peter said: "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 Spirit" (Acts, 2:38). Paul says: "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Col., 3:17).

VI. *The first additions were made to the Church*. Jesus said at Caesarea Philippi, "I will build my Church" (Matt., 16:13-19). After making this promise "he charged his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus Christ" (Matt., 16:20). They could not make additions to the Church and keep this charge. In fact His apostles themselves did not understand the nature of His work until after His resurrection. All the while they expected Him to re-establish the throne of David in Jerusalem, and begin to reign over the Jewish people. Peter rebelled when informed that his Jesus would be slain (Matt., 16:21-23). After He arose again they desired Him to restore again the kingdom to Israel (Acts, 1:6). The Holy Spirit enlightened their minds; after which they understood their mission. The result of their first day's labor is summed up by Luke: "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls" (Acts, 2:41).

VII. *The law of remission of sins published at the beginning was to continue to the end of time* (Matt., 28:18-20; Acts, 2:1-41). The day of Pentecost was the introduction of the grandest era that ever dawned upon a sinful race; a day to be remembered by all generations. It is literally the fountain of pure Christianity. The record of it left for us is remarkable for its brevity, simplicity and comprehensiveness. The apostles waited until they received authority from on high. When it came they began to preach. It is worthy of observation that they did not discuss such questions as "hereditary total depravity," "effectual calling" or "final perseverance of the saints." The sermon was full of Christ from one end to the other. The following

points are developed: (1) The introduction, consisting of a brief reference to the immediate surroundings and the prophecies that were then being fulfilled. (2) God sent His Son Jesus Christ into the world. (3) He proved Him by miracles, wonders and signs. (4) The Jews crucified and slew Him. (5) God raised Him from the dead. (6) The apostles were witnesses of these facts. (7) He is glorified in heaven. (8) The wonderful demonstrations which they beheld were from Him. (9) He is both Lord and Christ (10) The people were cut to the heart and inquired what to do. (11) They were told what to do. (12) They did it and were saved; added to the Church. (13) There were no failures; not one went away seeking, inquiring, or mourning.

Thus the gospel began according to "the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," and thus it continued uncorrupted for many years. If men had continued to drink at the fountain instead of the corrupted stream, the sects represented in this convention would have been unknown to history. Not one of them can find its name in the Bible. Not one of them, excepting Roman Catholic, can trace its existence to history beyond the sixteenth century, and Roman Catholicism is as far from the Bible as heaven is from earth. The Church established in Jerusalem in the year 33 was universally recognized as "one body," all members of which entered into it the same way. There were different congregations in the land of Judea, but in the aggregate they constituted the body of Christ. They were united by truth and brotherly love. They had a single mission—the conversion of the world to Christ. I am in favor of going back to Jerusalem, and this means a return to apostolic Christianity in letter and spirit How many of you are in favor of this? Are your faces. turned toward Zion? Are you willing to abandon your creeds and walk in the "old paths?" Are you willing to be simply members of the Church of Christ —Christians? Are you willing to be guided by the Scriptures in faith and practice? Will you unite with me upon the "Bible and the Bible alone?" We need

not formulate a new creed. We must go back beyond Rome, from whence came Roman Catholicism; back beyond London, from whence came Episcopalianism; back beyond Oxford, from whence came Methodism; back beyond Geneva, from whence came Calvinism; back beyond Wittenburg, from whence came Lutheranism; back beyond England, back beyond Scotland, from whence came Presbyterianism; back beyond America, from whence came Mormonism; *back*, **BACK**, **BACK** to the old foundation at Jerusalem: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God!"

CHAPTER XXIV.

PEACEMAKER

"For it is not ye that speak but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you" (Matt.. 10:20).

"It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the -words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life" (John, 6:63).

"But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (I. Cor., 2:14).

"Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into" (I. Pet., 1:12).

Our friend, Inquirer, raised a question which must be clearly answered before we can even approximate the unity in heart and work which the New Testament requires, viz.: How does the Holy Spirit operate upon the hearts of men in order to their enlightenment and redemption? It is universally admitted among religious people that the Bible contains the grandest principles that ever demanded the attention of a sinful race; that it contains the only reliable history of man's origin, condition, duty and destiny; that it is the only revelation God has ever made to His rebellious creatures; that it spans all time, and rests upon eternity past and eternity to come; that it tells of man as he was in his primeval home in the delightful Eden, man as he is since the disobedience, and man as he will be when the probation of life is over; that it unfolds to the mind the gradual development of the plan of salvation, from the banishment of our ancestors to the crucifixion of Christ; that it shows how God dealt with Patriarchs and prophets under former dispensations; and how He

deals with us under the "dispensation of grace;" that it is "profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness;" that it thoroughly furnishes the Christian unto every good work. ALL the denominations represented in this convention unite in one grand and triumphant declaration that the word of God is sufficient in matters of faith and practice; yet we frequently hear them use such expressions as "apply the word," "send home to the word," "back the word," "render the word effectual," "Pentecostal showers," and "accompany the word," thus indicating that they believe that something in addition to the word of God is necessary to render it effectual. "What power," they sometimes inquire, "is there in the mere word? Can ink and paper awaken the dead sinner and give him spiritual life!" Jesus said: "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words which I speak unto you, they are the spirit and they are the life" (John, 6:63). The word of God certainly is not a "dead letter," and I suggest to my friends who use those expressions that the power is not simply in the "ink and paper," but in the Divine intelligence communicated in words adapted to the human understanding. When a man reads or hears the word of God, his Creator is literally addressing him. Glancing backward over the ages, taking the Bible as our telescope, we find to our satisfaction that God has embodied His will in human language under all dispensations, Patriarchal, Jewish and Christian, and I do not think that there is embraced in all the literature of all the centuries a single spiritual thought that is not traceable, either directly or indirectly, to this Divine source. It is to the spiritual universe what the sun is to the natural universe. If we are in darkness, it is our light-house. If we are weak, it is our strength. If we are ignorant, it is our instructor. If we are in trouble, it is our everlasting consolation. God has spoken to man by His own voice! through the holy prophets; His Son our Lord Jesus Christ; and finally the gospel was preached by the apostles "with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven;" but every message has been presented in

words; living, instructive, elevating, burning, everlasting words, and when the last book of the New Testament was written, He placed the seal upon it, and from that day forward no additional revelation has been made, and for all time to come men will be absolutely dependent upon the "Bible, and the Bible alone." It is perfect. It can not be improved. If men refuse to hear it they would refuse a messenger from the dead (Luke, 16:31).

, Before Jesus ascended to the Father He promised His apostles that He would not leave them comfortless. He said: "Nevertheless I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you, and when he is come, he will reprove (convict) the word of sin and of righteousness, and of judgment of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged" (John, 16:7-11). "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you" (John, 14:26). "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me, and ye shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning" (John, 15:26, 27). "If ye love me, keep my commandments, and I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world can not receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you and shall be in you. I will not leave you comfortless (orphans): I will come to you" (John, 14:15-18). "For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you" (Matt., 10:20). Luke describes the scene which followed the fulfillment of those promises in the following language: "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they

were all with one accord in one place, and suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them, and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance" (Acts, 2:1-4). No one who accepts the Bible as an inspired revelation will deny that God works in the hearts of men by the Holy Spirit; that He is to comfort the Church and convict the world. But the question arises: What means does He use, and how are His power and presence known? For example, will the Holy Spirit make the white man black, or the black man white? Evidently he will not Will the Holy Spirit make the ignorant man wise, or enlighten the mind of the sinner? Unquestionably He will. If these statements are true, and they will not be denied, the Holy Spirit does not work upon the physical body, the "natural man," or the "heart of flesh," but upon the "inner man," the "hidden man of the heart" What is man? What are constitutional parts? Man is a being in whom spirit and matter, heaven and earth, and time and eternity are associated. His body, "our earthly house of this tabernacle," comes from the earth, and to the bosom of the earth it must return. His spirit, "the immortal part," comes from God and to Him it must return (Ecc., 12:7; Heb., 12:9). "But," says Inquirer, "I should like to hear a little more Scripture bearing on the creation of man—his elementary parts." Well, to the Scriptures let us turn: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul" (Gen., 2:7). "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it" (Ecc., 12:7). "For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting" (Gal.. 6:8). "The flesh profiteth nothing" (John, 6:63). "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die" (Rom., 8:13). "The

natural man" (I. Cor., 2:14). The "outward man" and the "inward man" (II. Cor., 4:16). "The hidden man of the heart," "that which is not corruptible," a "meek and quiet spirit" (I. Pet, 3:4). "Reprobate minds," or "minds devoid of judgment" (Rom., 1:28). "Blinded the minds" (It Cor., 4:4). "The pure in heart" (Matt., 5:8). "Pure in mind" (II. Peter, 3:1). "Our heart is enlarged" (II. Cor., 6:11). "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God" (Acts, 26:18). "The eyes of your understanding being enlightened" (Eph., 1:18). "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness" (Rom., 10:10). "So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin" (Rom., 7:25). These passages are sufficient to inform us in reference to our constituent elements, their condition in sin and their respective relations to the work of redemption. They indicate to an unerring certainty that the Spirit does not operate upon our natural bodies like heat, cold or electricity, but upon our minds; that the faculties of the "inner man" are enlightened and elevated. The feelings of the flesh are delusive. We can not decide by them whether we are influenced by the "spirit of truth" or the "spirit of error." A man may be honestly mistaken and still be happy, but if he is led by the words of the Spirit as they are presented to us in, the New Testament, he can not be mistaken, neither can he fall into gloom and doubt. The work of redemption begins by planting the "story of the cross" in the heart, mind, and it is to be carried on until it subjugates the whole man to the will of God.

Jesus promised His disciples that the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, the Comforter, the Spirit of the Father, should come into the world and abide forever (John, 14:16). In the face of this undeniable testimony I hear people, who are doubtless sincere in doing so, pray to God to "send the Spirit from on high;" "pour out thy Spirit upon us;" "baptize us with the Holy Spirit and with fire;" or "send some means of thine own appointing to convert these sinners," or

"come, dear Lord, and bless these mourners;" or affirm with confidence that men are saved by a "direct putting forth of the Spirit from the throne of God, or that "God saves men independently of the word." The entire mourner's been," or "anxious seat? practice, so prevalent among Methodists and Baptists, especially in the less enlightened communities, is based upon the supposition that salvation is obtainable through other means than those ordained of God: faith in Christ through the words of the gospel; and obedience to His law. If God converts men by the words of the Spirit, the New Testament, the petitions and practices just described are wrong. If God converts the sinner independently of His word, it is absolutely a "dead letter," Did any man in this convention ever hear of the conversion of a sinner who had not, in some way become acquainted with the gospel of Christ? If God converts sinners independently of His word in this country. He will do it in all countries, and I should be glad to know why so many of the "evangelical denominations" send missionaries to preach the gospel in foreign lands— among the heathen. If He does the work here, He will do it there without the assistance of our feeble efforts. If there is a "direct putting forth of the Spirit," the work of the ministry is useless. The money we spend for books, tracts and religious newspapers, should be appropriated to something else. Human accountability is at an end if a sinner must wait for what is called God's "own good time." Says Brother Baptist: "A man must experience something in addition to the assurances of the mere word." Suppose we admit that this is true, by what standard is he to decide his acceptance? "He must feel it." Feelings are not reliable, for "the flesh profiteth nothing." He might experience too much or too little. Or he might experience the influence of "an evil spirit." The feelings which are supposed to result from the so-called conversion of many do not last. When the excitement is over the good feelings depart, and the person at once begins to doubt. We must "live-by faith," making our trust in Christ translated into living deeds, with the promises of the gospel

our assurance of everlasting life. The man who reads the Bible, meditates upon its precepts, obeys its commands, and lives in sight of the cross, will be "strong in the Lord and the power of his might," but the man who does not appreciate these means will be a moral weakling, to say the least of it. Bear in mind I do not deny that there is a Holy Spirit, nor that He is instrumental in the conversion of the world, but I do assert in all confidence that He operates through the word of God, and it alone. If this is true, it is indispensably necessary to send missionaries to respond to the "Macedonian cry." It is necessary to "preach the gospel to every creature." It is necessary to publish the truth through the instrumentality of books, tracts and newspapers. Most of my friends in this assembly virtually admit that this argument is correct, for when a revival is proposed among them, they endeavor to procure the most talented, eloquent and magnetic preacher attainable, thus indicating that they believe that there is power in the spoken word. When they buy books, papers or tracts, they get the best. "But," urges Brother Presbyterian, "the Spirit accompanies the word." Where is the chapter and verse in the Bible which says so? If the minister rehearses the words of Jesus, "they are spirit and they are life." If he preaches his opinions or uses such arguments as will excite rather than enlighten, there is no "spirit of truth" about them. Look at these additional facts: The spirit was to "speak," "teach," "testify," "comfort," "convict." In the second and third chapters of the Revelation, I find the following statement seven times: "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches." The last invitation in the New Testament is embraced in the following language: "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely" (Rev., 22:17).

