

# NICHOL-HENSLER DEBATE

A. A. HENSLER, Baptist

CHAS. R. NICHOL, Christian

PROPOSITION: Resolved, that the Scriptures teach that the Church or Kingdom of Christ was set up or established during his personal ministry on earth.

A. A. HENSLER, AFF.

CHAS. R. NICHOL, NEG.

PAGES 5-85

PUBLISHED BY  
Nichol Publishing Co.  
CLIFTON, TEXAS

COPYRIGHT 1954 BY  
THE NICHOL PUBLISHING Co.  
CLIFTON, TEXAS

All rights in this book reserved. No part may be reproduced without permission in writing from the publisher, save brief portions for review in magazines and papers.

Printed in the United States of America

## **PROPOSITION. 1st AFF.**

Resolved, That the Scriptures teach, that the Church or Kingdom of Christ was set up or established during His personal ministry on earth.

---

### **Mr. Hensler's First Speech**

Definition: "The Scriptures," the Old and New Testaments, "Teach." That they either teach it direct or that it is reasonably or logically adduced therefrom. "The Church or Kingdom of Christ." We mean that institution of the Bible or New Testament called "Church" and sometimes called the kingdom of heaven, or the kingdom of God. By "set up or established," I mean that it was organized and its membership so united as to receive instructions, laws and commands as a body; and as a body carry out the will of its Founder and Head. By "during His personal ministry on earth," I mean the period of time that He (Christ) was on earth, between his baptism by John, and his death on the cross. 1.—The Church or Kingdom prophesied of: (Dan. 2:44), "And in the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed." Here we learn that a kingdom shall be set up; it shall be set up by the "God of Heaven," and during the reign of certain kings—the four Caesars.

This God of heaven, is Jesus Christ. We read in Phil. 2:6, "Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." He was the image of God, (2 Cor. 4:4. John 1:1, 14) — "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us. Also 1 Tim. 3:16, "God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

Again: "Thus sayeth the Lord of hosts, behold the man whose name is the BRANCH, and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord, and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and the council of peace shall be between them both." Zech. 6:12-13. "Behold thy king cometh unto thee; he is just and having salvation; lowly and rid-

ing upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass," Zech. 9:9. Notice that this "God of heaven," and this "BRANCH," is Christ.

He is to grow up, and increase, and He is to build the temple of the Lord. He is to bear the glory. He is to sit and rule upon His throne. He is to be a priest upon his throne. Notice, I am discovering whether these scriptures point to the first advent of Christ as the time when these events are to be fulfilled. Christ, "The God of heaven," the "BRANCH," is to grow up, be a priest, build the temple of the Lord, bear the glory, rule over the house of God, which is to be a spiritual house; he is to be just and bring salvation, he is to be lowly and riding upon an ass. He is to rule as king. Notice also that it is the same prophet, Zechariah, that uttered both these predictions of the coming of the Branch; the manner of his coming and the setting up of his kingdom or temple, when he comes as king to rule and riding upon an ass. 2.—The fulfillment of these predictions. Matt. 21:2-5, "Saying unto them, Go into the village over against you, and straightway ye shall find an ass tied, and a colt with her; loose them and bring them unto me. And if any man say ought unto you, ye shall say, the Lord hath need of them. All this was done, that it might be fulfilled what was spoken by the prophet, saying, tell ye the daughter of Zion, behold thy king cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass." Here the predictions of Zechariah is by the Saviour himself declared fulfilled in this His entry into Jerusalem and during his personal ministry. What was the announcement? "Behold thy King cometh." "Tell ye the daughter Zion, behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt, the foal of an ass." Here he is emphatically declared to be king. Now let us see if there are other scriptures that regard him as king. Luke 15:38, "Saying, blessed is the King that cometh in the name of the Lord." This statement refers to Christ, who as King came in the name of the Lord, as Zechariah predicted that he would come, taking charge of the people, RULING over them; his laws written in their hearts, they his people, called out from the world. Looks like he had a kingdom at that time. Matt. 2:2, "Saying where is he that is born King of the Jews? John 1:49. "Nathanael answered and sayeth unto him, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel." Was this man deceived? No. If he had been deceived Jesus would

surely have undeceived him. John 18:37. "Pilate therefore said unto him, "Art thou a King then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am King." In the Diaglot it reads, "Thou sayest, I am a King. For this I have been born; and for this I have come into the world, that I may testify to the truth."

The Bible Union revision also gives Christ's answer—"I am King." And in 1 Tim. 6:13 Paul says, "Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession."

3.—The preparation of a people for this BRANCH—King, when he comes. Isah. 40:3. "The voice of him that cryeth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God." Malachi 3:1. "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me." This, no doubt, has reference to John the Baptist. In Luke 1:13-17 you will find the fulfillment of the above prophecies. What was John to do? "Make ready a people prepared for the Lord." Now we see Mark 1:1-4, "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; as it is written in the prophets, Behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight." John did come and preach and baptize in the wilderness and make ready a people for the Christ. Luke 1:17, it says, "He shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias." So we have John making ready a people for the Lord—the King. What does my proposition say? That the church or kingdom was set up during Christ's personal ministry. When was the personal ministry of Christ? Immediately after John's ministry, and it lapped over somewhat on John's ministry. What was the God of Heaven to do? Set up a kingdom? What was John to do? Make ready a people prepared for him—Christ. "The Kingdom of Heaven is at Hand." What is at hand? "The Kingdom of Heaven." Who said that? John the Baptist. Did he know anything about it? Yes, he knew all about it; for he was there, and did that preaching for that purpose.

Mark 1:14, 15. "Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying"—what did he say? "The time is Fulfilled." What time is fulfilled? What time? The time the prophets spoke about. "The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand." Who said

that? Jesus Christ said it. When did he say it? During his PERSONAL MINISTRY. That is what my proposition says. Well did he set up a Kingdom? We will see. "Repent ye and believe this Gospel." This is the first time men were called upon to repent because the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand.

Matt. 5:3. "Blessed are the Poor in Spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of heaven." Have they a Kingdom? Yes. Who have? "The Poor in Spirit." Who said that? Jesus said it. Well, did he know? Who will say he did not?

Matt. 6:33. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." How could they seek the Kingdom of God if no such kingdom existed?

Mat. 9:35. "And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom." Preaching the Gospel of what? The Gospel of the Kingdom. Who did? Jesus did. Preach the Gospel of the Kingdom? Yes. Was the Kingdom at hand then? Jesus said it was, and I believe it.

Matt. 10:5-8. Jesus sent out the twelve and told them, "As ye go, Preach, saying, The Kingdom of Heaven is at Hand." What were they to preach? The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. After that, Jesus sent out seventy more preachers, and he told them to preach the same thing.

Matt. 12:28. "But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the Kingdom of God is come unto you." Who said that? Jesus did! When did he say it? During his Personal Ministry. What did he say? "If I cast out devils by the Spirit of God," and no lover of truth will deny that he did that very thing, and if he did, then what? "Then the kingdom of God is come unto you."

Luke 11:20. "If I by the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt"—did you hear that "No Doubt?" "The kingdom of God is come unto you." Who said there was no doubt? Jesus said it. What did He say? He said there was no doubt about it. When did He say that? During His personal ministry. That is exactly what my proposition says—the kingdom of Jesus was here in the personal ministry of Jesus.

Matt. 13:31-32. "Another parable put He forth unto them, saying, the kingdom of Heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field." A small beginning just

as Paul said in 1 Cor. 12:28, "God set same in the church, first apostles." "Which indeed is the least of all seeds: but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof." Yes, the church or kingdom of Christ had a small beginning, only twelve members at first. 1 Cor. 12:28. Paul says they were the first set in the church. When were they set in the church? Luke 6:13. Here He called unto him his twelve apostles and gave them power over unclean spirits and sent them out to preach the Gospel. The same is found in Mark 3:13-19. After he chose the twelve, ordained them, gave them power over unclean spirits, and to heal diseases, it says: "And they went into an HOUSE." The margin says "HOME." This is where the apostles were set in. And Paul says they were the first set in, and he says they were set in the church. If there was no church or kingdom till the first Pentecost, then the apostles could not be the FIRST set in the church, as Paul says. Because, if the church was set up on the day of Pentecost, then about three thousand were the FIRST set in the church.

Matt. 13:33. "Another parable spake he unto them; the kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened." What is it that Jesus said was like leaven? The kingdom of heaven. Is the kingdom of Heaven like leaven? Yes, Jesus said it was.

Now let us see if the church and kingdom during Christ's personal ministry were the same. Matt. 16:18. "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." Now notice the next verse: "And I will give unto thee the keys to the kingdom." The keys of what? The keys of the kingdom. Who said that? Jesus. To whom does He give the keys? To Peter. To what do they belong? To the kingdom. Have the apostles a kingdom? Yes, the Saviour, Jesus, said they had one. And John the Baptist preached, it was at hand. Jesus preached the kingdom; the twelve and the seventy preached it. Why have keys if there is no house, and no doors to lock or unlock? Have we found that they had a kingdom during the personal ministry of Jesus? Yes. Jesus said He would give them the keys of the kingdom. Well, what are these keys Jesus gave to them? The judicial and executive power to carry out the king's instruction. See Matt. 17:1-6. Here the power

passed over from Moses to Christ and from the church of Moses to the church of Christ. Here we have three witnesses from earth: Peter, John and James, and three witnesses from heaven: Moses, Elias and God. They are all with Jesus on the Mount of Transfiguration. And, "while he," Peter, "*yet* spake, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold, a voice out of the cloud, which said: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear ye him." The voice of Moses and the law or rule of Moses was reigning, but now a change, you hear my son, now, and obey him. In Matt. 16:28, the last verse of the chapter, it is said: "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his Kingdom." And in the 17th chapter they saw the Son of Man coming in his Kingdom. Now turn to the 18th chapter of Matthew, 18:15-19: "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he will hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it to the church." How could they tell it to the church if there was no church? How? "But if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall lose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Here is the key power which Jesus said in Matt. 16:19 he would give them, and in Matt. 17:1-6 they received that key power, and in Matt. 18:15-19 they were shown and told how to use that key power.

Matt. 11:11-15 we read: "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." The least in what? In the kingdom of heaven. If there had been no kingdom there could be neither greatest nor least in it. But Jesus said: "The least was in the kingdom of heaven."

Luke 16:16. "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the Kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." I ask, how could men press into a Kingdom that did not exist? In Matt. 11 it said: "The Kingdom suffered violence." How



could the kingdom suffer violence if no such kingdom existed?

What suffered violence? The kingdom of heaven. Who said it? Jesus. When was that? During Christ's personal ministry. Some one tells me that the Baptist church house at Clifton was destroyed last night by a violent fire. I ask who was its pastor? He says it had no pastor. Who were its members? It had none. Who had charge of it? Nobody. Where did the building stand? He says there wasn't any building. Now, how could a building be destroyed that had no existence? Now, if there was no church or kingdom in the days of Christ how could it suffer violence?

Matt. 21:31. "Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you." Who said that? Jesus said it during his personal ministry. Well, did the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God? Yes, Jesus said they went into the kingdom of God during His personal ministry on earth. That is what my proposition says, that the Church or Kingdom was in existence during the days of Christ's personal ministry on earth.

Matt. 23:13. "Ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in." What did Jesus say? He said the Pharisees and Sadducees would not go into the kingdom of heaven, and that they were keeping others that would from going in.

Matt. 21:42. "Jesus said unto them, did ye never read in the Scriptures, the stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes?" That this stone refers to Jesus is proven by Paul in Eph. 2:20 "And are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone." This "cornerstone" is Jesus, and this Jesus is the God of heaven, who was to set up a kingdom. Add to this the testimony of Paul in Heb. 8:2, "A minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man." This stone is what? Is become the head of the corner. IS become, not going to become. Who pitched this tabernacle? The Lord did. Who said so? Paul said it. Whose doing was this? The Lord's doing. Who said it was the Lord's doing? Jesus said it. When did he say that? During His personal ministry on earth. That is what my proposition says, that it was done during the personal ministry

of Christ on earth. I will now pen a few questions for Mr. Nichol to answer.

1. Could Christ have been just and condemn the Scribes and Pharisees for not entering the kingdom if no such kingdom existed, as He did in Matt. 23:13?

2. Did Jesus offer himself on the cross as a sacrifice for sin?

3. Was Aaron made priest before he entered in behind the veil to make atonement?

4. Did Jesus cast out devils by the Spirit of God?

5. Can a person perform the official duties of a Kingdom and not be a citizen of that Kingdom?

A summary of this speech:

I have proven that the God of heaven and the "Branch" is the same person. That they refer to Jesus Christ. That Christ, the God of heaven, was to set up the Kingdom, Temple or Church. That it was to be set up during the reign of these Kings — the Caesars. That He was to be meek, lowly, and bear the glory and be a ruler of His people. He was to be King and Priest. I have shown that John the Baptist was sent to make ready a people for this King—Jesus. That John did make ready a people. That Jesus did come as King and did select the people that John made ready for him. That he ordained twelve apostles, called them by name, gave them power over diseases and unclean spirits, and sent them forth to preach in his name, i. e., by his authority. Luke 10:17. He ruled and controlled them as King. We have seen that these twelve apostles were the first members set in the church. We have seen the Church or Kingdom with Christ on the mountain in His transfiguration; we have seen that there the power was transferred from Moses to Christ and from carnal Israel to spiritual Israel. We have seen the church, in Matt. 18:15-19, exercising the key power given to them by Christ. We have seen where Jesus declared He was King. Where others said He was King. We have seen and proven that the kingdom of heaven, the Kingdom of God or the church was in existence long before Christ was crucified. That the least in the Kingdom then was greater than John. That numbers had entered the Kingdom. That some were trying to enter. That some would not go into the Kingdom or church themselves, and they were keeping others from entering. That some were trying to take the kingdom by force. We

have also proven that this Church or kingdom had a small beginning; began with only twelve members, but it would increase. And all of these facts existed during the personal ministry of Christ on earth. And that is what my proposition says: That the Church or kingdom of Christ was set up or established during His personal ministry on earth.

#### Nichol's First Reply

There is much in the speech of Mr. Hensler that I fully accept, and some things that do not concern the time when the Kingdom was established. I will note only such as is germane to the question. We have not the time for any "side issues."

In defining his proposition he says: "The Church or Kingdom of Christ." We mean that institution in the Bible or New Testament called "church" and sometimes called the Kingdom of Heaven, or 'the Kingdom of God'." You note that in the proposition he says the "Church or Kingdom." Thus he expresses his belief that the church and kingdom are the same, and then in defining he says that he means by "church" that institution sometimes called "kingdom." Is it not remarkably strange that he would so define? Mr. Hensler, please tell us what you mean by "church." What kind of an institution is it? What is the faith of the members of the "church," or does their faith have anything to do with their membership ?

He says: "By set up, or establish, I mean that it was organized and its membership so united as to receive instructions, laws and commands as a body." By this he clearly declares that Christ had disciples before they were organized, but that they were organized or constituted into a "church or kingdom" during the personal ministry of Christ. Indeed he says that the Church was "set up or established" when Christ ordained the Apostles. Hear him: "Yes, the Church or Kingdom of Christ had a small beginning, only twelve members at first. 1 Cor. 12:28. Paul says they were the first set in the church. When were they set in the church? Luke 6:13. Here 'he called unto him his twelve Apostles and gave them power over unclean spirits and sent them out to preach the Gospel.' The same is found in Mk. 3:13-19. After he chose the twelve, ordained them, gave them power over unclean spirits, and to heal diseases, it says: "and they went into an house." The margin says "home." This is where the apostles were set in, and Paul says that they were the first set in, and he says that they were set in the church." Thus Mr. Hensler tells us very plainly where he thinks the church was established or set up; that it was on the mount, and at the time that Christ called unto him his dis-

ciples and ordained the apostles. Please let us remember that we have the record of the transaction in the passages that Mr. Hensler has cited, (Lk. 6: Mk. 3:) and in Mt. 10: I am very anxious that you remember that Mt. 10: has the account of the ordaining of the twelve as well as the passages that he cites. Then, according to Mr. Hensler, the kingdom was not established or set up till the twelve were ordained. We will see about this, per his argument, soon. Let me say in this connection, the word "first" in 1 Cor. 12:28, does not have reference to the "time" when the apostles were set in the church.

