

Johnson's Speeches.
HEMSTEAD—JOHNSON DEBATE,

Thorn Grove, Tenn.,
September 16,17,1891.

PRICES, PREPAID:

One Copy, 30c.;

Four Copies, \$1.00.

Agents Wanted.

Address the Author:

ASHLEY S. JOHNSON, LL.D.,

Kimberlin Heights, Tenn.

KNOXVILLE, TENN.:

**OGDEN BROS. CO.,
PRINTERS AND STATIONERS.**

1895.

SOME EXPLANATORY REMARKS.

I regret to present only one side of the discussion, but I could not induce my opponent and his friends to join me in printing a book. Soon after the discussion I printed an outline of my arguments, and the popularity of it may be judged from the fact that I have sent out nearly 25,000 copies. After serious thought I have decided to give my speeches in full as nearly as the lapse of time will allow. I can only claim that these speeches are substantially as I delivered them. The line of argument against the claim of the Baptists is the same, and is built upon their doctrine as enunciated in their creed, the Philadelphia Confession of Faith, a few hundred copies of which I have on hand. I can send a copy prepaid to any address for 36c. in stamps. I reprinted this creed and only have a few copies left. The Baptists have quit printing the creed, but they hold on to the same old doctrine. You cannot get this creed anywhere else, to my knowledge.

A. S. J.

Kimberlin Heights, Tenn.,

Feb. 8, 1895.

FIRST DAY'S DISCUSSION.

PROPOSITION: *"The Church with which I, (H. C. HEMSTEAD), stand identified, is Apostolic in doctrine and practice."*

FIRST REPLY.

MR. PRESIDENT, MODERATORS AND FELLOW-CHRISTIANS: I congratulate you on this bright and beautiful day. I count myself particularly happy in having the privilege of standing before you and presenting what I conceive to be the truth. I wish to say at the beginning, that my only object is the acquirement or defense of the truth. The thought of victory for victory's sake, plays no part whatever in the matter so far as I am concerned. I desire the truth, the whole truth, and the truth unmixed with error, and I must have it at whatever cost. I hesitate not to say, however, that I feel elated over my success in bringing these momentous questions to public issue. I have long endeavored to induce my Baptist friends of this community to publicly discuss our differences, but previous to this occasion I have not been successful. The people want light. They demand the facts. They want to see both positions as they are. I have been willing. Indeed, I have been anxious. I am anxious yet. We differ most radically. Some one is in error. Who is it? Let the Bible, as it is written, settle it, for nothing else can or will.

I will now turn my attention to the speech to which you have listened so patiently. In the main it was a good speech, and I endorse-it, but it misses the issue almost entirely. Note the proposition. It is clear-cut and unequivocal. It involves the simple question of identification. There was a church in Apostolic times. No one denies this. It was an undivided church so far as doctrine was concerned. No one denies this. Peter, James, John, Paul, Timothy, Titus, Philemon and a host of others, Jews, Samaritans, and Gentiles were members of it. No one denies this. They had but one gospel and one test of fellowship. No one denies this. They were not distinguished by adherence to different human creeds. No one denies this. They loved each other, stood together on the same foundation, and labored together with the same object in view. No one denies or even doubts this. Now with these facts before us it seems to me that my brother had an easy task before him. What was necessary to his success? I should say that he should first have defined his position. This he utterly failed to do. Why? For the simple reason that the correct definition of his proposition would have completely upset his whole argument. The question at issue is whether or not the Missionary Baptist Church, with its creed and customs, is the same as the Church of which we read in Acts of the Apostles, Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Hebrews, James, Peter, John, Jude, and the Revelation. This is what the affirmative claims in the proposition, and must prove or abandon the field. To my mind it is a big undertaking, and he has laid a very poor foundation for his superstructure. I think this will be more apparent as I proceed. In the second place, he should have showed what the Church was in the days

of the Apostles. Let me emphasize a few words: "Apostolic in doctrine and practice!" I intend to hold him fairly and squarely to his contract. We may appeal to Abraham, Moses, Samuel, David, Isaiah, Joel, Malachi, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, but the last court of appeal must be the Twelve Apostles as they sit on twelve thrones (Matt., 19:28), and unfold the gospel as recorded in the book of Acts and in the epistles. Nothing is "Apostolic" before the crucifixion, for previous to this mighty event they had not received their world-wide commission (Matt. 28: n-20); neither were they convinced that Jesus had come to set up a spiritual kingdom (Acts, 1:6, 7). "Apostolic," "doctrine," "practice." These three words carry volumes of meaning, and volumes of danger too. It is no wonder that my opponent had so little to say about them. In the third place, he should have showed the doctrine and practice of the Baptist Church of to-day. Did he attempt this? I leave you to judge for yourself, and take the risk of saying that a man could never learn how to become a member of the Baptist Church from that speech. This being admitted, it must also be admitted that he did not show what the doctrine of the Apostolic Church was; neither did he even attempt to specifically identify his doctrine and practice with the doctrine and practice of the Apostles of Christ. Let me narrow the issue down to a few words. Either the Baptist Church is Apostolic in doctrine and practice, or it is not. The road is short and unmistakable. Here is the New Testament. Let him take it, and show the doctrine and practice of the Church of Christ at the beginning, specifically, and lay his doctrine and practice down, specifically, by the side of what he reads in the Book. If they are the same, that ends it, ends it in detail, ends it in general, ends it for time, ends it forever.

Come to judgment! No dodging; you helped to make the issue, you must meet it fairly and fully or acknowledge that you have departed from the Apostolic pattern, and therefore that your claims are unfounded. Let me help you a little. I suggest that you establish a few parallels. The Church in Apostolic times had a creed. It had one article. What was it? What did it include? What did it imply? How many articles did it contain? Who compiled it? Was there any salvation for those who refused to accept it? Here it is: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God (Matt., 16:16)." Again, "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ (I. Cor., 3: n)." This is the simplest, yet deepest, briefest, yet most comprehensive creed in the history of man. This creed differs from all others in bringing us face to face with Jesus Christ and thundering in our ears that mighty truth, that awful destiny from which there is no appeal: "He that believeth not shall be damned (Mark, 16:16)." Here is the creed of the Baptist Church compiled by human hands and promulgated from Philadelphia, Pa., 1724 years after Jesus was born! Is this creed identical with the creed of the Apostles and their contemporaries? If yes. you are forced to the affirmation that every man who disbelieves is doomed to hell. Are you prepared to affirm this? If not, you admit that it is out of your power to establish your proposition. Again, the Church in Apostolic times had a name. If your organization is identical in doctrine and practice, you must find your name in the Bible; yes, in the New Testament; yes, you must find it in the book of Acts or in the Epistles. No equivocation here. I demand the book, chapter and verse, and I demand it now. I hang the issues of the discussion here. Find your Church name in the book, and I will give up the dis-

cussion and leave the field. Again, the Apostles knew just how to admit men into the Church, and they agreed among themselves. Acts of the Apostles is full of this. In fact it is the book of conversions. It was written to show what the Apostles preached, and on what terms they offered pardon. My friend has, by his proposition, undertaken to prove that he and his brethren take members into the Church precisely as the Apostles took them in. Has he done it? He has not even attempted it. Why not? Because he knows, his brethren know, and the world knows that they have an entirely different method. Let him deny it. I force the issue. Identical indeed! The methods are not even remotely similar. Open to the book of Acts. Read the second chapter. It gives a detailed account of how the first additions were made to the Church. I call on him to present one, only one, authenticated account of the admission of men and women into the Baptist Church as the Apostles admitted them on that great day. He fondly thinks Peter was a Baptist. I call upon him to present one, only one, authenticated case where a Baptist ever "conducted a revival" as Peter did his work there. I call upon him to present one, only one, authenticated case where any Baptist preacher, in any age or country, ever gave to inquiring penitents the answer that Peter gave: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost (Acts, 2:38)." Open the book of Acts again. Read the eighth chapter. I call on him to present one, only one, authenticated case where any Baptist preacher in any age or country ever conducted a revival like the one Philip the Evangelist conducted in the Ethiopian chariot, or baptized a convert without requiring him to relate "an experience of grace" or without the vote of the Church

(Acts, 8:26-40). He must present a similar case or admit that either he or Philip is not Apostolic. I wonder if he thinks Philip was a Baptist! Open the book of Acts again. Read the ninth and the twenty-second chapter. I call on him to present one, only one, authenticated case where any Baptist preacher in any age or country ever said to a man who like Saul had been agonizing in prayer and hunger for three days, in the exact words of Ananias: "And now, why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord (Acts, 22:16)." Open the book of Acts again. Read the sixteenth chapter. I call on him to present one, only one, authenticated case where any Baptist preacher in any age or country "ever conducted a revival" like the one described in this chapter, and baptized his converts the "same hour of the night" without asking the consent of the church. I will stake my reputation on the statement that he will not even try to find the man! What is it to be Apostolic? That is the question on which everything hangs. How may we find out? I know of but one way, but it is simple and absolutely certain. Turn to the record and find out just what they did. Their acts settle the question beyond dispute or even doubt. If the Baptist Church is Apostolic in doctrine and practice, its doctrine and practice can be found without the change of a dot on an "i," or a cross on a "t," in the book of Acts. Has my opponent affirmed this? No! Will he affirm it? No! If he, individually, is Apostolic in doctrine and practice, he gives the same answers, under similar circumstances, that Peter gave, that Philip gave, that Ananias gave, that Paul gave. Does he do it? Let him answer for himself. This is no child's play. He must meet the issue and meet it now. If he will agree to give the same answers to inquirers that Peter gave, I will agree to stop the de-

bate and give him the right hand of fellowship, for then there would be no issue between us, for all other differences grow out of this refusal to give inquiring penitents the answer given them by the apostles. If he will not agree to do this, he must acknowledge that he cannot sustain his doctrine and practice by the Book. If he cannot show that he is Apostolic, what is he? I insist upon an answer to this question.

The rules of debate require me to follow him. This I propose to do, but let me make it clear that the rules governing the discussion do not require me to dispute what I do not deny. I tried to get him and his associates to agree on propositions that would accurately express our differences, but in this I signally failed. It was just what we have or nothing. We have many things in common, and I do not like to put myself in a place where I appear to antagonize what I truly believe. Much of what my friend believes I believe, but I antagonize his doctrine when he plainly departs from Apostolic doctrine and practice, and I think he does this in many instances. Still, I will follow him in his circuitous route as best I can. He attempted to establish a line of so-called Apostolic succession. He practically began with the dawn of time and traced it through to the end. There is nothing startling about this. Why did he not trace his Church back to the Apostles, or, which is far better, show that his doctrine and practice are identical with theirs? That was in the bond, but he has taken another route by attempting to prove what everybody believes and nobody denies. Let us examine his argument. What was his design? Evidently to show that the gospel should outlive empires and kingdoms, and that the Church, built upon Jesus Christ, should never perish. Who denies this? Who doubts it? No one, so far as I know. Individuals

and communities may apostatize, darkness may for a time prevail, but Jesus and the gospel live on uninterruptedly. I firmly believe this. Indeed, without it nothing could be secure. The permanency of the Church does not depend on fickle and sinful man, but upon principles that are as enduring as God himself. I believe that God promised to bless all nations through Abraham (Gen., 12:1-3; Gal., 3:8, 16). I also believe that God was to set up a permanent kingdom (Dan., 2:44). I believe also that Jesus Christ is stronger than death (Matt., 16:13-19; Rev., 1:17, 18). But what has this to do with the question? Nothing of importance, so far as I can see. Let us look further into it. He has labored hard to establish a line of succession without having the courage to say what he was trying to do, but, strange to say, he has not fastened a Baptist Church on to either end of the line! The way is still open. I challenge him to try again. Here is a Baptist Church. If the connection can be made, it will not take long to do it, and that is just what he is here for. I will give him a little help. I will, for argument's sake, admit that the Baptist Church has substantially existed as it is now back to the time when the last Apostle died. Now we are ready for the demonstration. Here are the Baptist Church and the Apostolic Church side by side. All he has to do to demonstrate his proposition is to find his doctrine and practice in the book of Acts and the thing is done, well done, done forever, but alas! he will not even attempt it! The Baptist Church has much truth, but as long as it has a human name and a human creed it cannot be Apostolic in doctrine and practice, for the Apostles had neither. Let me simplify. Note what he has undertaken to prove. Note the method by which he tries to do it, I assert that in order to success he must show that his position is the same as the

position of the Apostles. Suppose I assert that the Baptist Church of Thorn Grove is the same as the Church in some other locality. My brother disputes it. How can the dispute be settled? Simply by appealing to the record. Upon investigation it turns out that the name is the same, the creed is the same, the customs are the same in every detail, and my position is admittedly correct. But suppose that on investigation it turns out that while the name and creed are the same in many respects, it is also true that in actual faith and practice they differ fundamentally, my contention falls to the ground. It is easy to make the application.

I come fairly to the issue. If I seem severe please remember that I must show that his claims are without D[ivine authority. I deny his claims and do it most emphatically.

I. The Baptist Church has an unscriptural name. No institution, whatever else it may be, with a name unknown to Peter, James, and John can be "Apostolic in doctrine and practice." This may at first glance appear to be a small matter, but let us test it. I affirm that it is impossible to identify anything in heaven or on earth without knowing its name. Knowledge cannot be classified without naming it. Everything known to man, from the smallest atom in the physical world up to Him who inhabits eternity and fills immensity with His presence, can only be known by name. Man made slow progress in learning, and in order to assist his memory and help the generations following, he has given every new fact discovered a name. This is true in every department of human attainment. If by some miraculous intervention, the recognized names of all things in all departments of knowledge should be changed to-night, the world, as we now know it, would tomorrow morning be a mass of worthless ruins. It

would be impossible to turn the wheels of the educational, commercial, and spiritual worlds a single time. There is something, yea, much in a name, for the simple reason that things are known by their names, and in no other way. My opponent must, in order to establish his claims, prove that the Apostles were called "Baptists," and that the churches established by them were called "Baptist Churches," or he must show some authority for assuming a name that is not recorded as a name for the followers of Christ, in the New Testament. He cannot, even if his life depended on it, do either.

II. It has a human creed. In proof of this declaration I present for your consideration the Philadelphia Confession of Faith, first published in the United States as an authoritative statement in the year 1724. It looks somewhat antiquated, but it has never, so far as I can learn, been formally abandoned by those whose ancestors first promulgated it. Let us look into it. If you will listen I shall read: "God hath decreed in Himself, from all eternity, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably, all things whatsoever come to pass; yet so as thereby is God neither the author of sin, nor hath fellowship with any therein, nor is violence offered to the will of the creature, nor yet is the liberty, or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established, in which appears His wisdom in disposing all things, and power, and faithfulness in accomplishing His decree.

Although God knoweth whatsoever may or can come to pass upon all supposed conditions, yet hath He not decreed any thing, because He foresaw it as future, or as that which would come to pass upon such conditions.

By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His

glory, some men and angels are predestinated or foreordained to eternal life, through Jesus Christ, to the praise of His glorious grace; others being left to act in their sin to their just condemnation, to the praise of His glorious justice.

These angels and men thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished.

Those of mankind that are predestinated to life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal irremutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of His will, hath chosen in Christ into everlasting glory, out of His mere free grace and love; without any other thing in the creature as a condition or cause moving him thereunto.

As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so He hath by the eternal and most free purpose of His will, foreordained all the means thereunto, wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ, by His Spirit working in due season, are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by His power through faith unto salvation; neither are any others redeemed by Christ, or effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only."

Lay the doctrine down by the world-wide invitation of Christ to the s-in-cursed sons of men (Matt., 11:28-30). Lay it down by the risen Redeemer's world-embracing commission (Matt., 28:19, 20). Lay it down by Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost (Acts, 2:1-47). Lay it down by Philip's sermon in the city of Samaria or Philip's sermon to the Eunuch (Acts, 8:1-40). Lay it down by the statement of Paul that Jesus tasted death for every man (Heb., 2:9). Lay it down by the last great invitation to every man in every age

and every clime (Rev., 22:17). Lay it down by anything in any book within the lids of the Bible and this will prove that the doctrine is utterly false, destructive, and damnable. It is a pure invention from the beginning to the end. Does this satisfy you ? If so, I will pass on. I want my brother to say in his next speech if he endorses this creed, and particularly if he endorses this doctrine. If he does, I want him to turn to the book of Acts and read from Peter and Philip, and Paul the passages that he considers the best proof of it. If he does not, I have certainly broken one link in the chain of "Apostolic succession I" Suppose this doctrine had been proclaimed on the day of Pentecost just as the creed has it, do you think three thousand would have been added to the church ? This is genuine Baptist doctrine, and its promulgation is dangerous; indeed, it means death to every individual effort to find salvation, and to every effort to proclaim the gospel to the whole creation. If "what is to be will be" without our co-operation, we might as well sit down and wait.

III. It has an unscriptural organization. The Baptist Church as now organized is the exponent of a doctrine that dooms a man to hell ages before he is born. In Apostolic times each church had a plurality of elders (Acts, 20:17; Titus, 1:5). These churches were not Baptist Churches, for Baptist Churches do not as a rule have more than one elder, and many of them have one only one-fourth of his time.

IV. It has an unscriptural language. This is all-important. We should stand by and speak by the Book. We should not give sectarian names to Bible things. The Bible is intended to unify, and it will do it if we respect its teaching. In the Baptist Church much unscriptural language prevails. They use such expressions as "get religion," "get through," "mourn-

ers," "regenerated and born again," and they call their preachers, "Reverend," "Rev. Dr.," and "Doctors of Divinity." This language was absolutely unknown to the Apostles.

V. It teaches that salvation comes in answer to the prayers of the church. The whole mourner's bench system in all its variation is based upon this error. It completely sets aside the gospel and its conditions. It often happens that their preachers proclaim the gospel earnestly and truthfully. They hold up Christ and Him crucified. They emphasize the power of the Cross. They stir the people mightily. But this seems insufficient. It is admitted that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation. Penitent sinners cry out under conviction of sin. Here the preacher makes a fatal blunder. Instead of following up his sermon with a full presentation of the gospel as did the Apostles, he calls the penitents forward to the "altar of prayer," or asks them to "arise for prayer." This subverts the whole plan of salvation as unfolded in the book of Acts. There is, there can be, no defense for this grave departure from Apostolic doctrine and practice. With an open New Testament before me, and with profound reverence for the conviction of all others, I must say that in my judgment it is the most shameful abuse of the gospel I ever witnessed.

VI. It places repentance before faith, and, as repentance is pleasing to God (Luke, 15: i-io), makes it possible for men to please God without faith, in open contradiction to His word (Heb., 1:6). If repentance precedes faith, what brings it about? If he answers, godly sorrow (II. Cor., 7:10), I ask what produces it; and if he answers that the Holy Spirit produces it, I then ask what means does the Holy Spirit employ? And from every standpoint of Baptist doc-

trine, my brother must answer, none! That the Holy Spirit produces godly sorrow in the sinner's heart I must confidently assert. But man is not a mere machine. He is an intelligent being, and the Holy Spirit uses the gospel to reveal to the sinner his lost condition (Rom., 1:16); and as he takes hold of the Truth, the crucified Christ, sorrow for sin fills his heart, and repentance must follow. It is certain that there are only two things that lead men to repentance: (i). The goodness of God: "Or despiseth thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance (Rom., 2:4)?" God's goodness is displayed in the gospel: "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel * * * by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you (I. Cor., 15: i, 2)," and the gospel must be preached before it can be believed: " How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed ? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard ? and how shall they hear without a preacher (Rom., 10:14)?" In the gospel the sinner sees that he is a sinner, and that Jesus died in order to his salvation: "For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life (Jno., 3:16). These things must be brought to his understanding before he can take one step toward repentance. (2) The fear of judgment: "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent: because he hath appointed a day, in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance to all men in that he hath raised him from the dead (Acts, 17:30,31)." Now according to Baptist theology the sinner cannot

feel God's love or fear His judgment until after he has repented, for these things can only be apprehended by faith, and faith follows repentance! Here is another argument: No man can approach the Father save through His Son (Jno., 14:6); and we can only approach the Father by the help of the Son by believing in Him, for "he that believeth not shall be damned (Mark, 16:16)." If a man can repent under the gospel without faith, he can repent without Christ, and if he can repent without Christ, He died in vain. This cannot be, for repentance is His command (Luke, 24:47), and it is granted by Him (Acts, 5:31).

VII. It calls upon its converts to confess their feelings instead of confessing Christ. Every applicant for admission to the Church is expected to tell how he feels. I denounce this custom as at utter variance with Apostolic Christianity. It mystifies the simple process of turning to God as revealed by the Apostles. It makes the hope of heaven depend on that which is both elusive and delusive. The center and circumference of every conversion recorded in the book of Acts is Jesus Christ, hence the emphasis I place on the necessity of confessing Him: "That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation (Rom., 10:9, 10)."

VIII. It does not admit men and women into the church as the Apostles did it. Neither Peter, nor Paul, nor James, nor John ever submitted such a question to vote of the church. In their time a man who was competent to preach was also considered competent to pass judgment on the qualifications of a person who demanded baptism at his hands, and it should be so considered now.