Many centuries have gone to dwell with the years beyond the flood since this invitation was given, but the Divine Spirit is still calling to the weary and disappointed ones of earth to come and drink at "the

fountain free," drink and never thirst, obey and never die.

My next argument is based upon the fact that in the work of redemption, whatever is ascribed to the office work of the Holy Spirit is ascribed to the gospel: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (John, 3:6). "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently; being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever" (I. Peter, 1:22, 23). "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, though sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" (I. Peter, 1:2). "But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth" (II. These., 2:13). "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth" (John, 17:17). "The Spirit of grace" (Heb., 10:29). "The word of his grace" (Acts, 20:32). "Quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you" (Rom., 8:11). "My soul cleaveth unto the dust, quicken thou me according to thy word" (Ps., 119:25). "Thou gavest also thy good Spirit to instruct them, and withheldest not thy manna from their mouth, and gavest them water for their thirst" (Neh., 9:20). All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works" (II. Tim., 3:16, 17).

I glean the following from these quotations: Born of the word, born of the Spirit; sanctified through the Spirit, sanctified through the truth; the Spirit of grace, the word of grace; quickened by the Spirit, quickened by the word; instructed by the Spirit, instructed by the Scriptures.

Paul says: "For the preaching of the cross is to them

that perish, foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God" (I. Cor., 1:18). Please examine this passage carefully, especially the phrases "the preaching of the cress" and "the power of God." How could the apostle have made this statement if there is "an immediate power" or "putting forth the Spirit" in conversion? "For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified" (I. Cor., 2:2). If there is a power to convert outside of "Jesus Christ and him crucified," the apostle was determined not to "know" it among the Corinthians. "But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world" (Gal., 6:14). If the commonly accepted theory of spiritual influence is true, the apostle refused to glory in it. "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). Observe, the apostle uses a definite article before the word gospel, and also before the word power. He does not say, "a power" or "some power," but *the* power." He does not say anything about the gospel being a dead letter, or the necessity of the Spirit accompanying it in order to render it effectual. This argument is unmistakably plain. Hence I conclude that the same apostle spoke an important truth when he said: "The sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God" (Eph.. 6:17).

Jesus said: "Behold, a sower went forth to sow; and when he sowed, some seeds fell by the wayside, and the fowls came and devoured them up; some fell upon stony places, where they had not much earth, and forthwith they sprung up because they had no deepness of earth, and when the sun was up, they were scorched, and because they had no root, they withered away; and some fell among thorns, and the thorns sprung up, and choked them: but others fell into good ground, and brought forth fruit, some a hundredfold, some sixtyfold, some thirtyfold. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear" (Matt., 13:3-9). The disciples did not

understand this parable, hence the great Teacher explained it to them. (1) The sower is the Son of man, the Son of God (Matt., 13:37). (2) The field is the world, all mankind (Matt., 13:38). (3) The seed is the word of God, the glad tidings of Christ (Luke, 8:11). (4) The wayside represents persons who hear the word and understand it not. The devil, who understands the power of good seed, the word of God, comes and steals it out of their hearts, lest they should believe it and be saved (Luke, 8:12). (5) The stony ground represents a person who hears the word and receives it with joy: "Yet hath not root in himself but dureth for a while; for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended" (Matt., 13:20, 21). (6) The thorny ground represents persons who receive the "seed of the kingdom," but failing to cultivate it, the cares of the world, the deceit-fulness of riches, the allurements of sin, the dreams of ambition, choke it, overcome it, and it brings forth no perfect fruit (Mark, 4:18, 19). (7) The good ground represents persons who possess "good and honest hearts;" who hear the word of God and understand it, and bring forth fruit to perfection; some thirty, some sixty and some one hundred fold. There are six grades of people (character) in this parable; the bad, worse and worst; the good, better and best. It is shown here, in unmistakable simplicity, that in order to spiritual life, spiritual seed must be sown in the rich soil of a "good and honest heart;" not by some mysterious, supernatural or irresistible power, but by the persuasive proclamation of the cross; the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Since creation's dawning, there is not an instance in all history where a tree or a cornstalk has grown to perfection without the planting and subsequent cultivation which nature has ordained, and since the inauguration of the gospel dispensation, there is no proof that any one has been converted in the absence of the words of eternal truth. Every one of the six characters in this parable received the seed, but only three of them produced perfect fruit. The first one permitted the devil to steal the word out of

his heart. If he had obeyed the apostolic injunction: "Resist the devil" (Jas., 4:7), the result would have been different. The second one became offended because the word was not popular with his associates, and he could not endure their persecutions. The third one received the word, but he loved "this present world," and therefore neglected to attend to his spiritual and eternal interests. The three last received the word and cultivated it, and produced fruit according to talent. It is believed by many who are considered "orthodox Christians," that all men are "totally depraved;" that their minds strive against the influence of the Holy Spirit until they are overpowered and brought into submission. Now, if this is true, I affirm that, as God is omnipotent, every person to whom the Spirit comes will be converted, whether he is willing or not, and the "parable of the sower," the persuasion, conviction and conversion process is not applicable to the situation. Peter, the apostle, doubtless understood this, for he said: "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever. For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away; but the word of the Lord endureth forever, and this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you" (I. Pet., 1:23-25). He teaches that spiritual growth is produced by the "sincere milk of the word," and using the means ordained of God he informs the brethren that they may become a "spiritual house," a "holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ" (I. Pet., 2:1-5). John said: "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; 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, 20:30, 31). For what purpose did John write? That men might believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and believing, they may receive life through His name. Paul said: "For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom

knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe" (I. Cor., 1:21). He does not say that it pleases God to save where there is no preaching. Jesus said: "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you" (John, 15:3). Mark you, Brother Quaker, Jesus cleansed the hearts of His disciples through the spoken word! God said: "Is not my word like as a fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces" (Jer., 23:29)? Is the sinner's heart filled with trash? Introduce the word of God and it will consume it. Is his heart hard like a rock? Introduce the word of God and it will break it in pieces. Jesus said: "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. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live" (John, 5:24, 25). Is the sinner "dead in trespasses and sins?" Let him hear the word of God and he "shall live." James said: "Of his own. will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures. * * Wherefore lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls" (Jas., 1:1-8-21). Is the sinner lost? Announce to him that the "engrafted word" is able to save his soul. Paul said: "For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel" (I. Cor., 4:15). The Corinthians were made believers through the gospel of Christ. Paul said: "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom., 10:17). Solomon said: "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination" (Prov., 28:9). These passages exclude everything but the word of the Lord. All faith is based upon testimony. I am aware that some may say that believing evidence is merely a historical faith. There is one faith (Eph. 4:5), and it

comes by hearing the gospel. All religion is based upon history, facts. Is there a man in this convention who knows or believes anything concerning Moses or Jesus Christ, which he did not get from the Bible? The Divine arrangement is fact, testimony, faith. Where there is no testimony there is no faith. Where testimony begins faith begins, and where testimony ends faith ends. A man's faith may fall below the full measure of the facts and testimony of the gospel, but it can never rise above it To sustain these assertions beyond the possibility of doubt or contradiction. I appeal to the history of the work of the inspired apostles. There is not a single example given that even intimates that the work was done by supernatural agents, excepting as the Holy Spirit spoke through them, or in the absence of the second party, the preacher of the word: (1) The ambassadors of Jesus began their work in the city of Jerusalem. On the day of Pentecost they preached the gospel to the astonished Jews. They were cut to the heart, and inquired what to do. The apostles had a clear and well-defined plan by which to operate. They told them what to do. Result: "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about there thousand souls" (Acts, 2:1-41). (2) Peter and John went up into the temple at the hour of prayer. The lame man who was laid at the "Beautiful Gate" of the temple was Sealed. The people were astonished. They ran together in "Solomon's porch." Peter explained the power by which the miracle was performed, and rehearsed his argument delivered on the day of Pentecost. Result: "Howbeit may of them which heard the word believed; and the number of the men was about five thousand" (Acts, 4:4). (3) Stephen was a man of God; "full of faith and the Holy Spirit." He preached to the Jews in the city of Jerusalem. They resisted the Holy Spirit by stopping their ears end refusing to listen to his arguments. Their fathers had done this before them (Neh., 9:30). Result: They "cast him out of the city, and stoned him" (Acts, 7:1-60). Please contrast this with the record of the

apostolic labor on the day of Pentecost. If there is a direct operation of the Holy Spirit, if God comes as many prayers seem to indicate, I do not think He could be resisted by stopping the ears. (4) Philip introduced the gospel in the city of Samaria. Results: "When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of *God*, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women" (Acts, 8:12). (5) The same evangelist preached Jesus to the Ethiopian officer. Result: They came to a "certain water," and the officer commanded the chariot to stand still: "and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him, and when they were come up out of the water the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more; and he went on his way rejoicing" (Acts, 8:38, 39). (6) Saul of Tarsus persecuted the Church of Christ. He procured authority from the high priest to bind its members and cast them into prison. On his way to Damascus the Lord called to him from heaven, saying: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" He inquired what to do. The Lord directed him to go into the city, saying: "It shall be told thee what thou must do." He went. Annanias approached him. Result: "And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized" (Acts, 9:18). (7) Cornelius, the centurion, was a devout man, and one who feared God, with all his house, and gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God always. He saw an angel in his house, which stood and said unto him, "Send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter, who shall tell thee the words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved" (Acts 11:13, 14). They were saved by words. This is sustained by the testimony of the angel, the two servants and the soldier, Cornelius himself and the apostle Peter. Cornelius and his household were saved like all others, precisely as they were on the day of Pentecost Peter preached Christ. The people heard, believed, repented, and were baptized. The outpouring of the Holy Spirit

was accompanied by supernatural demonstrations which have not been repeated since the close of the apostolic age. These miraculous demonstrations were not conditions of salvation. If they had been they doubtless would have been repeated in all ages. If the Spirit is poured out in our day as on this household, men would be able to "speak with tongues," as they did. These manifestations were rather intended to convince Peter and the rest of the Jewish brethren, "That the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel" (Eph., 3:6). The Holy Spirit did not come on this occasion in answer to prayer, and it is a notable fact that He fell on those who heard the word, and those alone. (8) Lydia was a worshipper of God. She heard Paul preach the gospel. God thereby opened her heart Result: "She attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul," and "was baptized" (Acts, 16:14, 15). (9) Paul and Silas were in prison at Philippi for preaching the gospel and casting out evil spirits. At midnight they prayed and sang praises to God. The prisoners heard them. An earthquake shook the prison's foundation, opened its doors and loosed the bands of the prisoners. The jailer awoke and attempted to kill himself. Paul assured him that the prisoners had not escaped. He inquired what to do to be saved. Paul preached unto him the word of the Lord. Results: He and his believing household were baptized "the same hour of the night" (Acts, 16:25-34). (10) Paul preached at Athens, "in the midst of Mar's Hill. Result: "Certain men clave unto him, and believed" (Acts, 17:16-34). (11) He preached at Corinth. Result: "Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized" (Acts, 18:8). (12) He preached in the city of Rome. Result: "Some believed the things which were spoken, and some believed not" (Acts, 28:16-24).

I now proceed to sum up my argument, and submit to you some transcendently important propositions. I challenge your attention and invite your investigation:

1. God has never in any age or any country, by patriarch, priest, prophet, or apostle, promised the Holy Spirit to any person in unbelief or disobedience.

2. The Bible furnishes no record of any person in any age who received the Holy Spirit in unbelief and disobedience.

3. The Bible does not furnish the record of any sinner being commanded in any age to pray for, or expect, the gift of the Holy Spirit.

4. The Bible furnishes no command to the Church to pray for the Holy Spirit to come upon a man in unbelief and disobedience.

5. The advocates of the abstract work of the Holy Spirit can not present one thought concerning redemption, and demonstrate it to be true, that can not be found in the Bible.

6. Every operation that comes within the domain of the human mind is inseparably, in some form, connected with language. Man can not act without thinking; he can not think without words. Let the man who denies it, bring the proof to the contrary.

7. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the words on the minds of sinners, and God is no respecter of persons, why are there no believers where missionaries have not gone?