"Set up" means: "To begin a new institution; to institute; to establish; to found." "Establish" means: "To set and fix firmly or unalterably; to settle permanently." Then Mr. Hensler contends that the church began when Christ ordained the apostles; that the apostles who were the only members of it were then "firmly or unalterably" fixed, "settled permanently." We shall see about this in due time.

Mr. Hensler contends that when the kingdom spoken of in Dan. 2:44 was established, the church was established. True. He then has much to say about the "God of Heaven" being Christ. That has not one thing to do with the time the Kingdom was established. Reference is then made to Zech. 6:12-13, and the contention made that Christ is the "branch" and that He is to be priest upon his throne. True. But Christ was not priest while on earth, and therefore was not on His throne while on the earth, and for that reason the kingdom was not established. For this passage to serve the opposition he must prove that Christ was priest while on earth. We await his effort.

He then called your attention to Scriptures to prove that Christ was King while on earth. Certainly He was. Among the number is Lk. 19:38, "Saying, blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord." Mr. Hensler says: "This statement refers to Christ who, as King, came in the name of the Lord, as Zechariah predicted that He would." He then adds, "This looks like He had a Kingdom." The very next quotation that is introduced proves that Christ was born King. Does the fact that Christ was King while in this life prove that he had the Kingdom? If it does, then He had the Kingdom when He was born, for He was born King. But Mr. Hensler says that the Kingdom was not established

till some thirty years after the birth of Christ. Then, what is he after in proving that Christ was King before His death? To be born a King and to be crowned King is very different.

Scriptures are next introduced from the Old and New Testament to prove that John the Baptist was to come before the Christ to prepare a people for Him. True. In the work of John he said: "The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Mr. Hensler says that the Kingdom was not at that time established, even though John did say the Kingdom is "at hand." Then in Mk. 1:14-15 Christ said: "The Kingdom of God is at hand." Is what? "At hand." But Mr. Hensler says it was not at that time established, even though Christ did say it is "at hand."

Commenting on Mk. 1:14-15: "The time is fulfilled and the Kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel," Mr. Hensler says: "This is the first time that men were called on to repent because the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand." Not true, sir. John preached that. See Mt. 3:1-2.

Now see how the man is confused. I have never heard a Baptist try to defend their position on the Kingdom and not contradict themselves. Mr. Hensler introduces Mt. 5:3, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for their's is the Kingdom of Heaven." Commenting on this passage he says: "Have they a Kingdom? Yes. Who have? 'The poor in spirit.' Who said that? Jesus said it. Well, did He know? Who will say He did not? Mr. Hensler, will you please tell us how it is true that the poor in spirit had the Kingdom at that time, when you say the Kingdom was not set up or established till Christ ordained the twelve which was after the time you refer to in Mt. 5: 3? How is it true that the poor in spirit had the Kingdom in Mt. 5: when you say the Kingdom was not established till Mt. 10: when the twelve were ordained? Don't forget to tell us. You then quote Mt, 6:33, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and His righteousness: and all these things shall be added unto you." You inquire: "How could they seek the kingdom if no such kingdom existed?" This is before the twelve were ordained, and you say the kingdom was not established till Christ ordained the twelve, then you will please tell how the people could "seek" the kingdom before the kingdom had an existence. We are anxious to see your answer. Don't forget it.

Mt. 9:35. Yes, Christ preached the gospel of the kingdom,

but that is no evidence to you that the kingdom had been established, for Christ preached it in Mk. 1:14-15, and you say the kingdom was not then established. ,

You next come to Mt. 10: In this chapter we have the record of the ordaining of the twelve. The same account is given in Mk. 3 and Lk. 6. But you say that the ordaining of the twelve as recorded in Mk. 3 and Luke 6 is the time that the kingdom was established. Then since Mt. 10 is the narrative of the same thing, Mt. 10 contains the narrative of the establishment of the kingdom. Let me read from Mt. 10:1, "And when He had called unto Him His twelve disciples, He gave them power against unclean spirits. Now the names of the twelve apostles were these, x x x x x x x. These twelve Jesus sent forth, x x x x x And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of Heaven is at hand." You will please remember that this is just after Christ had ordained the twelve. This is the very time that Mr. Hensler says the kingdom was established. Now, Mr. Hensler, will you please tell, if the kingdom was established in the ordaining or at the time Christ ordained the twelve, why did the Lord tell them to preach "The kingdom of heaven is "at hand," after the time that you say it was established. Why is it that "at hand" in the days of John the Baptist did not mean that the kingdom was established, and from the time that Christ ordained the twelve "at hand" meant established? When Christ preached the kingdom is "at hand" in Mk. 1:14-15 you say it was not then established, but when the Apostles preached the kingdom is "at hand," as directed in Mt. 10:7, you say it was—had been established. Tell us why the words "at hand" have these different meanings.

Yes, the kingdom of God began as the smallest of all kingdoms.

Commenting on Mk. 2:13-19 you say: "And they went into an house." Well, what of that? Is the fact that they went into an house, dwelling or home evidence that the kingdom was then and there established? Certainly they went into an house and the record says that the multitude crowded them so closely that it was difficult for them to eat their food. Because the Lord and the disciples went into an house to take some food you think that was the establishment of the kingdom, eh? What next? Are you trying to make the impression that they "became an bouse?" If so, say it. Mr. Hensler, did they ever come out of the house they

entered, the house you refer to as spoken of in Mk. 3:19? Don't forget to tell us.

An argument is then offered to prove that the "church" and "kingdom" are the same. So far as this earth is concerned, grant it. He reads Mt. 16-18, "And upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." What will you do Christ? "I will build my church." You will do what? "I will build my church." Mr. Hensler, why did Christ say "I will build my church" if it was established at the time you say it was, when he ordained the twelve? Christ says "I will build;" and you say it was already established and had been for something like a year. Why do you say it had been established, when Christ says "I will build?" We wait your reply.

We have our attention called to Mt. 17:1-6 next, which gives an account of the transfiguration. Commenting on it Hensler says: "Here the power passed over from Moses to Christ and from the church of Moses to the church of Christ. The voice of Moses and the law or rule of Moses was reigning, but now a change, you hear my Son now and obey him." There, now, you have it. Hensler says that the kingdom was established when Christ ordained the twelve, in A. D. 31, the church was then set up, but the power did not pass from Moses to Christ till the time Christ was transfigured in A. D. 32. Mr. Hensler tell us, what kind of a kingdom was that any way? Again, since you say that the kingdom was established when Christ ordained the twelve, and the "change" was not made from Moses to Christ till the time Christ was transfigured, was not the church established under the law? Again, if the change was made from Moses to Christ in the 17th of Mt. why did Christ tell the disciples to observe the law of Moses in Mt. 23? You quote Mt. 16:28 and say that it had its fulfillment in Mt. 17. Tell us which one died before the fulfillment of Mt. 16:28. I am anxious to know. If they saw him come in his kingdom in Mt. 17 tell us where he came from, that they could see him "coming in his kingdom."

Mt. 11:11-15 is introduced. "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." Mr. Hensler says: "If there had been no kingdom there could be neither greatest nor least in it."

Mr. Hensler says the apostles were in the kingdom at that time. Let us see. At the time Christ spoke in this passage.

1st. None born of women were greater than John.

2nd. But the apostles were born of women,

3rd. Therefore the apostles were not greater than John,

4th. But the least in the kingdom was greater than John.

5th. The apostles were not greater than John.

6th. Therefore the apostles were not in the kingdom.

7th. But at the time Christ spoke none that were born of women were greater than John.

8th. But the least in the kingdom was greater than John.

9th. Therefore at that time not one person that had been born of woman was in the kingdom. Mr. Hensler, who was in that kingdom that you say had been established at that time? I challenge you to give the name of one citizen.

During the life of Christ on earth the kingdom existed in preparation and into this preparatory work the people could and many of them did enter by accepting the Christ as the Son of God.

Mr. Hensler is anxious for me to tell him how the kingdom could suffer violence before it was established. I will be very pleased to give him the information that he so much needs. That the kingdom was in preparation in the days of Christ on earth I believe, but it was not established. It was in preparation in the days of John the Baptist, but not established then. While Christ was here it was said, "The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence."

1st. Things in a state of preparation may suffer violence. Ez. 4:23-24.

2nd. This violence is said to be exercised against it just as if it was completed. Ez. 4:23-24.

3rd. Therefore the kingdom of Christ could and did suffer violence while in the process of building. Watch the answer that Hensler makes to this.

Mt. 21:31. "Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you." Yes, some of them entered into the preparatory work, or the kingdom in preparation.

1st. The kingdom in a state of preparation is the kingdom though not complete. Ez. 1:2; 2:68-69; 3:6-8.



2nd. He who enters the preparatory state of a thing is said to enter that thing. Ez. 5:15.

3rd. Therefore those that pressed into the preparatory state of Christ's kingdom are said to have entered into the kingdom.

Mt. 21:42 is read, "Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the Scriptures. The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes." Yes, this refers to Christ. Commenting on it Hensler says: "Is become the head of the corner. IS become, not going to become." Thus he tries to make the impression that Christ was the head of the corner at the time He spoke in Mt. 21. Mr. Hensler, Christ was quoting Ps. 118:22-23, "The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvelous in our eyes." Thus you note that David said "IS become," not going to become. Will you contend that Christ was the head of the corner at the time David wrote? Sir?

YOUR QUESTIONS—

1st. "Could Christ have been just and condemned the Scribes and Pharisees for not entering the kingdom if no such kingdom existed, as He did in Mt. 23:13?"

Ans. Yes. At the date to which you refer the kingdom was in a state of development immediately prior to the actual Mediatorial reign of Christ. In this view Jesus had the right to condemn those that refused to accept Him as the Son of God and thus enter that preparatory work or the kingdom in preparation.

2nd. Did Jesus offer Himself on the cross as a sacrifice for sin?

Ans. He was selected as a sacrifice. Killed on the cross. The offering or the atonement was made in Heaven.

3rd. Was Aaron made priest before he entered in behind the veil to make atonement?

Ans. I think so. But what official power did he have till he went behind the veil? Christ could not make atonement in the temple made with hands. The atonement was made in the glory world. He could not be priest on this earth.

4th. Did Jesus cast out devils by the spirit of God?

Ans. Yes. God gave Him the spirit without measure. "The father that dwelleth in me he doeth the work."

5th. Can a person perform the official duties of a kingdom and not be a citizen of that kingdom?

Ans. I think not. Will you show us "official" acts that Christ or one of the apostles performed before the death of the Lord?

#### QUESTIONS—

1. Did the relative time that Aaron was made priest have anything to do with the relative time Christ was made priest?

2. If Christ had not been raised from the dead would the church or kingdom have been an established institution?

3. Was Christ priest while on earth? See Heb. 8:4.

4. When did Christ make the atonement?

5. You say the church was established when Christ ordained the twelve on the mountain. Mk. 3:13-19. Where was that mountain? In Jerusalem?

Mr. Hensler will contend that no one can enter the kingdom till they are born of the spirit. Then when one is born of the spirit he does enter the kingdom. He will not say that one could be born of the spirit before the spirit came. Jesus says, "If I go not, away the comforter (spirit) will not come."

1st. Man must be born of the Spirit to enter the kingdom.

2nd. Spirit did not come till Jesus went away.

3rd. Mr. Hensler, did they enter the kingdom before Jesus went away and the Spirit came? Were they born of the Spirit before the Spirit came?

### **KINGDOM—GLORY**

In Mt. 20:21 we learn that the Zebedee children desired to be with Christ in His kingdom. "Grant that these, my two sons, may sit, the one on thy right hand and the other on thy left, in thy kingdom." Noticing the parallel account in Mk. 10:37 it is said: Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory." Thus we see that these men believed that when Christ entered into His "glory" would be the time that He would enter His "kingdom." Such is the truth or these men were deceived, and Christ, by His silence, contributed thereto. So certain as Christ did not allow these men to continue in a state of deception, just that certain was He not in the "kingdom" till He entered His "glory." But when did He enter His "glory?" Before Christ died He had not entered into His "glory."

He entered His "glory" when He entered the "glory world." Lk. 24-26, "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into His glory?" He was "received up into glory." 1 Tim. 3:16. Christ was not "glorified" till He entered Heaven. But when He was in His "kingdom" He was in His "glory." But He was not in His "glory" till He entered Heaven, which was after His "personal ministry." Therefore the kingdom was not established during the "personal ministry" of Christ.

Mr. Hensler says that the kingdom was established during the personal ministry of Christ," and he defines the personal ministry of Christ as the period of time that he (Christ) was on earth, between his baptism by John, and his death on the cross." Let us note some of the scriptures that speak of the kingdom.

1st. Mt. 4:17, "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." H. says that it was not at that time established for it was before the Twelve were ordained.

2nd. Jesus taught the disciples to pray, "Thy Kingdom Come." This too, is before the Twelve were ordained, and the kingdom was not established, says Hensler.

3rd. Mk. 9:1, "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." Was the kingdom established at this time? Hensler says that it was, and had been for some time.

4th. Mt. 10:7, "Preach, saying the kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Still it is in the future.

5th. Lk. 10:9, "The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you." In this passage the words "come nigh" are from the same Greek word that "at hand" is from in Mk. 1:15. Thus we find that the kingdom is still future, though Hensler says that it was set up in Lk. 6.

6th. Mt. 16:18, "Upon this rock I will build my church." If it was future at that time. "Will build," says the Lord. Has been built says Hensler. 1st. A thing cannot be in the future when it is past. 2nd. Jesus said that the building of his church was future, in Mt. 16:18. "Will build my church." 3rd. Therefore it was not built before that time as Hensler contends.

Mt. 18:1-3. Christ said to his disciples in this passage. "Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little chil-

dren, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven." Here Christ plainly says that the apostles are not in the kingdom. Still the kingdom is future.

Lk. 19:11-12, "And because they thought that the kingdom of God would immediately appear. He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." Hensler says that the kingdom had already come when Christ thus spake, and the people thought it would "immediately appear," but Christ said that it would not come till he went into the far country." Still the kingdom was future.

9th. Mt. 21:31. The priests and the elders are not in the kingdom.

10th. Mt. 23:13. The scribes, Pharisees and hypocrites are not in the kingdom. In reasons name, Mr. Hensler, will you tell us who is in the kingdom, if it had been established as you say. The apostles were not in it, (Mt. 18:13); the priests and elders were not in the kingdom, (Mt. 21:31); the scribes, Pharisees and hypocrites were not in the kingdom, (Mt. 23:13). Tell us who was in the kingdom?

11th. Lk. 22:18. Here we are the night before the Lord's death, and all thru his "personal ministry" we have found the kingdom spoken of as future. Listen to the way that he speaks about it just the night before his death. "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come." Can language be plainer? Hensler says that the kingdom had been established, and Christ says, "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come."

Thus we come to the close of the personal ministry of Christ, and the kingdom is still in the future. We may find in my next address when it was set up.

## **A. A. Hensler's Second Speech—Aff.**

I wish first to pay attention to Mr. Nichol's reply to my first affirmative.

1. My definition of the proposition Mr. Nichol is clear enough. The question of the faith or conduct of the membership of the church does not enter into the discussion of my proposition. I am to show, only, that the church or kingdom of Christ was set up, or established, during his personal ministry, on earth.

2. The church of Christ is, in the Bible, sometimes called kingdom of heaven and sometimes, kingdom of God. Do you deny it?

3. I get my two meanings of the expression "At Hand," from Webster. "At hand," near; either present and within, reach, or not far distant."—Webster.

4. In order to make it appear that Mark 3:13-19 Luke 6:13-16, does not teach what I claim for these texts, you refer to Matt. 10:1-7 where the same transaction is recorded; then argue upon the phrase—"At Hand," coupled with Matt. 3:2, and Mark 1:15. I wish to call your attention to the Emphatic Diaglot, on these three texts as follows: Matt. 3:2 reads—"Reform (repent) because the ROYAL MAJESTY of the HEAVENS has approached." Mark 1:15. "The time has been accomplished, and God's ROYAL MAJESTY has approached."