IX. It preaches and enforces by practice a system of works—the mourner's bench. Not one syllable can be found in the word of God in support of this practice. I denounce it as works. Why ? Because it is not once mentioned in the word of God, and cannot therefore be of faith. My friend has the effrontery to stand before a nineteenth century audience and claim that the Baptist Church is Apostolic in doctrine and practice when he knows that such practices are not once named by the Apostles. Let me test his claims by bringing the thing down to this hour and I hang everything on it. Brother HEMSTEAD, arise in your place and announce to this audience: "From this time forward I am determined by the grace of God to narrow my faith and practice down to a 'thus saith the Lord;' and as the mourner's bench is wholly an invention of men, I hereby proclaim unrelenting war upon it, and. from this day forward, let come what may, I shall stand by Peter, Philip, Paul, and answer inquirers precisely as they answered them." Could he make this announcement ? Not without coming out of the Baptist Church, for such a declaration would be rank heresy in the eyes of the Baptists. I can make it, I have made it, I do make it, for I am not bound by any human tradition or intimidated by any ecclesiastical court. In the days of the Apostles the preachers appealed to the minds of men; in other words, they taught them how to become Christians. In a modern Baptist revival the preaching is often good and true, but when it comes down to the test, to the actual making of men Christians, the gospel plays only a minor part. Imagine a man reading the second chapter of Acts in a modern Baptist revival, or any other chapter of Acts for that matter! I made an effort along that line once but failed. If you doubt it, try it for yourself.

X. It teaches and enforces the doctrine of the total depravity of the human race. Excuse my repeated reference to the proposition. I mean to stick to it, and hold him to it too. He affirms that the Baptist Church is Apostolic in doctrine and practice. The Apostolic records begin with Acts and close with the Revelation. I defy him to find the phrase "total depravity" in them or anywhere else in the book of God! That men are sinners I do not deny. That they are at variance with God I must confess. That without the redeeming blood of Jesus they are doomed to destruction I earnestly proclaim. That men, all men, any man, can be considered totally depraved I most emphatically deny. If you want the proof I can give it in abundance: (i) The fact that the words are not found in their present use and acceptation in the Bible proves that the idea is not there. The Lord certainly knew what He was about when He gave us the Bible, and as He left the phrase out, it is rebellious and insulting to put it in. (2) If the whole race, out of Christ, is totally depraved, either men inherit depravity or become so through their own conduct. If the first is true, men are damned on account of ancestral sin, for if a man is totally depraved at birth he is already condemned and cannot do anything personally to add to his condemnation or to relieve himself of it. If the second is true, the doctrine that all men are totally depraved is confessedly false. (3) The doctrine grows out of the erroneous conclusion that our fore-parents became totally depraved by the one act of eating the forbidden fruit. This is delusively and destructively false. Turn to the third chapter of Genesis. Read it with care. Man sinned and reaped its consequences, but total depravity was not one of them. Why not? Look for yourself. Did God forsake them? Did He treat them as mere machines? Not

by any means. He communicated with them, and provided for them as intelligent beings. The doctrine makes the whole drama of revelation a farce unworthy of the respect and attention of any self-respecting being. If man were and is totally depraved, which means that mind, heart, and conscience are wholly given over to sin, how do we explain the fact all revelation proceeds upon the principle that man though a sinner is still able to comprehend and do the will of God if he chooses to do it? (4) The doctrine is opposed to the plainest declarations of the gospel. The Messiah's great invitation is radically opposed to it: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you. and learn of me: for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls; for my yoke is easy and my burden is light (Matt., n:28-30)." It is uncompromisingly antagonistic to the analysis of the heart in His parable of the sower: "But that on the good ground are they, which in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience (Luke, 8:15)." It is unalterably opposed to the first sermon preached by the Apostles after the descent of the Holy Spirit as summed up in the exhortation of Peter: "Save yourselves from this untoward generation (Acts, 2:40)." It forever makes void the final world-wide invitation of the gospel: "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 of the waters of life freely (Rev., 22:17)." (5) The attempt to sustain it by the word of God is a gross perversion of the intention of its author. The favorite proof of the advocates of this doctrine is in the Old Testament, and it is applicable only to the condition of apostate Israel (Isa., 1:10-15), but the very next verse after this shows

that even they still had the power to reform! But why multiply quotations ? Take your Bible and search for yourself.

XI. Its theory of conversion tends to produce unbelief in the word of God. This is a grave charge, and I make it deliberately. They teach that sinners are dead, and therefore helpless, and that regeneration is a miracle brought about by the direct work of the Holy Spirit, and that the word of God is a dead letter previous to regeneration. If the word of God as it is written does not possess power, inherently, to bring about regeneration, men naturally think that it is worthless. I call my opponent's special attention to this charge.

XII. It sets up the Church at the wrong place, or rather no place! I call on my opponent to state in his reply in plain words where the Church of Christ was established. In other words, I demand of him an answer to this question: Where did the law of Moses end and where did the gospel begin, or where did the temple service end and Church service begin? This question is certainly relevant. People must find the beginning corner. I insist that he point it out. If he cannot do it, he cannot identify his doctrine and practice with the Church as it was at the beginning. I can locate the beginning and give proof in abundance, and shall do it at the proper time. It is his job now. I call upon him to come up to the task. There is no way out of this but the name of the place with the proof.

XIII. It misuses the name of Baptist. To this I object. A Baptist is one who baptizes, and no one else can appropriately wear the name. In the correct sense, the New Testament sense, I am as much of a Baptist as he is, for I baptize as many men and women as he does. The very moment a person who does not baptize puts on the name it becomes sectarianism of

the rankest type. Let us look at the history of this sectarian use of the word Baptist. It originated undoubtedly with the King James translation in 1611 or later, and if the original word had been correctly translated this use of the word would never have been heard of. How inconsistent the Baptists are on this point! Consider their claims. They contend that the original word from which baptism comes means immersion, and this is true, and look at their conclusion: "Therefore we are Baptists!"

XIV. It makes too little of baptism. This strikes you strangely, but it is true, Jesus Christ said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved (Mark, 16:16)." Reflect on this. What does it mean? What would you say if you had never heard it before and if you had no prejudice for or against any prevalent interpretation? Evidently, that the promise of salvation is to those who both believe and are baptized. The fact is you cannot make it mean anything else. You may reject it altogether, but cannot get any other meaning out of it than that which is apparent to the most ignorant. Now to the test of my assertion. Many of you have heard Baptists preach all your lives; did any of you, one of you, ever hear one Baptist preacher take this passage for a text and labor to enforce its natural meaning, its only meaning? You never did and you never will, for the simple reason that the moment a Baptist preacher does this he throws off his denominational shackles, and stands before the world as only a Christian, a Christian only. On the day of Pentecost the Apostle Peter, in answer to the thousands who were cut to the heart by the hearing and belief of the truth, told them to repent, and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, promising those who did it the gift of the Holy Spirit. If my opponent will preach a ser-

mon on this passage and insist that Peter said what he meant and meant what he said, and that the answer as it is recorded is good for us, and his brethren do not treat him as a heretic, I will acknowledge that I have known the Baptists all my life to no avail. So far as I am concerned, and I speak for a host of those who are my brethren, I extend my hand to my opponent and his brethren, and declare in view of Christ's prayer (John, 17:1-21) for the oneness of His people, to agree with them in the presence of this multitude to forever stop the dispute on the design of baptism, on the basis of the exact words of Scripture. In other words, I am willing to agree with them that the words of Jesus and the Apostles on this question shall be final with us. and that hereafter when we speak of baptism it must be in the words of the record without word or comment. Will this settle it? It does settle it. Nothing else can settle it.

XV. It makes too much of baptism. It makes baptism its standard, its test of fellowship, calls itself for it and rallies around it. With them it is baptism from Dan to Beersheba, and baptism further north of Dan, and south of Beersheba than any one has ever gone ! I protest against this sectarian exaltation of one command of the gospel. Look at it. Baptism can only be performed once in the case of each person. Faith, repentance, self-denial, righteousness, sobriety, godliness, patience, love, are to continue to the end of the race, it matters not how long it lasts. I solemnly declare that if they must make a sectarian use of a Christian idea, that the single act of baptism should be the last one that should be considered. The Missionary Patience Church, or Missionary Love Church would sound infinitely better than Missionary Baptist Church, for then the emphasis would be on the whole life and not on a single act. How much more appro-

prate it would be to say the Church of Christ, or Christians. Why ? For the simple reason that by so doing we would exalt our Redeemer and make it known that baptism is nothing save an act of obedience that brings our souls into closer contact with Him.

XVI. It teaches that men are saved out of Christ. I must be careful here. I want to be absolutely fair. Wait until I explain. Open your Bibles and follow me as I quote: "Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen, and my fellow prisoners, who are of note among the Apostles, who were also in Christ before me (Rom., 16:7)." What is affirmed of these two ancient disciples? Answer: They were in Christ. What else? Answer: They were in Christ before Paul. Again, "Paul, called to be an Apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God, and Sosthenes our brother, unto the Church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours (I. Cor., 1: i, 2)," What is affirmed of the Christians at Corinth? Answer: They were sanctified in Christ Jesus. Again, "Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new (II. Cor., 5:17)." What is affirmed here? Answer: That those who are in Christ are new creatures. Again, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus (Gal., 3:28)." What is affirmed here? Answer: That sexual and national distinctions are blotted out in Christ. Again, "In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit (Eph., 2:21, 22)." What is affirmed here? Answer: That the Ephesians were in Christ and were growing together in Him.

Again, "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons (Phil., r: i)." What is affirmed here? Answer: That all the Philippian saints were in Christ Jesus. Again, "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, and Timotheus our brother, to the saints and faithful brethren in Christ at Colosse: Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ (Col., 1: t, 2)." What is affirmed here? Answer: That the brethren at Colosse were in Christ. Again, "Paul, and Sylvanus, and Timotheus, unto the Church of the Thessalonians which is in God the Father, and in the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ (I. Thess. 1)." What is affirmed here? Answer: That the Thessalonians were both in God the Father and in His Son. Again, "Paul, and Sylvanus, and Timotheus, unto the Church of the Thessalonians in God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ (II. Thes., 1: i, 2)." What is affirmed here? Answer: Simply what was affirmed in the first epistle, no more, no less. "In Christ;" study these words. Do you think their repeated use in the epistles an accident? By no means, for we hold that the epistles are inspired and therefore true in every particular. If the phrase had occurred but once in the Apostolic writings we might be justified in considering that but little emphasis had been put upon it. But it occurs over and over again. Indeed, I challenge my opponent to find one Christian out of Christ from Pentecost to the death of the last Apostle. If he can name one and give the proof I will withdraw this charge. What is meant by being in Christ? Let the New Testament answer: "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones

(Eph., 5:30)." What is meant by being members of His body? Let the New Testament answer: "And He is the head of the body, the Church (Col., 1:18)." How do men get into the body, the Church, or Christ? Let the New Testament answer: "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son (Col., 1:13)." What is the last act, the consummating act, in this translation? Let the New Testament answer: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; for as-many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ (Gal., 3:26, 27)." My brother and his Church teach that a man is saved when he believes, and therefore out of Christ.

XVII. It teaches that men are saved outside of the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, for they are saved according to their teaching before and without baptism. This openly antagonizes the Great Commission. Hear the Master: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in (literally into) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit (Matt., 28:18, 19)." In the days of Moses the Lord declared that in every place where He recorded His name He would meet with the children of men and bless them. Do you wish the proof? Here it is: "In all places where I record my name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee (Ex., 20:24)." Was this true in the days of Moses and Israel? My opponent will not, cannot deny it. Is it true now? I most deliberately and solemnly affirm that it is. Where is the name of Jehovah—Father, Son and Holy Spirit—recorded in the New Covenant? In faith? Let him find the proof of it. In repentance? Let him turn to book, chapter and verse and read the proof. At the mourner's bench? The New Testament knows nothing about such a thing. Where then? I answer: In

the solemn ordinance of baptism, and no where else. I propose to push this on him. His practice denies it. He must bring the proof up to his practice or his practice up to his proof! Which will he do?

XVIII. There is not a Baptist preacher on earth who will give the answers to inquirers that are recorded in the book of Acts, for the very act of doing this would make him a heretic in the eyes of his brethren and turn him out of the Church!

XIX. It makes God a tyrant—responsible for the damned. The Baptist theory in brief is: (i) All men are totally depraved and therefore unable to do anything to save themselves. (2) 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! I ask you to calmly examine this charge. Scrutinize it in every part, and follow me and decide on the evidence I adduce whether it is true or false. A majority of you are familiar with Baptist doctrine or practice. You know what they teach just as well as I do. My friend must either deny his doctrine or admit my conclusion. I insist that there is no other way out of the difficulty. If all men are totally depraved, and they all believe it, it follows as inevitably as light follows the sun that they are all dead, helpless and utterly opposed to all good, and if this is their true condition it follows irresistibly, also, that regeneration is a miracle in which the sinner does not and cannot co-operate in any sense. If it takes a miracle to convert the sinner, and if God only can perform miracles, who is responsible for failures? Let my brother answer, and while he is at it I want him to harmonize his theory of God's government and his doctrine of total depravity, election and miraculous conversion with the Fatherhood of God. No

good man, indeed but few unconverted men, denies the universality of parental love. Show me a father, just one, who would treat his helpless child with the insatiable cruelty, the vindictive hate, the unchangeable burning to which this doctrine consigns, by an unalterable decree before creation, untold millions of the human race without giving them the shade of the shadow of a chance to decide their destiny for themselves. And yet he claims that God is the Creator and Father of us all! Oh! the shame of it! God save us all from such delusion! Nor is this all. They declare that the thing is settled, settled now, settled beyond change. Will you calmly weigh this statement? Admitting that it is true, what use is there for the Church, the preacher, the gospel, anything else? I will follow this falsehood of falsehoods further. Do the Baptists really believe it? I fear that some of them do. Is their practice consistent with it? I will state it and let you decide for yourself. Here is a Baptist revival. Things are getting hot. Excitement increases and sinners cry for mercy. My opponent is the preacher. This is the hour for service. What a mighty gathering! He takes the words of the Master as a text for his sermon: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life; for God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved (Jno., 3:16, 17)." He emphasizes two points; first, God's love as revealed in the gift of His Son, and second, the universality of that love. Is that consistent? Does he not know that according to Baptist theology God does not love the world? Does he not know that according to his own creed the majority of his audience is already doomed, irretrievably doomed to hell, that they have been doomed since the morn-

ing of time; that there has never been a time when they have not been doomed? But that makes no difference as the revival must go! The sermon is finished. The front seats are vacated and in response to the invitation forty persons come forward. Now while they sing and pray let us calmly take in the situation from the standpoint of their doctrine of election, and also their theory of direct spiritual operation. Either these forty men and women are of the small number of those elected to salvation from eternity, or they are of the immense number of those doomed to hell. Which? If they are of the elect the time of their conversion is settled to the second, and no power in earth or heaven can hurry it or postpone it for a moment. On that ground the whole procedure is a farce. If they are of the non-elect no power in the universe can save one of them. On this ground the whole procedure is a waste of time, energy and vocal power. The whole thing amounts to this: they cry to God to save the elect, which He cannot and will not do until the time comes, and they cry to Him to save the non-elect, which He cannot and will not do unless their doctrine is false. Let us view it from the standpoint of their theory of conversion. For a moment I dissolve their theory of election and place the whole world on the same basis—God's love and free salvation, on the terms of the gospel, to everybody. Listen, to that prayer: "Oh God our Father, save these poor penitents now. Send thy Spirit with sin-destroying power. Thou knowest these sinners are dead. They cannot do anything. Save them Lord, save them now through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen." Follow this brother as he goes among the penitents. Listen to his instructions to them. To one he says: "Only believe." To another he says: "You must give up everything." To another he says: "You must not try to work your way

out, cast yourself on Jesus." Mark you, he is the same man who said in his prayers that these penitents could not do anything? Why does he not give them the answer that Peter gave the Pentecostans? There are two reasons. One is, he does not believe in Peter's way of doing it. The other is, it would kill out the excitement and restore reason to its throne, and that would be a fatal blow to the whole thing! The revival ends. A review of it will help us out of the darkness. Reflect on the preaching. The preacher repeatedly asserted that all sinners are totally depraved, and assured his audience over and over again that an attempt to "do" anything would be fatal, and in the face of this he also proclaimed that if these "totally depraved," "helpless," "dead" sinners did not repent they would be damned. He preached that God is willing, willing now, and then called penitents to the altar and by united and repeated prayers tried to make Him more willing. The praying was peculiar. God was besought to save men who had, according to the preaching, done nothing, and who could not possibly do anything, in obedience to His requirements. On the supposition that God is willing and the sinner helpless, I want my brother to answer a question or two. I want to know how he escapes the conclusion that, according to his doctrine, nothing plays any part in the conversion of men save the prayers of the Church. I also want to know if all the penitents were totally depraved, and God answered the prayers of him and his helpers and brought some of them to light, why some went away mourning. I hold him to his doctrine. One sinner cannot be more dead than another, and "coming forward" to the "altar of prayer" or "standing for prayer" does not help the matter in the least, for a "dead man tells no tales," and a dead sinner cannot do anything, and if he tries he will dam-

age his own cause. If therefore conversion comes in answer to the good man's prayer, and the sinner cannot pray until he passes out of sin, I boldly affirm that my opponent and his brethren have placed themselves in a position where they are responsible for the world's salvation. Further than this, if they will stick to their doctrine and induce men to believe and act upon it, they will never make another convert while the world stands. Allow me to sum up this revival. Altogether there were sixty persons at the altar. I concede that these people were honest and earnest. Why did they go there? I answer: They were in the precise condition that the Pentecostans were in when they cried for help. Why did they continue to go there? Simply because they had been taught that, in spite of the theory that said that they could not do anything, they must, by physical suffering and prayer, work themselves to the point where God would grant them relief, and because no one would give them the Apostolic answer. Forty persons "professed a change." What became of the others? A few gave up while the battle raged because they thought God was acting with partiality. The others were persistent until almost midnight on the last night, and went away in deepest trouble. See that dear old white-headed mother. She did her best to the last and went away in the same condition as that in which the beginning of the meeting found her. There is failure here. Who is to blame? I challenge him to name one man who honestly sought pardon as these have done, and failed to find it, in the days of the Apostles. He cannot find one, and therefore "the Baptist Church is Apostolic in doctrine and practice!" What became of the converts? Thirty of them "joined" the Baptists, and four "joined" the Methodists, and the others being doubtful as to the genuineness of their conversion, concluded to wait on

the outside. I digress long enough to offer my Baptist friends a suggestion: In the days of the Apostles the same process that made men Christians made them also members of the Church. If you will therefore adopt Peter's method you will not have to submit to the humiliation of dividing your converts with the Methodists. The process is not patented. Try it by all means. But let me warn you that the process only makes Christians, Christians without prefix, Christians without suffix, Christians only, only Christians! You cannot make a Baptist Christian or a Christian Baptist, or Baptist of a Christian without adding something to the oracles of God.

XX. In the face of the plain statement of the Apostle Peter at the beginning of his work in the city of Jerusalem (Acts, 2:1-38), as interpreted by the ripe and unbiased scholarship of the world, they affirm that baptism is because of the remission of sins, thus making that act of obedience, for that is all it is, absolutely unnecessary to salvation. Here is the Baptist position in five chapters: (i) All men, even the elect, are totally depraved and therefore unable to do anything in order to salvation. (2) The first step in the redemption of the elect, all others are hopelessly damned, is regeneration brought about by the prayers of the Church for sinners. He may deny this, but I shall stand by it. If all men are totally depraved it follows that a man cannot even desire to become a Christian until after he becomes one. I must follow his doctrine to its legitimate conclusion. Reading the Bible will not help the sinner, for according to this theory he would not understand it if he could, and could not understand it if he would. Hearing the Gospel will not help him because he cannot believe it. Praying will not help him for that is "doing" and hence unavailing. He is helpless and the only hope *is*

in the prayers of the Church to God to "bring him through" by direct power. (3) Repentance. (4) Faith, (5) Remission of sins and citizenship in the kingdom of God. I ask my friend to take this little summary up, chapter by chapter, and show that it is in harmony with what we know of the constitution of man, also that it is in harmony with the Apostolic writings. I want him to harmonize his position that baptism is the first act of the new-born child of God with the words of Jesus, in which it is made to appear that baptism is a part of the birth: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God (Jno., 3:5)." I want him to explain it on the ground that all the Christians of whom we read in the New Testament were "in Christ," and according to Paul had been baptized "into Him." A position, to be Apostolic, must be harmonious in all its parts, and it must also harmonize in letter and spirit with what we know is true according to what is written. The Baptists glory in making baptism a non-essential, and they undoubtedly succeed, the Apostles of Christ to the contrary notwithstanding. XXI. It sets up one plan for salvation and another for Church membership. I want to make this unmistakably clear. Do you catch the point? Well, I will try it again. According to Baptist usage and doctrine it is more difficult to get into the Church than it is to get into heaven. Or to put it still stronger, it is easier to become a Christian than it is to become a Baptist. The Apostolic Church set up one test for salvation and the same answered for Church membership. In other words, that which was necessary to salvation was necessary to Church membership, and that which was necessary to Church membership was necessary to salvation. The Apostles knew of no method by which a man could be made a Christian and left out of the

Church. But my friend represents a process that is guaranteed to do it without fail, for after a man "repents and believes" he is "taken in" by a process that is unknown to the New Testament. Perhaps you think I cannot establish what I have said in reference to the Church at the beginning. I will try it. Luke, in giving a summary of the results of Apostolic preaching says: "And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved (Acts, 2:47)." My opponent will not deny that the original brings out a different idea altogether: "And the Lord added to the church daily such as were being saved;" thus proving that being saved and being added to the Church were one and the same thing. Again, "Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ also hath received us to the glory of God (Rom., 15:7)." If this does not mean that we are not to set up any test or requirement at the door of the Church that the Lord does not set up at the gate of heaven, pray tell me what it does mean. Again, "But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him (I. Cor., 12:18)." What does this mean? To whom was it spoken? It is addressed to the Church of Christ at Corinth, and means unquestionably that when men comply with the terms of the gospel that God places them in the body which is the Church. Do you ask for further proof? Read the book of Acts. If this view is not correct, all the early Christians were left out of the Church, for the idea of joining the Church is neither expressed nor implied in the book. I present the matter in few words and challenge contradiction. In Apostolic times every man who believed in Christ and obeyed Him became a member of His Church without any other act, personal or otherwise. My brother will work earnestly for weeks to make men Christians, and just as soon as this process is completed, as he claims, he does his best

to make Baptists of them, and this he does, according to his claims, by requiring them to relate an experience unknown to the Apostles, and then submit to a vote of the Church, also unknown to the Apostles, and then submit to baptism at the hands of what he solemnly calls "a legal administrator," meaning thereby that save a Baptist preacher no one is authorized to baptize! I think this a little presumptions in the light of his speech, for he cannot set up his claims by the word of God. It is positively painful to see a Baptist preacher divide his converts with the Methodists at the close of a union revival, but his plan is defective and he cannot help it. If he would be satisfied with simply making men Christians the difficulty would be obviated, but with one plan to make a man a Christian and another to get him into the Baptist Church, I see no way out but to divide, but it is a pity!