8. In every example of conversion recorded in the book of Acts, the preacher was present and the gospel was preached.

9. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, how is the sinner to distinguish His work from the work of other spirits, seeing there are many spirits in the world (I. John, 4:1-3)?

10. Throughout the record, whatever is attributed to the word is also attributed to the Spirit. This proves that they work together in bringing men to Christ.

11. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, what is the use of preaching? Why is one preacher more successful than another?

12. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, on what are His operations dependent? If on

preaching, the theory falls to the ground. If not on preaching, the gospel falls to the ground.

13. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, how does He do it? If not through the eye or ear, how?

14. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, why is it that all are not converted who come under His power? Men can resist argument, appeal, exhortation, but naked Omnipotence, never!

15. If the Holy Spirit is not in the gospel, it is not of God, for the Holy Spirit is God. If He is in it, there is no need of additional power.

16. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the gospel, how can the gospel be the power of God unto salvation, as Paul affirms (Rom., 1:16)?

17. Throughout the New Testament the Holy Spirit is described as speaking; if He spoke then, why does He not speak now? When, where and under what circumstances did He stop speaking, and adopt another method?

18. I challenge this assembly to produce one individual who has been operated on by the Holy Spirit independently of the gospel, and demonstrate how it was done by the testimony of inspired men!

19. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, how are we to explain the passages that teach that men are cleansed by the word, made alive by the word (John, 5:25; 15:3)?,

20. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, how are we to explain the declaration that the preaching of the cross is the power of God (I. Cor., 1:21-24)?

21. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, why did Jesus Christ say that He would give the keys of the kingdom to the apostles (Matt., 16:17-19)? If the sinner is dead, and helpless, and the gospel as preached by the apostles will not bring him to life without the outside work of the Holy Spirit, He has the keys of the kingdom, and not the apostles!

22. If a man reads the New Testament, believes it, obeys it, lives up to its requirements, will he have the

Holy Spirit, will he be a Christian? If not, what use have we for it?

23. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, what necessity is there for printed Bibles, newspapers, tracts, books, preachers, missionaries?

24. The New Testament promises the gift of the Holy Spirit only to the obedient. If you deny it, produce a proof or example to the contrary.

25. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, what motive does He use? Man can not act in the right direction without a good motive. Can the Holy Spirit, by abstract operation, introduce any stronger motive than the Cross? Can He introduce a stronger motive than the love of God manifested in Christ? Are not the arguments, entreaties, exhortations and commands of the Holy Spirit given in the New Testament complete, perfect and all-sufficient? If not, point out what is lacking.

26. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, how are we to explain the great number of passages that plainly teach that redemption involves the human understanding (Luke, 24:45; Acts, 8:30; Eph, 1:18). The advocates of the direct work of the Holy Spirit teach and believe that His work and His operations can not be explained or understood. Human mind can only grasp, comprehend or understand that which conies in language.

27. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, what seed does He plant? Nothing can be produced without seed. This is true in the vegetable kingdom, the animal kingdom, and in the kingdom of Christ. If the Holy Spirit, by direct contact with the sinner's mind, plants different seed from that furnished in the gospel, the gospel falls to the ground. If He plants the same seed, the theory falls to the ground.

28. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, by whose authority does He do it? Jesus commanded the apostles to go and disciple all nations. They either could or could not do this. If they could do it through the aid of the Holy Spirit, there was no need of abstract operation. If they could not there was

no use of the apostles. Did the Holy Spirit, immediately after His descent, supersede the apostles? If not then, did He ever do it? If so, when? If He superseded the apostles, their work falls to the ground. If He cooperated with them, inspired their words, the theory of the direct work of the Holy Spirit falls to the ground. If one person, representing any age since the day of Pentecost, can be produced who was converted without the aid of what the apostles preached, the Great Commission forever falls to the dust. If one person can not be produced, the theory is forever false!

29. The Old Testament was a type of the New Testament (Heb., 10:1). If the Holy Spirit operates on the sinner's mind now in order to conversion, it must be shown that He operated without language before the coming of Christ. Let the advocates of miraculous conversion bring the proof, and bring it now!

30. If the Holy Spirit works on the sinner's mind in order to conversion, independently of the word, how are we begotten by the word or gospel (I. Cor., 4:15; James, 1:18; I. Pet, 1:23)?

31. If the Holy Spirit works on the sinner's mind in order to conversion, independently of the word, how are men to be saved by obeying the form of doctrine (Rom, 6:16-18), or how do men purify their souls in obeying the truth (I. Pet, 1:22)?

32. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word in the redemption of men, in what sense were the apostles ambassadors of Christ (II. Cor., 5:17-21)? An ambassador is one who represents or does work in the name or by the authority of another. What necessity was there for Peter, James, John, Paul and other preachers, if the Holy Spirit did the work without them?

33. If the Holy Spirit works where the gospel has never been preached, or if the preaching of the gospel is unnecessary to His operations, why was the "ministry of reconciliation" committed to the apostles (II. Cor., 5:18, 19), and why did they in turn commit it to

others and assure them that it was sufficient in all things (I. Tim., 4:14-16; II. Tim., 2:2; 3:14-16)?

34. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, and feelings are an evidence of pardon, by what is man to know whether or not he has been operated upon? If by the Bible, the theory falls. If not by the Bible to what shall appeal be made?

35. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, what design did the Master have in giving the Great Commission (Matt., 28:18-20; Mark, 16:15, 16; Luke, 24:45-49). He charged them to teach, preach, and baptize. If the Holy Spirit does the work, the apostles were superfluous, and their efforts absolutely unnecessary.

36. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, how are we to explain Paul's statement that he gloried only in the cross of Christ, proclaiming that by it he was crucified unto the world, and the world unto him (Gal., 6:14)?

37. If the Holy Spirit works on the minds of sinners in order to their conversion, independently of the word, how are we to explain the plain statement of Jesus Christ that the world can not receive Him (John 14:15-18)?

38. If the Holy Spirit works on the mind of an unconverted man, independently of the word of God, which is equivalent to a naked spirit on a naked mind, how are we to explain the statement of John that the Spirit, water and blood agree in one (I. John, 5:8)?

39. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, and if He were sent to work and convert men without the aid of the preacher, why did wicked men antagonize the apostles, seeing they could do nothing without the abstract agency of the Spirit (Matt., 10:16-25; Acts, 5:12-18; II. Cor., 23:33)?

40. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the revealed word of God on the mind of the sinner, how can he be judged by the word, as Jesus declared (John, 12:48, 49)? Does God set up one plan for salvation, and another for judgment?

41. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, a sinner can not do anything until He comes, and if He never comes, who is responsible for the damnation of those who are never influenced by Him?

42. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, and God is no respecter of persons (Acts, 10:34, 35), how are we to explain the statement that the wicked shall be sent to hell (Matt., 25:31-36)?

43. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, and all who claim this are really under His direction, how are we to account for the divisions among the people of God? There is one Spirit (Eph., 4:1-6). Does He lead one man to be a Baptist, another a Methodist, and another a Presbyterian, and another a Quaker? If He does He contradicts and condemns Himself, for these orders differ fundamentally. If not, how are we to prove that He does anything outside of God's revealed plan? Those who claim the abstract operation of the Holy Spirit are forced to endorse everything claimed by its advocates, notwithstanding the unmistakable contradictions among them.

44. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, how are we to explain the teaching of Jesus that His words are spirit and life (John, 6:63)? Can a man received more than spirit and life?

45. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, what becomes of the conditions of the gospel (Matt., 7:21)?

46. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, how are we to explain the doctrine of John and Paul that faith comes by reading or hearing the word of God (John, 20:30, 31; Rom., 10:5-17)? There is one faith (Eph., 4:4, 5). If the Holy Spirit plants it in the unconverted man's heart without the word of truth, John and Paul forever fall to the ground!

47. If the Holy Spirit works on the sinner's mind independently of the word, why did Jesus pray for those who believe on Him through the apostles' word (John, 17:11-21)? And why did Peter declare that God made choice of him that the Gentiles should hear

"the word of the gospel" by his mouth and "believe (Acts, 15:7)? Are there two ways of believing, one by the word and the other by the independent work of the Holy Spirit?

48. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, how can it be true that the grace of God that bringing salvation to all men hath appeared, seeing that a majority of the human race is still out of Christ (Titus, 2:11)?

49. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, and God gives Him to the sinner in disobedience, how are we to explain the fact that the Holy Spirit was not sent upon Jesus until He was baptized (Matt., 3:13-17)?

50. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the gospel, and if the gospel as preached and recorded by the apostles is insufficient to save, what did Paul commit to Timothy (I. Tim., 4:13-16; II. Tim., 2:2; 3:16, 17)?

51. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the gospel, and thereby accomplishes the work of regeneration, why was "necessity laid upon" Paul to preach (I. Cor., 9:16)? Will some one rise and explain the necessity of preaching?

52. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, and saves men by these operations, how are men saved by the gospel (I. Cor., 15:1-4)?

53. If the Holy Spirit works independently of the word, who obeys the law of God (Acts, 6:7; Jas., 1:25)? Listen, oh ye contending sects! God gave us a law; that law was revealed and recorded in the New Testament It declares that men must believe, must repent, must confess Christ, must be baptized in order to salvation (Matt., 28:18-20; Mark, 16:15, 16; Acts, 2:38; Rom., 10:8-10). Now, if the Holy Spirit comes to the sinner outside of this law, and gives him salvation, God obeys the law and the sinner does not. The advocates of abstract spiritual operations stand before the intelligence of the present decade of the twentieth

century, and proclaim by their acts that God makes a law, adds the promise of salvation, and the threat of eternal damnation, obeys His own law and lets the sinners go free!

54. If the Holy Spirit works on the mind of the sinners independently of the word of God, how are we to explain the principle that underlies all revelation, that when God designs to reach and influence the people by the Holy Spirit, He always sends Him to one of His servants who delivers His message, and that those who receive this message receive also the Holy Spirit? When He desired to rescue His people from the King of Mesopotamia, He sent the Spirit upon Othniel (Judg., 3:10). When He desired to redeem them from the oppression of the Midianites, He sent the Spirit upon Gideon (Judg., 6:34). When He desired to deliver them from the vindictive Ammonites, He sent the Spirit upon Jephthah (Judg., 11:29). When he desired to break the galling yoke of the Philistines, He sent the Spirit upon Samson (Judg, 13:24, 25). When He designed to teach, comfort and warn them, He sent the Spirit to the prophets, and through them addressed the minds of the people (II, Kings, 17:13; II. Chron., 36:13-16; Neh, 9:30; Jer.. 7:25; 25:4; Acts, 7:51; I. Peter, 1:11, 12; II. Peter, 1:21). When He desired to send salvation to the ends, of the earth, He sent His Son as the great missionary, and gave not the Spirit by measure unto Him (Isa., 61:1-3; Matt., 3:16, 17; John, 3:34). When Jesus departed from earth, He sent the Holy Spirit to the apostles that they might proclaim an infallible gospel to the whole creation (Matt., 10:16-20; John, 14:15-17, 26; 16:7-11; Acts, 1:6-8; 2:1-4). I challenge the world to produce one example of the Holy Spirit being sent directly or miraculously to any one where the good of others, and ability to teach or warn them, was not involved, except where God sent Him in Judgment on the ungodly (Lev., 10:1, 2; Num., 16:35; I. Sam., 25:38; II. Sam., 6:6-8; II. Chron., 13:20; Acts, 5:1-10; 12:21-25).

55. If the Holy Spirit works on the sinner's mind independently of the word in order to conversion, how are we to explain the statement of Jude that "the faith" was once for all delivered to the saints (Jude, 3)?

56. If the Holy Spirit works on the sinner's mind, in conversion, independently of the word, what part has the Church in bringing the world to Christ? If the Holy Spirit works in answer to the prayers of the Church, and if all unconverted men are dead, passive or helpless in conversion, why can the Church not bring Him down upon the world, and thus make short work of the evangelization of the human race? If the Church can by intercession bring the Holy Spirit down upon one man, the same faith and intercession will bring Him down on the whole human family. If the Church can not bring Him down on the whole human family, it can not bring him down on a single man. No man who reads the Bible can deny that the Church has a work to do. It remains for the advocates of abstract spiritual operation to define the relation and the responsibility of the Church in the salvation of men. Either the Holy Spirit comes and brings converting power in answer to prayer, and thus leaves the Church responsible for the damnation of millions who have died out of Christ, when they could have been saved by prayer without any faith, desire, or work on their part, or the Church must see that the gospel is preached to "every creature," and recognize a truth that the world can not overturn; that the gospel of Christ, dictated to the apostles by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven, is God's power, only power to save men from sin (Rom., 1:16; I. Peter, 1:12)!