Now, what about Matt. 10:7? Hear it. "The kingdom of the heaven's has approached."

So, Mr. Nichol, you have lost your point.

Webster says "Majesty" means "A title of emperors, kings and queens." Don't forget that.

5. You asked me to prove that Christ was a Priest while on earth. I'll do that. And if I do, you have virtually admitted my proposition.

Christ a priest before he died on the cross. Proof. Heb. 7:15-28. In this chapter Paul is discussing the priesthood of Christ. He says "THERE RISETH ANOTHER PRIEST." V.15. "He was made priest by an oath." V.21. "By so much was Jesus made surety of a better Testament." V.22. "For such an high priest becometh us." V. 26. "Who needeth not daily," to offer

up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this he did once when he offered up himself." V.27.

From this we learn Jesus was made priest by an oath, and he was thus made surety of a better covenant. That, as priest he offered up himself for the sins of the people. That as priest he put away sins by the sacrifice of himself, and obtained eternal redemption for us. That this word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son (priest). "Since the law," i. e., since the giving of the law.

6. My contention, that Jesus was a king before his death on the cross, you admit. Whether crowned or not, cuts no figure in this debate. I have read in history where kings reigned long before the crown was placed upon them.

7. You seem to think you have a point on me in regard to the chronology of Matt. 5:3, 6:33, 10:7, 16:18 and I believe one or two others. Now I wish to say, you need make no argument on chronology. Because that is the work of men. And if you will notice Matt. does not give the attention to chronology and order that Mark and Luke give. This is conceded by some, if not the majority of translators. I cite an instance, See the "Modern Speech New Testament," viz.

Introduction to Matt. "It's aim is manifestly didactic, rather than chronological."

Mark. "It's manifest vividness of narration and pictorial minuteness of observation, etc."

Luke. Luke's object, however, was rather to write history than construct an apology "and for this reason his order is generally CHRONOLOGICAL." (my emphasis.)

8. You seem to deny that the church or kingdom of Christ is called a "house." If you will study the scriptures I gave on this point you will see it is a fact. And the "house" or "home" mentioned in Mark 3:19 was nothing else than the church organization.

9. On Matt. 17:1-6, you miss my thought. God commanded the disciples of Jesus to hear what Jesus commanded, and to obey him. Moses is no longer leader; but Jesus is leader and commander.

10. Matt. 16:28, no matter which one died. Some of them saw the "Son of man come in his kingdom."

11. Your reply on Matt. 11:11-15 misses the point clear.

Jesus says, of those born of women there hath not risen a greater (prophet) than John the Baptist. That this is the subject matter, see verse 10. Jesus was the least in the kingdom, for He was also a servant. And He was a greater PROPHET than John the Baptist.

12. Jesus Christ and the twelve apostles were in the kingdom in Matt. 11:11.

13. Your reference to Ez. 4:23-24, and Ez. 1:2, 2:68-69, 3:6-8. Does not meet my argument on Matt. 21:31, hence it stands.

14. You say on Matt. 21:42, that Jesus was quoting from Psal. 118:22-23, and that David used the expression, "Is become the headstone of the corner." But you must remember that David was uttering prophesy, while Jesus was speaking of the fulfillment of prophesy. That I am correct in my position, the next verse shows. After Jesus says, "The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner; this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes?" He says, "Therefore say I unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."

15. In regard to your answers to my questions, I have this to say. You admit Aaron was made priest before he officiated as priest, just so Jesus being the anti-type of Aaron, as priest, was made priest before he officiated as priest; but he officiated as priest when he offered himself on the cross as a sacrifice for sin. Therefore, he was made priest before he died on the cross or during his personal ministry on earth. See Heb. 7:15-28.

On second question it matters not where the atonement was made, but I read in Heb. 9:12 that he entered heaven, by (not with) his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. So we see the redemption was obtained before he entered the holy place. Aaron also had the power to make the atonement before he made it, or the sacrifice either; just so with Christ.

To my fourth question, you answer yes, Jesus cast out devils by the Spirit of God, Now listen to what Jesus says in Luke 11:20. "But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come unto you." Notice! Jesus says. "No doubt the kingdom of God is come unto you." See also Matt. 12:28.

To my fifth question, you answer no, i. e. You think no one can perform the official duties of a kingdom without being a citi-

zen of that kingdom. We agree. Now Jesus performed such duties, viz. Luke 6:13-16; Mark 3:13-19; Luke 10:1-17. Also the 120 elected a successor to Judas, Acts 1:15-26. Other references could be cited; but these are sufficient. Hence Jesus and the 120 citizens of the kingdom at the time of performing these official duties.

#### YOUR QUESTIONS.

To the first, I answer, each had to be made priest before they could perform the office of priest. The one being type the other anti-type.

To your second question, I answer. The church or kingdom was an established institution before Jesus died, but if he had not risen from the dead it would have come to naught—the gates of hell would have prevailed against it.

Your third question. Christ was not priest while he was on earth, after the Aaronic order of priesthood, but he was priest after the order of Melchisedeck. See Heb. seventh chapter, verses 1-15. The priesthood was changed before the law was changed. But the law was changed when Jesus died on the cross, hence the priesthood was changed before that.

Your fifth question. It matters not where the mountain was, on which the church was established, it was in Judea, that's enough.

16. You should distinguish between the Spiritual birth, and miraculous power of the Spirit, which was first given on Pentecost. But the Spirit of God was here and with Jesus and the apostles during Christ's ministry on earth; for you have admitted that Jesus cast out devils by the Spirit; his apostles did the same thing by the Spirit. Besides, Jesus, when he met his disciples, breathed on them, and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost (Spirit)." John 20:22-16. Matt. 20:21. Mark 10:37, 24:26. Luke 11:2; 19:11-12; 22:18. Matt. 18:1 3, all refer to Christ's heavenly kingdom, i. e., his reign in the world above.

Take Luke 11:2. Jesus says, when you pray, say "Our Father who art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done as in heaven. So in earth." What kingdom should they pray for? That kingdom when God's will would be done on earth just as it is in heaven. See?

The same in Luke 23. Where the thief said "Lord remember



me when thou comest into thee kingdom. The same kingdom Peter speaks of in 2 Pet. 1:11. "So an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom, etc." Or as Paul says in 2 Tim. 4:18. "The Lord will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom, etc."

Now I am through with Mr. Nichol's reply and will resume my affirmative.

We have already proven that the church or kingdom of Jesus was called an house. See 1 Tim. 3:15; Heb. 10:21; 1 Pet. 4:17.

### 1. LAYING THE FOUNDATION. PROPHESED.

Zech. 4:8:10. "Moreover, the hands of the Zerubbable have laid the foundation of this house; his hands also shall finish it; and thou shall know the Lord of hosts has sent me unto you. For who hath despised the day of small things?" Notice (a). "Zerubbable" is a prophetic name for Christ, (b). This house refers to the church of Christ, (c). The hands of Zerubbable were to lay the foundation of it, i. e. Christ was to lay the foundation of his church, (d). His hands also shall finish it, That is Christ will complete the building. See also Luke 14:28-30.

### 2. PROPHECY FULFILLED.

"Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. Because it is contained in the Scriptures: Behold I lay in Zion a chief corner stone, elect, precious; and he that believeth on me shall not be put to shame." 1 Pet. 2:5-6. Peter here applies this language of the prophet to Christ.

1 Cor. 3:11. "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

### 3. WHEN AND WHERE THIS FOUNDATION WAS LAID.

(1) Prophecies respecting the time and place.

Zech. 6:12-15. Already given in first speech. Jesus is called "The Branch." He was to build the temple. This temple refers to the church. He was to "rule upon His throne." That is to be King and law giver. He was to be "a priest," to offer sacrifice and make intercession in his temple.

Psal. 87:1-5. "His foundation is in the holy mountains." "And the Highest himself shall establish her."

Fulfillment of the above prophesies. See Mark 3:13-19; Luke 6:12-16.

Now, if John did make ready a people for the Lord, and he did; then Jesus, when he came, accepted that material made ready by John, and used it for the purpose for which it was made ready. And if it was not made ready for Jesus to build the foundation of His laws, and build His house the temple—the church with, then for what purpose were they made ready by John?

(a.) Jesus himself, not the apostles on Pentecost, took the material John had prepared, (b.) Jesus during his personal ministry, not the apostles on Pentecost, was the founder and builder of his church, (c.) It was set up or established in the top of a mountain, not in a house in Jerusalem, (d.) It was composed of the very persons who had been made ready by John; and we have seen how Jesus utilized this material in the erection of his temple— church, (e.) The establishment of the church was accompanied by prayer, according to Prophecy. If there is still a doubt left, Paul will settle that. "And God hath set some in the church first apostles." 1 Cor. 12:28.

Who does Paul say were the first set in the church? apostles. Who does Luke say Jesus "called unto him" in the mountain where he called out his church? The twelve apostles.

This ought to settle the question.

But we give you some more. Eph. 2:20. "And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." Rev. 21:14. "And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles." By reference to Heb. 12:22, we learn that Mount Zion, City of the living God, and Heavenly Jerusalem, are one and the same thing, the church or kingdom of Christ.

So far we learn that the foundation of God's spiritual house, the church or kingdom of Christ, has for its foundation, the twelve apostles, with Jesus as it's chief corner stone. Hence, if the church was set up, built or founded on Pentecost as Mr. Nichol will claim, then it's foundation could not be the twelve apostles and Jesus Christ, but the 10 plus about 3000 others. But as the Bible teaches that the church was built upon the foundation of the apostles, Jesus

being the chief corner stone, and that the names of the twelve apostles alone appear in the foundation; it must surely follow that the church was set up during the personal ministry of Jesus on earth. And this we find did occur when Jesus called the twelve apostles and ordained them. (The apostles of the Lamb.) And as Paul says, they were the first in the church.

#### 4. THE CHURCH IN IT'S DEVELOPMENT.

Isah. 9:67. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulders; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, 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 and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever."

(a.) David's kingdom was a typical kingdom, and David's throne was a typical throne, and David was a typical king. David, the literal king, with his literal kingdom and literal throne, typified Christ the spiritual king, with his spiritual Kingdom and His throne. When Jesus appeared on earth and set up his church or kingdom, these types were fulfilled in him. He then, and now, reigns as spiritual king and ruler. He was then king and priest upon His throne. And when he comes again He will occupy the double Kingship of spiritual and literal King and Ruler.

In the above prophesies are some words or phrases I wish to emphasize, viz.

(a.) "The government shall be upon His shoulders." He did govern and rule while on earth; before He was crucified.

(b) He was "The Mighty God," while on earth; He had the power of a God.

(c.) He was the "Prince of Peace." While on earth he gave peace to all who believed in him, and bestowed peace upon the membership of his church. John 20:19-20.

(d.) "Of the increase of his government there shall be no end." If you apply this to the time when Jesus will come in Ms glory, there will be no INCREASE. But his kingdom had only a small beginning, a mustard seed, a little stone, the twelve apostles, but it has increased and will increase till he comes again. Yes, it began with only the twelve apostles, just before Pentecost we find

120, and on Pentecost it was increased about 3000 more, shortly afterwards by 5000 more, etc.

(e.) "To order it." He did order it while on earth.

(f.) "And to establish it with judgment and with justice." He did this while he was on earth. Matt. 18:15-19.

#### 5. EAT AND DRINK IN THE KINGDOM.

Luke 22:29-30. "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father had appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

Did Jesus have a kingdom? Yes. Did Jesus appoint that kingdom unto his apostles to eat and drink at His table in His kingdom? Yes, he said He did. Did he appoint that kingdom to the apostles that they might sit on twelve thrones and judge the twelve tribes of Israel? Yes, he said he did, and I believe it.

#### 6. I now make an argument upon the word "Lord."

Lord, "A master, a person possessing supreme power and authority, a ruler, a governor."—Webster. Jesus applied this term "Lord" to himself. Matt. 21:3; Mark 11:3; Luke 19:31-34; Mark 5:19; Luke 6:44 and John 13:13. In this last text He says, "Ye call me Master and Lord; and ye say well, for so I am, etc."

The apostles recognized Him as "Lord" during His personal ministry on earth. Matt. 26:22. If then Jesus was Lord during his personal ministry on earth, and Jesus said He was Lord, then he was a master. A person possessing supreme power and authority; a governor; and all this during his personal ministry on earth.

(a.) He could not be a ruler, ruling with authority unless he had something to be ruled.

(b.) He could not be a Governor unless he had something to govern. But as we have proven he was on his throne, in his kingdom, exercising governorship and kingship, then He had a government. But he exercised this Lordship, governorship or kingship during his personal ministry on earth, hence his church or kingdom was established during his personal ministry. That is what my proposition says.

7. I make an argument on the extension of the gospel of the kingdom. Matt. 24:14. "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be

preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come."

(a.) "There could be no gospel of the kingdom," unless that kingdom had been in existence.

(b.) But there was at that time a gospel of the kingdom.

(c.) Therefore the kingdom was then in existence.

If there was no kingdom existing then, will you, Mr. Nichol, tell us what gospel must be preached for a witness to all nations before the end can come? Prove that there was no kingdom when Jesus uttered this language, and you prove it possible for the end never to come.

8. My next argument on those scriptures which prove that Jesus sung in the church before he was crucified.

(1). Psal. 22:22. "I will declare thy name unto my brethren in the midst of the congregation will I praise thee."

"In this text the prophet David tells where this singing or praising will take place. That it will be in the congregation, or church. Now see Heb. 2:11-12. "For hath he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee."

Here Paul quotes the prophesy of David and uses the word church instead of congregation, both words mean the same thing. Only while David points to the future, Paul points to the past; and both locate the singing at the same point or place — in the church. David said Jesus would sing in the church and Paul said Jesus did sing in the church. Now if we can locate the exact point or time when the singing was done, we will locate the church, for this singing or praising God was done in the church. Matt. 26:28-30. "For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom. And when they had sung an hymn, they went out into the mount of Olives."

This is the only record of Jesus singing praises to his Father while on earth. But here he declares his Father's name unto His brethren and they all engage in singing praise to the Father.

Notice! David said the singing would take place in the church.

Paul said it did take place in the church. And Matt. says it took place the night before Jesus was crucified. Here then we have the church or kingdom in existence before Jesus was crucified, and that was during his personal ministry on earth. That is what my proposition says, the church or kingdom of Christ was set up or established during Christ's personal ministry on earth.

9. My ninth argument is based upon the widow-hood of the church, while the body of Christ lay in the grave. Isah. 54:1-10. "Fear not, for thou shalt not be ashamed, for thou shalt not be put to shame, for thou shalt not forget the shame of thy youth, and shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood any more. For thy maker is thine husband; the Lord of hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel. The God of the whole earth shall he be called. For the Lord hath called thee as a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit, and a wife of youth, when thou wast refused, sayeth thy God. For a small moment have I forsaken thee; but with great mercies will I gather thee. In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment, but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, sayeth the Lord thy redeemer. For this is as the waters of Noah unto me; for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more govern the earth; so have I sworn that I would not be wrath with thee, nor rebuke thee. For the mountains shall depart and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall thy covenant of my place be removed, sayeth the Lord that hath mercy on thee."

I give this long quotation so the reader can get the entire thought of the prophet. Here is a prophesy that can be made applicable to nothing but the church of Christ. "Thy maker is thy husband. The Lord of hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy one of Israel," etc.