XXII. It teaches that salvation is by grace alone. Watch the old Calvinistic fatality crop out: Predestination, total depravity, limited atonement, salvation by grace alone, impossibility of apostasy. I deny the whole thing, from the mudsill on which it rests to the last stone on the top of the building. God never predestinated a single man to heaven or hell; total depravity, as he teaches it, is a dogma that may do to pad out human creed, but practically it is without gospel recognition; limited atonement is a figment of a disordered imagination; salvation by grace alone is utterly without Divine recognition, and the theory of the impossibility of apostasy is simply the outgrowth of false premises, and he cannot uphold it. Let us reason. If men are saved by grace only, only grace, the sinner might as well fold up his hands and give it up; we might as well call the missionaries home and let the Church go out of business, but he is not willing to do this! Why? Because that which looks well in print

and sounds well in a sermon will not work out in practice. I charge on him that he will not, he dare not, carry his doctrine out to its legitimate limit. Let him try it and he will either have to claim to be a dispenser of the grace of God, and surely he will not do this, or quit preaching. I propose to hold him strictly to his doctrine, and by so doing drive him either to universalism or to baptism for the remission of sins, for if I can demonstrate that the sinner can and must do one thing, trusting the Redeemer for salvation, I thereby demonstrate that he can and must do everything that is commanded or perish; and if he cannot do anything, and if God is just, universal salvation must follow. Both roads lie before him. He may take his choice, and before he gets half way through he will wish he had taken the other road! "Grace alone." Look at these words. Weigh them. Do they ever stand together in the oracles of God? Never! "Grace alone" absolutely excludes everything else. Faith, repentance and godliness play no part whatever with it. Baptist doctrine reads well, sounds well, but the thing will not work practically. It heads in the direction of too many pitfalls for me. Before proceeding further I wish to say most emphatically that I do not discount the grace of God. I believe in it, I build on it. It is the word, Baptist word, "alone," that excites my opposition. It makes a false impression, and certainly leads toward entanglements. If my opponent will find the phrase in the book of Acts, I will withdraw this charge with pleasure. By what are we saved according to the word of truth? I will answer. We are saved by grace: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God (Eph., 2:8)." We are saved by Jesus Christ: "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people

from their sins (Matt., 1:21)." We are saved by the gospel: "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)." We are saved by faith or belief: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house (Acts, 16:31)." We are saved by repentance: "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. Pet., 3:9)." We are saved by confessing Christ: "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation (Rom., 10:10)." We are saved by calling on the name of the Lord: "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved (Rom., 10:13)." We are saved by baptism: "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh. but the answer"—seeking—" of a good conscience toward God), by the resurrection of Jesus Christ (I. Pet., 3:21)." We are saved by works: "Ye see thee how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only (Jas., 2:24)." Conclusion: Therefore men are saved by grace alone, and the Baptist Church is Apostolic in doctrine and practice, and Baptist preachers only are authorized to baptize, and all others, it matters not what they have done, are unbaptized in the sight of God !!!

XXIII. It teaches the impossibility of apostasy. Of course the Church cannot do otherwise, for this is the logical outcome of the doctrine of predestination. If a man's salvation has been settled from all eternity, he is bound to persevere; he is made that way, and he could not do otherwise if he would. Man is a machine, pure and simple. Before his conversion he cannot do

anything to save himself; after his conversion he cannot do anything to damn himself. Before conversion he cannot do anything in order to get in. After conversion he cannot do anything in order to get out! It reminds me of a safe of which only one man knows the combination. He alone knows how to open it, and after it is opened no one else can close it. Here is the sinner. His heart is locked up. God only knows the combination, whether it is of the elect or of the non-elect. If he is of the elect God will open his heart and take care of him whether he perseveres or not. What encouragement is there in this doctrine to righteousness, sobriety and godliness? If right doing will not save the non-elect and wrong doing will not damn the elect, we might as well eat and drink and be merry (I. Cor., 15:32), for we cannot hurt or help ourselves in the least, and all the preachers, and all the Christians, and all the Bibles, and all the tracts on earth cannot change or turn from its course for one second the destiny of a single individual. Is the doctrine true? Can it be supported by the word of God? Argument against it is abundant. In the first place it destroys completely all free agency. Man is a free agent in everything else, why is he not when the interests of his soul are at stake? I insist on an answer to this question. I will introduce a few proofs. Stand with me at Kadesh-barnea and look back over the great and trackless desert. What do we find? Not less than one million one hundred and ninety-nine thousand nine hundred and ninety-eight graves. How came these graves here? Who were they? They are Hebrews who were once in Egypt. What about them? Were they not all under the cloud and in the sea? Yes. Were they not all baptized unto Moses? Certainly. Did they not all eat of the same spiritual meat? Undoubtedly. Did they not all drink of the

same spiritual drink? No one denies it. Why then are they here? Let us draw nigh and examine one of these graves with care. What is the inscription on that one? Canst thou read Hebrew? Here is a liberal translation: "But with many of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness." See! there is another inscription. Canst thou read Greek? Here is my translation: "Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall (I. Cor., 10:1-12)." Who said this? Paul the Apostle. Conclusion: Therefore the Baptist Church is Apostolic in doctrine and practice! Again, if a Christian cannot fall what use have we for the epistolary writings? They were written solely to warn Christians, and by actual count there are not less than two hundred passages in them alone in which the Christian is warned of his danger, or in which his eternal salvation is conditioned on his faith, obedience, steadfastness and self-denial. If my brother calls for more proof I shall bring it forward with pleasure.

XXIV. Their teaching tends to confusion. My friend is a Missionary Baptist, and he claims to be a representative of the true Baptist Church, and also that it is the only Church of Christ. I admire his courage, but must remind him that there are many other kinds of Baptists, and I suppose they all make the same claim. I mention a few of the kinds: Primitive Baptists, Seventh Day Baptists, General Baptists, Regular Baptists, Free-Will Baptists, Old Connexion Baptists, New-Connexion Baptists, Particular Baptists, Six Principal Baptists, and Two-Seed Baptists. This is all I can think of now, but you may look out for more, for just as soon as some Baptist preacher gets a new idea and has the courage to stick to it, another sect will be born that can trace its history back to the Apostles.

XXV. 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!

XXVI. It nullifies the gospel by teaching that sinners are converted outside of it. While they preach with great zeal and insist on sending the gospel to the heathen, they claim that men are converted by the direct work of the Holy Spirit. Granting this for argument's sake, what part can the facts and requirements of the gospel play in the conversion of men? Granting this, what part does the preacher play in the conversion of men? Granting this, what part does the Church play in the conversion of men? Granting this, what part does anything or any person save the Holy Spirit play in the conversion of men? He will have plenty of time in his reply to tell. I trust that he will do it. I insist that men are converted by the Bible. But I go further than this; I insist that they are converted by the New Testament. But I go further than this; I insist that they are converted by the gospel as unfolded by the Apostles and recorded in the book of Acts. I want my opponent to make a note of this question and answer it: Is the Bible inspired, is the New Testament inspired, is the gospel an inspired message to men? Also, is the Bible, is the New Testament, is the gospel perfect; perfect in its fulness and in its adaptation to the needs of the lost? If he answers these questions in the affirmative, I cannot see the need of any outside power to make men Christians. If he answers them in the negative, I must say that I cannot see any need for the Bible. It is a fact

that we differ widely on this point. I will state the difference as I see it. He believes that the Bible is inspired, but that inherently it has no converting power, and that therefore the Holy Spirit must come with converting power outside of the Bible, outside of the New Testament, outside of the gospel, and enter the heart of man and give it life and peace. I believe that the Bible is an inspired book, that it has converting power by reason of the constant presence of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit in it, and that when a man hears the gospel in its fulness, simplicity and plainness, he hears the words of the Holy Spirit just as much and just as certainly as the contemporaries of the Apostles heard Him when they began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance. (Acts, 2; 1-4). In other words, he believes the Holy Spirit converts men outside of the gospel. I believe that the Holy Spirit converts men through the gospel. We are agreed that the Holy Spirit does the work. We disagree about how He does it. I contend that He does it through the facts, commands and promises of the gospel, and he denies it by praying for and expecting direct power. The issue is clearly drawn. I am expected to pull his position down and set my own up. I think I can do both, but I am the advocate, not the jury. I mean to give him a fair chance to set up his claims. Here is an easy way out for him: If he can produce one thought concerning redemption, and demonstrate by the testimony of Peter and John and James, or any other inspired man that it is true, and I fail to find it in the Bible, I will confess that his position is correct and mine false. He claims an independent action of the Spirit in each individual conversion. I call on him to tell what He thus reveals. If What is in the Bible the independent action is useless. If something else, the Bible is worthless. Not only so,

but if there is a new and distinct action and revelation in every case, each preceding convert failed to receive something that was necessary. If there is not a new revelation in each case we might as well go back to the Bible and take it as we find it. My friend takes great pride in calling himself a "Missionary" Baptist, and I admit that I like their missionary spirit, but what can a missionary do if the gospel of itself is not enough to save men? I cannot harmonize his missionary idea with his theory of miraculous conversion. The missionary idea is the logical and inevitable outgrowth of my position, for, as I take it, men cannot believe without hearing, and cannot hear without a preacher (Rom., 10:13-15), but according to his theory he must find Christians where the missionary has never gone, or affirm that God is a respecter of persons, for surely if He must send converting power outside of the gospel to those who are blessed with it, He would not be less kind to those who are confessedly in darkness and apparently hopeless. If he says the Holy Spirit comes only where they have the gospel in order to justify his missionary operations, it follows that this theory of "grace alone," or "Spirit alone," cannot stand. If the Lord has any special favors to bestow outside of the gospel, I say with reverence that on every known principle of justice and mercy He would send them to the heathen, but can my friend find any proof that He does it? Manifestly he cannot; neither can he demonstrate that He works outside of the truth in gospel lands. I challenge an examination of this argument. I am not done with his theory of conversion. There are many influences, many spirits, in the world (I. Jno., 4:1-3). How can the sinner tell when the Holy Spirit comes? My friend must tell or leave us in the dark. What does He say outside of the gospel? What does He promise outside of the gospel?

Does He speak? If not, how does He do His work? My friend says He does it, and I want to know how He does it, for I can never be sure it is He unless I can find out just what He does and how He does it. I want my friend also to tell us, in view of his theory of conversion, on what the operations of the Holy Spirit are dependent. Why, w*hen, and under what circumstances does He work? Give us proof. I take the liberty to say that if His operations are dependent on preaching, the theory falls to the ground. If not on preaching, the gospel falls to the ground. I close this speech by introducing five brief arguments, and proclaim my willingness to hang the issues of this discussion, so far as this point is concerned, on whichever one he chooses to attack:

(1). If the Holy Spirit operates independently of the word, why did Jesus Christ say that He would give the keys of the kingdom to the Apostles (Matt., 16:18; 18:18)? 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!

(2). If the Holy Spirit-operates independently of the word, what motive does He use? Man cannot 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.

(3). If the Holy Spirit operates 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.

(4). If the Holy Spirit operates 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)?

(5). If the Holy Spirit operates independently of the word,-and all who claim this are really under His directions, how are we to account for 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 word? 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. My friend cannot deny fellowship to Mahomet, or Chas. J. Giteau, or Freeman of Mass., who plunged the murderous knife into the bosom of his child, for they all claimed precisely what he claims: the direct illumination and guidance of the Holy Spirit!

FIRST DAY'S DISCUSSION.

PROPOSITION: *"The Church with which I, (H. C. HEMSTEAD), stand identified, is Apostolic in doctrine and practice."*

SECOND REPLY. MR. PRESIDENT, MODERATORS AND FELLOW-CHRISTIANS:

My time expired when I was in the midst of my argument. I should like to resume where I left off, but before I do so, I must notice some things of which my friend delivered himself in his last effort. I insist that he has not yet attempted to define his proposition, or to find a Baptist Church in the book of Acts, or any where else in the Bible. I think this failure is fatal to his cause. In my first speech I called upon him to show where the Church was set up, so an inquirer can turn and read the law of admission for himself. He is not certain where it was set up, but finally hit upon Caesarea Philippi. Did he offer any proof? Not one syllable. Did he affirm that it was a Baptist Church, or the Baptist Church? You know he did not. I will give him a little help, for he surely needs it. "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 mountain, 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 Caesarea Philippi (Isa., 2:1-3)." This seems final, but here is another proof that is still stronger: "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 Caesarea Philippi (Luke, 24:46, 47)." This should convince the most incredulous, but I have still stronger proof: "The church which was at Caesarea Philippi (Acts, 8: i)." If you still doubt, try this: "But Caesarea Philippi which is above is free, which is the mother of us all (Gal., 4:26)." Does this satisfy you? But hold! I made a mistake. It does not read Caesarea Philippi. It says Jerusalem! Jerusalem!! Jerusalem!!! I want to get to the bottom of this thing, and shall do it if it has any. To this end I will admit that the Church was established at Caesarea Philippi, and that it was the Missionary Baptist Church. Is not this generous? Now, with this admission in mind I am sure our friend will not object if I take you on a little tour of inspection and investigation. Look at the foundation of this Church. It is built upon One who has proclaimed Himself stronger than death (Matt., 16:13-19), but He has not proved it, and His most intimate friends and disciples do not even know what He means by rising from the dead (Mark, 9:9, 10). It is established under, and is running in conflict with, the Law of Moses, for the law was not abolished until Jesus died upon the cross (Eph., 2:13-17). It has no atonement as a basis of pardon, for the blood has not yet been shed (Matt., 26:28; I. Jno., 1:7). It has a commission only to the few lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt., 10:1-6). It has no head, for Jesus did not become head of the Church until He went up on high

(Eph., 1:18-23). It has no Holy Spirit in it, for He did not come until after the glorification (Jno., 7:38, 39), and it is therefore a dead body (Jas., 2:26). It has no priest, for Jesus entered upon His priestly labors by the word of the oath when He entered heaven (Heb.7:27, 28; 9: n, 12). It is without authority to proclaim anything in the name of Jesus (Matt., 16:20). I am free to say that if he can get any comfort out of a Church that has no "true" foundation, no head, no atonement, no world-wide commission, no Spirit, no priest, and not one regenerated member in it, seeing the blood of Christ had not yet been shed, he is more than welcome to it; but before he begins to console himself I want to say that he cannot even set up this kind of a Church! He was pressed for something to say, and he made his situation worse when he set the Church up at a time when not one element that was to enter into it was ready to go into it, and there is not one syllable of proof to sustain him.

He made a point on John's baptism, and asked me to say whether or not John's baptism was Christian baptism. I will answer him, but I can not see how that will do him any good, for in reality such a man as John the Baptist never lived! He was and is "John the Immerser." My friend argues that the original word means immerse, and thus backs me up in this statement. A correct translation of the Scriptures, Baptists themselves being judges, would cause the words "baptist" and "baptism" to disappear altogether. Now to the question: John's baptism was not Christian baptism for the simple reason that Christian baptism—meaning by this the baptism commanded by Christ—brought men into the blessings of His death (Rom., 6:1-5). I have answered his question without hesitancy or equivocation, and in return I want him to *s candidly answer one for me, and I want you to

watch him and see if he does it: Do you think, with an open Bible before you, that the fact that John baptized people was ever designed by the Lord to play any part in naming the Church or in determining its doctrinal peculiarities? Surely he will be neighborly enough to answer this. If he does not do it, we might conclude that silence on his part indicates that he cannot do it without overthrowing some of his denominational claims.

He made his strongest fight on the words of Jesus: "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it (Luke, 16:16)." Wilson translates this passage, and I think makes the meaning clearer: "The law and the prophets were till John; from that period, the kingdom of God is proclaimed, and every one presses towards it." However, I am willing to fight it out with him on the passage just as it stands in our common translation. It is strange to me that he is so extremely anxious to stay back of the Cross. Can you see a reason for this? I can: If I ever get him into Acts of the Apostles, where figures give way to facts, it will surely be a day of trouble to him. I take this passage to mean that the law and the prophets continued as the only instructors of men to the time of John, and that after he began to proclaim the coming of Christ's kingdom, the people rushed out to hear him, thus pressing towards the kingdom. It cannot mean that the law was abolished when John began to preach, for the law continued in full force, and the temple service continued uninterruptedly up to the expiration of Jesus on the cross (Matt., 27:50, 51). It cannot mean that the prophecies were all fulfilled when John began to preach, for we know that many of them were fulfilled at the crucifixion, and during the period following, and down the ages of the new

dispensation, even unto our day. It cannot mean that the kingdom of heaven was set up, but that it was preached, for my opponent knows, and every other man knows who reads the Bible, that not one man comprehended the mission of the Messiah until the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. If my brother knows of one man who understood the mission of Jesus when these words were spoken, let him name him. He cannot name one. I push this on him—he cannot name one! Yet he insists that the kingdom was set up at this time; the fact that he cannot point out the King, and the fact that none of the people who were in it knew what the Kingdom of Heaven meant, matters but little with him if he can only steer clear of Jerusalem .the day of Pentecost, and the second chapter of Acts! There are many proofs that this view is correct, but I shall only give one, but it will outweigh all he can give to the contrary: After Jesus had expired on the cross, one of His disciples, a distinguished man, was still waiting for the kingdom (Mark, 15:43). Do you think it possible for an institution of such momentous importance, such revolutionizing tendencies and such world-embracing benevolence as God's Kingdom, could be established for over three years in a little place like Judea, and a man of Joseph's position not find it out, particularly as he was anxious for its coming? Certainly not. Yet this is a fact if the kingdom began in the days of John. While on this point, I want to call my brother's attention to one thing that he seems to have overlooked: The kingdom of Jesus is established in the hearts of men, and this was an impossibility until He demonstrated by rising from the dead that He is worthy to reign (Rom., 1:4).

My opponent made a distinction without a difference when in order to justify his treatment of other

professed followers of Christ, he claimed to give them Christian fellowship but not Church fellowship. This distinction is absolutely unknown in the New Testament. In the New Testament the conditions of Christian fellowship and Church fellowship are precisely the same. I wish him to point out a difference and find the proof in the book of Acts, or anywhere else. The book, chapter and verse will settle it, and nothing else will.

He said also that the keys of the kingdom were given to the Church. This is entirely without foundation.

I want to propound a few questions to my opponent, and if he will answer them I will agree to answer an equal number along the same line when it comes my turn to work in the lead. I will number the questions so he will find no difficulty in following me:

I. "The churches of Christ salute you (Rom., 16:16)." "The church of God which is at Corinth (I. Cor., 1:2)." "The churches of Judea which were in Christ (Gal., 1:22)." Where is the proof that Jesus established a Baptist Church or that the Apostles did so, or that either Christ or His Apostles ever called it the Baptist Church, or the Baptist Church of Christ? Nicknames are not in good taste. Who nicknamed the Church Baptist, and who authorized him to do it?

II. Why do you monopolize the name "Baptist," seeing that other people baptize as well as you? You surely cannot mean that we are all unbaptized. Please come out on this point. An anxious world is waiting for information. We want to know if it is not a fact that you consider the Church more sacred than heaven, and that after all you make baptism so important that a Baptist only can baptize, and that he gets his authority to baptize by an unbroken line back to the Apostles. If yes, I want you to help me out on two points: First,

I admit for argument's sake that I have never been baptized, and that he has the authority that he claims. Now, I want to ask who baptized him? and who baptized him, and so on back to the beginning? Supposing that the average life of a Baptist preacher is twenty-five years, the line of succession would comprehend about four hundred and fifty men. How many rascals do you suppose there were in the line? Would the fact that there was one hypocrite in the line break it and destroy the charm? If no, I do not see why a God-fearing Christian may not baptize with at least as much authority as the Baptist preacher who was baptized by, and succeeded the hypocrite. If yes, my baptism is as good as his. I am ready to acknowledge that I have never been baptized, and submit to it at his hands the very moment he presents to me the certificate of absolute soundness in the faith and unimpeachable moral character of each of his predecessors in office. I want the best. He claims to have it. I am ready to go with him if he will present the proof to set his claims up, but, however much I may respect his sincerity, I cannot do it on his bare statement. Historical allusion will not convince me, I must have absolute proof. In order to give him a start, I admit that the line exists, but he must prove that it is unbroken in morality and doctrine, and while he is doing this I respectfully suggest that he pay his respects to the claims of the Primitive Baptists, Protestant Episcopal and Roman Catholics, all of whom make precisely the same claim that he makes. The Primitive Baptist says that his line is unbroken, and that he only can baptize. The Protestant Episcopal says his line is unbroken, and that he only can baptize. The Roman Catholic says his line is unbroken, and that he only can baptize. The Missionary Baptist says his line is unbroken, and he only can

baptize. I will turn these three claimants over to my opponent's tender mercy and pass on. Second, I want him to explain how the Baptist church, having continued in one unbroken line through all the ages, is not mentioned once in the New Testament.