57. If the Holy Spirit works on the sinner's mind independently of the word, how are we to account for the declaration of the prophet (Isa., 54:13), endorsed by Jesus Christ, that men are to be taught of God (John, 6:44, 45)? Man is to be drawn to Christ by something taught and learned. Can a man be more than drawn to Christ?

58. If the Holy Spirit works on the sinner's mind independently of the world in order to conversion, man is a mere machine. He has neither volition nor the ability to resist. He can not act until the "power" is applied, and he can in no way influence the Spirit in His work! When the Spirit comes, he is powerless to resist; he must be converted whether he desires it or not. I challenge you to bring any proof to the contrary. If man is absolutely dead, helpless or passive in conversion, he is no more than a lump of clay. If the Holy Spirit comes and converts him, he is saved; if not, he is damned. Who is accountable in either case?

You have heard my propositions. Can you meet them? Nay, verily! How much longer will you delude men with the belief that salvation is a miracle, and that they can do nothing until God sees proper to perform it? Oh ye blind guides, come to judgment! Are you ready for the conclusions? Here it is: "And we are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Spirit, whom God hath given to them that obey him" (Acts, 5:32).

CHAPTER XXV.

PEACEMAKER.

"Men and brethren, what shall we do?" (Acts. 2:37).

"Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" (Acts, 9:6)

"Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" (Acts, 16:30).

These passages are presented as a basis for an examination of the gospel plan of salvation; in other words, the law of admission into the kingdom of God. This is unquestionably the greatest subject that ever demanded the attention of sinful man. Upon the proper understanding and appreciation of it, his eternal welfare is suspended. I propose to examine it in the light of the New Testament, permitting it to be its own interpreter. The gospel is God's only remedy for sin. There is one God, one Saviour, one Spirit, and one scheme of redemption for accountable creatures. Whatever released men from sin in the days of apostolic labor will release them now. There are different forms of speech used in the New Testament to convey the same idea. For example: The change from sin to righteousness; from darkness to light; from the power of Satan unto the power of God, is called salvation (Mark, 16:16). It is called reconciliation (II. Cor., 5:17, 18). It is called redemption (Col, 1:14). It is called regeneration (Titus, 3:5). It is called conversion (Matt., 18:3; Acts, 3:19). It is called a birth of water and of the Spirit (John, 3:5). It is called sanctification (John, 17:17; I. Cor., 1:2). It is called translation into the kingdom of God's dear Son (Col., 1:13). It is called a death and resurrection (Rom., 6:1-6). It is called passing from death unto life (II. Cor., 5:17; I. John, 3:14). It is called adoption (Gal., 4:5, 6). It is called putting on Christ (Gal., 3:26, 27). These expressions substantially embrace the same principles, and when taken together they exhibit to an amazing degree

the beauty, symmetry and harmony of the will of God to man.

Before entering into an investigation of the conditions of the gospel, I propose to settle beyond the possibility of cavil or contradiction one very important proposition: Can a sinner do anything to save himself? Some of the leading denominations represented in this convention assert that "doing is a deadly thing;" that man is utterly passive and helpless in regeneration. Is this true? Is it in harmony with the word of God? I assert that it is not. Jesus said: "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 which is in heaven" (Matt., 7:21). Entering into the "kingdom of heaven" is here suspended upon doing the Father's will. Peter said: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him" (Acts, 10:34, 35). How are men to gain acceptance with God? By fearing Him and working righteousness. John said: "The world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever" (I. John, 2:17). When thousands of convicted sinners on the day of Pentecost cried out in their great anguish: "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" *the* apostle did not say "doing is a deadly thing," but proceeded to inform them what they were required to do. When the convicted and astonished Saul of Tarsus said: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" the Lord did not say, "you are helpless and passive," but said: "Arise and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do" (Acts, 9:6). When the distressed jailer at Philippi said to Paul and Silas: "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" they did not say, "regeneration is a miracle," "you must wait for a blessing from on high," or "come forward to this anxious seat and get religion," but without hesitation, they proceeded to show him that salvation was within his reach.

Jesus, in closing the Great Commission, said: "He that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark, 16:16).

This indicates the Redeemer's determination to condemn the unbelievers of all ages. Has man the power to believe the gospel of Christ? If he has the power to believe it, and refuses to do so, he is responsible for the failure. If he has not the power to believe it he is not responsible, and a righteous and merciful God can not condemn him for failing. The same rule may be applied to repentance, confession and baptism. They are obligations of the gospel. If a man can perform them he is responsible. If he can not he is not responsible. Ability and responsibility are inseparably connected. It will therefore be admitted by all reasonable men that the obligation to act is laid upon the sinner, and his Creator can, and will, hold him accountable for the performance of such requirements as are revealed in the gospel.

It is asserted on good human authority that all men are "totally depraved," "wholly corrupted in body and soul." They attempt to prove this by referring to the first chapter of the prophecy of Isaiah, and sixth verse. This, I think, is a perversion of the word of God, for a careful examination of the entire chapter will convince any impartial observer that it has reference to the corruptions of the Jewish government. In the "parable of the sower," Jesus declared that the "seed of the kingdom" falls into "good ground"—"honest and good hearts" (Luke, 8:15). Paul said: "Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived" (II. Tim., 3:13). Now, if all men are "totally depraved" how can some of them possess "honest and good hearts?" How can others "wax worse and worse?"

There is no doubt that men are wicked, depraved, but the Bible does not say that they are "totally depraved," and I do not understand how devout students of it can affirm that they are. It is asserted that the unconverted are "dead in trespasses and in sins" (Eph., 2:1). This is true, but in what sense are they dead? What does the word "dead" mean when applied to living men? Examine the following passages: "She that

liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth" (I. Tim., 5:6). "Let the dead bury their dead" (Matt., 8:22). "How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein" (Rom., 6:2)? "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God" (Col., 3:3). "For he that is dead is free (justified) from sin" (Rom., 6:7). "The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live" (John, 5:25). "The wages of sin is death" (Rom., 6:23). Death, in these passages, evidently means separation. The sinner is dead to or separated from the love and practice of the "truth as it is in Jesus." The Christian is dead to or separated from the love of and practices of sin. The sinner is guilty and condemned. His mind is filled with wicked and unholy thoughts. His life presents many contradictions and inconsistencies. His sensibilities are enfeebled by long and constant indulgence in that which is evil. Notwithstanding these things, he still has a heart, a judgment, and a will; a heart to receive the truth, a judgment to weigh it, and a will to put in practice the demands of his King.

The theory of "hereditary total depravity" has exerted a very bad influence upon the minds of many. The sinner is frequently taught that he is responsible for his acts; that if he remains in sin he will be lost, and then he is informed of his utter helplessness— that he can not "obey the truth" until after he is regenerated, and that this must be done by a "power from on high." The order of nearly all the denominations represented here is: The "Adamic sin," "hereditary total depravity," the gospel a "dead letter," a "direct putting forth of the Holy Spirit," and the "absolute passiveness of the sinner in regeneration." This is not the gospel of Christ. The gospel makes us responsible for our own sins. It proclaims the conditions of pardon, and holds us responsible for the performance of duty. It presents to our contemplation the Divine part and the human part; in other words, what God has done for us, and what we are required to do for ourselves. He knew the demands of His sinful creatures, hence

He adapted the gospel scheme to their necessities. He did for us what we could not do for ourselves. Man could not furnish a sin-offering adequate to meet the demands of Divine justice. This God graciously did for him in giving His Son to taste death for every man.

Man was a prisoner of death. Darkness and gloom gathered in awful clouds around his dying hours. He was "without strength." He could not see the bright elysian fields "beyond the swelling flood." Jesus broke the chains of death, scattered the night, destroyed the gloom, "abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel. "

Man was not able to frame a system which would purify his heart, elevate his character, save a perishing race and bring it into communion with God. This has been done for him in the "glad tidings" of Jesus Christ. God has opened a fountain for sin and uncleanness, but it is quite another thing to be cleansed therein and made "whiter than snow." He has broken the "bread of life" and laid it at our door. We can eat it and be satisfied, or refuse it and hunger forever. The Kingdom of Christ has been established on earth. We can enter into it and be saved, or refuse and be lost. The turning point in man's redemption is submission. He is responsible for every act of his life. Every thought, word or deed will tell in the coming judgment. God therefore says to him: "Choose you this day whom you will serve" (Josh., 24:15). Surely, He would not make such demands if man is unable to choose or serve! Jesus said: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest" (Matt., 11:28). Strange, Jesus would invite the "weary and heavy laden" to come to Him and find rest if they are too sinful to heed His blessed invitation!

I will now return to the question presented at the beginning of this discourse. What are the conditions on which the Lord has promised remission of sins to gospel subjects? This great question is answered in clear terms in the New Testament by the apostles of Jesus Christ. I do not propose to search for a new

answer to it, but I propose to rehearse the answer given by them. God is the great fountain from whom the gospel flows (Rom., 1:1). Jesus is the mediator between God and man (I. Tim., 2:5). The Holy Spirit came into the world to guide the apostles into all truth, and bring to their remembrance the saying of Jesus, or to preach the gospel through them, and therefore to convict the world of sin, righteousness and judgment. Men heard the sweet story of redeeming love. They believed it with all their hearts (Acts, 8:37). They were sorry for sin (II. Cor., 7:10). Godly sorrow led them to repentance (Rom., 2:4). They confessed their faith in Christ (Rom., 10:10). They were baptized into Christ and raised up to walk in newness of life (Rom., 6:1-5).

I. *Faith*. The first thing that must be done by the sinner is to hear the gospel; the proclamation of mercy to a sinful race. "Hear, O heaven, and give ear, O earth! for the Lord hath spoken" (Isa., 1:2). "Incline 'your ear, and come unto me; hear, and your soul shall live" (Isa., 55:3). "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination" (Prov., 28:9). "Who hath ears to hear, let him hear" (Matt., 13:9). "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom., 10:17). When he hears it he must believe it. If he does not, he will be condemned. God does not require a man to believe the gospel unless he hears or reads it There is some confusion on this point It is argued by some that faith is a direct gift from God; that it is planted in the heart by the immediate touches of the Holy Spirit This argument excludes Paul's testimony that it comes by hearing the word of God. It is asserted that Paul teaches that faith is the gift of God when he says: "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). Salvation and faith are not the same. Salvation is the gift of God. Faith is the act of the creature. This view of the question is sustained by the apostle himself, for he says,

"Man believeth" (Rom., 10:10; Phil., 1:29). The ninth verse is often quoted to prove that a sinner is not saved by works. This evidently has reference to the works of the law of Moses, for Jesus said: "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent" (John, 6:29). Jesus said to the Jews: "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins" (John, 8:24). David said: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting (restoring) the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple" (Ps, 19:7). Paul said: "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sins and death" (Rom. 8:20). James said: "So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty" (Jas., 2:12). Laws demand the obedience of those to whom they are given. The "law of the Lord" is given to the children of men. It says, believe! Now, if the Lord gives the sinner faith independent of the law, it is a "dead letter," and God is the one who obeys the law, and not the sinner! Faith comes through the word of God. It is trust in God through the gospel of His Son. It is not a bare assent of the mind, but a believing, trusting, or confiding with all the heart. It is a trust that will always take God at His word and ask no questions. Paul said: "Now faith is the substance (ground or confidence) of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen" (Heb., 11:1).

This is the most important proposition. We can not exaggerate its importance unless, by endeavoring to make it conspicuous, we neglect some other obligation of the gospel. Paul said: "But without faith it is impossible to please him; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him" (Heb., 11:6). "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom., 14:23). "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom., 5:1). Peter said: "And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith" (Acts, 15:9). Faith is a wonderful word; without it all is dark' and dreary. It connects us

with the years that are gone. It makes the great facts of history sparkle into undying realities before our enraptured vision. It brings heaven and earth so near together that we can almost see the tree of life, the crystal river, and hear the music as it rolls in swelling strains over the flowery hills of the better country. It carries us back over the centuries to the cross of Jesus. We see Him as He dies for us. We follow Him to the resurrection morning, the summit of Olivet, and up to His Father's throne, where He lives as the mediator between God and man. Faith purifies the heart. It changes the affections and establishes the kingdom of heaven in the minds of men. Faith is a long word. It covered the whole transaction of the erection of Abel's altar and the presentation of his sacrifice. It stretched itself over all the years in which Noah was building the ark. It embraced the entire journey of Abraham from his father's house to the land which the Lord promised for an inheritance for his descendants. It has been connected with every act of righteousness since the creation of man. It has enduring prominence in our salvation. It reaches from the proclamation of the gospel to the everlasting city of God. By it we live, and by it we press onward to the rest that remaineth for the people of God. By it we look unto Jesus and endure the temptations and trials of life. By it we bear the cross and despise the shame, and by it we will "enter in through the gates into the city." There is nothing said about "historical faith," "faith of miracles," "faith of devils," "temporary and enduring faith," or "saving faith." The Bible recognizes but "one faith," but it may be great or weak, according to the testimony and the opportunities of the individual.