A woman cannot become a widow unless she has once had a husband. So the church could not become a widow unless she had once been married—had a husband. My contention is that the three days and nights while Jesus lay in the grave the church was a widow. Jesus said to her before he died, "Yet a little while and ye see me no more, then a little while and you see me again." "But go into Galilee there will I gather thee." Every point, in the prophesy given above, had its fulfillment in the four gospels. But let us see whether Jesus was the husband of the church before he

died on the cross. See John 3:27-30. "John answered and said, A man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven, Ve yourselves bear me witness, that I said, I am not the Christ, but that I am sent before Him. He that hath the bride is the bridegroom, but the friend of the bridegroom which standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice. This my joy therefore is fulfilled. He must increase but I must decrease." In this scripture we learn that Jesus was the bridegroom and John said, he had the bride—the church. The church could not have been the bride of Christ at that time if she had not been in existence. but she was the bride of Christ, hence she was in existence at that time. So says John, and so says my proposition.

## Nichol's Second Reply

Mr. Hensler has been before you for his second speech, attempting to prove his proposition. It seems that he is beginning to realize that the task is too great.

If the faith and conduct of the membership of the church has nothing to do with the proposition, why did you introduce it? Is it possible that you scented danger?

Mr. Hensler says the church was established in 31, and that Christ and the apostles were in it, but in 32 Christ says the apostles were not in it, and could not enter it till converted. Hensler will fill the church with unconverted material rather than lose his proposition. No wonder the faith and conduct of the membership has nothing to do with the proposition.

2. No sir, I do not deny that the church is sometimes called kingdom, but if you can afford to go before the public with such a blunder in your definition of the proposition, I suppose I can stand it, too. The church is the kingdom and vice-versa. But when you are asked, "What is the church," you look wise, and say, "Why, it is sometimes called the kingdom." Ugh, that is defining with a vengeance. Of course that proves that it was established during the personal ministry of Christ.

3. You get your definition "at hand" from Webster. Alright. Now does "at hand" in Matt. 3:2 mean what it does in Mt. 10? Does it mean "within reach" or "not far distant?" Or does it mean both? Come, Mr. Hensler, don't be evasive. Here is work for you. How do you tell when it has the different meanings? Information, please.

4. Certainly I will not forget what Webster says about "Majesty." May I without becoming offensive ask you to remember what he says about "at hand?"

Kind readers don't think that Hensler is blind. He can see the ditch as plainly as anyone—when he is in it. Poor fellow, he saw the ditch after he had fallen into it. Then a happy thought struck him, viz. I'll make a step-ladder out of the Diaglot, and get out before Nichol comes along." So he attempted to climb up. He says: "I wish to call your attention to the Emphatic Diaglot on these three texts, as follows: Matt. 3:2 reads: "Reform (repent) because the Royal Majesty of the Heavens has appeared."



Mk. 1:15 "The time has been accomplished, and God's Royal Majesty has approached." Now what about Mt 10:7? Hear it. "The kingdom of heaven has approached." So Mr. Nichol, you have lost your point." No, Mr. Hensler I have not "lost" the point. You are painfully aware that I made the point and that you will lose your footing on the ladder that you have attempted to make out of the Diaglot. Hensler, why do you introduce the Diaglot, when you know, that I know, that you will not endorse the book? Let us look at the passages; I read the Greek as it appears in the Diaglot.

Mt. 3:2. Metanoetei eggiken gar et Basileia ton

Reform ye has come nigh for the majesty of the ouranon.

Heavens. This is the passage just as it is in the Diaglot. and Mr. Hensler says that the passage means that the kingdom was not then established; but he says when Mt. 10:7 was spoken it means that the kingdom was established. Let us look at that verse.

Mt. 10:7 Oti eggiken e Basileia ton

That has come nigh the kingdom of the ouranon.

heavens. It would be amusing to hear Hensler try to tell why the passage in Mt. 10:7 means the kingdom was established, when he says the one in Mt. 3:2 means that it was not established. Hensler tell us what is the difference in the two passages. Here they are in the Greek. Let us look at Mk. 1:15. Remember that Hensler says the kingdom was not established when Mk. I. was spoken.

Mk. 1:15 Eggiken e Basileia ton Theon

Has come nigh the majesty of the God.

Hensler, the Greek in Mk. 1:15 is the same as the Greek in Mt. 10:7, just exactly the same, now tell why in Mk. 1:15 the Greek expression means that the kingdom was not established, when in Mt. 10:7 the identical Greek expression means that the kingdom was established. Hensler, tell us please, don't forget it.

5. Of course WHEN you prove that Christ was priest on earth; but when are you going to do that? You will prove it from Heb. 7:15-28, eh? Let us see verse 16. Made priest "after the power of an endless life." Was this true of Christ before His death? Verse 18 was the commandment disannulled before the death of Christ?

No matter if Paul did say that the law was disannulled at the cross, Hensler must prove that Christ was Priest while on earth, or stay in the ditch. Other priests could not continue by reason of death, but Christ died and was still a priest! Shucks, When Christ became priest He was "separate from sinners." Of course the people that tried and crucified the Lord were all saints, and fit subjects for the Baptist church, but excuse me, Mr. Hensler, the faith and conduct of the membership has nothing to do with the proposition. Mr. Hensler, you had better consult the Diaglot again. Tell us, was Christ perfected for the age during his personal ministry?

Mr. Hensler says that Christ was priest while on earth, and Paul says that Christ was not a priest on earth. Heb. 8:4. Hensler says that He WAS, Paul says that He WAS NOT. Which will you believe? Is this the way that you "prove" things Mr. Hensler?

6. Well, I thought the CROWNING of Christ had something to do with the matter, but Hensler says not. Mr. Hensler does the fact that Christ was a king prove the existence of the kingdom? SAY. No matter what you have read in history, answer this question, please. There will be "something doing" when you do.

7. Why may I not make an argument on "Chronology?" Oh, it is the work of men. That is not the point, Mr. Hensler. Did Jesus use the language of Mt. 5 before, or after that of Mt. 10? Watch for his answer. I'd like to be obliging, but I can't let you hide away that way. No, I don't THINK I made a point; I MADE IT, and you feel the force of it.

8. No, I don't deny that the church is called a house, but I deny the "house" of Mk. 3 being the church. Mr. Hensler did they GO INTO an house, or did they BECOME a house? If the former, where is your argument: if the latter, where is the proof?

9. I didn't miss your argument on Mt. 17:1-6, but you dodged my question. Please answer. If you are correct, why did Christ command his disciples to observe the law of Moses?

10. Well, if you just wont tell us which one died, do please give us the proof of the death of any one with reference to Mt. 16:28. Remember, sir, it is your duty to prove, not assert.

On Mt. 11:11-15, you say that I missed the point again. Hard to hit the point, when it is not made. You say that Jesus was in the kingdom at that time, and was the least in the kingdom, for

He was a servant. That is about as clear as mud. Was Christ a prophet? If Christ was including Himself in the list of prophets, He says that He was not in the kingdom. Hensler says that He includes Himself; therefore Christ was not in the kingdom. You say that He was a servant, and therefore in the kingdom. If that proves the existence of the kingdom, it proves that it was set up in the days of Moses. Are you willing to abide your logic?

11. You say that Christ and the apostles were in the kingdom in Mt. 11:11. Who said so? Mr. Hensler. Anyone else? No. Proof please.

12. Why don't the references in Ezra meet your argument on Mt. 21:31? "Just 'cause?" An easy way to meet argument, indeed. "Don't meet the argument" is easy to say, but in debate it don't amount to much. This may be news to Mr. Hensler, but it is a fact. Of course your argument stands. Stands exposed, and will forever so stand.

13. Mt. 21:42. You say that Christ was speaking of the fulfillment of prophesy. When did Christ become the head of the corner? Hensler says that He was head of the corner at the time the passage was spoken. David and Christ both say the stone must first be rejected. Mk. 8:31 says that when He is rejected He is to be put to death. Acts 4:11 brings out the same thought. In order for this passage to be of use to you it is necessary for you to prove that Christ was put to death and that the death did not end His personal ministry. I am sorry for you Mr. Hensler, for you have undertaken a task that cannot be proven.

14. We now come to the questions that I answered. He touches them lightly. To be sure any one has to be a priest before they can officiate, but the trouble with Hensler he wants Christ to officiate before He is priest. Hensler insists that Christ was a priest while on earth, when Paul says He WAS NOT. Mr. Hensler does not distinguish between the common priest and the high priest; nor between the death of Christ on the cross and the offering of his blood in the "holy place." Christ offered His blood in Heaven, and there obtained redemption. Do you deny it? You must or your argument is no good.

On the second question he gathers a little courage and says He obtained redemption before He entered the holy place. I shall now put you to the test. You have placed some stress on Types

and Anti-types, declaring Christ to be the Anti-type of Aaron. Did Aaron obtain redemption out side of the "holy place?" No dodging here. Your rope of sand must break, for you must fly into the face of scripture or go back on your argument. Which will you do? In either case your rope breaks. If it makes no difference where the atonement was made why do you make the argument that it was made before Christ entered heaven; to save your argument? You show too plainly for the good of your cause, your evasions.

On the fourth question Hensler no doubt has been chuckling for quite a while, but as usual, he is so awkward that he falls into the pit he thought he was preparing for me. Hear him: "Did Jesus cast out devils by the finger of God?" Of course! He then read with much assurance, "Then no doubt the kingdom of God is come unto you." He seems to think there is no escape for me. Mr. Hensler, wont you be good and answer one question for me. Does the casting out of devils by Christ "by the finger of God" prove the existence of the kingdom? If NO you have wasted your time; if yes, did Christ ever cast out devils by any other "finger?" No dodging, I mean to meet you with your own tricks and show the falsity of your position. What do you say, Hensler? You dare not say that He did. Now tell us about the casting out of devils in Mk. 1:23-25, Lk. 4:33-36, eh? What about your boasted chronological order of Mk. and Lk.? Got your church established too soon, Hensler. In reason's name can't you see the folly of trying to prove a proposition that lands you in such absurdities. Before God I'd accept the truth and quit such foolishness. You boldly affirm that the kingdom—church—was established in Mk. 3; Luke 6, etc., then bob up with a question that a ten-year-old school boy can break your theological neck with. Say, Hensler, answer your own question. Did Jesus cast out devils by the finger of God? SAY. Don't forget the chronological order of Mk.

The fifth question. As usual you tumble into the ditch again. Going to show some "official acts of Jesus which proves the church in existence. You cite Mk. 3:13-19; Lk. 6:13-16 among others. Here we have a record of Christ choosing the twelve. What for? Hensler says to start a church with. But mark says "to be with him." O, but that don't change things one bit. It don't, eh? Then what about choosing Simon and Andrew? See Mk. 1:16, John and his brother, verses 20. Did he choose them to be with him?

Then if your argument is worth a hill of beans the church was established in Mk. 1, Bah! Hensler can't you make a respectable argument? You made your "chronological" boast too soon. Your work is calling loudly for you along here; you must meet the issue or you are forever gone.

I'll have to be a little harder on you. In your speech you make an argument on the apostles being the first in the church. Was Paul talking about the same apostles that Mk. and Lk. were? Yes? And they were the first in the church? You are positive now? Well please tell us when Jesus got in, will you? He didn't go in with the apostles, for they, the apostles were the first to go in. He was not in before for the same reason. Fix this up Hensler, for your position is in a bad fix here, and will get in a worse one if you will try your hand on this point.

He now comes to my questions. On the first he only repeats some things gone over.

2. He says the church was already established and offers no proof. He further says that if Christ had not been raised from the dead the church would have come to naught, the gates of hell would have prevailed against it. In Mt. 16 Jesus says that He is going to build His church; not HAD BUILT it Hensler. Do you want to try your chronological order here? He said he WOULD build it, and the gates of hell could not prevail—He built His church.

3. Christ never was a priest after the Aaronic order. How did you learn that He was not such a priest, if He was a priest on earth? Paul makes a long argument showing that Christ was priest after the order of Melchisedec, then says that He was not a priest on earth. What kind of a priest was he talking about? "After the order of Melchisedec." Christ was that kind of priest. WHERE was He priest? NOT ON EARTH. Hensler says that He was, but this is not the first time that he has taken an issue with Paul.

4. Why don't it make any difference where the mountain is? If the church was to be established on a mountain, you should be certain you have located the mountain before you are so sure a certain mountain is the one. Again I ask you, where is the mountain? I insist that you answer.

Lk. 19:11-12; Mt. 18-3, etc., Mr. Hensler says these passages refer to the heavenly kingdom. Why, Mr, Hensler? "Just because?" You can't meet them, and think to escape by such a reply.

Look at Mt. 18:3. Why is it that the disciples had to be converted to enter into the kingdom, when they were already in the "earthly kingdom," you say? The truth is conversion stood between them and THE KINGDOM. Shame on you for such silly twaddle. You say that the church or kingdom was established in Mt. 10, and that that church was the Baptist church, the church of which you are a member, and when I invite your attention to the fact that in Mt. 18 the Lord says that the apostles had to be converted to enter the kingdom, you reply that it is the Heavenly kingdom. Am I to take you seriously? Do you really mean that the members of the church you are identified with HAVE TO BE CONVERTED before they can enter the HEAVENLY KINGDOM? So I contend, but I did not think you would admit the truth of the contention.

I now come to the argument based on Zech. 4: 8-10, which you style "Laying the Foundation." When Zechariah says: His hands have laid the foundation and shall finish it, etc. Hensler says Zerubbabel is a prophetic name for Christ, (proof please) hence Zerubbabel—Christ—shall lay the foundation and finish the house —the church. This is the most inexcusable blunder Hensler has made. The merest tyro in Bible information knows that Zerubbabel was one of the men to whose care was entrusted the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the temple, after the carrying away of the Jews into the 70 years of Babylonian captivity. Ez. 3:8-13. Zerubbabel had charge of building the temple; he began the work, but enemies hindered, and the work was stopped. Ez. 4:24. "Then the prophets, Haggai the prophet, and Zechariah the son of Iddo, prophesied unto the Jews that were in Judah and Jerusalem." Ez. 5:1. What was the burden of their prophesy? "The hands of Zerubbabel have laid the foundation of this house and his hands shall also finish it." Zech. 4:9, "Then rose up Zerubbabel and began to build the house of God which is at Jerusalem." Ez. 5:2, "and this house was finished on the third day of the month Adar." Ez. 6:15. Thus is Hensler exposed. I am astonished that a man will display so much ignorance; but when a man starts out to prove a false theory there is no telling what kind of positions he will get in.

Grouping two arguments, "Prophecy Fulfilled" and "When and Where the Foundation Was Laid." I pass them by with but

little comment, because he has asserted without proof. Concerning the laying of the corner stone in Zion and the fulfilling of the prophecies respecting the time and place, why do you now bring them up, when you say that it makes no difference where the "mountain" is. All, Mr. Hensler was answering questions then, but now he thinks the matter is disposed of. Mr. Hensler, where is Zion? Is the Mountain of Mk. 3 Mt. Zion? Come now, answer these questions, don't evade them. I hereby promise to turn you topsyturvy, when you say that Mk. 3 mentions Mt. Zion. But, sir, you must take a position here, or the readers will see the reason why. His argument, "The Church in its Development." He begins with Isa. 9:6-7. He has much to say about King David, his throne and kingdom, he plays around and leaves you to infer that Jesus occupied David's throne while on earth. Hensler, did Christ sit on David's throne while on earth—during his personal ministry? On this very point I am willing to rest the whole matter. Now let us look into the matter carefully. I begin with the same passage he introduced, Isa. 9:6-7. "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, Counselor, 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 for ever." Note please that Isaiah says that when Christ is seated on the throne of David the kingdom is then established "from henceforth" i. e., from this time forward. Then the kingdom was not established till Christ was seated on the throne of David. Acts 2:30-31. He, (David) "Being a prophet, and knowing that God had 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." Peter says that God had sworn with an oath to David that He would raise Christ from the dead to "sit" on his throne—David's throne, Christ could not sit on David's throne till the resurrection of Christ; for God swore He would RAISE him from the dead to "sit" on it. But Isaiah says Christ was to be on the Throne of David "to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth?" "Henceforth"—from this time forward. God swore that He would raise

Christ to "sit" on the throne of David and Isaiah says that from the time that he is on that throne forward he is to establish it. So he must be raised from the dead before he can be "set" on the throne of David "to order it and to establish it." Hence he could not be king on David's throne, nor the kingdom established till after his resurrection, for Peter says that God swore to it. But in Ps. 89:35-37. "Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in Heaven." God swore that He would raise Christ from the dead to "sit" on the throne of David, and swore that He would not lie about it. If Hensler is right when he says that Christ was on that throne before the close of the personal ministry of Christ, before the resurrection of Christ, then God lied about both of His oaths.