III. "So shall ye be my disciples (John, 15:8}." "And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch (Acts, 11:26)." "Beloved of God, called to be saints (Rom., 1:7)." "Heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ (Rom., 8:17)." "Love as brethren (I. Pet, 3:8)." "Now are we the sons of God (I. John, 3:2)." The followers of Christ in Apostolic times were called Disciples, Christians, Saints, Heirs of God, Brethren, Sons of God. I have given the proof. Where were they called Baptists, or Missionary Baptists, or Baptist Christians, or Missionary Baptist Christians?

IV. "But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived (II. Tim.. 3:13)." Where is the proof that the Apostles taught that men are totally depraved?

V. "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men (Titus, 2:11)." Where is the proof that the Apostles taught that men are saved by grace alone?

VI. "What! know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's (I. Cor., 6:19, 20)." "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time (I. Tim.2:5 6)." "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as

of a lamb without blemish and without spot (I. Pet., 1:18, 19)." "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood (Rev., 1:5)." "And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation (Rev., 5:9)." "And one of the elders answered, saying unto me, What are these which are arrayed in white robes? And whence came they? And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the lamb (Rev., 7:13, 14)." Where is the proof that Jesus had a church before He purchased it by the shedding of His blood? These passages are respectfully submitted in the hope that they may induce him to come out from under the law, and stand with me on the Apostolic gospel, depending on the actually shed blood for the blotting out of sins. I lay all emphasis on the blood of Christ, the shed blood! There is no use talking about a church without His blood: "Without shedding of blood there is no remission (Heb., 9:22)." A church at Caesarea Phillipi, indeed! It was the church of unwashed and unsaved sinners, and nothing more! I thought the Baptists believed in a regenerated membership.

VII. "And the word of God increased; and the number of disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith (Acts, 6:7)." This is a summary of the triumphs of the gospel under the Apostles. I call on you to tell what part the mourner's bench played in the work described in this passage. If you cannot or will not answer this question, I insist that your claim

of being Apostolic in doctrine and practice is unfounded and absurd.

VIII. "And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; vrhat doth hinder me to be baptized? * * * And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him (Acts, 8:36-38)." "And many that believed came, and confessed, and showed their deeds (Acts, 19:18)." Where is the proof that the Apostles ever required converts to relate such experiences as are now required by the Baptist Church, or where did the question of a man's baptism ever depend on the vote of the Church?

IX. "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight (Acts. 20:7)." "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come (I. Cor., 11:26)." "Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves 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)." Where is the proof that the early Christians only broke bread once a month, or once in two months, or that any Apostle ever said at the Lord's table: "We invite those of like faith and order?"

X. "Save yourselves from this untoward generation (Acts, 2:40)." Where is the proof that any Apostle ever taught that a sinner cannot do anything to save himself? I lay special emphasis on this question. My opponent teaches that a sinner cannot do anything to save himself. This quotation puts him in positive opposition to the Apostle Peter, and therefore to Apostolic Christianity.

XI. "And hereby we do know that we know him, if

we keep his commandments (I. Jno., 2:3)." Where is the proof that any Apostle ever asked a convert how he felt, or what convert described his feelings?

XII. "If any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf (I. Pet., 4:16)." My opponent knows, if he is the scholar he is reputed to be, that "on this behalf" means literally "in this name." 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 desired to be known simply as a Christian, would you baptize him? Would your church permit you to do it? If you answer in the negative you proclaim your hostility to Christianity unmixed with the traditions of denominationalism.

XIII. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may 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 (Jno., 17:20, 21)." This is the Redeemer's great prayer for us. "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of the 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: to)." This is Paul's great exhortation to the Church. Why do you refuse to affiliate with immersed believers outside of your organization, when you cannot deny that their lives prove that they have the Spirit of Christ and are therefore the children of your Father, particularly when you insist that baptism is not essential to salvation?

XIV. "Wherefore, my brethren, ye are also become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is

raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God (Rom., 7:4)." Are we married to Christ? If so, whose name should we wear? When does the bride lose her identity in the bridegroom and take His name?

XV. "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)." "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house (Acts, 16:31)." "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord (Acts, 22:16)." In view of these Apostolic answers to those who desired to become Christians, and at the time of asking did not know what to do, I propound three questions to my opponent: First, how do you harmonize these apparently conflicting answers? Second, would you give these answers under similar circumstances? Third, would these answers, followed out in obedience, make a man a Baptist? Further, what process makes a man a Christian; what process makes him a Baptist? Will the process that makes a man a Christian make him a Baptist, or will the process that makes him a Baptist make him a Christian. If his process is identical with that which was used by the Apostles, it is an utter impossibility for him to make a Baptist, for with all the wondrous equipment of the "twelve," they never made a single one!

XVI. "And whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight (I. Jno., 3:22)." Is prayer limited by the promises and commandments of God? If yes, where has He promised to save those who, though doubtless sincere, call on Him by your encouragement at the mourner's bench, when they have neither believed nor obeyed Him? If no, how

can we determine what we shall pray for? Do you, will you, affirm 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 cannot the Church save the whole world, especially the elect, seeing that all are alike dead and helpless according to your theory of conversion? If no, do you not think it would be wise to return to Jerusalem before trying to set up the claim that you are Apostolic in doctrine and practice?

XVII. "For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth. saith the Lord God: wherefore turn yourselves, and live ye (Ezek., 18:32)." Is God still willing to save the sinner? If you answer yes, how do you account for the large number of sincere persons who go away from your revivals seeking, seeing that all are dead alike according to your theory. If no. what will make Him willing?

XVIII. "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness (Rom., 10: 10)." What is heart-felt religion? If a man hears the gospel of Christ and believes and obeys it with all his heart, will he have it? I am anxious for an answer to this question. My Baptist friends put a great deal of emphasis on this, and I want to know just what they mean by it.

XIX. "Then Peter opened his mouth, and 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)." Is salvation conditional? If yes, what are the conditions, and how can a helpless, dead sinner perform them? If no, who is responsible for the damned?

XX. "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord (Acts, 10:48)." 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: "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, that liveth and abideth forever (I. Pet., 1:23)." If no, why practice it and make it a test of fellowship, and thus debar the Methodists, and other Baptists whom you acknowledge as Christians, from your table?

XXI. "For I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more (Jer., 31:34)." "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren (I. Jno., 3:14)." At what point is the penitent pardoned, and what are his evidences of it? This is a question of surpassing importance. I insist that we can know. I insist that we can learn this from the Apostles.

XXII. Would you retain in your fellowship a man who would persistently teach that baptism is for the remission of sins? If no, on what ground do you claim to be Apostolic, seeing Peter preached it with approval of all the other Apostles on the day of Pentecost? If yes, why do you not preach it?

XXIII. "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 (I. Pet., 1:22)." When does this process of purification begin; if not with the sinner's first step toward God, when? What is the first step, and who must take it?

XXIV. "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin. but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you; being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness (Rom., 6:17, 18)." Please explain this and harmonize it with Baptist doctrine and practice.

XXV. "And there are three that bear witness on earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and

these three agree in one (I. Jno., 5:8)." Please explain this and harmonize it with Baptist doctrine and practice, and tell us in view of the fact that the three "agree in one," how it is possible to obtain the benefits of one without the others?

XXVI. "Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ also received us, to the glory of God (Rom., 15:7)." Would you accept a Six-Principle, Primitive, Freewill, Seventh Day, Old Connexion, New Connexion, Regular, or Particular Baptist without re-baptizing him?

XXVII. 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?

XXVIII. Do hearing, faith, or 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?

XXIX. 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 would not be a member, and you could not baptize him because he would not let you!

XXX. What part of redemption is the work of the sovereign? What part is the work of the subject? If you say the subject 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.

XXXI. In view of the fact that man lost all by sin, that he could not without Divine aid re-instate himself

in the favor of God, and in view of the fact that salvation is the act and gift of the sovereign, is it any less salvation by grace if the sovereign sees fit to impose conditions in order to obtain it? If not, how do you account for the damnation of a large part of the human race?

XXXII. 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?

XXXIII. 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 (II. 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 violation to the same?

XXXIV. Is there any difference between the Old and New Testaments? If so. what is it. and how and where may an inquirer find the dividing line? Does the Old Testament, in this age, tell us what to do in order to be saved from our sins? If it does, where can the inquirer find the proof? If it does not, will you be generous enough to tell us where the old administration ended, and where the new began? If an inquirer were to come to you and ask you where to read in order to find a correct answer to the question, "What must I do in order to be saved from all my past sins?" what would you tell him? Would you send him to Genesis, Proverbs, Malachi, Matthew, or Romans? Do

you not know that this question is answered fully and repeatedly in the book of Acts, and nowhere else?

XXXV. Did you ever answer an inquirer as Peter answered the thousands on the day of Pentecost? Did you ever answer an inquirer as Philip the Evangelist answered the man of Ethiopia? Did you ever answer an inquirer as Paul and his fellow-worker answered the Philippian jailor, or do you stop when you quote the command to believe, in the face of the fact that this was only the introduction of what was told him? Did you ever answer an inquirer as Ananias answered Paul, according to the Apostle's own testimony? Have you forgotten that unto Peter were given the keys of the kingdom, and that the other Apostles had also the power to loose, with the Redeemer's promise that their words should be given them by the Holy Spirit, and ratified in the courts of heaven? If we can overturn their answers to those who wished to know the way of life, we can overthrow the whole remedial scheme and the throne of life itself! What is the meaning of Apostolic? It can only have one meaning, and that is apparent to the most superficial thinker: that which pertains to the Apostles of Jesus Christ, their words, their acts, and their conduct. Will you as a God-fearing man stand before this audience and repeat your claim?

SECOND DAY'S DISCUSSION.

PROPOSITION: *"The Church with which I, (Ashley S. Johnson), stand identified, is Apostolic in doctrine and practice."*

FIRST SPEECH.

MR. PRESIDENT, MODERATORS AND FELLOW-CHRISTIANS:

You will remember that in my speeches yesterday I constantly charged on my opponent that he would not define and stick to his proposition. I insisted that from his speeches a person could never learn how to become a member of the Baptist Church. I see no reason, after reflection, to change my mind. My proposition is exactly the same as his in phraseology, and the burden of proof now falls on me. I shall endeavor to be systematic, and I respectfully ask him to follow me and assault my arguments with all the powers of logic, Scripture and eloquence at his command. If I am not Apostolic I want to become so just as soon as he can point out the way. If my position can be overthrown by the word of God, now is the time and he is the man; and I shall be glad to see it collapse. I am anxious to be saved, and error cannot save me. That is absolutely certain. Study the proposition with care. The issue is a fair one. I shall not evade it in any sense. I helped to make it and am willing to stand or go down with it. I use the word Church in the general acceptance of the term, and I

shall endeavor to show that I stand with the Apostles, and that my brethren do the same thing. I have undertaken to demonstrate that as a preacher I believe what Peter, John and Paul believed, and, circumstances considered, give inquirers the same answers that they gave. I have undertaken to prove that the Church with which I stand identified, believes the same doctrine, wears the same name, practices the same things as did the Church at Jerusalem, Samaria, Rome, Corinth, Antioch, Ephesus, Philippi, Colosse, Thessalonica, or elsewhere in Apostolic times. I want to go into detail; I must make myself clear. What is meant by Apostolic? This is very important. Everything primarily hinges on this word. Evidently it is derived from the word Apostle. We agree on this. Does it embrace Moses? Not in any sense. Does it include Elijah? It certainly does not. Does it take in John the Baptist? Most emphatically no! Why not? For the simple reason that they were neither called nor sent in the Christian dispensation. Let me narrow the issue. Who were the Apostles? This is all-important. I name them: Simon Peter, Andrew, James the son of Zebedee, John, Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, Matthew, James the son of Alpheus, Lebbeus, Simon, Judas (Matthias) and Paul (Matt., 10:1-7; Acts, 1:15-26; Rom., 1: i). Why were they called Apostles; in other words, What does the word mean? I affirm that it means "sent;" and is derived from the fact that Jesus Christ chose these men and sent them to represent Him during His absence in the Court of Heaven as the High Priest of our profession. Do you ask for the proof? I can easily give it. Just before His death, in that most solemn prayer, He said concerning them and their work: "I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world: thine they Were, and thou gavest them me; and they have kept

thy word. Now they have known that all things whatsoever thou hast given me are of thee; for I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me. I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine, and all mine are thine, and thine are mine; and I am glorified in them; and now I am no more in the world, but they are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are. While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name; those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the Scripture might be fulfilled, and now I come to thee; and these things I speak in the world, that they might have my joy fulfilled in themselves. I have given them thy word; and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil. They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth. As thou hast sent me unto the world, even so have I also sent them into the world; and for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth (Jno., 17:6-19)." This will give you an idea of the dignity and sweeping grandeur of the mission and authority of the Apostles. Jesus invested them with the same power and dignity that He claimed from His Father. Surely the word Apostolic in my proposition means infinitely more than my opponent seemed to think when he worked in the lead. God sent Jesus; Jesus

sent the Apostles; Jesus came in His Father's name (Jno., 5:43) to reveal His Father's glory; He sent the Apostles in His name to reveal His glory. I lay down a proposition and proceed to its demonstration: The fullness of the gospel could not be proclaimed until after the death, burial, resurrection and glorification of Jesus were accomplished in fact, and Jesus,, in recognition of this, called these men and prepared them by personal instruction under the law of Moses, to do this after His departure from earth, and, that they might do it successfully, stamped upon their commission the same dignity that the Father stamped upon His own commission. The negative is expected to deny. I call on him to take up this proposition and show wherein it is defective. I take my stand squarely upon it. In order to do this he must upturn some very strong proofs: (i) Jesus called these men to do a work for Him; the word itself proves this, the word is official. If it is not a fact that they were expected to do that which had never been done by man before, and what others could not do during their lives or afterwards, why were they called? (2) The confidence He reposed in them establishes beyond a doubt that their work was to be peculiar, permanent and revolutionary: "What I tell you in darkness, that repeat ye in light: and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye on the house top (Matt., 10:27)." What does my brother think of this passage? Again, addressing the twelve, He said: "But blessed are your eyes, for they see; and your ears, for they hear; for verily I say unto you, that many prophets and righteous men have desired to see these things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear and have not heard them (Matt., 13:16, 17)." But here is a still stronger proof: "And his disciples asked him, saying, What might this parable mean? and he said,

Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God: but to others in parables; that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand (Luke, 8:9, 10)." This is emphatically applicable to the twelve (Mark, 4:10, n). Go with me to the mount of transfiguration. Who had the honor of seeing a revelation of His eternal and indescribable glory? Peter, James and John (Matt., 17: i-13). Hear Peter's comment on this holy confidence: "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty; for he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, and this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount (II. Pet., 1:16-18}." Hear John's comment on this holy confidence: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word of life; (for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father and was manifested unto us); that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ (I. John, 1:1-3)." My opponent will not deny that the Lord reposed this confidence in the twelve that through them He might help the whole race, and I cannot see how he can deny my conclusion, that inasmuch as Jesus explained the principles and objects of His reign to them only, that we must go to their works and words for a knowledge of what is demanded of us under the reign of the glorified Re-

deemer; or, to put it in other words, we may appeal to Moses, to Elijah, to Jeremiah, to John, to Jesus as He walked and talked confiding His secrets to the Apostles, to the twelve as they walked with Him in half-faith and half-unbelief, but the final appeal must be to the Apostles at the time when they were authorized to reveal the secrets that He had confided to their keeping. If under the dispensation of grace anyone else were authorized to unfold the conditions of pardon to a waiting world, I demand his name and position. (2) The authority He gave them and the responsibility He placed upon them prove beyond a doubt that whoever refuses to hear them refuses to hear the Father and the Son, and does it at his peril: "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world (John, 17:18)." Nor is this all: "He that receiveth you receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me (Matt., 10:40)." I lay the emphasis on two things; Jesus sent them and also gave them a definite work to do. The kingdom was not yet established, but He made ample provision for the proclamation of its fundamental principles and the opening of its blessings and privileges to all nations: "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 Barjona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven, and I say unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven (Matt., 16:16-19)." This is clear, full and unalterable. There cannot be any appeal from this.

Mark you, Peter was authorized by the Lord, personally, to open the doors of the coming kingdom, to proclaim its laws, and define its limits with the undoubted assurance that his work would be ratified in the Courts of Heaven. He did not stop with this, but addressing all the Apostles He said: "Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven (Matt., 18:18)." He did not stop with this: "Then answered Peter to him, 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 on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt., 19:28)." These passages emphasize the fact that the Apostles were called and sent as exponents and representatives of the new dispensation, and that everything said and done previous to the beginning of their work must be interpreted in the light of what they "bound and loosed" in carrying out their commission. I call my opponent's special attention to this and challenge his denial. (3) The manner in which the Apostles were prepared for their work proves that they were to inaugurate a work of momentous importance. One would think that three years, nearly, of walking and talking with Jesus would have been enough, but not &c. The work was too stupendous to entrust to human hands unaided. I want my friend to give us the best at his command on this proposition: Jesus designed to commit to the Apostles the responsibility of making known His will, or in other words, the conditions of pardon, and they were the only men ever entrusted with the authority to proclaim a full gospel in His name, or in any other

name. I want you to observe how he comes up to this proposition. If he denies it altogether he must show the conditions of pardon outside of the Apostolic writings, who proclaimed them, and by what authority they did it. If he does not deny it I have landed him at Jerusalem, where he so greatly dislikes to be! I warn him of his danger. This proposition is set to catch him "a-coming or a-going," and he must meet it. His own position demands it, I demand it, and you demand it. What about the preparation of the Apostles? Answer: They were called, ordained, instructed and commissioned by the Lord. Was this all? No. What else? I will tell you in a moment. Be patient, I want to give my friend something to note down for his reply, and I want you to note it down too, and listen for his answer: Some of his brethren, I do not charge that he ever did it personally, but I should not be surprised to know that he has, try to make it appear by suggestion, innuendo or direct charge that we deny the personality and work of the Holy Spirit. This is utterly without foundation. We lay exceedingly great stress on this, but take the gospel too. I make a charge on him and dare him to deny it: He must deny the mission and office of the Holy Spirit, or begin with Peter and the others who worked with him at Jerusalem! Write that down. Underscore it once, that means italics. Underscore it again, that means small capitals. Underscore it a 'third time, that means big capitals. It resolves itself into this: The Holy Spirit was not sent until the day of Pentecost, and I want to see my friend try to save his position as to the setting up of the Church, get the Holy Spirit to come down upon the Church and at the same time keep out of the second chapter of Acts! I am working in the lead to-day, and I have a sword that cuts each way, and is as sharp as a dagger at the

point. Let him come. I defy his rushing charge. But back to the question: What else did Jesus do to the Apostles in order to enable them to preach the gospel to every creature? I can best answer this in His own words: "Behold, I send you (Apostles) forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents, and as harmless as doves, but beware of men: for they shall deliver you up' to the councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues; and ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles, but when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak, for it is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you (Matt., 10:16-20)," Give your mind to these statements. Were mortal men ever so honored before? Notice the Divine condescension: "Your Father" "speaketh in you." I want my opponent to explain this statement. and say whether or not I lay too much emphasis on the word Apostolic. Again, the Master said to the twelve: "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)." Was this promise fulfilled? If so, when? I answer yes, on the day of Pentecost: "And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with ether tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance (Acts, 2:4)." My opponent did not say that the Church began with John, the Immerser, for the simple reason that the effort seemed too dangerous, but in an indirect way he did everything he could to show that the kingdom began with John, the fallacy of which I showed in my last speech yesterday. Now with all these quotations before us, I wish to submit to him a few fundamental questions. I do not expect him to

answer, or even attempt to do it, but it will be of interest to you to note the diplomacy with which he will glide around them. Keep the quotations in mind. When, where and under what circumstances did Jesus place John's mission and work on the same basis as His own, as He did the mission and work of the Apostles? When, where and under what circumstances did Jesus give John the keys of the kingdom, promising to ratify his work and thus make it binding on all coming generations? When, where and under what circumstances did Jesus take His forerunner to the top of the mountain and give him a glimpse of the world eternal? When, where and under what circumstances did Jesus say that whoever received John, received Him? When, where and under what circumstances did Jesus ever tell John that he would, at the beginning of the regeneration, place him on a throne with the authority to judge the twelve tribes of Israel? When, where and under what circumstances did Jesus give John a world-wide commission as He did the Apostles after He arose from the dead (Matt., 28:19, 20). With these quotations and arguments before us, I sum up my conception of the proposition and pass on: The Apostles were called, ordained, instructed, commissioned, and inspired to interpret Moses and the prophets, to reveal the secrets that Jesus had entrusted to their keeping, to bind and loose in His name, to make known the conditions of salvation and membership in His church; by "Apostolic" is meant like the Apostles; whosoever therefore proclaims the same message, believes the same facts, obeys the same commands, submits the same test of fellowship to others, wears the same name, maintains the same unity, does the same work and enjoys the same hope, is "Apostolic in doctrine and practice." If my opponent will deny this and bring one passage of Scripture that indicates

the contrary, I will leave the field. The negative must follow. I insist that he come up to the mark. I have done what he would not do—define my proposition— and he must overthrow my definition or prepare himself for my conclusions, which in due time shall follow, and woe to the Baptist who stands in the way.