There is nothing said in the Holy Scriptures about salvation by "faith only," although it has been asserted in this convention that "justification by faith only is a wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort." This may be comforting to those who do not understand the other obligations of the gospel, but to the man who does, there is no comfort outside of a full surren-

der to the demands of Christ The "faith only" doctrine is false, for James says: "The devils also believe and tremble" (Jas., 2:19). Can a man be saved by an imperfect faith? Certainly not Faith is made perfect by works (Jas., 2:22). Can a man be saved by a dead faith? Unquestionably he can not. "Faith without works is dead" (Jas., 2:26).

II. *Repentance*. "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke, 13:3). "And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem" (Luke, 24:47). "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent: because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead" (Acts, 17:30, 31). "Or despiseth thou the riches of his goodness and forbearing and long suffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance" (Rom., 2:4)? "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is long suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance" (II. Peter, 3:9).

What is repentance? "Godly sorrow for sin," says a man. "Salvation," says another. "Religion," says another. "I am trying to learn," says Inquirer.

Does the word of God define this important word? It surely does, "for all men everywhere" are commanded to repent, and the Redeemer lays down the emphatic and startling proposition: "Repent or perish," and in His last commission to the apostles declares, that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

Godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation (II. Cor., 7:10). But it is not repentance. It only leads to it "Godly sorrow" is the cause; repentance is the

effect. We may grasp the solemn significance of this great gospel appointment by looking into the condition of those to whom the commandment is given. The sinner lives by the gratification of his body; forms his own plans, executes his own schemes, "loves this present world," disobeys his Creator, disregards the "wisdom of God," and follows in the instruction of the "wisdom of the world." His mind is "filled with all unrighteousness," and the "prince of the power of the air" presides over his actions as he pursues his downward journey. He loves the ways of sin and despises the ways of God. He lives for the present and boldly proclaims that "the future will take care of itself. "

He hears the gospel of Christ. He believes it. His mind glides backward over the ages past to the crucifixion of his Redeemer, and forward over the ages to come to the day in which God will judge the world. He stands between the divine charms of the one, and the awful horrors of the other. He sees "sorrow and love flow mingled down," and the gathering clouds of eternal vengeance. He realizes the magnitude of his crimes, ingratitude, unbelief. His stubborn will is broken, his stony heart is melted. He is deeply penitent on account of his sins. He is ready to do anything the Lord requires. He changes his mind or purpose, forsakes his sins, reforms his life, and amends his ways and turns his footsteps heavenward.

Repentance involves sorrow for sin, but it is more than this. It is the actual change of mind—purpose— inclination—the amendment of one's way or reformation of his life, and a turning to God with a full purpose of heart and a sincere inclination to "walk numbly" in all His commandments. It involves a full surrender to the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ.

A repentance that does not produce a "new man," is not recognized by the King of Heaven.

This view is sustained by the testimony of the Old as well as the New Testament: "Cease to do evil; learn to do well" (Isa., 1:16, 17). "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts;

and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and unto our God, for he will abundantly pardon" (Isa., 55:7). "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Amend your ways and your doings" (Jer. 7:3). "When the wicked man turneth away from all his wickedness that he hath committed, and does that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive. Because he considereth and turneth away from his transgressions that he hath committed he shall surely live, he shall not die. Yet saith the house of Israel, The way of the Lord is not equal. O house of Israel, are not my ways equal? are not your ways unequal? Therefore I will judge you, O house of Israel, every one according to his ways, saith the Lord God. Repent and turn yourselves from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin. Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed: and make you a new heart and a new spirit: for why will ye die, O house of Israel? For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God: wherefore turn yourselves, and live ye" (Ezek., 18:27-32). "Return unto me, and I will return unto you, saith the Lord of hosts" (Mal., 3:7). Brother Baptist says: "I take the position that repentance precedes faith; that is the first step a sinner must take in order to salvation." If so, what produces repentance? He replies: "Godly sorrow?" What produces "Godly sorrow?" He can not tell, nor can any other man who asserts that faith is second in the gospel order. A sinner must realize his guilt before he will be inclined to repent. He must believe in God and that he is a rebel in His government before he can realize his guilt. Therefore, in the gospel order faith precedes repentance.

Brother Baptist, does it please God for a sinner to repent? He replies: "God has no pleasure in the death of him that dieth." Paul affirms that "Without faith it is impossible to please him" (Heb., 11:6); also "Whatsoever is not of faith is in" (Rom., 14:23).

In the Great Commission, Jesus commanded His

apostles to go and "teach," or "preach the gospel to every creature." This was the first thing that He required them to do, and no man can affirm that repentance is the first requirement of the gospel without doing injustice to the last words of Jesus Christ. This is sustained by the record of the labors of the apostles. They preached the gospel of Christ After men heard and believed it they commanded them to repent, change their minds, reform their lives.

There are presented in the gospel only two motives to induce men to repent, the goodness of God and the coming judgment. Now if a man neither believes the one nor fears the other, how can he be expected to repent? Let my Baptist friend answer the question!

Certain passages are supposed to contradict these arguments. For example: "Repent ye, and believe the gospel" (Mark, 1:15). This is begging the question, for this command was to the Jews; believers in the true and living God. They departed from the law of Moses and rejected the Messiah. Hence they were commanded to repent of their transgressions and accept the "glad tidings" of Jesus Christ.

The obligation to repent is laid upon the sinner. God requires this of him, and if he fails he will be punished. Now is God's time. Do you hear His voice? Do you believe His word? If you do, "turn yourselves, and live ye. "

III. *Confessing Christ.* What does this mean? How is it done? Paul said: "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation" (Rom., 10:10). Examine the following: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Matt., 3:17). "I saw and bear record that this is the Son of God" (John, 1:34). "Thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel" (John, 1:49). "This is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world" (John, 4:42). "I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come unto the world" (John, 11:27). "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living

God" (Matt., 16:16). "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven" (Matt., 10:32). "Among the chief rulers also many believed in him: but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue" (John, 12:42). "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus said, I am" (Mark, 14:61, 62). "And many that believed came and confessed, and showed their deeds" (Acts, 19:18). "Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses. I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Jesus Christ who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession" (I. Tim., 6:12, 13).

Jesus Christ is the center, life and power of the Christian system. He is the fountain of eternal life. Whatever there is in the New Testament to make men pure, holy, just and good, is traceable directly to Him. Remove His name and presence from it, and the entire system will be dead. With me Christ is "the same yesterday, today and forever." To confess Him is the grandest work of the human tongue. To obey Him is the grandest work to which a man can devote his life. Would to God I could write this thought upon the hearts of the generation for whose salvation I labor and pray! A penitent believer is not required to confess more or less than that he believes with all his heart, that Jesus Christ is the Son of the living God, and the Saviour of the world!

All the regeneration the heart can know is to learn to trust Christ, accept His sacrifice, learn His will, and bow to His demands.

It is asserted by some of the people of this convention that this is insufficient, that a man must believe something more than that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, that every sinner in the community believes this. I think this is a mistake. I can prove by the sinners themselves that they do not. Mr. A., do you believe

that Jesus Christ is the Son of God? "Yes, sir!" Are you born or begotten of God? "I am not". The New Testament says: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born (begotten) of God" (I. John, 5:1). Mr. B., do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God? "Yes, sir!" Have you overcome the word? "I have not." The New Testament asks: "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God" (I. John, 5:5). Mr. C, do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God? "Yes, sir!" Have you the witness in yourself? "I have not." The New Testament says: "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself (I. John, 5:10). Mr. D., do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God? "Yes, sir!" Do you keep His commandments? "I do not." The New Testament says: "He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him" (I. John, 2:4). Believing in Christ is more than a bare assent of the mind It is a confidence in Him which accepts His word and obeys His will. If we apply this rule to the professing people of this age, I fear that we will be forced to conclude that many of them are not believers, for I find many who profess to know Him who make a greater effort to explain away certain passages which condemn their profession than they do to obey them.

In the apostolic age they preached Christ; His divine nature, His glorious mission, His wonderful words, His tragic death, His triumphant resurrection, His ascension to God and His coronation as "King of kings and Lord of lords" in the presence of angels of heaven! When men believed this sufficiently to abandon sin, they confessed it and were baptized; after which they were taught to obey every requirement of the gospel. This statement is sustained by the testimony of all the leading writers of the dispensation of Christ.

IV. *Baptism*. How is it performed? There is "one baptism" (Eph., 4:5). This is universally admitted, but it is affirmed that there are "different modes of the

one baptism." This is purely an opinion, for the New Testament says nothing about "modes" of doing the Divine will. Some say the one baptism may be administered either by pouring, sprinkling, or immersion. Others say "water baptism" belonged to an "inferior dispensation," and therefore exclude it from their catalogue of gospel appointments. Let us look into the practice of the people of God in the New Testament times. The question for us to decide is, not whether sprinkling or pouring is regarded by men as sufficient, but whether either was practiced or recognized in the early ages of the Church. I affirm that there is not the slightest trace of either during the lives of the apostles, or for many years afterwards.

"John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins" (Mark, 1:4, 5). This is the first baptism of which we have a divine record. It was performed in a river, and if any man in this convention can show that they simply had a few drops of water poured or sprinkled upon them, let him proceed to the task! "And John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there; and they came and were baptized" (John, 3:23). Brother Episcopalian, do you baptize where there is "much water?" You do not, for your creed directs your applicants to present themselves at "the font," which contains little water at best. But does not Mark say John "baptized with water?" Yes, but the *Revised Testament* informs us that this means "in water. "

"And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth to Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan, and straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit like a dove descending upon him; and there came a voice from heaven saying, Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Mark, 1:9-11). Brother Presbyterian, do you believe that Jesus had only a few drops

of water sprinkled or poured upon him? Jesus was immersed; buried. Paul says: "Buried with him by baptism into death" (Rom., 6:4). Dr. Carson said: "There is not, there never was in existence a great scholar who would deny that Jesus was immersed in Jordan." Dr. Macnight said: "Jesus submitted to be baptized, that is, buried under the water, by John, and to be raised out of it again, as an emblem of His future death and resurrection." What does "buried in baptism" mean? John Wesley, commenting on Rom., 6:4, says: "Buried with Him, alluding to the ancient practice of baptizing by immersion." Brother Methodist, do you imitate the example of Jesus, and follow the wisdom of your founder in this particular? This is a most serious question. Are we better than our Lord? Can we not "follow in His steps?" Listen to His words: "He that taketh not his cross and followeth after me, is not worthy of me" (Matt., 10:38). "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me" (Matt., 16:24). "They came to a certain water." Brother Lutheran, do you proceed to the water with your candidates? "They went down both (preacher and convert) into the water." Brother Quaker, do you take your converts "down into the water?" "And when they were come up out of the water" (Acts, 8:36-40). Mr. Roman Catholic, do you bring your converts "up out of the water?" Mr. Catholic replies: "We do not. The Church has a right to change the ordinances. Immersion was the original practice. The Church is infallible and has substituted sprinkling for immersion, and the Protestant sects borrowed the practice from us. "

Sprinkling and pouring will not harmonize with the facts presented in reference to "in water," "in the Jordan," "much water," going "down into the water," "up out of the water," "buried in baptism," and no human argument can make them do so. No man who believes the Bible doubts that immersion is authorized, but no man can find a single verse indicating that sprinkling or pouring will gain the approval of Jesus Christ. The

man who submissively bows to the plain teaching of the New Testament will be safest in time and eternity.