An argument is offered from Lk. 22:29-30. In this same conversation Jesus says "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine till the kingdom of God shall come." Verse 18. You say that Jesus had a kingdom in verses 29-30. I don't think you have the hardihood to say He had a kingdom in verse 18; if you do you have less respect for the word of God than I think. Now the only thing left for you is to say, as you once did, that between these verses, Lk. 22:18 and Lk. 22:28-30 the kingdom was established. Will you do it? Then away goes your argument on Mk. 3, for remember your chronological "blow." Remember the kingdom had not come in Lk. 22:18, and you say it had in Lk. 22:30, now when did it come? Please tell us.

Next he makes an argument on the word "Lord." The gist of the argument is that "Lord" means Master, a Ruler, a Governor, according to Webster; he then contends that since Christ is called "Lord" during His personal ministry, His church was set up then. If this argument proves anything it proves that when Christ became "Lord" His church was established. But as usual this proves more than Hensler wants, for Christ is called "Lord" in Lk. 2:11, and the church was not set up till Lk. 6, says Hensler and Luke wrote chronologically, so says Hensler, and thus away goes that attempted argument.

He next introduces an argument on the "Gospel of the kingdom." Mt. 24:14. He contends that since the gospel of the king-



dom was preached, the kingdom was established. But the gospel of the kingdom was preached, as per Mk. 1:14, and Mk. 1, comes before Mk. 3, and as you are aware, Mark wrote chronologically. Again you have proven too much, according to your position. Is that the best that you can do?

He next brings up his celebrated "Song Argument." From Ps. 22:22, Heb. 2:12, Mt. 26:28. He puts it this way. David said Christ would sing in the church; Paul said He did sing in the church; Matthew says He sang. Therefore the church was established during His personal ministry. Mr. Hensler, who told you that David and Paul said Christ would sing in the church? THEY NEVER SAID ANY SUCH THING. The word "sing" is not in Ps. 22:22 or in the Greek of Heb. 2:12. Take the Greek. Look good. Point it out. In the name of God, are you so hard pressed already that you have to put words in the scriptures to make out your case? Before you can make any showing here, you must prove that a man can praise only by singing. We wait your effort.

Next he introduces an argument he calls the "Widowhood of the Church." Listen, ye hosts of Baptist. Hear your champion call the church a "widow." Remember how eloquently he talked about the gates of hell NOT "prevailing" against the church. But he says they did "prevail" sufficiently to cause it to become a widow. Well that is enough, is it not? See how easily his argument is exploded. Isa. 54:1-10 refers to National Israel. See Isa. 52:1-5.

2. Christ was not angry with the church, neither did He forsake it; but God was angry with Israel. Heb. 8:12.

3. God was an husband to Israel. Jer. 3:14; 31:32.

4. If the church was married to Christ during His personal ministry as Hensler contends, then when Christ was crucified it was loosed from his law. Ro. 7:2-5. I read about being married to him, (by a spiritual law), that is raised from the dead, therefore the marriage spoken of was not before his death. The church was NEVER A WIDOW. I will have more to say about this when Hensler replies.

He tells us that the church could not be a widow unless it was married, and the Lord died. Well, if the Lord died, I am a bit anxious to know what the condition of the kingdom was, if as you say it was established during the personal ministry of Christ. Who

king while the Lord was dead? Are you right certain it was established when the devil could kill the king of the kingdom?

I have more than complimented all that Mr. Hensler has said, save reference to his argument from Eph. 2:20. "Are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone." In this passage we have the words "are built." In Mt. 16:18 we have the words "will build." Mr. Hensler by what authority do you say that the church had been built before the expression in Mt. 16:18? Christ says: "Will build," and you say it had been built. Friends, who will you accept? The church is called a house. Then the idea of a building is before us. Mr. Hensler had the foundation been tried and laid before the death of the Lord ?

After the death of the Lord, Joseph with the other disciples were waiting for the kingdom (Lk. 23:51). If the kingdom had "been established, why were they waiting for it?

The church is called the "Body" but Christ was not made head of the church till after his death. If a church before the death of the Lord, who was the head of it? Eph. 1:18-22.

## A. A. Hensler's Third Speech

First I wish to examine Mr. Nichol's reply to my second speech. I wish, in the first place, to call attention to the manner in which Mr. Nichol has attempted to reply to me and some expressions he used, viz: Mr. Nichol, in his first reply to my second speech said, "The task is greater than he is equal to." "You look wise." "He is in the ditch." "Poor fellow." "He has fallen into the ditch." "Making a step-ladder." "Loose your footing on the step-ladder that you attempted to make out of the Diaglot" "Shucks." "Stay in the ditch." "I can't let you hide away that way." "You dodged my questions." "Just 'cause." "I am sorry for you Mr. Hensler." About "dodging." "Your rope of sand." "Your evasions." "Chucking for quite awhile." He is so awkward he falls into the pit," etc. "No dodging." "Your own tricks." "The falsity of your position." "Your boasted chronological order." "Folly and absurdities." "Such foolishness." "Hop up," etc. "A ten-year-old school boy could break your theological neck," etc. "You tumble into the ditch again." "It don't eh?" "A hill of beans." "Can't you make a respectable argument?" "Your chronological boast." "You are forever gone." "Your position is in a bad fix." "Just because." "I shame on you for such twaddle." "Inexcusable blunder." "The merest tyro in Bible information." "I am astonished that a man will display such ignorance." "I propose to turn you topsy-turvy." "He plays around and leaves you to infer." "Chronological blow." "Is that the best you can do?" etc.

This, dear reader I have culled from Mr. Nichol's reply to my speech. He certainly forgot that we agreed to be governed by Hedge's rules. After these expressions do you think I have much else in his speech that needs reply?

I hope that Mr. Nichol will omit these expressions and their like out of this discussion in the remainder. These things will not show up very well in the book.

Now I will pay attention to some of his criticisms.

2. I am perfectly willing for my definition of church to go before the people. What is my "definition?" I give it again. "I mean that institution in the Bible or New Testament called church, sometimes, 'the kingdom of heaven' or 'the kingdom'."

As to the membership and their qualifications or what they

believed does not enter into this discussion. If we had the general church question it would be different.

3. I am staying with Webster on the definition of "at hand."

4. You are mistaken about my not endorsing the Diaglot. Your display of the Greek from the Diaglot does not effect the position taken on those texts in my former speech. Viz: Mat. 3:2 reads, "Reform (repent) because the ROYAL MAJESTY of the HEAVENS has appeared." Mark 1:15 reads, "The time has been accomplished, and God's ROYAL MAJESTY has approached." Mat. 10:7. "The kingdom of heaven has approached." Webster says Majesty means "A title of emperors, kings and queens."

5. I proved clearly that Jesus was priest before He offered Himself on the cross, and you never noticed my argument at all. But you present your interpretation of a text and make that cross the texts I gave in proof. You misquote Paul in Heb. 8:4. He does not say "Christ was not a priest while He was on earth" as you charge. But in addition to what I have already given you on Christ's Priesthood, I will give you Heb. 7:12. "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Here we learn that the priesthood was changed before the law was changed. The law was taken away when Jesus was crucified, hence the priesthood was changed before that. This harmonizes your text Heb. 7:18. He was made priest before the "Disannulling of the commandment going before."

6. I proved from Zech. 9:9 and Matt. 21:4-5 that Jesus was king during His personal ministry on earth and you have admitted that He was. That settles that point.

7. Jesus commanded His disciples to observe the law of Moses, and He did the same because it had not been yet taken away.

8. Jesus did not say that some of them should die before they saw the son of man coming in his kingdom. And if some of them did or did not does not touch this proposition.

9. Yes, Jesus was a prophet and He was in the kingdom when He spoke the language in Matt. 11:11. So were the apostles in the kingdom. And Jesus presents Himself as the least in the kingdom because at that time He was servant as well as king. Hence He was least in the kingdom, but a greater prophet than John. But John was not in the church—kingdom.

10. You ask, "When did Christ become the head of the cor-

ner?" I answer, when "God laid Him in Zion." Yes He was first rejected. John 1:11. "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not." He did not come unto the Gentiles, but "UNTO HIS OWN."

11. The Bible no where says that Christ offered His blood in heaven. But the Bible does say, "He offered up Himself." Heb. 7:27. We are "sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." Heb. 10:10. "For by one offering He hath perfected them that are sanctified. V. 14. "Christ gave himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God." Eph. 5:2. "But this man (Christ,) after He had offered one sacrifice for sin forever, sat down on the right hand of God." Heb. 10:12.

The one offering, of Himself, on the cross for sin settles the matter forever. No more offering. And you agree with me, that no one but a priest can offer an acceptable sacrifice to God.

12. I did not say that Jesus obtained redemption before He entered the holy place. Paul in Heb. 9:12 says, "By His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." This is not my saying so, but Paul, and you must take issue with him, not me.

13. No use parling over your answer to my fourth question. You answered it right. You say, "Yes, Jesus cast out devils by the finger of God." Well Jesus in Luke 11:20 says, "But if I by the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you." Also Matt. 12:28. Jesus says "No doubt the kingdom is come," etc. "No doubt," and "is come." Do you have a doubt about it Mr. Nichol? I have none.

14. Mark 1:16-17 says nothing about Jesus choosing Simon, Andrew and others. He called them and bid them follow Him. But in Mark 3:13-19 and Luke 6:13-16 we have Jesus calling His disciples unto Him and then the choosing takes place. He called them or chose them out from among others, and that is the meaning of the original word—"The called out." Here is the congregation, church—kingdom.

15. In the building of the temple the building was erected, then the stone that was rejected was placed in. And became the chief corner. Just so with Jesus He was rejected as I have shown you, but He became the "Chief Corner."

16. Mr. Nichol, you ask me in regard to the mountain on

which the church was built and you ask me this question, "Where is the mountain?" It is in Judah, and recorded in Mark 3 and Luke 6.

17. I now come to notice your reply to my argument on Zech. 4:8-10. I repeat what I have already said. That the word Zerubbable in this scripture refers to Jesus, and that Jesus was to build the church or kingdom that "His hands have laid the foundation and shall finish it." Jesus was the prophetic Zerubbable just like He was the prophetic David and the prophetic Moses.

I ask the reader to read Zech. 4th chapter on through the seventh chapter and the entire book and you will see that I am correct. Let me note a few things recorded in Zech. concerning Christ, viz:

Zech. 4:1-9. "This is the word of the Lord unto Zerubbable, saying, not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, sayeth the Lord of hosts. Who art thou O great mountain? Before Zerubbable thou shalt become a plain; and he shall bring forth the head stone thereof with shouting, crying, grace, gave unto it." Vs. 6-7. The hands of Zerubbable have laid the foundation of this house; and his hands shall also finish it." Vs. 9. "Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, behold the man whose name is The Branch; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord; even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne; and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." Zech. 6:12-13. "Rejoice greatly O daughter of Zion; shout O daughter of Jerusalem; behold thy king cometh unto thee; he is just, and having salvation; lowly and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass." Zech. 9:9. Mr. Nichol had just as well say these two last quotations from Zech. have no relation to Jesus Christ as to say the one from the fourth chapter has not. He misquotes Zech. 4:9. I find no such language in the verse nor in the chapter. I hope he will give me the correct reference.

18. As to what you say about Jesus not sitting upon David's throne till after he was raised from the dead, you are only partly correct. There was in David's reign as king two points to be taken and fulfilled.

1. David's literal reign over Israel.

2. David's reign in anticipation over Spiritual Israel. Jesus began His spiritual reign during his personal ministry

on earth, and when he comes again he will occupy the double throne of spiritual Israel and literal Israel. David was the type of Christ. Hos. 3-5. Christ is the prophetic David of the New Testament. Jeremiah speaks of Christ as David because he is the antitype of David. Jer. 30:9.

John the Baptist in the same way was called Elijah because he came in the spirit and power of Elijah.

19. As to Luke 22:29-30, it was Jesus who said, "I appoint unto you a kingdom, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." Do you believe what Jesus said? I do. It needs no comment.

20. As to the word "LORD," I refer you again to what Webster said, until you deny the definition, that stands.

21. Mr. Nichol, you must admit the argument on Psal. 22:22; Heb. 2:12 and Matt. 26:30 or deny the plain statements of the scripture. While the Diaglot does leave out the word sing in Heb. 2:12, but you notice the word "praise" is there also and is in the Diaglot rendering. No, praise does not always mean to sing. But it means sing as well as it means something else sometimes. But that does not remove the fact that David said Jesus would praise God in the congregation and Paul said he did praise him in the church—congregation; and Matt. says he, with the apostles, sang a song and went out at the close of the institution of the Lord's supper; and this singing or praising was done the night before He was crucified, and was done in the church. Hence I contend the CHURCH WAS IN EXISTENCE.

22. As to my argument on the widowhood of the church, it stands.

You say Isaiah 54:1-10 refers to Israel, and you refer to Jer. 3:14; 31:32 to prove that "God was the husband." All right, I know God says that and He said He was married to Israel, too. But Mr. Nichol will you please tell us when "GOD," the husband of Israel died? When? You had better look into this matter a little closely.

Paul in Gal. fourth chapter quotes the first verse of Isaiah 54, and applies it to the Jerusalem (church) or free woman which is from above. I believe Paul knew more about it than either of us.

23. You wish to know if the church was established before Christ died, what was its condition during the time He was dead?

I refer you to John, 17th chapter. He knew he was going to be crucified, hence he prays his Father to keep them while he was gone, etc. So you see Jesus left His little church in good hands while he was in the grave.

24. Yes sir, I contend that Matt. 16:18 supports my position and harmonizes with Mark 3:13-19; Luke 6:13-16.

I make no argument based upon the chronology of the New Testament. It is the work of man and that by guess. I give you an example or two. Viz: John 2:13-17 is in the year 30 and Matt. 21:12-13 is in the year 33, and they both record exactly the same event, that of Jesus cleansing the temple and driving out the money changers.

25. I showed clearly in my former speech that many times the word kingdom is used in the Testament not referring to the church. And Luke 23: 51 where it is said that Joseph waited for the kingdom is one of these passages. He was in hopes the Lord would establish the kingdom of Israel.

26. You refer to Eph. 1:15-22, where it is said that God gave him to be head over all things to the church which is his body. Notice it says, "Head over all things." Not made him head of the church. Jesus was head of the church just as the husband is head of wife. You would learn this fact if I could get you to examine John 3:24-30. Where John referring to Jesus and the church says, "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom; but the friend of the bridegroom, which standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice; this therefore my joy is fulfilled." Why did you not notice that text friend Nichol?. It would have made a much better appearance in the book than those puny expressions I noted in the beginning of this speech. Also, why did you not notice my arguments upon 1 Pet. 2:5-6; Psal. 87:1-5; Rev. 21:14; Heb. 12:22; and my argument in regard to Christ being a two-fold king; and John 20:19?

The reader of the book you bring out will wonder why you ignored these points. I do not think that I have overlooked anything of importance in your reply.

Now I wish to ask you some more questions.

6. Did Christ have the bride (church) when John said, "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom?" John 3:39.



7. Can it be truthfully said that a man has a certain woman as his bride, if no such woman existed?

8. If the church was set up or established on the day of Pentecost, and composed of the 3000 and the 120, could Paul have spoken the truth when he said, "God hath set some in the church, first apostles?"

9. Did Christ make His will or Testament before or after He died on the cross?

#### SYLLOGISMS.

1. Men could not treat with violence an organization that did not exist.

2. But men did treat with violence the church or kingdom of Christ. Matt. 11:12.

3. Therefore, the church or kingdom of Christ was in tangible existence.

II—1. It would have been unjust for Jesus to have rebuked the Pharisees and Scribes for not entering an organization that did not exist.