Having defined my proposition — and I am willing to stand or fall with it,— I now proceed to show when and where the Church of Christ was first set up. This is the only way I know by which we can find out the way into the Church. The beginning is always important; in this case it is doubly so, for finding it certainly we can also find out what to do in order to salvation from sin. I cannot see why any one should object to this, for surely a good beginning is half of the battle. I shall hasten slowly. I want to fortify each step by the word of prophet, Redeemer and Apostle. In order to have something definite before us, I lay down a brief and clear-cut proposition, and challenge my opponent's attention to it: The Church of Christ was set up, or the kingdom of God inaugurated, on the day of Pentecost in the city of Jerusalem, following the ascension and glorification of the Lord. Surely there is no ambiguity about this proposition. Can I sustain it? I think I can. If my arguments and proofs are not enough to do it, it is my opponent's duty to show wherein I fail. I want to see him do his best. Hence I shall present my arguments in a systematic form, and number them. I proceed to show that in the very nature of things the Kingdom could not be set up until after the ascension of Jesus:

I. The Law of Moses, with all its ceremony, continued until Jesus expired on the cross. The proof of this is abundant and incontestable. My opponent tried to make it appear that the Law and the Prophets continued only until John. This is a mistake that the

dullest can see. Proof? Here it is: "Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to his disciples, Saying, The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not (Matt., 23:1-3)." According to the arguments you heard yesterday, Moses vacated his place when John began to preach. Again, "Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost. And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent (Matt., 27:50, 51)." What does the first quotation teach? Answer: That the Lord Jesus lived under the law of Moses, obeyed, and enforced obedience to it on others. What does the second mean? Answer: That the service in the temple continued by Divine authority up to the expiring breath, of the Redeemer, and that the rending of the veil at His death signified beyond dispute that the things that had been sacred from the days of Moses downward, were sacred in the eyes of God and man no longer. Is this view correct? If not, how may its incorrectness be shown? I say simply by turning to the Apostolic writings. Have the Apostles spoken on this point? Yes, voluminously. I select a few passages: "Wherefore, my brethren, ye are also become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that ye should bring forth fruit unto God (Rom., 7:4)." Comment is unnecessary. Let us try again: "For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace (Eph., 2:14, 15)." How did He abolish

these things in His flesh? Paul raised the question, and he will answer fully and satisfactorily: "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)." This is surely clear. Why was the old institution abolished? The Apostle answers: "He taketh away the first, that he might establish the second (Heb., 10:9)." When did He do it? At the cross beyond a doubt. Conclusion: If the Church of Christ were established before His death, and the authoritative announcement of it on the day of Pentecost, it was established under the Law of Moses. Surely my opponent will not affirm that the two covenants, the old and the new, ran parallel from Caesarea Philippi to the cross!

II. What is the foundation on which the Church rests? Everybody admits that it is built upon Jesus. I want my brother to tell us what he thinks about this. Is it built upon Jesus in promise, in prophesy; walking among men as a prophet almost without honor or recognition during the years of His earthly sufferings; or upon Jesus the mighty conqueror of death, hell and the grave? Jesus laid the foundation of His splendid and unending reign in the hearts of His disciples, but this could not be fully done until he demonstrated that He could lay down his life and in three days take it again according to His own promise. He did many miracles, thus showing His power, but He put the keystone in the arch of His power when He gloriously came up from the dead. The plan on which Jesus proceeded was revolutionary in its tendency. He did not ask people to believe simply on His statement; He gave the proof even to rising from the dead. I declare most emphatically that Jesus Christ is the foundation of my hope because of His resurrection from the grave.

What about the foundation? I begin with the prophet Isaiah: "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)." I emphasize the fact that the foundation was to be tried. When was it tried? I want my opponent to tell us if the foundation had been "tried" when he labored to set up the Church at Caesarea Philippi. If not, how did he know that the Church he set up would stand? I insist that this is an important point. Note the Lord's claims to John in the isle of Patmos: "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)." Grand and glorious consolation; for this is He on whom we build. When did He establish His claims? Paul answers briefly and to the point: "Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead (Rom., 1:3,4)." On whom do you build, Christ after the flesh, or Christ the Conqueror? Think it over: "Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know him no more (II. Cor., 5:16)." What does this mean? Evidently that we are to set our hearts on the risen and exalted Son of God. Conclusion: If the Church of Christ were established before His death, and the authoritative announcement of it on the day of Pentecost, it was established before the foundation Was either laid or tried.

III. What is meant by the New Testament? Where is it unfolded? Who was the testator? Who are the witnesses? Has it been sealed by the testator's death? **Is** there blood in this testament? I call Jesus to an-

swer: "For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins (Matt., 26:28)." I call Paul to testify: "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)." What is the obvious meaning of these passages? Answer: That as a will or testament made by a man cannot be carried out until its ratification by the proof of his death, so the will of God in Christ, the last testament, could not be carried out until it was ratified by the proof of the death of the Savior, or testator. Why does the law require that the death of the testator be proven? For the simple reason that all wills are made by men who wish their business to be properly settled after their death. A testament is worthless until after the testator dies. Paul makes this perfectly clear in reference to the New Testament and the death of its Author. The Apostles were the witnesses of Jesus: "And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning (Jno., 15:27)." To what were the Apostles to bear witness? I answer: His whole life, but particularly His death and resurrection from the grave: "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses (Acts, 2:32)." I take this to be the most important work the Apostles had to do. I feel sure my opponent will not deny that at last everything turns on the death and resurrection of Jesus. Conclusion: If the Church of Christ were established before His death, or before the authoritative announcement of it on the day of Pentecost, it was established before the death of the testator, and before a single promise made by Him could be realized in reference to the forgiveness of sins

IV. What was the primary design of the coming of

Jesus? Paul answers: "But now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel (II. Tim., 1:10)." Is this clear? I will try again, Paul being my witness: "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised: and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable (I. Cor., 15:12-19)." This is a remarkable statement. Everything is made to turn on one thing, the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. On the supposition that He arose not, all preaching and faith are vain; deliverance from sin is an impossibility, and all who have died in the faith of the gospel have perished. Now if these statements are true, and no one doubts them, and if it is true also that Jesus abolished death by rising again, and subsequently brought us life and immortality through the gospel, can we assert that anything was positively settled before the morning of the resurrection? I want my opponent to take a position on this proposition. Is he for or against it? He has been against it, but how is he to-day? He delights to linger in the preparatory period—from John the harbinger, to the crucifixion. I want him to come out into the full light and liberty of the gospel. Why does he linger back under the

Law? Why does he delight in the moving shadows of the preparatory age? I will give an answer, but shall gladly withdraw it if he can give a better one: It best suits the demands of his theology. The book of Acts can never be made to cover the backbone and ribs of the Baptist theory! Never! But what of the Apostles in reference to the resurrection of the dead before it became an accomplished fact? Did they understand it? Did they know anything about it? If not, how could they understand anything else? Let the word of truth settle the matter forever. As they came down from the mount of transfiguration he charged them not reveal what they had seen up there until after His resurrection. Did they understand this? I answer you in the exact words of Scripture: "And they kept that saying with themselves, questioning one with another what the rising from the dead should mean (Mark, 9: r-io)." Who were these men? Christ's most intimate friends, Peter, James and John. They did not know what was meant by rising from the dead, and yet my opponent would have you believe that these men were proper subjects of Church membership and he would have you believe that they were members of the first Baptist Church! I put a question to him and insist on an answer: Would you admit a man to membership who knew no more about Christ and Christianity than Peter, James and John knew at this time? No dodging now. They did not know the first principle—the resurrection from the dead—on which the Church was to rest; would you take a man in, who did not know that Christ arose again? You know you would not. Why, therefore, do you try to set up the Church before its time? Of course you will not answer, for the simple reason that to do so would be to upset your own position, and force upon yourself the doctrine of Peter on the day of Pentecost. Are you

ready for my conclusion? Here it is, write it down: If the Church of Christ were established before His death and resurrection, and their authoritative announcement on the day of Pentecost, it was established before Jesus abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel, and before a single man knew what He meant by rising from the dead. Will he deny the arguments leading up to this conclusion? Perhaps, and with the wish to see him make an effort I will present some more arguments and see where they lead. The prophet of God, looking forward to the new covenant, said: "After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and I will be their God. and they shall be my people, and they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more (Jer., 31:31-34)." We know this refers to the gospel, for Paul so applies it (Heb., 8:7-13). Now I want to know the sum of the remedial scheme in few words. Where shall I go, to whom shall I turn? Ask Paul: "For if the dead rise not, then is Christ not raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins." When was this written on the minds of the disciples of Christ? Was it back at Caesarea Philippi, when my friend organized the first Baptist Church? Was it during the natural life of Jesus? I must again make my appeal to Scripture. Did they believe He would rise? They did not even know what He meant by it. How did they receive the news of His resurrection after it was an accomplished fact? The answer is plain and irresistibly conclusive: "And their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they be-

lieved them not (Luke, 24: n)." Conclusion number two: The Baptist Church had already been set up, and all these men were Baptists, and my opponent can trace his theology back to the mists and fog, and doubts and darkness and unbelief that they then enjoyed! i i

V. Jesus came to earth for a specific purpose. What was it? I answer: To die for our sins. The prophet, centuries before His birth, looking forward to His sufferings, said: "Surely he hath borne our grief, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted, but he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken. And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth. Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities (Isa., 53:4-11)." A more graphic picture of the agony of Jesus has never been written. Every word is a tear, every sen-

tence a sob, every verse a wail. Why all this agony? I turn to the Apostolic writings: "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified, we shall be saved from wrath through him; for if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son: much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life, and not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus, by whom we have now received the atonement (Rom., 5:8-n)." My opponent takes great pride when he gets into war with Methodists and Presbyterians on infant baptism, in claiming that he represents a Church "whose membership is regenerated." Is this claim well founded? If it is, and I grant it for argument's sake, he cannot, even admitting that he can trace the Baptist Church back through Acts of the Apostles, get the Church back of the Cross, unless he can show regeneration without atonement—without blood. Will he undertake it? Dare he undertake it? I take him on his own grounds, admit his own claims, recognize his own doctrine, and by all the powers of history, logic, Scripture, and common sense declare that the Church before the Cross was an impossibility. I want him to tell this audience how a Church of regenerated members could be set up at Caesarea Philippi, or anywhere else, back of the Cross, when the regenerating blood had not been shed? This one point outweighs every argument that can be adduced against the setting up of the Church on the day of Pentecost. I flaunt defiance in his face, let him come with his best; I declare most solemnly that he cannot meet this argument. Call another witness: "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)." My opponent claims

that Paul was a Baptist. I admit it for argument's sake, and declare that if this is so he did not glory in a Church back of the Cross, and this breaks a big link in the chain of Apostolic succession, for Paul gloried only in the Cross! If Paul belonged to the Baptist Church, which he could not prove if his soul were at stake, it certainly began after the crucifixion, or the great Apostle was ashamed of his ancestry. I explicitly emphasize three things as necessary to the Church—the very life-source of its existence: Cross! blood!! resurrection!!! A Church never did exist before these things became facts—they make the Church, and the Church could not exist one-millionth part of a second without them! Call another witness: "Who his own self bear our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sin should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed (I. Pet., 2:24)." Question: Who healed, whose blood cleansed the Church which my friend set up at Caesarea Philippi? Are you prepared for my conclusion? Prepared or unprepared, here it is: If the Church were established before the death of Jesus on the Cross, and before the authoritative announcement of it on the day of Pentecost, it was established before the atonement was made, and consequently the Baptist claim of a regenerate membership is without foundation or Scriptural warrant, so far as the first Church was concerned, and they voluntarily break the chain of "Apostolic succession."

VI. I emphasize the importance of the Great Commission—the last commission. Back of the Cross the commission of the Lord to the Apostles was limited. Do you want the proof? Here it is: "These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying. Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and as ye go preach.

saying, the kingdom of heaven is at hand) Matt., 10:1-7)." This is the commission, under which my friend set up the Church, and as he is a Gentile, and as it was composed solely of Jews, he snaps another link in the chain of Baptist Apostolic succession, and leaves himself outside of the fold! I suggest that he get some open-links and try to mend it, or there will not be enough of it left to rattle. Where is the world-wide commission? On what was it based? To whom was it given? What does it submit for us to believe? What does it require us to do? What blessing does it hold out to us? I answer one question, and as to the others the commission speaks to the point for itself: The commission was and is based on the death of Christ, and in the progressive development of God's plan to save, as seen from Adam to the Cross, a world-wide commission, and a Church with doors open to every tribe, kindred and tongue in every age, were absolutely impossible until he shed His blood for the remission of our sins. Will my opponent deny this? But I turn to the commission and let it do its own talking. Here is Matthew's testimony: "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they worshiped him: but some doubted. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen (Matt., 28:16-20)." Here is Mark's testimony: "Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them With their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was

risen. 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, 16:14-16)." Here is Luke's testimony: "And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. 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 (Luke, 24:44-48)." Here is John's testimony: "Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord. Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them. Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained (John, 20:21-23)." This Commission, as you must see, was given after the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. It embraces the last instructions of Jesus Christ to his Apostles. I take this to be at once a generalization, or a synopsis of all that had gone before, and a prophecy of all that was to come afterwards. Everything before it and everything after it must be interpreted in the light of it. The Apostles could not go behind this Commission, neither could they go beyond its bounds. Its world-wide and age-lasting character must have been a surprise even to them. I insist that the Church could not exist behind this Commission, for the promise even from the days

of Abraham our father was to all nations, and the way was not opened to all nations until the Crucifixion, and it was not announced until the day of Pentecost. I wish to see my brother take up this argument, and meet it fairly. I have not counted them, but I do not hesitate to say that I can find as many as a thousand proofs that the Church of Christ was and is and shall be intended for everybody, and yet he persists in setting it up in a place and at a time when it was absolutely impossible for "all nations to flow into it." He knows this as well as I do. If the first Church were really set up before the death of Jesus, and if it were a Baptist Church, it was composed of Jews, not one of whom knew or believed that Jesus would rise again from the dead. I console myself with the thought that such a Church never had any existence any where or any time except in my opponent's head! That Church is his, not by the right of discovery, but by the right of invention. I congratulate him on his ingenuity. Conclusion: If the Church of Christ were established before the death of Christ, and the authoritative announcement of it on the day of Pentecost, it was set up under a commission that limited its blessing to the Jews alone, thus contradicting every promise and prophecy in the Old Testament on this subject.

VII. The gospel of Christ—what is it? Ah! That is the most momentous question of the times. Can it be answered? I am sure of it: It is the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. Three facts are presented, and only three, and all commands and blessings are based upon them. Do you ask for proof? I can give plenty of it: "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. For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wis-

dom; but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness: but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God (I. Cor., 1:21-24)." This seems full and conclusive, but let me try again: "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures; and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the Apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time (I. Cor., 15: i-8)." If there is a full gospel in the Bible that has in it no death, no burial and no resurrection, I call on my opponent to present it and to tell who preached it. Conclusion: If the Church of Christ were established before his death and the authoritative announcement of it on the day of Pentecost, it was set up before the gospel could be fully preached.

VIII. Who is the head of the Church? I am glad to find an important point on which we can and do all agree. Jesus Christ is the head of the Church, and when did He become head? I assert, and ask my opponent to make a note of it, that He did not become head of the Church until He ascended to heaven. Call Paul: "And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence.

For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself, by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven (Col., 1:18-20)." Call Paul again: "The eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and what is the exceeding greatness of his mighty power to usward who believe, according to the workings of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all (Eph., 1:18-23)." Conclusion: If the Church of Christ were established before His death and. the authoritative announcement of it on the day of Pentecost, it was before Jesus became head of the Church.

IX. My opponant insists that the kingdom of heaven. or Church of Christ, was set up during the Savior's natural life, but up to date he has not succeeded in establishing his claims. I want to see the bottom of this matter if possible. Therefore, I suggest that we put the thing to a test. How many elements enter into the inauguration of a kingdom? I will answer: first, there must be territory; second, there must be subjects; third, there must be a constitution; fourth, there must be a law of admission, and fifth, there must be a king. Now if my friend can find all these elements back of the Cross, I will give it up; if he cannot do it, he must give it up. I grant that before the Cross

there was a territory, but it did not reach beyond the limits of little Canaan. Hear the Master: "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt., 15:24)." I grant that at this time there were subjects, but he cannot name one, only one, who understood the nature of the kingdom. I must be specific on this point, as he may try to contest it. Jesus is witness: "At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, saying, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven? And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven (Matt., 18:1-3)." On my friend's hypothesis—the Church having been set up when John began to preach—He should have threatened to turn them out of the kingdom of heaven! Who were these people? The disciples, Apostles, His most intimate friends and followers, and they were not yet in the kingdom, for the simple reason that the kingdom was not in existence. He may deny that this includes the Apostles, but I furnish the proof, specific proof, that it does: "Then there arose a reasoning among them, which of them should be greatest, and Jesus, perceiving the thought of their heart, took a child, and set him in the midst of them, and said unto them, Whoever shall receive this child in my name receiveth me; and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth him that sent me: for he that is least among you all, the same shall be great. And John answered and said unto him. Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and we forbade him, because he followeth not with us (Luke, 9:48, 49)." Soon after this He passed through Samaria with His disciples and the Samaritans would not receive them. James and John became exceedingly indignant, and asked permission to call fire down from heaven upon

their enemies. Do you think any man who had imbibed the true spirit of the kingdom of heaven, the heavenly kingdom, would be disposed to fight his enemies with fire? Read John's gospel after his eyes were opened, and you must become convinced that he preached a gospel of love. How did the Master receive their request? I answer you in His exact words: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of; for the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives but to save them (Luke, 9:51-56)." Yet my opponent would have us believe that the kingdom of Christ had been set up at the beginning of John's ministry, and that these men were members or citizens of it, and that they fully understood it! Oh! the folly, the blindness, the narrowness of human tradition. I grant that at this time there was a foundation—Jesus Christ, God's only Son—but no one comprehended Him. Thomas represented the extreme materialism that pervaded His little flock previous to the descent of the Holy Spirit, and he did not believe until he saw the wounds in His hands and feet (Jno., 20:25-28). His resurrection and re-appearing to the Apostles was a matter of inexpressible astonishment to all of them, as witness the following: "And they rose up the same hour and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon. And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known of them in breaking of bread. And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And he said unto them, why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not

flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he showed them his hands and his feet (Luke, 24:33-40)." I grant that at this time there was a law of admission wrapped up in figurative language which was not fully understood by any one. I call on my opponent to name the man who understood the mission of Jesus during His natural life. Did Peter understand Him, when in reply to the statement that He would soon be delivered into the hands of His enemies and suffer for the sins of men, said: "Be it far from thee, Lord, this shall not be unto thee?" The Master's answer is sufficient; addressing Peter, he said: "Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou art an offense unto me: for thou savorest not the things that, be of God. but those that be of men (Matt., 16:21-23)," Did Nicodemus, a "ruler of the Jews," "a master in Israel," understand it when he asked: "How can a man be born again when he is old (John. 5:1-13)?" Did the Apostles understand Him at the moment when it is recorded of Him: "And they all. forsook him, and fled (Mark, 14: .so)?" Did Peter understand Him when he denied Him and swore that he had never known Him (Matt., 26:69-75)? Did they understand Him when they received the news of His resurrection as an idle tale (Luke, 24:10, n)? Did Thomas understand Him when he said: "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 (Jno., 20:25)?" Did they understand Him when, after the resurrection, they asked Him to restore the old kingdom of Israel? But did they do this? Yes: "When they were therefore come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom of Israel (Acts, 1:6)?" I have a little problem for my brother. If he will solve it I will undertake to do as much for him: He sets up

the Church at Caesarea Philippi. Admitting that this is so, the Church had been in existence a good long time before the reappearance of Jesus after the resurrection; now I want him to explain how it was that its chief members, having grown tired of it, desired the Master to dissolve it and re-establish the old temporal kingdom of Israel; and further, if the Church is a "spiritual house" and it is composed of converted men and women, I want him to present what he considers the claims of these men to spirituality at this time. As a little help to him I assert without the least fear of contradiction that they were yet in the dark as to the realities of His mission. Further, I assert that the service of God in the Church depends on a correct knowledge of Him as revealed in the person of His Son, and at this time they absolutely did not know what to expect. Now, if Jesus was and is to reign over those who know Him, where is the man who was prepared in heart and mind at that time for the inauguration of His kingdom? Just give his name and address and everything else will be admitted unhesitatingly. Was Jesus king before His glorification? I answer in the exact words of Scripture: "When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take him by force, to make him a king, he departed again into a mountain himself alone (Jno., 6:15)." I leave it to my opponent to say why and of what they wished to make him king. Is Jesus King now? I answer in the exact words of Scripture: "But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming. Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet (I. Cor., 15:23-25)." When did Jesus become king? I answer in the

exact words of Peter on the day of Pentecost: "For David is not ascended into heaven: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool; therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ (Acts, 2:34-36)." Again, "And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS (Rev., 19:16)." Conclusion: If the kingdom of Christ were set up before His death and before the authoritative announcement of it on the day of Pentecost it was without a king.