Baptize, immerse, sprinkle, pour. Here are four words. Do they all mean the same thing? They do not, is the universal response. Baptize means to immerse; some contend that it means to sprinkle and pour also. I have in my possession the testimony of the most eminent lexicographers or writers of the Greek language, none of them immersionists in practice. They are unanimous in teaching that baptize and baptism means immerse and immersion. I do not find the word sprinkle in the catalogue a single time. Immerse means to "plunge into a fluid." Sprinkle means to "scatter in small drops;" pour means "to cause to flow in a stream. "

Now, according to these definitions and the place which "baptize" occupies in the passage of the New Testament, I affirm that it is a physical impossibility to sprinkle or pour a man. I will introduce a few passages, but the truth is the same in every place where the word baptize occurs: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them" (Matt., 28:19). Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, "scattering them in small drops." Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, causing them to "flow in a stream." Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, "plunging them into a fluid." Try another: "Buried with him by baptism" (Rom., 6:4). Buried with Him by being "scattered in small drops." Buried with Him by being caused to "flow in a stream." Buried with Him by being "plunged into a fluid." Comment is unnecessary. The distinguished American scholar and preacher, Dr. Philip Schaff, testifies that: "On strictly exegetical and historical grounds, baptism must be immersion. Without prejudice, no other interpretation would ever have been given to Bible baptism. It is the most natural interpretation, and such we must always give. Immersion is natural and historical; sprinkling is artificial and an expedient for convenience's sake. All the symbolism of the text (Rom., 6:3, 4), and everywhere in the

Bible, demands the going under water and coming up out of it Sprinkling has no suggestion of burial to sin and resurrection to holiness. In order to be true to its original meaning, and its vital relation to redemption through Christ Jesus, baptism must be immersion. Why do you wish to get rid of it? Eminent theologians have wasted their learning attempting to defend infant sprinkling. Imposition is not exposition. All the early defenders of Christianity taught that nothing but immersion was baptism, and all the Greek and Oriental churches continue to immerse to this day. "

Prof. A Diomedes Kyriacos, Professor of Church History in the University of Athens, Greece, a native and learned Greek, is an important witness as to the meaning of the original Greek word. Some times since C. D. Jones, of Lynchburg, Va., wrote a letter to Prof. Kyriacos, making inquiry as to the meaning of the word *baptizo*. The following letter was received in reply:

"ATHENS, August, 1890.

"DEAR SIR: —The verb *baptizo* in the Greek language never has *the meaning of to sprinkle or to pour, but invariably that of to dip'* In the Greek Church, both in its earliest times and in our days, to baptize has meant to dip. It is through this process that our church baptizes and always has baptized both infants belonging to Christian families and adults turning from any other religion to Christianity—that is, by dipping them into water. Thus, also (meaning by dipping), used the apostles to baptize. Were it not so, St. Paul could not have compared baptizing to the death of Christ, saying that in baptism we are buried with Christ and are risen with Him—that is the old man in us has been buried, and the new man fashioned according to the likeness of Christ risen again. Since baptism, therefore, represents the cleansing of the soul,

this idea can only be clearly represented by the *entire dipping of the body into water and not by sprinkling or pouring.*

Yours truly, etc.,
DR. A. DIOMEDES KYRIACOS,
Professor. "

A few years since, Prof. J. N. Johnson, of Morton's Gap, Kentucky, addressed the following letters to five professors of Greek in five of the leading universities or colleges of the United States:

"DEAR SIR: —I desire a favor of you. Will you please to write to me the name and publishers of at least one standard Greek-English Lexicon that gives sprinkle or pour as one of the meanings of *baptizo*? If there is no such standard Lexicon, please state the fact to me.

With much respect, yours truly,

J. N. JOHNSON. "

1. Prof. W. S. Tyler, of Amherst College, Massachusetts wrote:

"I do not know of any good Lexicon which gives sprinkle as a rendering for *baptizo*. Liddell and Scott, which is now the standard Lexicon for classic Greek, gives 'pour upon' as one of the meanings, and the Lexicons generally give 'wash' and 'bathe/' together with 'dip,' 'immerse,' 'sink' and 'dye' among its meanings. The primitive meaning of the word was probably dip, indeed the root *bap*, like our word *dip*, seems to represent dipping in its very sound. "

2. Prof. L. R. Packard, of Yale College, New Haven, Conn., wrote:

"Liddell and Scott, American edition, gives 'pour how upon' as one of the meanings of *baptizo*. I do not know how it is with other English-Greek Lexicons, except that the last English edition of Liddell and Scott omits the above definition. "

3. Pro. M. L. D'Ooge, Colby University, of Michigan, wrote:

"There is no standard Greek-English Lexicon that gives either sprinkle or pour as one of the meanings of the Greek verb, *baptizo*, "

4. Prof. Isaac Flag, Cornell University, of New York, wrote:

"I know of no Lexicon which gives the meanings you speak of for *baptizo* (that is sprinkle or pour), not even the Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine periods, by Prof. E. A. Sophocles. "

5. Pro. Milton W. Humphreys, of Vanderbilt University, of Tennessee, a noted Methodist institution of learning, wrote:

"Although some Lexicons give pour or sprinkle as meanings of *baptizo*, there is no standard Greek English Lexicon that does. "

You can take your choice; be immersed according to the demands of God, or have a little water sprinkled or poured upon you, according to the traditions of men!

Before dismissing this phase of the subject allow me to suggest that immersion is "union ground." No respectable scholar—I repeat respectable!—doubts or denies it. We can never unite on anything else, for we must have Christian union on Christian principles, or nothing.

What character of persons are to be admitted to the benefits of Christian baptism? Those and those only who have been changed in heart and life by faith and repentance; penitent believers. As to infant baptism, no one can show either by a command of Christ, or the practice of the apostles, that it is of divine origin. It was originated by man, and its practice in my judgment is a sin, for it proposes to perform an act in the name of divinity which has no foundation in Scripture or common sense.

What is baptism for? Every institution has a design peculiar to itself. What, therefore, is the design of this

command of the gospel of Christ? One man teaches that it is the "sign of an inward work." Another that it is "the seal of pardon." Another that it is "the door into the Church." Another that it is "essential to Church membership and admission to the Lord's supper, but nonessential to salvation." Surely these theories are not very harmonious!

In order to bring the subject fully before the convention, I will introduce all of the most important passages of the inspired volume embracing the idea: (1) "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins" (Mark, 1:4). (2) The people of Judea and Jerusalem "were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins" (Mark, 1:3). (3) "And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins" (Luke, 3:3). (4) Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God" (John, 3:5). (5) "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in (into) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt., 28:19). (6) "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark, 16:16). (7) "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 Spirit" (Acts, 2:38). (8) "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord" (Acts, 10:48). (9) "And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway" (Acts, 16:33). (10) "Many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized" (Acts, 18:8). (11) "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord" (Acts, 22:16). (12) "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death" (Rom., 6:3). (13) "For by one Spirit are we *all* baptized into one body" (I. Cor., 12:13). (14) "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have

put on Christ" (Gal., 3:27). (15) "One Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph, 4:5). (16) "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" (I. Pet, 3:21). (17) "And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one" (I. John, 5:8). Examine this list of seventeen passages and decide whether or not baptism is a "non-essential," "a mere Church ordinance!"

It is plainly stated that John, the forerunner of Christ, "preached the baptism of repentance for (Dr. J. R. Graves says 'into') the remission of sins." Strange that he would baptize the repenting Jews "into" the remission of sins if their pardon had been secured when they believed! Stranger still that the Baptist denominations take John as their founder, and persist in denying one of the most important features of his work!

Jesus said: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God" (John, 3:5). This is a broad declaration. A man must be in the kingdom of God on earth in order to enter the kingdom of God triumphant. In order to enter the kingdom of God on earth he must be born again; born of water and of the Spirit, born of the will of God, born of the incorruptible seed, the word of God (John, 1:13; I Pet, 1:23). Brother Methodist says: "Born of water does not mean baptism." This passage is so quoted and applied in the Methodist Discipline, the Presbyterian Confession, and the Episcopal Prayer Book! The illustrious George Whitfield, (Methodist), says concerning this passage: "Does not this verse urge the absolute necessity of baptism? Yes, when it can be had. "*—Works, Vol. iv., page 353.* Albert Barnes, the great Presbyterian commentator, says: "Born of water —by water here is evidently signified baptism; thus the word is used in" (Eph., 5:26; Titus, 3:5). Timothy Dwight, one of the leading theologians of the age, says: "To be born of water here means baptism, and in my

view it is as necessary to our admission in the visible Church, as to be born of the Spirit is to our admission into the invisible kingdom. It is to be observed that he who understands the authority of this institution, and refuses to obey it, will never enter into the visible or the invisible kingdom." The distinguished Dr. Wall says: "There is not any one Christian writer of any antiquity in any language, but what understands it of baptism; and if it be not so understood, it is as difficult to give an account how a person is born of water any more than born of wood." John Wesley, the great reformer and advocate of personal holiness, says: "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit—except he experience that great inward change by the Spirit and be baptized (wherever it can be had) as the outward sign and means of it. "—*Wesley's Notes on John*, 3:5. Whoever affirms that "born of water" does not mean baptism, does so in opposition to the principal creed of this age and the learning of the greatest men who have lived since the inauguration of the gospel dispensation. It is an established law in the kingdom of nature that anything brought into the enjoyment of life by birth, is smaller than that of which it is born. It is therefore a physical impossibility for "a man" to be "born of" a few drops of water. This being true, is any man, however good he may be, in the kingdom of God if he has never been "buried" in baptism?

In Matthew's report of the great commission I find the following: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt., 28:16-20). The *Revised Testament* says, "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." You will observe that he did not command them to baptize any save the taught, the disciples. These characters were to enter into the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit by being baptized. By this act they were to be brought into all the enjoyments and privileges of the "reign of Christ," In the former

dispensation the Lord made the following promise to the children of Israel: "IN ALL PLACES WHERE I RECORD MY NAME I WILL COME UNTO THEE, AND I WILL BLESS THEE" Ex., 20:24). Under the dispensation of favor, God has recorded His name in the ordinance of Christian baptism. No man can claim the approbation of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit until he is baptized. Peter commanded the Jews on the day of Pentecost to "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts, 2:38). He declares that that is salvation in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts, 4:12). Paul teaches that men are "justified in the name of the Lord Jesus" (I. Cor., 6:11),

Mark's report of the commission embraces the same principles: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark, 16:15, 16). The promise of salvation is placed after both faith and baptism. The conclusion of this part of the commission has been variously interpreted In order to correspond with Baptist doctrine it should read, "He that believeth and is saved shall be baptized; but he that believeth not shall be damned." In order to correspond with Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian or Lutheran doctrine it should read: "He that is baptized and believeth shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned," for their infant sprinkling virtually says: "Baptize them in infancy and teach them to believe when they grow up." In order to correspond with Quaker doctrine it should read: "He that believeth shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." In order to correspond with Universalism it should read: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be saved also." In order to correspond with Restorationism it should read: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be saved when he is punished as much as he deserves." Says Brother Baptist: "If baptism is necessary to salvation Jesus would have said:

'He that believeth not, and is not baptized, shall be damned. "' I think not. The unbeliever is "condemned already" (John, 3:18). Unbelief alone will condemn a man, but it takes both faith and obedience to save him.

On the day of Pentecost, thousands of convicted Jews who had participated in the crucifixion of the Son of God, cried out in their great distress: "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" The preaching of the apostles had convinced them that they had committed an awful crime, and that they were guilty before God. They believed in Jesus Christ and were endeavoring to learn the way of salvation. Peter's answer is one of infinite importance. It is an answer to penitent believers in all generations. Had some of the preachers of this convention been present, the answer would have been: "Brethren, vacate these front seats and let these mourners come forward and pray and be prayed for, and 'get religion, ' and then be baptized with any mode of baptism they think proper!" Peter was speaking by inspiration; binding and loosing in the name of the King, hence he said: "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 Spirit" (Acts, 2:38).