2. But Jesus did rebuke the Pharisees and Scribes for not entering the church or kingdom of Christ. Matt. 23:13.

3. Therefore the church or kingdom of Christ was in existence, at that time.

III—1. The publicans and harlots could not enter an organization that did not exist.

2. But the publicans and harlots did enter the church or kingdom of Christ. Matt. 21: 31.

3. Therefore the church or kingdom of Christ was then in existence.

IV—1. If Jesus cast out devils by the finger of God then the church or kingdom of God had come unto the people.

2. But Jesus did cast out devils by the finger of God, C. R. Nichol.

3. Therefore the church or kingdom of God had come unto the people.

V—1. An organization that had no existence could not be represented as a mustard seed, or as leaven, hid in meal.

2. But the church or kingdom of Christ is represented as a mustard seed, or as leaven, hid in meal. Matt. 13:32-33.

3. Therefore, the church or kingdom of Christ was then in existence.

VI—1. These things and expressions could not be made applicable to a time when no such organization as the church or kingdom of Christ existed.

2. But they are all made applicable to the time of Christ's personal ministry on earth, for Christ spoke them.

3. Therefore the church or kingdom of Christ was in existence during His personal ministry on earth.

My next argument is based upon the fact that Jesus was God's Anointed during His personal ministry on earth.

1. All kings, prophets and priests, in the Old Scriptures were consecrated to their office by anointing with oil.

2. Jesus Christ was God's Anointed. He was God's Anointed during His personal ministry on earth. Luke 4:18. "He hath anointed me to preach the gospel." Acts. 4:27. "Thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed." In these scriptures we learn that God anointed Jesus. And that that anointing was during His life on earth. Hence during His personal ministry on earth. He was prophet, king and priest.

My next argument is based on Jesus as mediator.

Heb. 9:15. And for this cause He is mediator of the New Testament (covenant) that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first Testament (covenant).

(a) Jesus was mediator of the new covenant, that by His death He might redeem the transgressors that were under the first or old covenant.

(b) He was mediator in order that He might redeem by His death.

"Mediator." One who interposes between parties at variance, for the purpose of reconciling them."—Webster.

"For there is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." Heb. 2:5; Rom, 5:10.

(a) It was by his work, suffering and death that Jesus Christ brought about reconciliation between God and man. But this was during His personal ministry on earth. But Jesus is the mediator of the New Covenant, Testament or Will. Hence this New Covenant, Testament or Will existed before Jesus was crucified.

(b) But this New Covenant or Testament, contains the sys-

tern of laws and government for the new institution, the church; but the new covenant or Testament existed before Jesus was crucified, i. e., during His personal ministry on earth. Therefore, the new institution, the church or kingdom was in existence during Christ's personal ministry on earth. This is just what my proposition says.

My next argument is made from the typical relation of Moses and his church, in Israel, and Christ and His church.

Heb. 3:1. "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the apostle and high priest of our profession, Christ Jesus; who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house. For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honor than the house. For every house is builded by some man: but He who hath built all things is God. And Moses verily was faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after; but Christ as a son over His own house; whose house are we, etc."

In this scripture we learn that, (1) Moses, the founder and builder of his church (the Old Testament church), was a type of Christ as founder and builder of His New Testament Church. (2) Moses was head over his church, so Christ was head over His church.

3. Moses was a prophet in his church, so Christ was a prophet in His church.

4. Moses was the deliverer and Saviour of National Israel; so Jesus was and is deliverer and Saviour of Spiritual Israel. Acts. 7:35; Ex. 3:7-10.

5. Moses was the leader of his people, so Christ is leader of His people now and was during His personal ministry. Acts. 7:36; Ps. 77:20; Isaiah 63:12, 55:4; John 10:34; Rev. 7:17.

6. As Moses was the only mediator between his people and the Lord, so Christ is the only mediator between God and His people. Deut. 5:5; 1 Tim 2:5.

7. As Moses was an intercessor for his people, so Christ is the intercessor for his people. Ex. 32:30-32; 1 John 2:1; Mem. 14:13-19.

8. As Moses was the law giver to National Israel, so Christ is law giver to Spiritual Israel. John 1:17; James 4:12; John 7:19;

Gal. 4:2; Rom. 8:2. Jesus gave laws to Spiritual Israel during His personal ministry. Matt. 18:15-19.

9. As Moses was judge over his people, so Christ was judge over His People. Ex. 18:13-16; 2 Cor. 5:10. As Moses built his church before he died, so Jesus built His church before He died.

My next argument is based on the prophesy of Ezek. 17:22-23. "Thus sayeth the Lord God; I will also take of the highest branch off the high cedar, and will set it; I will crop of from the top of his young twigs a tender one, and will plant it upon an high mountain and eminent. In the mountain of the height of Israel will I plant it; and it shall bring forth boughs, and bear fruit, and be a goodly cedar; and under it shall dwell all food of every wing; in the shadow of the branches thereof shall they dwell."

Here is a prophesy concerning the church of Christ. Now let us see its fulfillment in Matt. 13:31-32.

"The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field; which is indeed the least of all seeds; but when it is grown it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof."

What a nice picture of the church or kingdom the prophet drew, and the parable of Jesus proves.

When Jesus called His twelve apostles and ordained them, He then cropped off a small twig of the cedar of Israel and planted it on an high mountain, only a small swig, a little mustard seed; only twelve apostles. But the little twig or mustard seed began to grow and develop into a large tree-church, till fowls of every wing, (men of every character) are lodging in the branches or places thereof. All this took place during the personal ministry of Christ on earth, i. e., the cropping and planting of the cedar twig or the mustard seed. That is what Paul says, viz: "God set some in the church, first apostles." 1 Cor. 12:28.

My next argument is on the promises God made to Israel, viz:

All the promises of another priest, another king, another kingdom—or church, another covenant, etc., were made to Israel—the Jews. And an order for the word of God, His promises; to stand true, all this had to occur while the Israelitish institution still stood.

1. Christ, the king, was promised to the Jews to bless them in person. Zech. 9:9; Luke 19:30-38.

2. The new covenant which governs this spiritual kingdom was also promised them. Jer. 31:31-34 and Heb. 8:8-13.

3. The new church or kingdom was promised them. Dan. 2:44.

For the word of God to stand sure, these prophecies must have been fulfilled during the existence of the Jewish institution. Not one "jot" could pass till all be fulfilled, says Jesus.

Hence if Jesus did not officiate as priest when He "offered Himself," as a sacrifice for sin on the cross; then the Aaronic priest hood was not fulfilled in Christ as the anti-typical priest.

My next argument I make in regard to the type and anti-type of the 120 priests officiating in the temple of Solomon when it was completed and the 120 officiating in the church of Jesus before Pentecost. Compare 2 Chron. third, fourth, fifth and sixth chapters; and especially the twelfth and fourteenth verses of the sixth chapter; with Acts. 1:15-26. 120 priests under Aaron, the high priest officiating in the temple-type and 120 officiating in the church of Christ, the anti-type, our high priest.

## Nichol's Third Reply

Mr. Hensler's third effort is before us. Men don't complain as he does when things are going their way. The trouble is I completely blocked the way, and feeling the force of it he seeks to raise a fog and hide away. He has taken positions that are untenable; I have shown the ridiculousness of them, and he seeks to cover his defeat by complaining. Had you tried as hard to remove the difficulties that I presented as you did to enlist sympathy, your efforts would have been appreciated more by the readers.

He reiterates his definition. It was for his good that I called attention to it. No one doubts that "church" is "sometimes called kingdom." But why did he affirm of both, and then say that one means the other?

If the qualifications of the members have nothing to do with the proposition, why bring them into the definition of it?

He assures us that he is staying with Webster on "at hand." Yes, he is staying so closely that he can't answer my question.

Mr. Hensler does "at hand" in Mt. 3, mean what "at hand" does in Mt. 10? If yes, was not the kingdom in existence in Mt. 3? If not, where do you get the different meanings? This is the point that I made in my first speech. I am still trying to get you to pay your respects to it. If you continue to evade it the readers will plainly see the weakness of your position.

He still contends that "Majesty" is a title for kings and queens. I never denied it. You say that you endorse the Diaglot on Mt. 3:2. I'll test you. Was the kingdom in existence in Mt. 3:2? If not, (and your position says it was not) how is it that the same expression in Mt. 10 proves it's existence? Your complaining comes with bad grace, when you positively refuse to notice these points. You may pass them by silently, but they will stare you in the face till the close of this discussion. You must meet them.

He claims that he has proven clearly that Christ was priest on earth; and I as emphatically say that he has not. You asserted it, but that by no means is proof. Paul says, "If he were on earth, he should not be a priest," Heb. 8:4. Do you say that he shall? Paul says he "should not." You says he SHALL. Reader who will you believe? But he informs us that the law was changed at

the cross, and gives Heb. 7-12, which says, "the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." But the law was not abrogated till the cross, and the priesthood had not been changed as he contends. The priesthood had not been changed, for the Aaronic priesthood was in force till the crucifixion. Paul says there are many priests because they could not continue by reason of death, but this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchanging able priesthood. Heb. 7:23-24. Now if death prevented the priests from continuing, why would it not with Christ? Paul says, "he continueth ever." Hensler says that he died. Behold the disagreement.

What do you mean by "change of law?" Paul says that the law was "taken out of the way" at the cross. In Hebrews, he is, as you well know, talking about the taking away of the old and the giving of the new. The law was taken away at the cross, but the change consisted in the giving of the new law.

Hensler says that he proved from Zech. 9:9 and Mt. 21 that Jesus was king during His personal ministry. I never denied it. The point I made, and you never noticed it, was; does the fact that Jesus was king prove the existence of the kingdom? You will not answer, for you know it ruins your position. Jesus was born king. Was His kingdom in existence then? Will you grapple with this, or continue to assert?

He says, "Jesus commanded His disciples to observe the law of Moses because it had not yet been taken away," but in his first speech, commenting on the Transfiguration he says, "the voice of Moses and the law or rule of Moses was reigning, but now a change, you hear my Son obey him." Why such a contradiction? Can't you make two statements without contradicting yourself?

Hensler says that Jesus did not say that some of them should NOT die before they saw him come in his kingdom, Jesus said, "there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Did he mean that none of them should taste of death? Every one knows that he did not. When Jesus said that "some" of them should taste of death till the kingdom came, he by implication, asserted, that some would die. Hensler, I would be ashamed of such evasion.

He says that I answered his question right about the casting out of devils by the finger of God. Of course I did, I always an-

swer questions correctly, but you did not answer my question. You contend that the kingdom was set up in Luke 6, and Jesus casting out devils is proof of its existence; but Luke, "who wrote chronologically," says Jesus cast out devils before that time. Question: Did Jesus cast out the devils of Lk. 4:33-36 by the finger of God? No evading, answer.

He says that the building was erected and then Christ was placed in. Just prized up one corner and stuck corner stone in, eh? Well, I'd be ashamed of it. The idea.

Mr. Hensler refuses to state where the Mountain of Mk. 3 and Lk. 6 is, but in another statement he says that Christ was made head of the church when God laid Him in Zion," Now will you say that the mountain of Mk. 5 and Lk. 6 is Zion? You have made bare assertions when proof was demanded. Now, sir, I deny that the mountain of Mk. 3 and Lk. 6 is Zion or even in Judea. Here is some work for you. You cannot sustain your proposition unless you overthrow my denial. Will you come up to the work or continue to assert. Sir, it is your position that is on trial. I deny the Mountain of Mk. 3 and Lk. 6 being Zion or even in Judea. God declared that the church would be built in Jerusalem (Zech. 1:16) and you say that Christ was made head of the church "when He was laid in Zion." "But you say the church was established on the Mountain of Mk. 3 and Lk. 6, when that is not Zion nor is it at Jerusalem.

He makes another attempt on Zerubbabel. I showed in my last that Zerubbabel was one of the men to whose care was entrusted the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the Temple, Ez. 3:8-13; 5:2, and that when the work was hindered to console the people, Zechariah prophesied (Ez. 5:1) and his prophesy is found in Zech. 4:8-10 Ezra says that Zerubbabel began the house (Ez. 5:1) and Ez. 6:14-15 says that he built and finished it. Mr. Hensler does not notice this, but continues to assert that this refers to the church. Is that the way propositions are proven?

I quoted Zech. 4:9 correctly.

All of this silly twaddle about Christ sitting on the throne of David in a spiritual and literal sense is the very essence of nonsense. God raised Christ to sit on David's throne. He is on that throne now. In the name of reason, why do you fly into the face



of scripture in such a way. David's throne is in heaven, and God has shown that it will always be there. Ps. 89:35:37.

Hensler dies hard on his "Song Argument," but die he must. He says the word "sing" is not in Ps. 22:22 nor Heb. 2:12, but, but, well, it should be there; yes, to suit your argument, and it is bad that you have not one proof text. You made the argument on the word "sing," and without this word your attempted argument fails.

Since the word "sing" deserts you and you are in such straightened circumstances as to try to hold to the word "praise," did Christ praise God but one time? You were very bold about this being the only singing that Christ ever done; now what about "praising?"

About his "church widow" argument, Hensler views the wreck and wails, "if you are correct about it." Of course I am correct. But he wants to know when God died. Well, well, who said that He died? I didn't. That widow was only a "grass widow" and no one has to die to make "grass widows;" didn't you know that?

Poor Hensler, he thinks he finds some consolation in Mt. 16:18. He says that it harmonizes with Mk. 3 and Lk. 6. True, but it likes much of harmonizing with your position. You say that the church was built in A. D. 31, but Jesus says in A. D. 32, "I will build my church." You think there is harmony with your position. Your thinker is out of fix. Jesus says in A. D. 32, "I will build my church." You think it was built a year before that.

You say that the word kingdom is used many times in the New Testament when it does not mean church, in not a single instance did he cite the word when he could torture it into testifying in his favor.

Eph. 1:18. "Head over all things." You say that He was not made head of the church, but all things to it. What is the "all things?" It seems strange that He could be head of the church during his personal ministry, but not heard over "all things" to it. Such an attempt. The truth is, he was made head over all things to the church, and your weak effort only shows the weakness of your position. Try again.

He thinks that if he could get me to notice Jno. 3:24-30 I would disbelieve what Paul said in Eph. 1:18. I believe both statements.

John made the statement you cite in A. D. 30. But you say the church was not established till 31. This proves too much for you,

You want to know why I did not notice the argument that you

made on 1 Pet. 2:5; Ps. 87:1-5, etc. These passages refer to Zion, and you have piked down into Galilee and built your church. Do you believe your proof texts?

#### QUESTIONS.

6. The church was in preparation, and in that sense he had the church. You say the church was built in Mk. 3, and Jno. 3 is a year before that time. Did Jesus have the church at the time Jno. 3 was spoken? Answer your own question.

7. No.

8. No, but who said that the 3,000 were in the church when it was set up? The church was set up, and the 3,000 were added to it.

9. Before, but was not in force till after his death. See Heb. 9:16-17.

#### SYLLOGISMS.

Six syllogisms are offered. Every one of them were answered in my first speech, though they were in different form. They are all alike, an answer to one is an answer to all. Take the first one.

1. Men could not treat with violence an organization that did not exist.

2. But men did treat with violence the church or kingdom of Christ.

3. Therefore the church or kingdom of Christ was in tangible existence.

#### ANSWERS.

1. Men could not treat with violence an organization that did not exist.

2. Men did treat the temple with violence. Ez, 4:23-24.

3. Therefore the temple was in existence at that time.

In truth the temple at that time was in process of construction—in preparation—and in such a state could and did suffer violence. Just so the church or kingdom was in a state of preparation and in such state could and did suffer violence.

An argument on the "Anointing of Christ is offered, and Lk. 4:18 is cited. But Luke wrote "chronologically" you know, and Lk. 4 comes before Lk. 6, and you say the kingdom was not set up till Lk. 6. Too much for you.

His next is on the Mediatorship of Christ. He says that Christ was mediator before His death, but died that he might redeem. But you contend that the church existed before his death, then the

church was in an unredeemed state; if unredeemed, then unsaved, for Paul says that we are reconciled by His death. Ro. 5:8-10. According to your own showing they were unsaved, not redeemed, irreconciled. No wonder the qualifications of the members have nothing to do with the proposition.