X. The priestly idea underlies all religion. The development of the scheme of redemption presents to our consideration three distinct priesthoods, which for want of better words I shall designate, the Patriarchal Priesthood, the Levitical Priesthood, and the Everlasting Priesthood. The first was restricted to the family, the second was restricted to the tribe of Levi, the family of Aaron, and the third to Jesus Christ, God's only Son. The first began with the transgression and extended to the proclamation of the Law; the second began with the proclamation of the Law and extended to the death of Christ on the cross; the third began with the entrance of Jesus into heaven, and has not yet ended. There is a principle underlying this to which I call my opponent's attention. I want to see him wrestle with it: "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law (Heb., 7:12)." I want him to say when the Levitical priesthood ended and when the everlasting priesthood of Jesus began. I do not see how he can get around this, particularly as we are agreed on the great importance of His priestly work. Was He a priest while on earth. I answer: He was not. Why

not? Because he did not belong to the family of Aaron, to which the priestly office of the old institution was confined (Num., 18:1-7), but He came out of the Royal Family (Gen., 49:8-10): "For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning the priesthood (Heb., 7:14)." Nor is this all. Paul is witness: "Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have seen a high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man, for every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer; for if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer their gifts according to the law (Heb., 8:1-4)." How was Jesus made priest? Answer: "The Lord swear and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec (Heb., 7:17)." When did Jesus become priest? I answer, after the abolishment of the Law: "For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, Who is consecrated for evermore (Heb., 7:28)." Where did Jesus become priest? Answer: "For such a high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and higher than the heavens, who needeth not daily, as those high priests to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered himself (Heb., 7:26, 27)." What is He doing now? Answer: "Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession; for we have not a high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are,

yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain, and find grace to help in time of need (Heb., 4:14-16)." Conclusion: If the Church were established before the death of Christ and the authoritative announcement of it on the day of Pentecost, it was without a high priest.

XI. The gospel age is pre-eminently the age of the Holy Spirit. My friend will not deny this. Indeed he emphasizes it almost as much as I do, and in one respect he goes beyond me and says that conversion is brought about by the direct operation of the Spirit, which of course I deny. When did the Holy Spirit come? I answer in the exact words of the Holy Book of God: "He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water, but this spake he of the Spirit, that they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified (John, 7:38, 39)." I want my brother to answer a question: Could the Church exist without the presence and comforts of the Holy Spirit? If yes, why did the Holy Spirit come into the world on the day of Pentecost to remain unto the end of the Christian age? If no, why did he set up the Church back in the age when the Holy Spirit was practically unknown even among those whom he organized into a Baptist Church at Caesarea Philippi? I insist that I have tied his hands in any event. Conclusion: If the Church were established before the death of Jesus, or the authoritative announcement of it on the day of Pentecost, it was without the Holy Spirit.

These eleven arguments prove beyond a doubt that my opponent's claim that the Church of Christ was established before His death on the Cross is the very quintessence of absurdity. I do not hesitate to say that the man does not live who can upset this chain of

argument, but I am not sent simply to destroy; hence I turn to the more pleasant task of showing when and where the Church was set up, or in other words, where the kingdom of God's dear Son was inaugurated on earth. I will first present what may be appropriately circumstantial evidence:

I. I assert that, from the transgression to the day of Pentecost, that nearly every prophecy or statement relating to the reign of heaven, placed it in the future, while after that event it was always spoken of as a real thing. To me this is both striking and conclusive. I present a few contrasts. When God called Abram out of his native land He gave him a promise that embraced the whole world: "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed (Gen., 12:1-3)." Turn to the Apostolic writings after Pentecost: "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, and in thy seed shall all the kindred of the earth be blessed: Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities (Acts, 3:25, 26)." Try again. The prophet of God, looking forward to the day, said: "And in the days of the 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)." Turn to the Apostolic writings and see how they regarded the kingdom. Did they put it in the future? I answer in the words of Scripture: "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably With godly fear: for our God is a consuming fire (Heb., 12:28, 29)." Try again. Call John, the harbinger of Jesus: "Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven

is at hand (Matt., 3: i)." Call John, the Apostle after the day of Pentecost: "I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ (Rev., 1:9)." Come downward a step further, to Caesarea Philippi, my opponent's theological shrine. What do we find here? Simply what we have found all along the line, that the Church was yet in the future: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it (Matt., 16:13-19)." Turn a new leaf and listen to Paul: "Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth (I. Cor., 1: i)." I admit that this testimony is circumstantial, but let my opponent undertake to overthrow it and I shall come forward with plenty more of the same kind. I want him to show wherein this argument is fallacious, or admit it like a man.

II. My opponent tried to show that the kingdom began with John, but he set up the Church at Caesarea Philippi with Jesus! This is strange teaching. I have demonstrated beyond contest that John, being a Jew, lived and died under the Law of Moses, for the law was nailed to the cross with or in the body of the Messiah. Was John ever at any time a citizen of the kingdom, or member of the Church of Christ? I answer in the exact language of the Redeemer Himself: "Verily I say unto you, among them that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he (Matt., 11:11)." I place this passage by the side of his favorite passage and call upon him to give an explanation of it in harmony with the theory he advanced: "The law and the prophets were until John: since that the kingdom of

God is preached, and every man presseth into it (Luke, 16:16)." I have given my explanation and it harmonizes with all the facts presented. I demand of him an explanation on the same basis.

III. The whole drift of the teaching of Jesus was in the direction of the cross, Pentecost, and thence to the world. He was constantly endeavoring to enforce on the minds of the chosen witnesses that everything hung on His death, and at the same time He told them not to proclaim His name: "Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus Christ (Matt., 16:20)." He also exhorted them to courage by saying: "But rather seek ye the kingdom of God; and all these things shall be added unto you: fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom (Luke 12:31, 32)." This is clear, but indefinite as to time. Try again: "And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, that there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power (Mark, 9: j)." I should like to know by what linguistic jugglery my opponent can make this mean that the kingdom had already come, and that the very persons to whom it was addressed were already members of it? I cannot see how it can have any but its natural meaning, yet I push on him the fact that John's work had previously been completed!

IV. The disciples as they walked and talked with Jesus, were expecting the kingdom to come: "And as they heard these things, he added and spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear (Luke, 19:11)." What kingdom were they looking for? If he answers the spiritual kingdom, it follows that it had not yet come, and thus he upsets **his** own boat. If he answers that they were looking

for the restoration of the old temporal kingdom, it follows that they entirely misunderstood the Messiah's mission; and he not only upsets his own boat, but sinks it in the Dead Sea a hundred fathoms deep!!

V. Jesus went away to receive His kingdom, which proves that it was not set up before His departure: "He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return. And he called his ten servants, and delivered them ten pounds, and said unto them, Occupy till I come. But his citizens hated him, and sent a messenger after him, saying, We will not have this man to reign over us. And it came to pass, that when he was returned, having received the kingdom, then he commanded these servants to be called unto him, to whom he had given the money, that he might know how much every man had gained by trading. Then came the first, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained ten pounds. And he said unto him, Well, thou good servant: because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities. And the second came, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained five pounds. And he said likewise to him, Be thou also over five cities. And another came, saying. Lord, behold, here is thy pound, which I have kept laid up in a napkin: For I feared thee, because thou art an austere man: thou takest up that thou layedst not down, and reapest that thou didst not sow. And he saith unto him, Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee, thou wicked servant. Thou knewest that I was an austere man, taking up that I laid not down, and reaping that I did not sow: Wherefore then gavest not thou my money into the bank, that at my coming I might have required mine own with usury? And he said unto them that stood by, Take from him the pound, and give it to him that hath ten pounds. (And

they said unto him, Lord, he hath ten pounds.) For I say unto you, That unto every one which hath shall be given; and from him that hath not, even that he hath shall be taken away from him. But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me. And when he had thus spoken, he went before, ascending up to Jerusalem (Luke, 19:12-28)."

VI. After the resurrection of Jesus, one of His disciples, a distinguished man, was still waiting for the kingdom: "Joseph of Arimathea, an honorable counselor, which also waited for the kingdom of God, came, and went in boldly unto Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus (Mark, 15:43)."

VII. A question: If the kingdom had already been set up, why did the Apostles tarry in the city of Jerusalem from the ascension to the day of Pentecost? If they understood the nature of their mission, why did they not begin at once to preach? Why lose so much valuable time? If they did not understand their own mission, it follows that the kingdom had not yet come,

VIII. The kingdom of God is established in men, that is in their minds. I give you the proof in the Savior's own words: "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo here! or lo there! for the kingdom of God is within you (Luke, 17:20, 21)." Under what circumstances were these words spoken? Answer: The Pharisees demanded of Him "when the kingdom of God should come," thus showing that the kingdom had not come. I want my opponent to say when in his judgment the conduct of the Apostles shows that the kingdom of heaven was within them, that heaven reigned in their souls. I regard this question as superlatively important, and I demand an answer. Was it during the Redeemer's natural life? If yes, why did His own dis-

ciples betray and deny Him, and why did they at first refuse to believe the news of His resurrection? If no, why not come out of the darkness and uncertainty, and stand with the Apostles on the day of Pentecost? It will not take long to settle this question if he will come up with a "thus saith the Lord," but nothing else will settle it. I insist on this.

Leaving this line of argument in the hands of my opponent, who is bound by the rules of debate to take it up and show wherein it is false, I now proceed to my direct proof, and in order to keep something definite before him, I affirm that the kingdom of heaven was inaugurated on the day of Pentecost in the city of Jerusalem, and lay down my proofs in order, and in the exact words of Holy Writ:

I. Call David, the King of Israel: "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. Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of youth. The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek (Ps. 110:1-4)." Part of this was quoted by Peter on Pentecost, and applied it to the inauguration of the gospel (Acts, 2:34), and it is evident to an honest inquirer that the whole thing applies to the beginning of the gospel.

II. Call the prophet Isaiah: "The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem, 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 (Isa., 2:1-3)." Again, "For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth (Isa., 62:1)."

III. Call Micah, another prophet: "But in the last days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and people shall flow unto it, and many nations shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for the law shall go forth of *Zion*, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem (Mic., 4:1, 2)."

IV. Call Joel, another prophet: "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: And also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my Spirit. And I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and the terrible day of the Lord come. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered: for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call (Joel, 2:28-32)." This is an important quotation. I call attention to two points: First, the prophet saw the day when the Holy

Spirit should come with power; and, second, he declared that deliverance — salvation — should be in mount Zion and in Jerusalem, but he did not say it should be in Caesarea Philippi! How do I know the prophet was looking forward to the day of Pentecost? Peter quoted the prophesy relating to the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost in the very city, Jerusalem, where Joel said there should be deliverance. If I am not correct, my opponent is here to show where I miss it. The prophet said that there should be deliverance in Jerusalem. I have gone to Pentecost and found it. I want him to show if he can that I am incorrect in my application of this prophecy. To do it he must account for Peter's use of it in his first sermon, and also show when deliverance was in Jerusalem if not on the day of Pentecost. If he cannot do this I have proved beyond dispute that the gospel began on the day of Pentecost, and if I have done this his claims of a church before the crucifixion must forever fall to the ground.

V. Call the Master Himself: "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)." Again, when the Apostles desired Him to restore the kingdom of Israel: "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power, 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:

6-8)." Look at the order: Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria, uttermost part of the earth! Where does Caesarea Philippi come in? I leave my brother to classify it.

VI. Call Luke and Peter: "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 Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven. Now when this was noised abroad, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language. And they were all *amazed* and marveled, saying one to another, Behold, are not all these which speak Galileans? And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born (Acts, 2:1-8)?" This is Luke's description of the beginning. But what does Peter say about it? In his defense of his conduct at the house of Cornelius, before his brethren at Jerusalem, he said: "And as I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them, as on us at the beginning (Acts, n:1-15)." Note how confidently Peter speaks of Jerusalem as the beginning; he speaks of it as if no one doubted it, and as a matter of fact no one did doubt it until long after Peter was dead!

VII. Call Luke again: "The Church which was at Jerusalem (Acts, 8:1)." I do not see how my opponent can get around this, but I can tell him how to get rid of me: Just find an expression similar to this before the day of Pentecost and I will withdraw from the contest.

VIII. Call Paul the Apostle: "But Jerusalem which

is above is free, which is the mother of us all (Gal., 4:26)." What does this mean? Evidently that the gospel began in Jerusalem, and that from the Church that was first established there, all the others sprang. However, to my great astonishment my opponent does not claim Jerusalem as his mother, and tries to get himself adopted into the family of Caesarea Philippi!

IX. Call Paul again: "But ye are come unto Mount Zion, 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, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel (Heb., 12:22-24)." Come up, my brother, to the general assembly!

I fearlessly pass on. I am ready to begin at Jerusalem. Why all this argument and labor? I answer, simply that we may stand at Jerusalem with the Apostles of the Lord and find out what they believed and practiced. Let us go back to Jerusalem. It is Lord's day morning, and the city is waking to new life. Let us climb up to the top of this hill and view the city. How indescribably grand is the scene! Yonder in the distance, on the rugged summit of Golgotha is the cross still red with the blood shed for the blotting out of our sins. Look again. There is the garden with the empty tomb. Where are the Apostles? In an upper chamber in the city. Where is Jesus? At the Father's right hand in the courts of heaven. I suggest that we go into the city. Watch the people as we go. Study that man's face. What is he saying? He is boasting of the part he took in the trial and crucifixion of Jesus. Hate is written all over his face. See what a crowd is gathering around him. Look at the people; push your

way through. Where are all these people from? They are strangers from distant places. Why have they come to the city at this time? It is the day of first-fruits, or the day of Pentecost, and they have come up to worship the God of their fathers according to the Law of Moses. Day of first-fruits? Yes, it may turn out to be the day of the first-fruits to the kingdom of God. At last we have found the place. I suggest that we go up to the chamber and see what the Apostles are doing. Walk in carefully. Let us not disturb them. What are they doing? Praying and waiting. We will join them. Listen! What sound is that? It must be that a storm has suddenly broken loose in the city. It cannot be that, for the sun is shining beautifully without. Listen again, this building seems to be the center of disturbance. Look at the Apostles; how strangely they appear. See those leaping tongues of fire; it is indeed wonderful. Try to catch their language; each one seems to speak in a different tongue. Can you understand them? Yes, I catch one word from each, the name of Jesus. Ah! it is sweet in every tongue. I am determined to hear that preaching; see! the people are pressing in from every direction. We must, if possible, catch it all. What is the theme? The death, burial and resurrection of Jesus—a mighty, a wondrous, a revolutionary theme. The building is overcrowded. We will follow the Apostles to the street. What an immense assemblage! I see the same group through which we passed this morning. What intense hate is written upon each face. This is truly a great assembly, a representative audience: Parthians and Medes, and Elamites, and dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judea, and in Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphilia, in Egypt and in parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and Proselytes, Cretes

and Arabians. Surely the Apostles are fearless, for all these people are bitter enemies? Why did they begin in this unpromising field? For three reasons, I think; first, the Lord proposed to rule in the midst of his enemies; second, the gospel was to be delivered first to the Jews, and third, Jerusalem being the Jewish metropolis, they could, particularly at the feast of Pentecost, reach the wanderers who had taken up residence among the surrounding nations. Do you think it possible to plant the banner of Emmanuel in this wicked throng? We shall see. Watch their faces. I can see murder in the countenances of many of them, but the gospel seems to reduce them to a condition of non-resistance. What are they saying? Now I have it: "Behold, are not all these which speak Galileans, and how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born (Acts, 2:7, 8)?" That question indicates not only astonishment but interest. Listen: What voice is that? It comes from that same murderous group. Do you catch it? Yes: "These men are full of new wine." Study those faces. The wisdom of beginning at Jerusalem cannot be doubted, for if the gospel can conquer this crowd, what can stand before it? What is Peter going to do? He stands up with the other Apostles. Surely the words of the Lord are being fulfilled, and they are elevated to thrones of judgment at the beginning of "the regeneration." Listen, Jerusalem, listen all ye nations, the day of your redemption has come. Peter speaks: "Ye men of Judea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be this known unto you, and hearken to my words; for these are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day. But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; and it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall

prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my spirit; and they shall prophesy: and I will shew wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath; blood, and fire, and vapor of smoke: the sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and notable day of the Lord come: and it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved. Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and fore-knowledge of God. ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain: whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it. For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved: therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope: because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. Thou hast made known to me the ways of life; thou shalt make me full of joy with thy countenance. Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulcher is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God hath sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised

up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear. For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ (Acts, 2:14-36)." How still the vast assemblage has become! Listen: What cry is that? It originates in that same boastful, murderous group. It is taken up by the Parthians, then the Medes, then the Elamites, then by the strangers from Rome, then the Cretes, then the Arabians, then the hardy Jews from the Judean hills until the cry seems but an echo, so great is the crowd. They seemingly cry in one tongue, the tongue of anguish. The cry becomes greater and greater, and the faces of the people reflect their terrible mental struggle. Where is that murderous group? It is there, but every face is bathed in tears, and the cry, cry of remorse and of anxious desire, continues. What is it? Do you catch the words? Listen more attentively: "Men and brethren, what shall we do (Acts, 2:37)?" As we are on the ground let us try to take a deliberate and unprejudiced view of the situation. What was the condition of these people when they assembled here? Some were indifferent and followed the crowd, some were curious, and others were dominated solely by hate—all were wicked unbelievers. What is their condition now? The question they have propounded indicates very clearly: first, they realized the awful crime of putting Jesus to death; second, their stubborn hearts were broken into fragments; third, they were profoundly sorry on the account of their sins; fourth, they were willing to for-

sake the past; fifth, they were willing to recognize the Apostles as the ambassadors of Jesus, and do whatever they required of them. This is a stupendous change; unparalleled in the world's history. What brought it about? Peter's sermon, beyond a doubt. How did Peter's sermon bring it about? I answer in the natural way; he proclaimed a gospel that they could understand, and through the organs of hearing it worked its way into the consciences of the people. There was nothing miraculous about what was preached. The sermon consisted of plain facts: first, God sent Jesus into the world; second, He died on the Cross for our sins; third, He was buried; fourth, He arose again; fifth, the Apostles were witnesses of these things; sixth, He has ascended up into heaven and sent the Holy Spirit into the Apostles to guide them into all truth. Surely this is plain enough even for the fool or the wayfarer. Reflect on it. It brings our minds face to face with facts. Why has it produced such a change in these wicked people? There is, there can be, but one answer, they were convinced that it was true and they believed it. Why were they so troubled if they believed the gospel? That is the very thing that troubled them. Note this fact: hearing and believing the gospel only produced a knowledge of sins and condemnation in the sight of God, and a burning desire for deliverance. Faith opens up to a man his doom and the possibility of avoiding it. Why do these people ask what to do? Because they are convinced that they must do something, but they do not know what. They see Christ, evidently, and desire to find His favor. Can Peter answer this question? Beyond a doubt. Why am I so certain? I give three reasons: first, Jesus gave him the keys of the kingdom; second, He gave him, with the others, a commission to all nations; third, he is speaking as he is

moved by the Holy Spirit. We may well listen to him. Hear him, ye men of Jerusalem, whose hands are stained with the Redeemer's blood; hear him, ye strangers sojourning in the holy city; hear him, ye unborn ages, for his words are to be ratified in heaven, and therefore binding on every generation to "the end of the world: "

"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 this mean? Can we find out? There is no doubt of it. Listen again to the wail of the penitent multitude? What do these people want? Remission of sins, unquestionably. What have they already done ? Answer: They have already heard and accepted the gospel as true. Their conduct proves this. What are they told to do? I answer, two things: first to repent; second, to be baptized. This seems clear. Did the people accept the conditions? They did : "Then they that gladly receive his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls (Acts, 2:41.)"

We must master this matter if we can. What object did the Pentecostans have when they asked what to do ? Answer: The remission of past sins. What object did Peter have in answering their questions? Answer: To inform them what, as penitent believers, they must do in order to attain their object. Surely this cannot be misunderstood or doubted. What did Peter tell them to do? Answer: To repent and be baptized. What for ? For the remission of sins. What does "for" mean in this passage? Answer: It signifies in order to, or with a view to, hence they were commanded to repent and be baptized in order to, or with a view to, the remission of sins. Repentance and baptism bear the same gram-

matical and logical relation to the object—remission of sins. There never has been a translation made that does not agree with this statement. I submit this statement to my opponent, and if he will give a translation of the passage that is not in harmony with my proposition I will abandon the field. I give the answer according to three translations, and ask your special attention: "Then said Peter unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost,"—Authorized Version.

"And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."—Revised Version.

"And Peter said to them; Reform, and let each of you be immersed in the name of Jesus Christ, for the forgiveness of your sins; and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."—Wilson's Translation.

Look at these statements: "For the remission of sins;" "unto the remission of your sins;" "for the forgiveness of your sins." What is the meaning of the word "for?" The whole thing turns on this one word. There has never been a translation made that did not make repentance and baptism bear the same relation to this word, and there never will be between this and the end of time. I submit a definition: The word "for" following verbs of motion always, I say always, premeditatedly and deliberately, indicates the end of the motion, or action; in other words, the design, aim or purpose. I will endeavor to prove that this definition is correct. I present the testimony of Webster's International Dictionary, the highest authority in the English language: "For—in the most general sense, indicating that in consideration of, in view of, or with

reference to, which anything is done or takes place." This is precisely what I affirm in reference to repentance and baptism in Peter's answer. Webster gives a number of definitions with appropriate illustration. They all tend to confirm my position. Please give attention while I read:

1. "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 not done.

'With fiery eyes sparkling *for* very wrath.'—Shak. 'How to choose *dogs for* scent or speed.'—Waller.

Now, for so many glorious actions done, *Far* peace at home, *and for* the public wealth, I mean to crown *a-bowl for* Caesar's health.'—Dryden. 'That which *we, for* our unworthiness, are afraid to crave, our prayer is, that God, for the worthiness of His Son, would, notwithstanding, vouchsafe to grant." —Hooker.

2. Indicating the remote and indirect object of an act; the end or final cause with reference to which anything is, acts, serves, or is done.

'The oak for nothing ill. The osier *good for* twigs, the poplar *for* the mill.—Spenser.

It was young counsel *for* the persons, and violent counsel *for* the matters.'—Bacon.

'Shall I think the world was made *for* one, And men are born *for* kings, and beasts *for* men, Not for protection, but to be devoured ?—Dryden. 'For he writes not *for* money, nor *for* praise'—Den-ham.