What does the passage, especially the phrase For the remission of sins," signify? In order to have something definite before us, I affirm that it means "in order to obtain the remission of sins." This can be proven by a common sense view of the entire passage. No one who is considered orthodox doubts for a moment that repentance was commanded "in order to the remission of sins." Examine the passage and you will find that the two commands, "repent," and "be baptized," are inseparably connected, and that they bear the same logical and grammatical relation to the end in view— the remission of sins. They therefore stand or fall together. What does the term "repent" signify? "Be sorry," says Brother Presbyterian. What does "for" mean? "Because of," says Brother Baptist. "What is

the use of baptism?" "It is a non-essential," responds the "orthodox world." I will revise the passage according to these suggestions, and possibly we can get nearer its meaning. It now reads: "Be sorry every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ because of the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." This is absurd. When a man's sins are forgiven he should rejoice. I will replace the word "repent" It now reads: "Repent every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ because of the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." This commands them to repent because their sins are remitted. I will replace the phrase "be baptized." It now reads: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ because of the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." This commands them to both repent and be baptized because their sins are remitted. This will not do. for it is certain that they had not received the remission of sins when they inquired what they must do. I will again omit the phrase "be baptized," and substitute "in order to" for "because of." It now reads: "Repent every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ in order to the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" This commands them to repent in order to the remission of sins. I will replace the phrase "be baptized." It now reads: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in name of Jesus Christ in order to the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." This commands them to do two things; perform two distinct acts, repent, and be baptized "in order to the remission of sins. "

In view of the fact that Jesus gave the keys of His Kingdom to the apostles (Matt., 16:13-20; 18:18), and commissioned them to make disciples of all nations (Matt., 28:18-20), it is infinitely important for us to know how they answered inquirers, and what they required them to do. Peter's answer on the day of Pentecost was the first answer ever given after Jesus ascended up on high. From the argument already

presented, it will be seen: (1) That the world's salvation depends on Peter's answer. (2) That the meaning of the answer turns on the little word "for." Take this word out of the passage, and you at once destroy the whole force and meaning. What does it mean? I am willing to submit the question to the unbiased scholarship of the world, but before introducing the testimony I want to lay down a proposition. It is this: "For" is prophetic, prospective; it describes motion toward an ultimatum; it looks to the end of an action; it never takes cognizance of what is past, but unexceptionally, unequivocally, and undeniably looks to the completion of an action for its full measure of meaning and power. I now proceed to examine my witnesses: Call Noah Webster, L. L. D., who, on the roll of fame, stands at the head of the world's lexicographers. Mr. Webster, what is the meaning of the word "for?" Answer: "In the most general sense, it indicates that in consideration of, in view of, or with reference to, which anything is done or takes place." Will you be specific? Answer: "Indicating the antecedent cause or occasion of an action; the motive or inducement accompanying and prompting to an act or state; the reason of anything; that on account of which a thing is or is done." "Indicating the remoter and indirect object of an act; the end or final cause with reference to which anything is, acts, serves, or is done." "Indicating that toward which the action of anything is directed, or the point toward which motion is made; intending to go to." The word "for" in Peter's answer shows the relation between the commands "repent" and "be baptized" and the remission of sins. Wherever the word follows words expressing action, it indicates the end of the action, or the destination of the action, its ultimatum, or the purpose of it. I therefore affirm before this convention, without the fear even of an effort to contradict me, that repentance and baptism in Peter's answer sustain the same logical and grammatical relation to the remission of sins. Call John Groves, author of the Greek and English dictionary. Mr. Groves, what is the meaning of the preposition (*eis*) for? Answer: "In, into, unto, towards,

for, in order to, to the end that, so that" Try these definitions in Peter's answer: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ towards the remission of sins," "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ to the end that you may receive the remission of sins." Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, so that you may receive the remission of sins. I affirm that it is impossible to translate this passage so that remission of sins does not depend on both repentance and baptism. Is there a scholar in this convention who will undertake the task? Let us pass to the original. Let scholarship testify. Call J. R. Graves, LL. D., of the Baptist Church. Doctor, what is the meaning of Greek word *eis* in Acts, 2:38? "In the original the preposition is *eis*, the natural significance of which is unto." "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ into the remission of sins." It is simply impossible to baptize a man "into" a thing if he has already entered into by some other act or acts! Who will deny it? Call Jacob Ditzler, D. D., of the Methodist Church. Doctor, what is the significance of *eis*? Answer: "*Eis* is always prospective, and never retrospective" (Louisville Debate, page 307). Call Prof. J. R. Boise, of the Baptist Church. Professor, what is the meaning of *eis*? Answer: "I render *eis* with the following accusative case into (rather than unto) the remission is sins; the clause denoting the end in view, and the result attained." Call Liddell and Scott, the eminent Greek scholars and lexicographers. What is the meaning of *eis*? Answer: "Direction toward, motion to, on, into." Call W. D. McLaughlin, Professor of Greek in Cumberland University. Professor, what is the meaning of *eis*? Answer: "End of purpose." Call Wilford Saulkins, Professor of Greek in the East Tennessee Wesleyan University. Professor, what is the force of *eis* in the original of the phrase, "for the remission of sins?" Answer: "In order to obtain the remission of sins. "

When Jesus presented the cup to His disciples He

said: "For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt., 26:28). Why did Jesus shed His blood? In order that we might receive the remission of sins. No one will deny this. If not, the design of baptism is forever settled. The expression "for the remission of sins" in the passage relating to repentance and baptism is the same both in English and in the original. Does this settle the controversy? If not, why? I desire to settle it forever, and if you are not ready to acknowledge the truth I am ready to continue the argument until "the last armed foe expires." During the convention I wrote the following letter to many eminent Greek scholars. Their answers ought to be final. These scholars represent nearly all of the denominations participating in these deliberations. The original communications are in my possession, and I will take pleasure in exhibiting them to all who are interested in the great question involved:

KIMBERLIN HEIGHTS, TENN., June 13, 1891.

Dear Sir: —Will you please give me what you consider a literal translation of Matt., 26:28, and Acts, 2:38? Is the expression "for the remission of sins" from the same Greek words in both passages? What is the meaning of the word from which "for" is taken? I ask you to answer these questions simply as a Greek scholar, without reference to theological tenet or dogma.

With much respect, I remain, faithfully yours,

ASHLEY S. JOHNSON.

To this letter I received thirty-one replies. The answers received are from men who have gained distinction in their chosen fields. They declare that the phrase "for *the remission of sins*" is the same in the English and Greek of both passages, and that the significance of "for" is the same in both places. I quote

from the letters the matter only that comes under the scope of my questions. I submit it to your candid consideration and ask, How can any unprejudiced mind hesitate to accept the conclusion that baptism under the reign of grace, to the individual qualified by faith and repentance to receive it, is for, with a view to, in order to, or hi order to obtain the remission of sins? How can any man go away from this convention and affirm that baptism is not essential to salvation, and stigmatize those who stand with the apostles of Jesus Christ and the unbiased scholarship of the ages as "water Salvationists," "baptismal regenerationists?" But here are the letters. They speak for themselves, and in thunder tones:

The Professor of Greek, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., says: "The expression 'for the remission of sins' is the same in both passages. The preposition (eis) rendered 'for, ' like most prepositions in Greek, require various terms to express it in English. Its *local* sense is 'into, ' but from this spring many applications which must be determined by the nature of the subject-matter, and by the context." He gives a number of renderings, and then concludes as follows: "It is quite obvious, therefore, that a Greek scholar can not offer a literal translation of the passages you name, without considering the theological import of his words; and I have found it best not to express any views, when the subject of baptism is involved. "

The Professor of Greek, University of Mississippi, University P. O, Miss., says: "Matt., 26:28, 'Drink ye all out of it (i. e., all of you must drink out of the cup); for this is my blood, the (blood) of the New Testament (or covenant), the (blood) poured out for 'many for (the) sending off of sins.' ¹The preposition used here is peri; its common significance is about, concerning, in *regard to*. ²The word rendered 'for' before 'remission', is the regular word for *into*, but a frequent meaning is *with a view to*. Acts, 2:38, 'And (or but) Peter said to them: Repent, and let each one of you be baptized in ¹the name of Jesus Christ

for ²sending off of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. ' ¹The Authorized Version's text has the preposition that means upon; and has the dative case. The Revised Version's text has the literal word for in. ²The text is precisely the same as regards the words used for 'for the remission of sins. '"

The Professor of Greek, University of Boston, Mass., says: "The words translated 'for the remission' are identical in the two passages. The word rendered 'for' means literally 'into,' and is given in the Revised Version. So far as I can see, however, 'for' gives a sufficiently accurate sense in the connection in which it is here used. "

The Professor of Greek (John A. Broadus), Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., says: "The Greek phrase is certainly the same in Matthew, 26:28, and Acts, 2:38. The Greek preposition in its local sense commonly signifies 'into;' in figurative uses it is commonly represented by 'unto.' Frequently, though not always, it introduces the design or object of the previous action. It certainly has this sense in Matthew, 26:28, and would very readily have the same sense in Acts, 2:38. But it sometimes introduces a variety of other ideas, which may be summed up under the general notion of 'in reference to/ or 'as regards, '"

The Professor of Greek, Knox College (Presbyterian), Toronto, Canada, says: "I would translate Matt., 26:28, thus: 'For this is my blood of the (new) covenant which is shed (poured out) for many unto (eis— in order to, with reference to) the remission of sins.' Acts, 2:38. 'But Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and let each one of you be baptized in (upon) the name of Jesus Christ unto (in order to) remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.' The Greek, 'for the remission of sins' is the same in both passages. "

The Professor of Greek, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., says: "The expression 'for the re-

mission of sins' in Matthew, 26:28, and Acts, 2:38, is taken from the same Greek word in each instance. The word 'for' is the translation of the Greek preposition *eis*, and is more commonly translated by our word *into* or *unto*, as indicating *unto* or *into* *which* anything is or is done, i. e., the *purpose, end* or *object*. "

The Professor of Greek, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, says: "Using Westcott & Hort's edition of the New Testament, I translate Matt., 26:28, thus: 'Drink ye all out of it, for this is my blood of the disposal, which is being poured out concerning many unto a remission of errors.' Acts, 2:38, is translated thus, 'Repent ye, and let each of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ unto a remission of your errors.' The phrase 'for the remission of sins' is the same in both passages. The Greek preposition meaning 'for', is here *eis*. It denotes the purpose, or end in view, the goal reached by an action or figurative motion or transition. "

The Professor of Greek, Victoria University (Methodist), Coburg, Canada, says: "Matthew, 26:28, 'Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood, that of the New Testament, that is shed for many for the remission of sins,' Acts, 2:38, 'And Peter said to them, Repent and be baptized each one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. The expression 'for the remission of sins' is the same in each passage. The word *eis*, which is translated 'for,' means properly to or *into*, being used, I think, primarily of local relations. Here, I think, it designates the object of the action in question. "

Professor Frank M. Bronson, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., a specialist in New Testament Greek, says: "Matt., 26:28, 'Drink (out) of it all of you, for this is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto letting-go sins.' Acts, 2:38, 'Repent ye, and be immersed each of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto letting-go your sins, and ye will (shall) receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.' The phrase rendered 'letting-go sins' might (taken by itself) mean a letting-

go on the part of the sinner. The phrase, however, seems always to be used of letting-go on the part of the *Judge* or person *sinned against*. Hence, remission or forgiveness is a better translation than the more literal one. "

The Professor of Greek, University College, Toronto, Canada, says: "Matthew, 26:28, is literally as in the Authorized Version—'For this is my blood of the New Testament which is (being) shed for many for the remission of sins.' Acts, 2:38, 'Peter said unto them, Repent and let each one be baptized in (or 'after' or 'according to' or 'in the strength of) the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.' The words for 'for the remission of sins' are identical in the two passages; eis translated 'for, ' means 'into' primarily, but is used very generally in classical, as well as later Greek, to mean for the purpose of. "

The Professor of Greek, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va., says: "The translation of Matt., 26:28, and Acts, 2:38, both in the Old and New Versions, are as good as I can make them, the only variation at all material is the preposition eis rendered 'unto' remission of sins instead of 'for, ' etc., the New Version having 'unto, ' which is perhaps better. The Greek text is the same in both passages, and means the same in both, the preposition eis used in both, and translated 'for' in the Old Version, 'unto' in the New, expresses *end, aim, purpose* to be attained, i. e., very generally *with a view to, to the end that*, a use that is constantly in classic Greek. The passage in Acts, 2:38, may be rendered, 'Repent and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, *that your sins may be remitted, or gotten rid of.* '"

The Professor of Greek, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan., says: "A literal translation of Matt., 26:28, I make, 'Drink of it, all of you; for this is my blood of the covenant which is being shed for many, unto remission of sins; ' or absolutely literal, 'concerning many into remission of sins, ' Acts, 2:38, reads: 'And Peter

said to them, Repent, and let each one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ unto (perfectly literal into) remission of your sins and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. ' The expressions 'unto remission of sins' and 'unto remission of your sins, ' are in Greek precisely the same, excepting the addition in the latter case of the word 'your. ' The Greek word which you translate by 'for, ' and the new revision by 'unto' means literally 'into. '''

The Professor of Greek, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., says; "You ask me to give you a literal translation of Matt., 26:28, and Acts, 2:38, and also to answer two or three questions touching certain Greek words contained in the original. The translation of both passages in the *Revised Version* is as literal as can be given in the English language. I should not depart from it in any respect in giving a literal translation of my own. The expression 'for the remission of sins' is the same in both passages. The word *eis* which is rendered 'for' in the Authorized Version, and 'unto' in the Revised Version, literally means 'into, ' but must frequently be rendered 'unto, ' 'to' or 'for' in translating into English the Greek, both of the classics and of the New Testament. It denotes the end of motion or action, *bodily* or mentally, the end arrived *at* or the end in view, according to the connection in which it is used. "