Next he gives us an argument "on the typical relation of Moses and his church, in Israel, and Christ and his church."

There is not a thing that he can say that proves his proposition. Note this fact: Of all who started out of Egypt with Moses, only two reached the promised land. Mr. Hensler was this typical of the church you are a member of? Again: Moses had a lot of infants with him, is this typical of the Baptist church? It does seem that the qualifications of the membership have but little to do with your proposition.

His "Cedar Tree" is next. He starts out with the "cedar twig" of Ezk. 17 and winds up with the "mustard seed" of Mt. 13. I think I can succeed reasonably well in answering arguments, but when a man starts out with a "cedar twig" and winds up with a "mustard seed talk" and declares they are the same, and because they are the same therefore the kingdom was established during the personal ministry of Christ, I hardly know how to proceed. Hensler have you run aground? How do you know that Ezk. 17 refers to the church? I am certain that the mountain spoken of in Ezk. 17 is Zion. See Ezk. 20:40; Zech. 8:3, and the mountain that you say the church was built on is not Zion nor is in Judea, but in Galilee.

His next effort is based on the promises that were made to Israel, and says that all must be fulfilled while the Israelitish government stood. Yes, to suit your argument that is so, but we are not trying the Truth of God by your proposition, but your position by the Truth of God. You are certainly an adept in asserting. Hear him. "All of the promises of another priest, another king, another kingdom—or church—another covenant, etc., were made to Israel—the Jews; and in order for the word of God, His promises, to stand true, all this had to occur while the Israelitish institution still stood." Hear Paul. "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second." Heb. 10:9. What was it that he\* took away, and what was it he established? Don't forget to answer.

Another "typical" argument. 120 priests in Solomon's Temple, and 120 persons in Acts 1. Where is the scripture that intimates that they are type and anti-type? Because you find 120 priests in Solomon's Temple and "about" 120 persons in Acts 1, you contend that the church was established during the personal ministry of Christ. Do you call that debating? Give us an argument; it would be real refreshing. Such a mass of ball-faced assertions and contradictions I seldom witnessed as you present. Note the following. Commenting on the Transfiguration, he says: "Here the power passed from Moses to Christ and from the church of Moses to the church of Christ. The voice of Moses and the law or rule of Moses was reigning, but now a change, you hear my Son now and obey him." In his second speech he says, "The priesthood was changed before the law was changed. But the law was changed when Jesus died on the cross." If the law was changed at the Mount of Transfiguration, and again at the cross, tell me how many times it was changed.

You were very bold when you introduced the priesthood of Aaron and the priesthood of Christ, wanting to know if they officiated before they were priests, etc. When I asked where the atonement was made, you looked wise and replied that it did not make any difference where it was made. Why not? The reason is evident, to answer would spoil your theory.

When I asked you who died, per Mt. 16: 28, you reply, it don't make any difference.

Again you had sputtered and spewed about the church being established on a mountain, I asked where the mountain was, you say it matters not where it was, it was in Judea. I ask, why does it not matter? If so much depended on these things why not be definite. To have answered these questions would have been suicidal and you were cognizant of it.

I have now gone through the speech of Mr. Hensler and feel that I owe the reader an apology for giving so much space to his assertions.

Please answer the following questions:

6. Luke says that God (Christ) purchased the church with His own blood. (Acts 20:28.) If it was in existence before He purchased it, who did it belong to?

7. Is the husband the head of the wife when the husband is dead?
8. You say that Christ was the head of the church, the Body, before He died, now tell us what effect the death of the head had on the body, does the body die when the head dies?
9. What are the "all things to the church?" Eph. 1:22.

#### OBJECTIONS:

If the church was established before the death and resurrection of Jesus it was

1. Under the law of Moses. Mt. 23:1-3; 27:51. Col. 2:14.
2. Before the death of the Testator. Heb. 9:16-17.
3. Under the limited commission. Mt. 10:5-6.
4. Before the atonement. Mt. 20:28; 26:28; Jno. 10:11; Ro. 5:8.
5. Before the death and resurrection of Christ could be preached as an accomplished fact.
6. Before they were at liberty to tell that Jesus was Christ. Mt. 16:20.
7. Before remission of sins was preached to the nations in the name of Christ.

Reader go with me on a tour of inspection. Mr. Hensler says that the church was builded on the mount of Mk. 3 and Lk. 6; and that Christ kept the church during his life, but when he died and the church became a widow it was then kept by the Father. During this time the devil prevailed against it sufficiently to destroy one twelfth of the foundation (according to Hensler, who declares the apostles were part of the foundation), (Judas) kill the head, (Christ) caused one twelfth to curse, swear and lie, (Peter) and the others to become discouraged—lose their hope. Don't look like it was very well taken care of. The head dying, the body forsaking the head, part of the body committing suicide and the whole number losing their hope. In fact there was very little left to become a widow. Worse and worse. When the bridegroom became reconciled to the bride she was so badly scattered—one-twelfth entirely gone—that he had to press into service the law of substitution in order to Have a whole wife or complete foundation, (according to my opponent). Worse still, the remnant of the wife failed to recognize him when he returned. Judas betrayed the Lord and suicided, Peter cursed, swore and lied about know-

ing the Lord, all became discouraged and declared that they were going fishing, and refused to believe that Christ was raised from the dead. Lk. 24:1-11. Don't you think the "gates of hell" were making a pretty good head-way in prevailing if the church was at that time established?

Mr. Hensler you are affirming the "establishment" of the church. The word "establish" means: "To set and fix firmly or unalterably; so settle permanently." Now, since you say that the church was set up before the Lord died, tell us, were the twelve fixed "firmly and unalterably," seeing that they all lost their hope? Tell us, was Judas fixed "firmly and unalterably" in the kingdom? He was one of the first set in you say. We will read your answer with pleasure if you will give it.

While Christ was with the disciples, before His ascension, they went to Him with all things that they wanted settled, (see Lk. 9:49,) but in giving the law for his kingdom which was to be established he bade them tell their troubles to the church. Mt. 18:15-19.

Will you please keep in mind the statement that Christ said: "Upon this rock I will build my church." Mt. 16:18. This is something like a year after Hensler says the church was builded. "Will build." Again the Lord said: "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come." Lk. 22:18. It is certain that the kingdom was not at that time established. Mr. Hensler's contention to the contrary. But Hensler says this passage has reference to what he calls the heavenly kingdom or the reign of Christ in the future. I wonder if he is to have wine in that heavenly kingdom that he talks about, which he makes different to the kingdom we are now in. Again, Mr. Hensler, what will be the object of drinking wine when the Lord has come? Indeed they are not to drink of the fruit of the vine after the Lord comes. See I Cor. 11:23-26.

My friends the church was established at Jerusalem as the prophet said, Zech. 1:16. "I am returned to Jerusalem with mercies; my house shall be built in it." There is no question then as to the place where the church was to be built. While the word of the Lord names Jerusalem and Mount Zion as the place. Mr. Hensler goes to a point beyond the confines of Judea, to a mountain in Galilee for the place to set up the kingdom. That the mountain of Mk. 3, Lk. 6 is in Galilee, see Mk. 1:16, 21, 28, 29; 2:1-13;

3:1-7, 10, 13, 19; Lk. 6:17; 7:1. Mk. 3:22. No question about it friends, the mountain of Mk. 3 is not at Jerusalem, and cannot be Mount Zion.

Hear the Lord: "Verily I say unto you. There be some of them that stand here that shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." Mk. 9:1. This is after the time that Hensler says the kingdom was established. Note: "Some that stand here, which shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom come with power" is but to say that some of them would die before the kingdom came. Again the kingdom was to come "with power." If we can find when the "power" came we will find the time when the Lord said the kingdom would come. Listen, "Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you." Acts 1:8, Now since the coming of the Holy Spirit brought the power, and the kingdom was to come when the "power" came, if we can learn when the Holy Spirit came we will at the same time learn when the kingdom came. "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were 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." Acts 2:1-4. That is the time that Christ said that the kingdom would come, for He said that the kingdom would come when the power came and the power was to come when the Spirit came. But the Spirit came on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, then the power came at that time; but kingdom was to come when the power came, therefore the kingdom came at that time.

## **A. A. Hensler's Fourth and Last Speech**

I wish first to call your attention to the tone or spirit of Mr. Nichol's replies, and the reflection he applies to his opponent. No such language or reflections can be found in my speeches, and they shall not appear in this one. We signed an agreement to be governed by the rules in Hedges Logic, and I shall keep within their limits. It seems that Mr. Nichol has become offended somewhat, else he would not ignore his agreement as he has. He loves to put up a man of straw and fire into that instead of answering my arguments. I have very little to do in replying to his speech. But I shall not abuse him nor cast reflections upon him. As to merits of our speeches I shall leave that to the judgment of the reader. Now I will devote a few pages to Mr. Nichol's speech.

1. You complain again of my definition. In my proposition, church and kingdom are synonymous. I showed that the membership were composed of those that John had Baptized and made ready for the Lord; that they had been Baptized by the authority of Jesus, (Mal. 3:1; Luke 1:33); they confessed that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God. Matt. 16:16; John 4:42. This last reference, with many others, shows that the disciples of Christ confessed Him as the Son of God, just as all who believe in him now should do. And this is just what Mr. Nichol requires of all those he "Baptizes." And so do I.

2. As to your question, whether "at hand" in Matt. 3:2 and Matt. 10:7 mean the same? I answer, no. I have shown you that the Diaglot shows clearly that they do not mean the same thing. Matt. 3:2 reads, "THE ROYAL MAJESTY is at hand." Jesus was "THE ROYAL MAJESTY" and He was at hand then. Matt. 10:7 reads, "The kingdom of heaven has appeared." This makes perfect harmony. Now don't say that I contradict Jesus Christ. These are the plain statements of scripture. I ask you, is the Diaglot wrong in this? Again, I showed you that "at hand" had two meanings, viz: "Either present and within reach, or not far distant." This is what Webster says.

3. As to Christ being priest before He ascended to heaven, I proved it by you and Paul. You said, "None but a priest could offer an acceptable sacrifice to God, and Paul said Jesus offered up Himself a sacrifice for sin.



You fail to understand the difference between the Aaronic priesthood and the priesthood of Christ. When the Aaronic priests died, that ended their office as a priest, and they were succeeded by others; but death did not effect the priesthood of Christ. He was a priest forever, or as Paul says, "But this man (Christ), because He continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood." Heb. 7:24. So we see that death of the body of Jesus did not effect His priesthood. Another distinction. The Aaronic priesthood was carnal, Christ's priesthood was spiritual. You and Paul for it. Paul says, "The priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Heb. 7:12. Paul says it was necessary to make this change of the law because the priesthood had been changed. I am not contending that the fact that Jesus was king proves the kingdom was in existence. But I prove Jesus was king and hence He had the power and right to establish a kingdom and did so. This is my point.

4. I did not say that the law ceased or was taken away at the transfiguration of Christ. But that here marks the power passing from Moses to Jesus and from the church of Moses to the church of Jesus; and God said to the disciples, "Hear ye him"—Jesus. I also showed that there was a LAPPING OVER of the two systems. But at the cross the old or Jewish ceased to exist by authority.

Mr. Nichol, why do you so misrepresent me? I did not say that Jesus said none of them should die, etc., I said "Jesus did not say that some of them should die." I admit that the language implies that some of them would die. And no doubt some of the people who thronged Jesus and His apostles did die, etc. See Mark 8: 34. This shows the multitude was present when He said that.

5. Yes, Jesus cast out devils by the finger of God in Luke 4. But Jesus did not say the kingdom had come then, but in Luke 11:20, Jesus did say, "If I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you." Also Matt. 12:28. Did Jesus tell the truth?

6. As to the mountain of Mark 3, and Luke 6, I will say I meant to answer Palestine, but said Judea. The mountain was near the sea of Galilee. Your mistake is that the church was to be established in Jerusalem. Not a text have you produced to prove this.

7. You err in your idea of Zion, because God says Jesus, the "tried stone," was laid in Zion, you conclude that Mount Zion joined to Jerusalem is meant. God was speaking of the church which is called Zion. Proof. But ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the Heavenly Jerusalem. "To the general assembly and church of the first born, etc." Heb. 12:22-23. Here we see that "Mount Zion," "City of the Living God" and "Church of the first born," are one and the same thing, i. e., Mount Zion and the church of the first born refer to the same institution. I showed this in a former speech, but you ignored it.

Zech. 1:16 has no sort of reference to the church of Jesus being set up on a mountain called Zion, near Jerusalem. The reader can turn and read the two first chapters of Zech. and decide for himself.

8. You next refer to Psal. 89:35-37, and say this refers to David's throne and also that David's throne was in heaven. Now Mr, Nichol will you tell us when David was in heaven to set upon the throne, which you say Christ is now on? The scripture you refer to in Psal. is a prophecy concerning Christ. Begin with the 27th verse and you will see that I am correct. Jesus is now on the spiritual throne which David never occupied. David occupied the literal throne of Israel and Jesus is now on His spiritual throne, the anti-type, and when He comes again He will occupy the literal also. I did not say the singing recorded in Matt. 26, was the only singing Jesus ever done. You misrepresent me again. I said this is the only record we have of Jesus singing while on earth. Do you understand it? I leave you to grapple with the widowhood of the church. My argument stands untouched. You may ridicule and talk about "Grass widows" if you wish.

9. What you say, in regard to my argument on John 3:24-30, is really amusing. John said, "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom, but the friend of the bridegroom, which standeth and heareth him, rejoices greatly because of the bridegroom's voice. This my joy therefore is fulfilled."

In this text John the Baptist says: 1. That Jesus was the bridegroom, and (2) that He (Jesus) had or possessed the bride, and (3) that he (John) was rejoicing in this fact. Did John know what he was talking about? Yes. Well he said Jesus then possessed the bride, and that fact was a joy unto him.

10. You never answered my 6th question at all. I pen it again. Did Christ have a bride (church) when John said. "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom?" You answer, "The church was in preparation, and in that sense he had the church." Why did you not answer it? John says, "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom." John said Jesus had the bride, you say not so John!!! Well if the word BRIDE in this text only means the church in preparation, then it must mean that Jesus was the bridegroom only in preparation . . . Is that your position? The reader will laugh. Question 7. Can it be truthfully said that a man has a certain woman as his bride, if no such woman existed? You answer, "no." Well then how could Jesus possess the church as his bride if no such church existed?

Well now we have you on record as saying the church was set up or established before the 3000 on the day of Pentecost were baptized. I have shown from Acts first chapter that there were 120 in that upper room in church capacity and when the 3000 were baptized they were added unto the 120. So you have just about given up your Pentecostal church theory and adopted the true idea that the church was set up during Christ's personal ministry on earth.

My ninth question reads as follows: "Did Christ make His will before or after He died on the cross?" Your answer is, "Before, but was not in force til after His death." See Heb. 9:16-17.

Here we are agreed. Now tell us to whom Christ made His will? Don't forget this.

The church is Christ's body to execute his will on earth. And it follows that they have the will of Christ, and his authority to execute it. Where did the church get that will? Who gave it to the church? If Christ did not give His will to the church when He made it, then when did he deliver it to her? And if Jesus made His will to the church, there was not the church in existence so as to receive it. And if Christ did not make his will to the church, but to some one else, then what has the church to do with the execution of that will; or was the will made for some other party than the church, and the church now the attorney to execute the will of Christ for that other party? Please tell us about this matter.

11. You name over several of my arguments and pass on without an attempt toward an answer. Viz: The anointing of

Jesus, the mediatorship of Christ, the typical relation of Moses and his church and Christ and His church. You ignored these arguments, and introduced the membership of the church of Moses and the Church of Christ. When individual membership is not type and anti-type, neither is their conduct.

You did not answer my argument on Ezek. 17 and Matt. 13. The cedar tree and the mustard seed.