3. Indicating that in favor of which, or in promoting which, anything is, or is done; hence, in behalf of; in favor of; on the side of; opposed to *against*.

'We can do nothing against the truth, but *for* the truth.'—I. Cor., 13, 8.

'It is *for* the general good of human society, and consequently of particular persons, to be true and just; and it is *for* men's health to be temperate.'— Tillotsom.

'Aristotle *is/or* poetical justice.'—Dennis. 4. Indicating that toward which the action of anything is directed, or the point toward which motion is made; intending to go to.

'We sailed from Peru, *for* China and Japan.'—Bacon.

I will let my opponent fight it out with Webster and pass on. I propose to show that Peter's answer means what I have declared, and that it cannot mean anything else. What is repentance for? It is for or in order to remission of sins, my opponent being the judge. Now I want him to tell us by what kind of jugglery he can get baptism out of this passage and save repentance. I insist that whatever repentance is for, baptism is for. I can prove that to any one who will listen. I will quote the passage, leaving baptism out: "Repent every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." I will quote it and leave out repentance: "Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." In the first remission depends on repentance. In the second it depends on baptism. You cannot deny this. Question: Why therefore does not salvation depend on both, seeing they are joined together by the Holy Spirit through the mouth of the Apostle Peter at the beginning at Jerusalem? I respectfully submit the question to my worthy opponent, and do not expect an answer!

SECOND DAY'S DISCUSSION.

PROPOSITION: *"The Church with which I, (Ashley S. Johnson), stand identified, is Apostolic in doctrine and practice."*

SECOND SPEECH.

MR. PRESIDENT, MODERATORS AND FELLOW-CHRISTIANS: My opponent seems unable to comprehend my definition of the gospel—the good news—of Christ. I do not wish to disappoint him, so I shall try again. In a general sense the word "gospel" may comprehend the whole of the scheme of redemption, but specifically, as preached by the Apostles, and bear in mind this is the real issue, the gospel embraces three facts, and only three. What are they? First, the death; second, the burial; and third, the resurrection. Paul declares in the plainest manner possible that this is the gospel he preached (I. Cor., 15:1-5.) I cannot see how I can be Apostolic if I fail to preach it, or if I try to make it appear that something else is the gospel. Perhaps he can tell us; will he do it? He seems to think that this statement conflicts with the power of Christ, and he thinks Christ preached His own gospel. If we accept Paul's definition this was simply impossible. His death could not be announced until after He died. His burial could not be proclaimed until after He was buried. His resurrection could not be preached until after He arose. Jesus Himself, and I say it with

reverence, could not proclaim these things before they were accomplished. The fact is, this is not altogether relevant, for the question at issue is, what did the Apostles preach, but as he has made an issue of it I shall not evade it. Let me turn to one of his proof: "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God (Mark, 1:i)." Put this beside Paul's definition of the gospel of Jesus Christ which he preached and which the Corinthians had received; What must we conclude? Simply that Mark announces a beginning of the glad tidings which was at last to culminate in the death, burial and resurrection, "only this and nothing more." Of this I am perfectly confident. Why? Wait a moment and I shall give my reply at length, but before I proceed I want to notice the passage with which he clinched his argument. While he did not say it, he left us to infer that he thinks the gospel has been preached in full down through the ages from the transgression. Then he might as well fall in with the Methodists and others, and claim that the Church was set up in the garden of Eden! But here is his proof: "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed (Gal., 3:8)." I am glad he brought this passage forward, for it completely upsets his argument. It does not mean that the gospel was preached to Abraham. What does it mean? Undoubtedly, that antecedent to the gospel God announced to Abraham that through his seed all nations should be blessed. Wilson brings out the thought fully and clearly: "And the Scripture, having foreseen that God would justify the nations by faith, previously announced glad tidings to Abraham, that in thee shall all nations be blessed." This must be correct for any other translation would be contrary

to the facts. I assert that the gospel was a growth from the transgression to the day of Pentecost, where it was for the first time proclaimed in its fullness. I can prove this by a Baptist witness, and he will surely not controvert the testimony of his own historian. Before quoting the proof I want to call your attention to one fact: He does not agree with the scholars of his own church on the questions at issue, and in every case where unbiased scholarship is demanded their testimony favors what I am endeavoring to establish, but here is the proof:

"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. Thes., 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, I, 6, 7.*

This is the kind of fruit the best trees in the Baptist orchard bear! It is sweet to me, will my friend be generous enough to tell us what kind of a taste it leaves in his mouth? If it is good fruit, if it is real Baptist doctrine, I must confess that the chief cause of this discussion has been removed, for if we agree

as touching the beginning, I see no reason why we should differ about anything else.

My friend tried to even up matters on the creed question by presenting to you a copy of Alexander Campbell's book, *The Christian System*, declaring that it is the creed of the Church. This I most emphatically deny. In the first place it is not a creed in any sense. In the second place it was never considered by any reformer as an authoritative statement in any sense, not a bit more than my speeches in this debate will be when I put them into print. In the third place, the book was written to show the fallacy of human creeds as authoritative statements. Mr. Campbell was a voluminous writer. He sounded the first war note in the great fight against creeds, and the statement that we have, or ever had, a human creed of any kind whatever is wholly false. The creed I presented was and is the creed of the Baptist Church, and he will not and cannot deny it, and I want to assure him that a five-cent Testament is good enough for me.

I must own up to one charge my opponent made. Some of our Churches have drifted away from the old foundation in reference to the name of the Church. "Disciple Church," or "Church of the Disciples" is just as unscriptural and sectarian as Baptist Church, or Methodist Church, or Presbyterian Church, but I cannot see how this can help his Church name. I denounce these names as an apostasy from the plain truth. Will he denounce his unscriptural names? I stand by the simple name, Church of Christ, or Church of God. No one has a patent on the name, and I respectfully suggest that while the Church is not known by one name exclusively we cannot go wrong unless we adopt one and make it sectarian by excluding the others, but my opponent has not even one scriptural

name! If you are a Christian the name belongs to you by Divine right—wear it, honor it, and, if needs be, die for it!

My opponent charges on me that we do not think it is right for a sinner to pray. I deny it. Let me tell you what we do teach. Write it down: We teach that prayer for pardon will avail when it is accompanied by obedience to the requirements of the gospel. I charge on him that his doctrine of total depravity makes it impossible for a sinner to pray! The very moment the sinner ceases to be totally depraved he is saved, and therefore his prayer, according to Baptist theology, is a sin!

I have asserted that the gospel was a growth, a development, a gradual evolution. Can I prove it? I think I can. Permit me to try, by introducing the testimony of Jesus, the author of the gospel. "So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; and should sleep, and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how; for the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear, but when the fruit is brought forth (ripe), immediately he putteth in the sickle, because the harvest is come (Mark, 4:26-29)." I want you to try to fully understand this. The gospel of Christ was unfolded from Adam to the Cross just as the ripe corn is developed from the grain planted in the earth. Notice the natural process: seed, blade, ears, ripe corn. So is the kingdom of heaven. First, the gospel in the purpose of God: "According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord: in whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him (Eph., 3:11, 12)." Second, the gospel in intimation: "And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all

cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life; and 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)." Third, the gospel in promise: "In thee (Abram) shall all families of the earth be blessed (Gen., 12:1-3)." In thy seed (Isaac) shall all the nations of the earth be blessed (Gen., 26:1-5)." "In thee (Jacob) and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed (Gen., 28:10-14)" Turn to the Apostle Paul: "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). Fourth, the gospel in prophecy: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Councillor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace; of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this (Isa., 9:6, 7)." Fifth, the gospel in preparation: "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand; for this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight (Matt., 3:1-3)." Sixth, the gospel in fact: "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)." First the seed, then the blade, then the ear, then the ripe corn—can my friend sug-

gest a better solution of this problem? If so I am ready to accept it.

As the chief part of my argument has not yet been touched, I shall now continue to develop what I conceive to be Apostolic doctrine and practice, for I cannot show' that I stand with the Apostles without first showing where they stood. I left off at Pentecost. I wish to refresh your minds somewhat. I had proved by numerous witnesses that Jerusalem was the place of the beginning; also that Peter had given a straightforward answer to an infinitely important question, and I showed that the people, having believed already, were commanded to do two things in order to the remission of sins: first, repent; second, be baptized, I affirmed and do affirm with all the earnestness and emphasis at my command, that these two requirements bear the same grammatical and logical relation to the object in view; namely, remission of sins, and further, that the preposition for following these two verbs of motion indicates the end of the motion, and that it does not, never did, and never can indicate anything else. This position stands before you untouched, unchallenged and impregnable. I go a step further and declare that Peter's answer is in harmony with the constitution of man and with everything revealed in the Scriptures. Every man realizes the necessity of doing something. My opponent says that a sinner cannot do anything in order to salvation, but he will not deny that the majority of men in every age and in every clime have realized the necessity of doing something in order to save themselves from the consequences of sin. If he calls this statement up and denies it, I am ready to argue it further. I insist that faith and repentance are antecedent to baptism, and that baptism without them is an impossibility. I further assert that faith and repentance, being pre-

paratory to baptism, that it is an act of obedience on the part of the penitent, and that the only motive that leads to it is found in the gospel. It is the supreme and final test of the returning sinner's faith in the personal Savior and the promise of salvation. I insist that Peter's answer harmonizes with every passage in the New Testament that emphasizes the necessity of obedience, and also with all the passages where baptism is specifically mentioned:

I. I think my opponent will admit that if a man, after having believed and repented, refuses to be baptized, that his salvation would be jeopardized. A proof: "And all the people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John; but the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him (Luke, 7:29, 30)." If these people rejected the counsel of God—a most serious blunder against themselves—by rejecting John's baptism, what shall we say of the man who refuses to be baptized in obedience to the command of our Lord and King?

II. Jesus laid immense stress on baptism when He said to Nicodemus: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven (Jno., 3:5)." J. R. Graves, a distinguished Baptist preacher, said in his paper, *The Tennessee Baptist*, May 17, 1884: "The consensus of all scholars, in all ages, establishes the fact that baptism is the act referred to by the phrase 'born of water'—and it is a Baptist doctrine." Baptism, to say the least of it, is necessary to citizenship in the kingdom of God on earth. Of what does this kingdom consist? Evidently of those who respect and obey its laws. Is citizenship in the kingdom here necessary to admission into the Kingdom Triumphant? I answer you in the exact words of Scripture: "Then cometh

the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power (I Cor., 15:24)." Do you think citizenship in the kingdom here is therefore unimportant ?

III. Jesus is our example as well as our leader: "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)." If baptism is not an act of obedience what is it? If it is an act of obedience it is necessary to salvation, for all acts of obedience are necessary to salvation—will he deny this statement? If it is not an act of obedience, why will he not receive those who have not been baptized, or why does he refuse to accept into his fellowship those who have been immersed by others? Does he not make it more important in his practice than he makes it in his preaching? He charges on me that I do not practice what I preach? I return the charge with a slight change, and with interest: He does not preach what he practices! I think we might fellowship each other now—here is my hand!!

IV. The great commission emphasizes the importance of baptism: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned (Mark, 16:16)." Where is the promise of salvation? It requires no effort to see that it follows both faith and baptism. Why? Evidently because faith and obedience bring us into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit (Matt., 28:19, 20).

V. Baptism is associated with other commands of the gospel in a way to indicate that the Apostles did not regard one obligation of it as more important than another. In Peter's answer on the day of Pente-

cost it is inseparably joined to repentance. Philip preached at Samaria: "But when they believed Philip preaching concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women (Acts, 8:12)." Luke sums up some of Paul's labors: "And 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)."

VI. Baptism is a command of the gospel: "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord (Acts, 10:48)." What shall we do with it?

VII. Baptism introduces us into the death of Christ: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection (Rom., 6:1-5)."

VIII. Baptism introduces us into the body of Christ: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles; whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one spirit (I. Cor., 12:13)." "He is the Savior of the body (Eph., 5:23)." You must be inside of the body in order to claim its blessings.

IX. Baptism brings us into Christ: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ; there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor fe-

male: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus, and if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise (Gal., 3:26-29)."

X. We are saved by baptism: "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 Christ (I. Pet., 3:21)." My opponent knows, and every other scholar knows, that the word "answer" here should be "seeking," thus demonstrating that we seek and find a good conscience in doing the will of Christ.

XI. John the Apostle declares that, "We know that we know him, if we keep his commandments (I. Jno., 2:3)." To know Him is good, but to know that I know Him is incomparably better. Question: Can a man know that he knows Jesus if he neglects or refuses to be baptized? I respectfully submit this question to my opponent.

XII. John also declares that the Spirit, the water, and the blood agree in one. This is *a* remarkable statement. He does not say they agree in two or three, but in one! I give you his exact words: "And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one. If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son (I. John, 5:8, 9)." Will my friend tell us at what point in Baptist theology the Spirit, the water, and the blood agree in one; if not in baptism, where ?

XIII. John hangs everything on doing the Lord's commandments: "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). I declare that baptism is just as much

a command of God as faith, or repentance, or prayer. I want him to say yes or no to this statement. That is easy and it certainly will not take much time.

XIV. As a fitting climax to this argument, I declare that baptism is joined to calling on or invoking the name of the Lord: "And now why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized, calling on the name of the Lord (Acts, 22:16)." I do not say that baptism is more important than faith or repentance, for I do not believe it is; but I ask my opponent to please produce one passage in which faith and prayer, or repentance and prayer, are joined in Apostolic instruction to inquirers!

There is an easy way for my opponent to settle this troublesome question. I affirm that baptism, preceded by faith and repentance, is for the remission of sins in the same sense that faith and repentance are for the remission of sins. In proof of this I have produced the Commission where faith, or belief, and baptism are united, and Peter's answers to the Pentecostans in which repentance and baptism are united. I have produced a long array of Scripture showing that this position is in harmony with the general tenor of Scripture. He denies it. Now here is a way out: Let him produce one passage showing what baptism is for. It is for something beyond a single doubt. Will he tell us what it is? If he will not or cannot, I have driven him to the point where he must accept baptism along with the other appointments of heaven for the remission of sins, or to really believe his doctrine that salvation is absolutely unconditional!

I have one more argument, and on it I hang everything so far as the meaning of Peter's answer is concerned. Jesus in presenting the cup to His disciples, said: "Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins (Matt., 26:27, 28)." What did Jesus

shed His blood for? The meaning here is unmistakable; He shed it "for," "unto," "into," "with a view to," "in order to," or "in order that we might obtain" remission of sins. My friend cannot deny this, even if it does overturn his theory of conversion—he must find another way out of the wilderness! Peter, in instructing the thousands who asked what to do, on the day of Pentecost, 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 Ghost (Acts, 2:38)." Why did Peter command these penitents to repent and be baptized? The meaning is unmistakable: "for," "unto," "into," "with a view to," "in order to" or "in order that they might obtain" remission of sins. Of this I am absolutely sure. Why so sure? Simply because the phrase "for the remission of sins" in this passage is precisely the same as in the passage relating to the shedding of Christ's blood where the meaning is indisputable, both in Greek and English. I challenge contradiction. But what is my testimony worth? I am only one man. Do I stand by myself, that is the question? I answer that I do not. I simply voice the world's scholarship, and I want you to note that I propose to prove my proposition by my opponent's own brethren. I knew this question would play an important part in this discussion, hence I made an effort to test the scholarship of the world on this point. In pursuance of this object I wrote to the leading Greek scholars throughout the world, and received the replies which I shall read from their letters which I now hold in my hand. I did not write to these men as Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, but as scholars. They have, in my judgment, done a remarkable thing: thirty-one men, from points thousands of miles apart, and differing widely religiously, have practi-

cally given the same answer to my questions. It is really astonishing, and it can be accounted for on one ground only: There is but one true answer to the question, and that is, that baptism is for the remission of sins in the same sense that faith and repentance are for the remission of sins, or it is impossible to find out the Apostle's meaning. Both roads are open to my opponent. Which one will he take?

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, as before intimated, thirty-one answers. 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 in order to obtain the remission of sins? How can my brother, in the face of this testimony, cling to his fast-sinking boat, and affirm that baptism is not essential to salva-

tion, and stigmatize those who stand with the apostles of Jesus Christ and the unbiased scholarship of the age as "water Salvationists," "baptismal regenerationists?" But here are the letters. They speak for themselves, and in thundering 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, requires 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 for¹ many for² (the) sending off of sins.' The preposition used here is *peri*; its common signification is *about, concerning, in regard to*. The 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 in¹ the name of Jesus Christ for² sending-off of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.'^J The 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*.

The text is precisely the same as regards the words used for 'for the remission of sins.'"

The Professor of Greek, University of Boston, 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.' "

Prof. Broadus answers as a scholar, and answers truly. He is one of the greatest scholars of the age. Will my friend deny him fellowship? If not on what ground does he deny it to me?

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 to 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 remission 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, Ithica, 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 let-ting-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 'on the strength of) the name Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.' The word 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 & 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 connections 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., 18:22, 'I *forgave* 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, DePaul 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. Why?

Because he knows, and every scholar knows, that my position is impregnable and he did not want to appear as favoring it. His translation of the other passage and the omission of Acts, 2:38, is a confession of inability to translate it in harmony with Baptist doctrine and practice, and a death-blow to their theory that baptism is because of remission of sins. 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 'your' 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 is, that for a literal rendering of Matthew, 26:28, and Acts, 2:38, I can not improve upon the Revised translation of 1884. 2d. The 'for' of the authorized version is a translation of the final *eis* of the original,—into, unto, for the purpose of, for, etc. 3d. 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 distinguished Baptist scholar, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ills., 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 free gift of the Holy Spirit,' etc. Questions (I). 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 for 'sins.' (2). What is the meaning of the word from which 'for' is taken? It means info, is used where a verb of motion is either expressed or implied-here the latter; a paraphrase would be, 'entering into t/le sphere of the remission of sin,' the precise meaning of which would be determined by the context."

My opponent is out of harmony with the scholarship of his own brotherhood. I want him to tell us his opinion of Prof. Harper.

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 unto 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 your sins.' The Greek of the

clause—'unto remission,' etc., is the same in both passages. The preposition translated 'unto' admits of various renderings, 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 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 joints 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) the 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 translations of Matthew, 26:28, and Acts, 2:38, in the Revised Version are literal. I cannot 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 *toward*, 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. The sense seems about the same to me either way."

I now present the testimony of three great professors from beyond the Atlantic. Their words come like the roar of a storm on the ocean, and woe be unto the Baptist preacher or any other who stands in the way of the incoming tide !

The Professor of Greek, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland, says: "The authorized version is quite literal. In both passages the expression *for 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 (i) 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 'testament' 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, 2:38,15— '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 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., TENN., 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. / *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,

ASHLEY S. JOHNSON.

ATHENS,

the fifth July, 1891.

Dear Sir — With great pleasure I answer to your questions. The expression "*of the remission of sins*" has the same signification 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 acquisition 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 Savior.

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 the Savior, 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,

Conclusion: Let my distinguished and scholarly opponent draw it!!!

SECOND DAY'S DISCUSSION.

PROPOSITION : " *The Church with which I, (Ashley S. Johnson), stand identified, is Apostolic in doctrine and practice.*"

THIRD SPEECH.

MR. PRESIDENT, MODERATORS AND FELLOW-CHRISTIANS:

Having presented to you, in systematic form, what I conceive to be Apostolic doctrine and practice, I now proceed to put the cap-stone on my argumentative structure by showing that we teach and practice what the Apostles taught and practiced. In order to prepare your minds for this, I ask you to indulge me the privilege of a few preliminaries; first, I do not propose to make any effort to establish any so-called historical succession, for the reason that it does not prove anything worth naming. The fact that an error is hoary with age is rather to its discredit than to its credit. However, I will say that if there is anything in it I have the same claim on it that my opponent has, for Alexander Campbell, the leader in this great movement to restore to the world Apostolic Christianity in letter and practice, was baptized by a regularly ordained Baptist preacher, and lived a member of the Baptist Church for a number of years, and he was an earnest and enthusiastic Baptist too. The fact that by study he made some new discoveries of old truths, and the fact that he at last got tired of the Baptist creed and

name, and threw them off and announced his determination to be only a Christian, a Christian only, certainly does not break the chain, for my opponent cannot deny that even the Baptists have made much progress in the last hundred years, and this is not all, the Baptists in some localities in Kentucky, and other places where we are strong and understood, admit our members on their baptism.

Rev. O. L. Hailey: "That is not true. I have preached in Kentucky, and I know that Kentucky Baptists would not do it." Sensation!

I was in Kentucky about twelve years ago, at Harrodsburg, and saw it done. I am willing to be qualified on the statement.

Wm. C. Maupin (my moderator): "Qualify me too! I have seen it and will testify to the same fact." Another sensation!