The Professor of Greek, Trinity College (Episcopal), Hartford, Conn., says: "The Revised Version seems to me to give the exactly literal translation of the passages in question. The Greek word, *eis*, translated *for* in the Authorized Version, and *unto*, in the Revised Version, indicates the aim, end or purpose with which a thing is done. In Matt., 26:28, it makes the purpose in the shedding of the blood. In Acts, 2:38, the purpose of those addressed in repentance and baptism. The word translated *remission* means, a *letting go, a dismissal*, or quittance, as in case of a person acquitted in court —then it is used of things, such as debts, a *passing over*, as if they had not been, a forgiveness, as in Matt.,

18:32, 'I *forgive* thee all that debt. ' The Greek phrases translated 'for the remission of sins' are precisely the same in both passages, excepting the use of the articles and the pronoun, as indicated in the Revised Version." The Professor of Greek, DePauw University (Methodist), Greencastle, Ind., says: "A literal translation of the passages named, 'For this is my blood, the (blood) shed for many for (the) remission of sins, ' 'And Peter said unto them, Repent ye and let each of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. ' The expression 'for (the) remission of sins' is the same in both places. The word translated 'for' (in the expression 'for the remission of sins') is the preposition *eis*, used only with the accusative case—its radical meaning is *to*, in the sense of direction or motion towards, and is employed here with the idea of *end* or purpose. "

The Professor of Greek, McMaster Hall (Baptist), Toronto, Canada, failed to translate Acts, 2:38. He says: "I think the following would be a literal translation of Matt., 26:28, 'Drink of it all for this is my blood of the covenant which is shed (being shed) for many for or unto the remission of sins. ' Yes, the expression 'for the remission of sins' is the same both in Matt., 26:28, and Acts, 2:38, with this exception, that the word 'you' occurs in Acts, 2:38. The preposition from which 'for' is taken is *eis*, and is correctly rendered in these passages by 'for' or 'unto. ' The preposition has, of course, other meanings, but the prevailing meaning is "into. ' I might here add that the expression in this place (Matt., 26:28) denotes the 'end or purpose' for which the blood is shed. "

The Professor of Greek, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga., says: "I must say 1st, that for a literal rendering of Matthew, 26:28, and Acts, 2:38, I can not improve upon the Revised translation of 1884. 2nd. The 'for' of the Authorized Version is a translation of the final *eis* of the original—into, unto, for the purpose of, for, etc. 3. The Greek for 'for the remission of sins'

is the same in both places. I must add that there is no *the* in the Greek though it is used in the Revised translation of Acts, 2:38, inconsistently with the translation of Matt., 26:28, 'Unto remission' would do for both passages."

Professor William R. Harper, the celebrated Baptist scholar, Chicago University, says: "Matthew, 26:28, 'Drink ye of it all, for this is my blood, of the covenant, that shed for many into remission of sins. ' Acts, 2:38, "Repent and be baptized each of you in the name of Jesus Christ into remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit, ' etc. Questions: (1) Is the expression 'for the remission of sins' from the same Greek words in both passages? Yes, precisely the same, except that in the latter passage the article is used with the word of 'sins. ' (2) What is the meaning of the word from which 'for' is taken? It means *into*, is used where a verb *of motion* is either expressed or implied—*here* the latter; a paraphrase would be '*entering into the sphere of the remission of sins*, ' the precise meaning of which would be determined by the context.

The Professor of Greek, Emory College (Methodist), Oxford, Ga., says: "The words used 'for the remission of sins' are the same in Matthew, 26:28, and in Acts, 2:38. In the former passage, reference is made to the blood which is pouring out into the remission of sins. In Acts, the command is, "Repent and be baptized each of you in the name of Jesus Christ into the remission *of sins*. The word translated 'for' is *eis*, into, which has here its ordinary meaning of *induction* or coming into. "

The Professor of Greek, Lane Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Cincinnati, Ohio, says; "The literal translation of Matthew, 26:28, would be: 'Drink ye all of it: for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for (or, on account of) many unto (or, in order to) remission of sins. ' Of Acts, 2:38: 'And Peter (said) unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized each one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto (or, in order to) the remission of your sins. ' The Greek of the clause—'unto remission/ etc, is the same in both

passages. The preposition translated 'unto' admits of various rendering, as 'unto,' 'into/ 'among,' towards,' 'as far as/ 'for,' 'for the benefit of,' 'against,' etc. The precise shade of meaning has to be determined by the connection. The somewhat analogous uses of 'for' in English may illustrate the variations of the Greek word. "

The Professor of Greek, Andover Theological Seminary (Congregationalist), Andover, Mass., says: "Matt., 26:28, 'Do ye all drink of it; for this is my blood of the covenant the (blood) poured out for (viz.: for the sake of) many unto remission of sins.' Acts, 2:38, 'But Peter (said) to them: 'Repent ye, and let each of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ unto remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit' I have translated from Westcott & Hort's critical edition of the Greek Testament, which differs somewhat from the common text, but not at the point to which you refer in your letter. The only differences are that in Acts the definite article '*the*' and the personal pronoun '*your*' are found. The preposition *eis*, translated in the Old Version '*for*' in the Revised Version unto, means, *to*, *into*, or *unto*. It follows verbs of motion, and when connected with a verb denoting a mental or moral act, it expresses the end aimed at or the end hoped for, or intended result of the action. In Matthew it means that Christ's blood was shed *to* secure remission of sins, and in Acts that this is the aim of repentance and baptism. "

The Professor of Greek, Davidson College (Presbyterian), Davidson College, N. C., says: "The Authorized Version of Matthew, 26:28, and Acts, 2:38, is correct. The expression 'for the remission of sins' is the same in Matthew and in Acts. The 'for' (*eis*) is literally 'to,' 'into;' in Matthew purpose, in Acts purpose shading into *result*. But it is impossible to get a correct idea of the word apart from the context, and without a comparison of the phrases with similar ones in other passages. "

The Professor of Greek, Union Theological Seminary'

(Presbyterian), New York, N. Y., says: "Matthew, 26:28, literally translated reads: 'For this is my blood of the covenant which is being shed for many with a view to the remission of sins.' Acts, 2:38, 'And Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ with a view to the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.' The phrase 'for the remission of sins,' is the same in the Greek of both passages. In Matthew it is general, the remission of sins: ' in Luke *special*, 'the remission of *your* sins.' The preposition *eis* (A. V. for), in both cases signifies *destination*, 'unto,' 'with a view to,' 'in order to,' i. e., in *order that your sins may be forgiven*. This, of course, does not imply that the mere act of baptism effects forgiveness; but that, as a divinely ordained sacrament, typical of the cleansing by the Holy Spirit, *it points to, conduces to, has in view, is in the direction of*—forgiveness of sins, which can not be effected without the agency of the Divine Spirit. Forgiveness may take place *in* baptism, or *through* baptism, but not by baptism. Hence baptism, *points to*, and is *with a view to* forgiveness. *In itself* as a symbol it means forgiveness. That intent may be nullified by the subject's unbelief, by his receiving the rite as a mere form; but that unbelief does not affect the divine meaning of the rite itself. "

The Professor of Greek, Trinity College (Church of England), Toronto, Canada, says: "For this is my blood, that of the new covenant, that which is being shed concerning many FOR the remission of sins." "Here *eis*—lit *into, unto, with a view to*. ' Repent and let every one of you be baptized on (the condition implied by) the Name of Jesus Christ *for* (with a view to leading up to) remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.' Here again the word is *EIS*. "

The Professor of Greek, Williams College, Williams-town, Mass., says: "In reply to your inquiries, I will say that the translation of Matthew, 26:28, and Acts, 2:38, in the Revised Version are literal. I can not

render them more literally. Secondly, the expression 'for the remission of sins' is from the same Greek expression in both passages, except that in the Greek, from which the Revised Version of Acts, 2:38, is taken, 'the' and 'your' are added, making 'the remission of your sins.' Thirdly, the Greek word *eis* rendered 'for' in the A. V., and 'unto' in the R. V., means *unto*, or *towards*; sometimes *in respect to*. "

The Professor of Greek, Yale College, New Haven, Conn., says: "I would say that the expression 'for the remission of sins' is found both in Matthew, 26:28, and Acts, 2:38. The Greek word which is here translated *for*, generally means *into* or *to*. It may mean *to the end* that sins may be forgiven, or simply *with* reference to the forgiveness of sins. This sense seems about the same to me either way. "

The Professor of Greek, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland, says: "The authorized version is quite literal. In both passages the expression for *the remission of sins* is the same in Greek. The word for *for* is *eis*, which the Revised Version renders *unto*. The word *eis* can only mean *for—with a view to produce, or unto—with a tendency to result in*, i. e., *eis*—indicates (1) end regarded solely as end, (2) end regarded as purpose or object"

The Professor of Greek, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, Scotland, says: "The expression Englished by 'for the remission of sins' is identical in Matthew, 26:28, and Acts, 2:38. So far as I can discover, there is no variant reading in the MSS. The word Englished 'for' is *eis*, which means 'to,' 'into,' here 'with a view to,' rather than 'resulting in,' as some seem to take it. "

The Professor of Greek, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland, says: "The literal translation of Matt., 26:28, is—'For this is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many unto remission of sins.' The best manuscripts have not the word 'new' before 'covenant,' and the phrase 'blood of the covenant' is verbally the same as the words used in the Septuagint version of Exodus, 24:8. The word translated 'testa-

ment' in the Authorized Version is regularly used in the Greek translation of the Old Testament in the sense of 'covenant, ' and this is its use also in other late Greek writings, though in classical Greek it very rarely means anything but a *will* or testamentary disposition. The literal rendering of Acts, 2:38, is—'Repent ye and be baptized each one of you in the name of Jesus Christ and unto the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost' The expression 'unto the remission of sins' is precisely the same in each passage. The "unto, ' or 'for, ' as it is in the Authorized Version, denotes the end or *result aimed at.* "

The Junior Professor of Greek, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., says: "The two passages in question can scarcely be more literally translated than they are in the Revised Version. The expression 'unto the remission of sins' is the same in both passages. There is this difference only, that, in the Westcott & Hort's Revised Greek Text, Acts, 2:38, reads, 'unto the remission of your sins, ' while the old Greek text reads simply, 'unto remission of sins, ' as in Matthew. "

The word rendered 'for, ' in the Old Version, more accurately 'unto, ' in the Revised Version, is the preposition 'into, ' which as early even as Homer's time expressed not only time' and 'place, ' but also 'purpose, ' as may be easily seen by reference to the Iliad. "

Here is another letter, and an answer to it. It comes from a Professor in the University of Athens, Athens, Greece. This comes from the home of Greek! Surely this distinguished Professor knows his language. Surely we can afford to listen to such testimony. Surely there is no appeal from such authority:

KIMBERLIN HEIGHTS, KNOX Co., U. S.

June 13, 1891.

DR. A. DIOMEDES KYRIACOS, Professor,
Athens, Greece:

My Dear Sir—Will you give me what you consider a literal translation of Matt., 26:28, and Acts, 2:38? Is the expression "for the remission of sins" from the same Greek words in both cases? What is the significance of the preposition "for" in the original of these two passages? What is the meaning of the expression: "The answer of a good conscience toward God" in I. Pet. 3:21? I ask you these questions without reference to theological distinctions. *I desire that you answer them simply as a Greek scholar.* I will be glad if you will put your letter in English. Hoping that you will oblige me, I am,

With much respect, faithfully yours,

ASHLEY S. JOHNSON.
Athens, the 15th of July, 1891.

Dear Sir—With great pleasure I answer to your questions. The expression "of *the remission of sins*" has the same significance in both passages, Matt., 26:28, and Acts, 2:38.

The preposition "*for*" means in both cases the design. The first passage says that receiving the communication we ought to remember the death of our Lord, who suffered for us, in order to get the remission of our sins, to regenerate and to be saved.

The second passage says that whosoever wishes to be 'saved and to get the remission of his sins, he ought to repent and believe in Christ and be baptized in the name of Christ

The meaning of the expression "*the answer of a good conscience toward God*," I. Pet, 3:21, is that the baptism (because it refers to that in this passage) is not the simple cleanliness of the flesh, but the acquisi-

tion of a good, quiet and serene conscience, which finds the baptized, who during the baptism is asked and confesses his belief to God and to the Saviour.

It was the custom in the ancient church of asking the baptized if he believes and confesses his faith to God the Father, His Son and Saviour, and the Holy Ghost.

It is to that question that refers this passage of Peter's I. epistle.

Receive, Sir, the assurance of my esteem.

Yours truly,
PROF. A. DIOMEDES KYRIACOS,