But there is nothing in this, for the simple reason that it cannot be upheld. That God has had a people on earth from the day of Pentecost forward I do not doubt, but it is also true that many of them have been seriously in error, and the fact that the Church has made progress on *zigzag* lines proves nothing against its Founder; it rather shows the frailties of the human element—men and women. The claimants to historical Apostolic succession are too numerous to demand serious attention of those who are satisfied with the plain teaching of the Apostles. I can trace my lineage back—on serious reflection I hesitate to say it—to the Baptist preacher who baptized Alexander Campbell. I take it back. I cannot do it. I cannot get back beyond the third man! But suppose I could get back to Eld. Matthias Luse who baptized Campbell, who baptized Luse? I candidly confess that I cannot tell, and further, I do not care. If my pedigree were clear back that far, I would have doubt thrown on it

by the Episcopal and Roman Catholic Churches, for they both make the same claim. With these claimants to the rightful succession what is the man to do who cannot read the respective arguments and decide for himself? If there is any importance attached to this, the honest inquirer is confronted by a grave danger. What can he do? What does my opponent suggest? If a knowledge of this proposition is necessary to success in finding the way of salvation, very few will ever reach the Church Triumphant, for the majority of those who have investigated it consider it an unsettled question. If it is not necessary to salvation I think it best to let it sink into merited oblivion. What do I suggest? Answer: With one stroke of the sword of the Spirit I cut the "Gordian knot," leap over the ages of ignorance, apostasy, superstition, confusion and intolerance, and take my stand with Peter and the other Apostles at the beginning in the city of Jerusalem—on the first Pentecost—"day of first-fruits"—after the glorification of Christ! Second, I want to present the testimony of the "Sage of Bethany," Alexander Campbell—the most distinguished scholar and reformer of the century—as to what he started out to do, and the reasons he had for his undertaking:

"We speak for ourselves only; and, while we are always willing to give a declaration of our faith and knowledge of the Christian system, we firmly protest against dogmatically propounding our own views, or those of any fallible mortal, as a condition or foundation of Church union and co-operation. While, then, we would, if we could, either with the tongue or the pen, proclaim all that we believe, and all that we know, to the ends of the earth, *we take the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, as the foundation of all Christian union and communion.*"

This is a view of the principles and objects of the restoration from one of its chief promoters. When I think it over and then take a view of the religious world to-day, I am forced to conclude that it was the misfortune of Campbell to live at least one hundred years in advance of his time. I proceed. In general terms we plead for a return to Apostolic Christianity in letter and spirit, and in order to give you a better understanding of what we teach, I am willing to lead you on a little expedition back through the ages. What do we find at the start? Enough to discourage us, most certainly: The Baptists claiming a line of succession of churches back to the Apostles; the Protestant Episcopalians claiming a line of succession of churches back to the Apostles; and the Roman Catholics claiming a line of succession back to the Apostles! This is confusion worse confounded. What shall we do? I suggest that we go back to the Apostolic age and come this way. Were the Apostles inspired? Yes. Could they see down the unborn centuries? Yes. Did they make any predictions concerning the future of the Church? Yes. Shall I present their testimony? Wait a moment and I will go back to the Master Himself. While at Caesarea Philippi He announced the ultimate triumph of the Church, and He subsequently indicated that apostasy would follow purity: "Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo here is Christ, or there; believe it not, for there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect; behold, I have told you before (Matt., 24:23-25)." My opponent may wish to cut this argument off by saying that if it is true the gates of hell have prevailed. I forestall him by calling his attention to the fact that the Head of the Church, the Foundation of the Church, triumphed over death, hell

and the grave, and that to-day He holds the keys of this conquered domain (Rev., 1:17, 18). Frail man may get off the track, but the King never dies; long live the King! In addition to this, Paul makes it plain that part of the Church is here and part yonder—in the world of Spirits—and thus the Church was, and is, and shall be triumphant: "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)." Again, "But ye are come unto mount Zion, 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 firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect (Heb., 12:22, 23)." The Church, therefore, on earth may apostasize for a time, but the promise and hope of the gospel still live.

What brought about the great apostasy? Where did it start? In what did it originate? Answer: It began in the Church of God at Corinth, Was it caused by a disagreement on the gospel? Not at first. What then? I answer that in general terms it originated in extraordinary laxity in morals; and finally extended to the denial of the resurrection of the dead. I mention four sins of which the Apostle Paul accused them; first, they tolerated in their fellowship a man who lived openly with his father's wife (I. Cor., 5:1); second, they retained in their fellowship men who went to law before unbelievers (I. Cor., 6:1-6); third, they turned the Lord's supper into drunkenness and revelry (I. Cor., 11:19-34); and fourth, they denied the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead (I. Cor., 15:1-23). What were they doing when Paul wrote them his first epistle? Were they trying to purge the body of Christ of this filth and disgrace-

fill unbelief? Nay, verily. What were they doing? Carrying on a successful warfare among themselves— in the Church—on the simple question of opinionism! How infinitely absurd, how ridiculously childish! They fell out and fought over their opinions and let the cancer of corruption eat up the vitals of the Church. Why did not this apostasy start at Jerusalem, seeing all men are frail alike? I can give but one answer: The war at Jerusalem was on the outside— a solid pressure of the enemy—the flesh, the world and the devil combined—and they that were scattered abroad, as the result of persecution, went everywhere preaching the word (Acts, 8:1-4). A persecuted church never apostasizes; neither does a church that goes everywhere proclaiming the word of life, and the church that does its duty fighting the enemies that are without will find no time to wage war inside. Why did the apostasy start in the Church at Corinth? I can give but one answer: The devil saw that selfishness and lasciviousness, and consequently unbelief, would bring swift destruction, and left it to work out its own disintegration. How strikingly true it is that division in the Church has helped the destroyer in obstructing the conquest of the whole earth!

What do the Apostles tell us about this apostasy? I answer you in the exact words of the Scripture, and as I want to offer some suggestions I will give you the reference first. Turn to II. Thess., 2:1-12: "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, that the day of Christ is at hand." It is evident that a good many people in the Apostolic Church lived in daily expectation of the return of the Lord from heaven. Paul fought this error, and in

order to deliver their minds from it said: "Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition." Think this over. The return of the Master was not to take place until the man of sin should be revealed. Who is the man of sin, son of perdition? Here is his photograph as taken by Paul: "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he is as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." If this is not a picture of the Pope of Rome, pray tell me whose picture it is? Was this the first time Paul had spoken of this? Let him answer: "Remember yet not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time." Was this departure from the pure gospel beginning in the days of the Apostles? Yes: "For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth now will let, until he be taken out of the way. and then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him. whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteous in them that perish; because they receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved, and for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." I insist that this language is as correct a representation of the apostasy as developed into the Church of Rome, as any contemporary historian could write. Is this all? Not by any means, Paul in his letter to Timothy brings out some

things fully that are only hinted at here. Hear him: "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth, for every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer (I. Tim., 4:1-5)." Did Paul ever recant? Hear him just before he testified to the truth of what he believed by giving up his life: "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine; for the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts will they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables (II. Tim., 4:2-4)." I want my opponent to tell us, in view of his claims of Apostolic succession, where he places these passages. If you wish to follow this subject further turn to the eleventh and twelfth chapter of the Revelation and you will find the picture completed in all its horrible details—the two witnesses, the Old and New Testaments—were trampled under foot and the people of God were driven from the haunts of civilized man.

The apostasy was beginning even in Apostolic times, but the extraordinary missionary zeal kept the Church as a whole, comparatively pure, until the days of Constantine, but from his day forward, the departure was rapid. Darkness deepened until Paul's prediction was fulfilled and the Pope of Rome became the head of the Church and the dictator

of the potentates of the earth. Opinionism sowed the error and the harvest was reaped in fire and blood. Intolerance was the characteristic spirit of the so-called Church. The inquisition was a positive and unailing remedy for heresy, but the mind of man cannot be chained always; and numerous efforts were made and crowned with—failure! At last Luther gave the world the Bible, and thus struck the shackles from the race. The war was long, fierce and destructive; the reformer, in swinging away from the doctrine of justification by works—penance—swung to another extreme and overlooked many fundamental principles of the gospel. The reformation was divided. Later, John Wesley started another reformation in England, and while Luther preached justification by faith, Wesley went a step farther, and in defiance of the formalities of the time, preached the gospel demand for personal holiness. Sect after sect was born. Why so many ? Each man who discovered what he considered a new truth, in his enthusiasm emphasized it too much, and thus lifted it out of its place in the gospel. It is an indisputable fact that all these sects were born in an effort to get back to the original ground, otherwise the Apostolic ground. What demand was there for another reformation ? Look over the ground—the reformers were divided into numerous belligerent factions, and when Alexander Campbell stepped upon the arena, and recognizing Luther's doctrine of justification by faith, went a step in advance, and declared that justification by faith is not incompatible with full and sincere obedience to the gospel of Christ; he also recognized Wesley's doctrine of personal holiness, and went one step further and declared that all who live righteous lives should be one, hence his plea—a plea that startled the whole world—for the union of all who

love the Lord on the Bible, and on it alone. Campbell and his co-laborers gradually worked their way out. I doubt if they had any thought at the beginning of what God in His providence intended for them to do. It is hard to break away from old training, for Protestantism is clannish to a degree that it is sometimes impossible for a man to follow the demands of his own judgment. The reformers began at Jerusalem. My time is growing short, but I want to present a systematic view of the ground of which we claim to be Apostolic:

I. We lay extraordinary emphasis on the personality, divinity, and saving power of Jesus Christ. Martin Luther laid extraordinary emphasis on justification by faith. John Wesley laid it on personal purity. George Fox laid it on the Spirit's mission. John Calvin, and the numberless sects that have sprung from his teaching, including the Primitive Baptists, my grand parents and my opponent's parents, "theologically," laid it on the sovereignty of God. But in our efforts to restore rather than reform, we have tried to call the people back to faith in the Christ and obedience to Him as the only test of fellowship among the faithful. We do not build upon a doctrine, a speculation, an opinion, a system compiled by human hands, but upon Jesus as the only Son of the living God, the revelation of God, the wisdom of God, the power of God. In other words, we try to call the world away from theological hair-splitting as to what might be or might have been, to the Apostolic writings, where Jesus is the center, the foundation, the head, in all, and over all, King, Priest, and Savior of all. Hear the Lord God at His birth: "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten you (Ps., 2:7)." Hear Him at the baptism of His Son: "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and lo,

the heavens were opened unto him and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting on him: and lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased (Matt., 8:16, 17)." Hear Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God (Matt., 16:16)." I emphasize the fact that Jesus made Himself the center of Christianity—"the Son of the living God!" Hear the Father again, at the transfiguration: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him (Matt., 17:6)." Moses, the great lawgiver, and Elijah, the great reformer, had laid their honors at His feet; how appropriate the acknowledgment accompanied by the command: "Hear ye him." We must appeal to Jesus because He came to speak for the Father; we must hear the Apostles because they were sent to speak of and for Jesus. He declared to Peter, in answer to his confession, that upon the confession—the One confessed—He would build a Church that would be perpetual and all-prevailing, that in its presence the battalions of death and hell could not stand. Oh! the beauty, the simplicity, the security of this foundation. If Luther broke away from the superstitions of his times and re-discovered some new truth, and no one doubts that he did; if Wesley broke away from the formalism of his times and re-discovered the individual man, and no one doubts that he did, it is not an exaggeration to say that Alexander Campbell broke away from the creeds and speculations of the times and re-discovered the individual Christ, the one Christ, the only Christ. The religious warfare of the times, found its center in speculations and discussions touching doctrines. He shifted the scenes, and lo! the smoke of theological conflicts floated away, the clang of the sword of denominational rivalry was sheathed, the heart of the world

was touched with the inspiration of the Christ-life, and the eyes of men have been turned upward and we behold the crucified One in the heavens lifted up as He unto whom all tribes, kindred, nations and generations must come, and I stand before you today to ring in your ears and down the corridors of your heart, and through the unexplored and yet fertile lowlands of your conscience to the very center of your being, one question, a question that for comprehensive meaning, for sweeping grandeur—a question on whose answer hangs every act of obedience out of the Church in order to get into it, or in the Church in order to remain in it—indeed the only question of the ages, touching every condition of man, and rolling with the thunder of the mighty ocean, breaking on the shore of the night-less country, and joining with the shouts of the redeemed who walk the city of fight in the calm radiance of the presence of the glorified King: "What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? (Matt., 22:42)."

II. We lay extraordinary emphasis on the importance of beginning at Jerusalem for the reason that a "good beginning is half a victory." The common people heard Jesus with gladness because He was simple in His style and came at once to the point, and as the most of us are common people, pressed to make "enough to eat and to spare," and utterly unable to read the immense amount of history necessary to decide on the claims of rival sects, it is a blessed thing to be able to stand in the presence of the Apostles of Jesus at Jerusalem—Zion—where the foundation was laid (Isa., 28:16), and look up into the face of the only Lawgiver and hear the terms of pardon as He dictated them to the world through His own representatives. I have introduced numerous proofs in support of my declaration that the gospel in full began at Jerusalem,

and they stand unshaken and impregnable. In this respect, having the support direct and unimpeachable of the prophets, of Jesus, and of the Apostles, we claim the full benefit of Paul's congratulations to the Church at Ephesus: "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints and the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God through the spirit (Eph., 2:19-22)."

III. We lay extraordinary emphasis on the fact that the terms of pardon and the terms of Christian fellowship are precisely the same, that if a man is a Christian he is in Christ, and that if he is in Christ he should have the free, frank and full fellowship of every other Christian: "Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ also has received us, to the glory of God (Rom., 15:7)."

IV. We lay extraordinary emphasis on the importance of answering those who are seeking the way of salvation in the exact words of the Apostles. To us this is a matter of surpassing importance because it is the only way of infallible safety, and my friend has failed to point out a better way. Hence to a heathen, like the jailor at Philippi, who asks what to do, we answer: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house (Acts, 16:31)." But we do not stop here. We follow the example of Paul and Silas and speak "unto him the word of the Lord," and if he understands it we baptize him into Christ, "the same hour of the night." I have done this repeatedly myself. I wonder if my opponent ever did it. To the nation who having heard, accepted and believed the gos-

pel, we answer in the words of Peter: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost (Acts, 2:38)." I want to enforce this with another quotation, immediately following it: "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call; and with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying: Save yourselves from the untoward generation; then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls; and they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and in fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers (Acts, 2:39-41)." If this does not mean that the way of salvation, or conditions of pardon, were submitted by the Apostles to the people in language that they could understand, I candidly confess that I am like a ship in mid-ocean; storm tossed, compass lost, and without hope of harbor. To the man who like Saul of Tarsus has been fasting, mourning, praying, penitent on the account of the pressure of the truth upon him, we say: "And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord (Acts, 1:16)." To the man who confesses his faith on the highway as did the Ethiopian officer, we administer the sacred ordinance and send him on his way rejoicing (Acts, 8:26-40).

V. We lay extraordinary emphasis on the power of the gospel of Jesus Christ, believing that it is at once the gospel of God our Father, the gospel of the Holy Spirit our Comforter, and the gospel of Jesus Christ our Lord. The Apostles were sent into the world to proclaim the gospel to the whole creation. It must indeed be God's great and only remedy for sin. Paul, in his great letter to the Romans, confirms this with

great clearness: "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; for therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith (Rom., 1:16, 17)." How is this gospel to be made known? What effect does it have on the mind, life and destiny? I answer you first in the exact words of the Apostle John: "And 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 (Jno., 20:30, 31)." Second, I answer you in the exact words of Paul; turn to Rom., 10:14-17: "But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is to bring Christ down from above:) Or who shall descend into the deep? (that is to bring Christ up again from the dead;) but what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thine heart: that is the word of faith which we preach." This is the whole thing in brief. Jesus has left the grave; we need not look for Him there. He has gone into heaven; we need not try to call him back to life on earth. What shall we do? I present you with the New Testament, the word of faith, written to lead you out of ignorance into knowledge; out of weakness into strength; out of sin into salvation; out of darkness into the glorious light and liberty of the children of God. Where is this word of faith? In thy heart and on thy tongue. Where is it? Call Moses: "It is not in heaven, that thou shouldest say, Who shall go up for us to heaven, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it? Neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldest say, Who shall go

over the sea for us, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it? But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it (Deut., 30: 12-14).” What is this word of faith?

Turn to Paul again: “That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved; for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.” How simple, how comprehensive, how sublime! The word of faith leads to Christ.

The appeal is to the word that is written: “For the Scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.” The gospel breaks down walls of national pride, dissolves prejudice and spreads unity and peace : “For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him; for whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.” How deep the love; how broad the philanthropy; how unsearchable the counsel of the Author of life! How are men made subjects of the saving power of the gospel? That is the question of questions, the question of the ages. Paul makes it clear, full and conclusive: “How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher.”

This is equivalent to the unequivocal statement: Men who have not believed in the Lord cannot call on Him; men who have not heard of the Lord cannot believe in Him; and men cannot hear without the preacher. Hear the Apostle’s conclusion: “And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things. But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith,

Lord, who hath believed our report? So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.”

Third, I answer you in the exact words of Peter: “Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls; 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. 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., 1:6-12).” The world needs one thing, and only one. What is it?

Answer: To have the sweet old story, sweetly told and retold, and told again, until it cannot be said by any of the sons and daughters of men “I never heard it before.” Is the gospel as it is written sufficient to save us from our past sins and guide us to heaven? Call Paul again : “Now to him that is of power to establish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but is now made manifest, and by the Scripture of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith: to God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ forever, Amen (Rom., 16:25-27).” How are the disciples to be established in the faith? By the gospel of Jesus Christ. How was Jesus preached? As an unfolding of what had been a profound mystery to previous ages. Why was this mystery revealed, this gospel made known to all nations? In order that they

might understand and obey it. Why obey it? That they might give glory, honor and praise to God through Jesus Christ our Lord. I close this part of my argument by giving a summary of God's will concerning us: By the gospel is meant the good news of salvation; it is inspired by the perpetual presence of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; whosoever therefore hears it, accepts it as the truth, submits to its requirements, and follows it out in his life, has the promise of present salvation, and the reward of the righteous hereafter.

VI. We lay extraordinary emphasis on the perpetual and personal mission of the Holy Spirit: First, in His extraordinary work of proclaiming the gospel through the Apostles: "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 of me, because ye have been with me from the beginning (Jno., 15:26, 27)." Please turn to Acts, 2:4, and see the fulfillment of this promise to the Apostles: "And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." Second, in His perpetual office as convincer, through the word, of the world; of sin, righteousness and judgment. I present the testimony of the Master Himself: "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are life

(Jno., 6:63)." Hear Him again: "But now I go my way to him that sent me, and none of you asketh me, whither goest thou? But because I have said these things unto you, sorrow hath filled your heart; 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 the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believed not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of the world is judged (Jno., 16:).” Third, in His perpetual office of bearing witness to our acceptance with God and His dwelling in these mortal bodies: “For the Spirit itself beareth witness with our Spirit, that we are the children of God (Rom., 8:16).” Again, “Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man shall defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are (I. Cor. 3:16, 17)” Again, “And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father; wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ (Gal., 4:6, 7).” Fourth, as the pledge or “earnest” of our eternal redemption: “In whom ye also trusted, after ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory (Eph., 1:13-14)

VII. We lay extraordinary emphasis on the name of Jesus Christ, and consequently on the name Christian, which is derived from it. In doing this we do not wish to monopolize the name, but we rather emphasize its importance and declare that it belongs to all who love and obey the Lord. Hear the Master: “And ye shall be hated of all men for my name’s sake: but he that endureth to the end shall be saved (Matt., 10:22)” Hear Luke, the historian of the Apostolic times: “Neither is their salvation in any other; for there is

none other name under heaven among men, whereby we must be saved (Acts, 4)." What name is derived from Christ? I answer in the exact words of Scripture: "And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch (Acts, II:26). Did the disciples accept and honor this name? I again answer in the exact words of Holy Writ: "But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evil doer, or as a busy body in other men's matter; yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf," in this name (I. Pet., 4:15, 16).

VIII. We lay extraordinary emphasis on the necessity of perseverance in the Christian life—we fully believe in the "final perseverance of the saints"—if they persevere ! Hear Paul, in his letter to the Philippians : "Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but much more now in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure (Phil.2:12, 13)."

IX. We lay extraordinary emphasis on the necessity for visible Christian unity. I want to speak with special care and deliberation on this point. Alexander Campbell did not un-church or un-Christianize any one, neither do I. He claimed, and so do I, that there has been a great and grave departure from the original gospel. Our position is, that so far as Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Friends, or Episcopalians go along with the Apostles of Jesus, and manifest His Spirit, they are Christians.

We object to their Baptism, Methodism, Presbyterianism, Friendism and Episcopalianism. We plead with them to lay down that which cannot be found in the Bible, and meet us on the broad platform of the word of God and the demands of the perishing race. We

agree with everything they teach that can be found in the Book. The Bible never made a sect or a sectarian; it takes something in addition to the Bible to do it, hence in order to Christian union we must lay down opinions and speculations, and get together on the truth and follow the Apostolic plan, and as it will produce nothing but Christians, the future Church is bound to be Christian only. I advance our Scriptural reasons for pleading for Christian union; first, God planned this even before Jesus came into the world: "That in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him (Eph., 1:10)." Second, Jesus expressed His intention to establish but one fold: "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd (Jno., 10:16)." Third, Jesus prayed that the divinity of His mission might be proven to the world by the oneness of His followers: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may 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 (Jno., 17:20, 21)." Fourth, the Church, which is the body of Christ, was one in teaching, name, and mission in the days of the Apostles, for His death had broken down all previously existing barriers, and prepared the way for love and good will: "But now, in Christ Jesus, ye who sometimes were afar off are made nigh by the blood of Christ; for he is our peace, who hath made both "Jew and Gentile-" one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making

peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby (Eph., 2:13-16).” Again, “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., 4:4-6).” Fifth, divisions are condemned in the Apostolic writings: “Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them that cause division and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them (Rom., 16:17).” Is this enough? Hear

Paul again : “Is Christ divided (I. Cor., 1:13)?” What basis of union do I suggest? Here it is in few words: Justification by faith in Jesus Christ, which means that we are to take Him at His word and do what He requires in order to salvation; and that we shall not set up any requirement as a test of fellowship at the door of the Church which the Lord has not proclaimed as a condition of the remission of our sins.

Finally, we emphasize everything that the Bible emphasizes, and in doing so express our willingness to know and abide by the oracles of God at all times and in all things.

Conclusion: The Church with which I, (Ashley S. Johnson), stand identified, is Apostolic in doctrine and practice!