On Heb. 10:9 I answer your question. He took away the old covenant and established the new, i. e., the old ceased to be of force. But notice the word ESTABLISH. To set and fix firmly or unalterably, to settle permanently."—Webster. Not to make or bring into existence, but to fix as a permanent thing. You simply made a little sport of the argument I made on the 120 priests in the temple and the 120 disciples of Jesus, but this was the best you could do, I complain not of it.

Now I pay attention to your questions, though you kept not your agreement with me to ask all questions before the close. This is my closing speech,

6th question. I answer to the claims of the law.

7. No. The wife becomes a widow. And when Jesus died on the cross the church was left a widow the three days and nights while Jesus lay in the grave.

8. Christ being the head of the church as His body is a figurative expression which you will admit. Hence the head could die and be buried while the body lived. Just as the head—Christ is now in heaven, while His body—church, is on earth.

The effect of the death of Christ on his body, the church, was a cessation of activity as a body. The church was discouraged, but did not despair or die.

9. "What are the all things to the church." Eph. 1:22. It means or embraces everything that pertains to the church. But notice that the CHURCH is one thing and the all things to the church is another thing, i. e., Smith's farm is one thing and all things pertaining to Smith's farm is quite another thing.

Yes, the church was established before the law was taken away and hence the members of the church of Christ during that time kept up an observance of that law. So did Jesus Himself.

Yes, the church of Christ existed before the death of the

testator. To whom did Jesus make his will but to the church— his bride?

Yes, the church was set up under the limited commission. But after Jesus rose from the dead He gave the general commission to the same church that He had given the limited commission to. But if no church till Pentecost then Jesus did not deliver the limited, nor the general commission to it. Then how and from whence did the church get the commission?

Yes, even before the atonement or sacrifice of his body. Now say, then the membership was all lost. And you have all who died before Christ's death on the cross lost forever. But we read that Moses, Abraham, Isaac and a host of others were saved by faith in Jesus.

Why did you not notice the argument I made on the fact that according to your position the end of the world can never come? For I showed that Jesus, before the cross said, "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness to all nations; and then shall the end come." Matt. 24:14. This is the gospel that was preached before the cross and Jesus says, "THIS GOSPEL SHALL BE PREACHED TO ALL NATIONS, THEN SHALL THE END COME." Why preach it if no one can be saved by it? And if it saved people before the cross, why won't it save people this side of the cross?

Yes, the church was set up before the remission of sins was preached to the nations. The church was under the limited commission till after Jesus rose from the dead. But before He ascended He gave them the general commission. You are mistaken Mr. Nichol, the apostles did not lose their hope of Christ's resurrection. Please give us the text that says the apostles "Lost their hope." You say the apostles (the 11) refused to believe Jesus had rose from the dead. Not so, they refused to believe the witnesses who said, "We have SEEN the Lord." Luke 24:11; Mark 16:11-14.

You say the kingdom and power came together on Pentecost. That affords you nothing.

1. Did the Spirit have an existence before he came on Pentecost? If the Spirit had an existence before he came on Pentecost, so did the church. Because a thing that had no existence, could not COME. Do you see the point?

And if there was no church till Pentecost, then there was no

Holy Spirit till Pentecost. And Paid said, God set in the church, first apostles, and you said the church existed before the 3000 were added to it. But the 120 including the apostles were already there and did not have to COME. Here is trouble for you Mr. Niched. This is the last point you tried to make. I will now proceed with my affirmative.

### A SUMMARY

I have shown in this discussion.

1. That the prophets prophesied that John the Baptist should come and "make ready a people prepared for the Lord."—The God of heaven.

2. That John did come and did make ready a people for the Lord—The God of heaven.

3. That the prophets foretold that the God of heaven would come and set up or establish a kingdom—church.

4. That this God of heaven was no other than Jesus Christ who was called in prophesy, "ZERUBBABEL," "The BRANCH," etc.

5. I showed that He should lay the foundation of the temple or church and that his hand should finish it. And that he should be king and priest upon his throne.

6. I showed that Zerubbable or the BRANCH—the God of heaven—The Christ did come and did lay the foundation of his church or kingdom, and did finish it. See Zech. 5:8-12; 6:12-15; 9:9. Also their fulfillment in John 10:1-4, called out. Mark 3:14-19; Luke 6:12-16—chosen and ordained and convened together—the church. Here he laid the foundation. Eph. 2:20; Rev. 21:14; I Cor. 12:28. The first in the church were the apostles, and they are the foundation of the church of which Jesus is the chief corner stone.

7. I showed that Jesus did establish his church or kingdom on a mountain as prophesied.

8. That Jesus did this during His personal ministry on earth and during the reign of the Roman kings as was prophesied.

9. That Jesus was king and exercised kingly authority during his personal ministry on earth.

10. That Jesus was priest on His throne and that He offered Himself a sacrifice, for sin on the cross, and that it was an acceptable sacrifice to God, which none but an authorized and an an-

nointed priest could do. On this point Mr. Nichol and I are agreed.

11. I have shown that Jesus was the anointed mediator between God and man during his personal ministry, to bring about a reconciliation.

12. That he built his house—church, and is head over it, as Moses built his house and was head over it.

13. That Moses built his typical church during his life's personal ministry on earth, i. e., before he died, so Christ built his church before he died or during his personal ministry on earth.

14. That Aaron, the type, was made priest before he could offer an acceptable sacrifice, so Jesus was made priest before he could offer his sacrifice—his body.

15. I showed that some of the apostles saw Jesus the Son of God come in his kingdom—church. Matt. 17:1-6. And I showed that here the power or authority passed from Moses to Christ and from the church of Moses to the church of Christ.

16. I showed that if the church was not set up till Pentecost, that then the apostles could not have been the "FIRST set in it."

17. I showed that the church had a small beginning—twelve apostles, illustrated by a little stone, a mustard seed, as leaven hid in meal; and that it increased to 120, then on Pentecost 3000 more, a few days later 5000 more and so on until it will fill the whole earth.

18. Mr. Nichol and I are agreed that none but citizens can perform the official duties of a kingdom; but I have shown that Jesus Christ performed such official acts during His personal ministry on earth—He ordained officers—the apostles, in his kingdom. Then the seventy. And the 120 performed such an act when they elected Matthias. Acts 1:23-26.

19. I showed that the church or kingdom was in existence while Christ was on earth, (a) Because some entered into it, and some would not enter in, and Jesus rebuked them because they would not enter, (b) That some were pressing into it. (c) That some were shutting it up. (d) That the least in the kingdom was greater than John the Baptist. And that Jesus referred to himself as being least in the kingdom— (a servant) and that he was a greater prophet than John who was not in the kingdom or church. That John had disciples and Jesus had disciples. See John 3:25.

(e) That the disciples eat and drank at the Lord's table in the Lord's kingdom.

20. I showed that the church was in existence during Christ's personal ministry on earth by the prophesy of Ezek. 17:22-23 and Matt. 13:32.

21. I have shown that the church existed while Christ was on earth, by showing that the church was the BRIDE of Christ and he was the BRIDEGROOM—husband. John 3:29.

22. I have shown that the church was in existence during Christ's personal ministry on earth, by showing from Isah. 54:1-10, that the church of Christ was a widow the three days and nights while Jesus lay in the grave.

23. I have shown that the church existed during Christ's personal ministry on earth, by showing they had the Spirit of God with them as a body, John 20:22, and this in fulfillment of Isah. 54:1-10. He gave them his PEACE. V. 21.

24. I showed that there was nothing lacking for the kingdom to then exist, (a) Jesus had all power in heaven and earth, (b) All things had been committed unto his hands, (c) He gave the apostles power to preach the gospel, heal the sick, cast out devils, etc. (d) They did this work in his name or by his authority. Luke 10:17.

25. I showed that the number of those who first officiated in the typical temple (Solomon's Temple), were 120, and the number who first officiated in the anti-typical temple—church were 120, see Acts first chapter.

Now I am done, and gentle reader all I ask of you is that you read the arguments and compare them with Mr. Nichol's reply. And when you discover the truth accept that. I think I have clearly proven my proposition to be true. Viz: The scriptures teach that the church or kingdom of Christ was set up or established during Christ's personal ministry on earth.



## Nicholas Fourth Negative

We now have the best and strongest arguments that Hensler can present on his proposition. Not only has he presented the best that he has, but doubtless he has drawn from others the best he could find. In meeting him *I* am engaging the full strength of the Baptist in the South. Mr. Hensler seems to have realized the weakness of his position from the opening of the discussion; for he would not attempt to meet my objections fairly, and many of them not at all, and when I pressed him he begged for sympathy, and declared that I had not noticed his arguments. Hensler your subterfuges are too thin, your inconsistencies too glaring, your evasions too plain to excite sympathy.

Your proposition antagonizes truth at every point, and tho you have made a desperate effort, failure perched itself on your banner at the beginning and has remained there to mock you in your wailings.

You have been nice indeed; while I have played the naughty boy. Not a time have I misrepresented you, not an argument or question that is germane have I failed to notice. Better would it be for your cause if you could say as much. Nice, indeed! Of course it is not violating the rules, when a question is asked that strikes at the very heart of your proposition to answer, flippantly, "It makes no difference," which means in other words, "it is none of your business."

I shall take up Hensler's speech as he numbers his points.

1st. As to your definition of "church." It was for your good that I mentioned it. In this connection he claims to have "showed" things that have not been heard of in this discussion. He contended stoutly that the faith and conduct of the membership had nothing to do with this discussion; now he says John baptized by the authority of Christ those who had confessed Christ as the Son of God. What if he did, does that prove the church in existence then? If yes, you had the church dating from the beginning of John's ministry; this you deny. Where did you learn that John baptized by the authority of Christ?

I have tried from the beginning of this discussion to get Hensler to tell whether "at hand" in Mt. 10:7 meant the same as "at hand" in Mt. 3:2. He calls on the Diaglot to help him out of the

difficulty and says: "Mt. 3:2 reads, 'The Royal Majesty is at hand.' Jesus was the 'Royal Majesty' and He was at hand then. Mt. 7:10 reads, The kingdom of heaven has appeared." Of course, you did not intend to misquote the passage. It says "has approached" not "has appeared." Let us look at the two passages as they are in the Diaglot.

Mt. 3:2. Eggike gar e basileia ton ouranon  
Has come nigh for the majesty of the heavens

Mt. 10:7. Egikken e basileia ton ouranon.  
Has come nigh the kingdom of the heavens.

The same Greek in each passage. Why does Hensler contend that the same phrases have different meanings? It is an attempt to save his theory. He says "'The Royal Majesty is at hand" means "Jesus was the 'Royal Majesty' and he was at hand." Then don't the same Greek phrase in Mt. 10:7 mean the same? Why did you not say this at first instead of beating the brush so long? The reason is apparent. "At hand" has well nigh gored your theory to death and something had to be done. Even his childish dodge fails to assist him, for John used the same expression in the beginning of his ministry, Mt. 3:2, this was before Jesus came to him, and fully a year before you say the kingdom was set up, and at the very time that John said it Jesus was some sixty miles away. Per your own argument you miss it in time about a year; in distance, some sixty miles, regarding the "Royal Majesty."

3. He dies hard on the priesthood. He claims to have proven by Paul and me that Christ was priest on earth. Indeed! Paul says, "for if He were on earth, He should not be a priest." Paul saw Christ was not a priest on earth; you say he was. Yes, you asserted it, but proved it; not much! The offering of the body of Jesus for sin was not a priestly act. The priests had to make the offering in the "most holy place." Christ was not crucified in heaven. After He became priest he offered his blood in heaven. W<sup>f</sup>+ did the Aaronic priests offer for sin? Blood. (Heb. 7). Where? In the "most holy place." (Heb. 9:7). What did Jesus offer? Blood. (Heb. 9:1-2). Where? "Heaven itself." (Heb. 9:24). Hensler says I fail to understand the difference between the Aaronic priesthood and that of Christ. You are mistaken. I understand it and your labored effort on the priesthood. You need a high priest in your so-called kingdom which you say was

established before Pentecost. See him cap the climax for nonsense. "When the Aaronic priests died that ended their office as a priest, x x x x x but death did not effect the priesthood of Christ. He was a priest forever, or as Paul says, 'But this man (Christ), because He continueth ever, has an unchangeable priesthood.'" There now! Christ died, but continued to be priest, because he continueth ever. Hensler do men continue ever when they die? Do you mean by "continue ever" to "exist?" Is it possible that you have turned Materialist as far as the Aaronic priests are concerned? A theory that forces a man to such nonsensical perversions is contemptible to God and men.

He continues to prate about the law being changed because the priesthood was. I have shown what "change of law" means. Did he grapple with it? Not he. There was a disannulling of the commandment before Jesus was made priest, (Heb. 7:18). This was at the cross, (Col. 2:14). Then Christ "established the second." (Heb. 10:9). These points cannot be disputed, nor can his theory live in their presence.

After being tossed from pillar to post on his "Kingship" argument, he now says he is not contending that Christ being King "proves the existence of the kingdom, but that because he was king he had the right to establish the kingdom. No one denies that he was king, nor that he had the right to establish the kingdom, when he made it possible. In your first speech you made a long argument to prove that Christ was king while here on earth, and in commenting on it you say: "This looks like he had then a kingdom." Reader this tacking of sail is easily understood. His ship is on the rocks, and in his desperation he wails, "I didn't so contend." *I* submit, sir, that you did.

4. "I did not say that the law ceased or was taken away at the transfiguration." Certainly you did. You were talking about the law of Moses and said: "But now a change has come." If you did not mean it. or want to take it back, do so, and that will end" the matter. It is hard to misrepresent a man when he takes a position and when he sees it cannot be defended, successfully, to flatly deny ever having taken it.

I pressed him on Mt. 16:28 to tell who died before the kingdom was established, per his theory. He replied: "Jesus did not

say that some of them should die." I insisted that he did. Hensler now says the language implies that some of them would die."

5. Yes, he says, Jesus cast out devils by the finger of God in Lk. 4, but he didn't say the kingdom had come then. Your contention was that if Jesus cast out devils by the finger of God the kingdom had come, but when I show that such a contention proves too much for you, you try to play on the words, "no doubt" the kingdom of God has come." Why this squirming?

6. As to the mountain of Mk. 3, he says: "I meant to say Palestine but said Judea." You mean, you meant to keep out of trouble but when you find that impossible you say you did not mean what you said. You said it did not matter where the mountain was; did you mean that? Why were you not civil enough to answer that it was near the sea of Galilee at first? Your complaint of the expressions I have used are not likely to be taken seriously when they note the way I have forced you to your many positions. Most certainly I gave the scripture that teaches the church was built in the city of Jerusalem. Zech. 1:16 says so plainly. It is a question whether you are stronger in denials or assertions.

7. My idea of Zion is not incorrect. The church is some times called Zion, and there is a mountain at Jerusalem called Zion, where Isaiah, Micah and Zechariah declared the church was to be built.

8. Who said that David set on the throne in heaven? God said and swore to it, that the throne of David was in heaven. Bo you propose to deny this also? I am surprised to hear you deny that Christ is on David's throne. Hear him: "Jesus is now on a spiritual throne which David never occupied." Peter declares that Christ was raised from the dead to sit on the throne of David. See Acts 2:30, also my argument in second speech.

I understand your sing-song misrepresentation of the truth, and that for your argument on Ps. 22:22 to avail you the word "sing" had to be there, and you tried to make believe that it was. It is not there and down came your attempted argument.

There was nothing about the "church widow" argument that he could deny, and resigned to his fate he says, "ridicule it if you wish." Pshaw! It is not worth a ridicule.

9. He is amused (?) at my reply on Jno. 3'24. Guess that

accounts for the fact that he did not notice the difficulty I presented. Hensler says Christ was head of the church before he died. Paul says He was made head after his resurrection. Hensler says Jno. 3:24-30 proves his point, but he says the church was not established till Lk. 6, and Jno. 3 was a year before that. Does it amuse you to miss your point a year?

10. I answered your questions, but it is evident that I did not answer as you wished. I showed that the church was in preparation, and that in that sense Jesus had the bride; but at the time you say Christ had the bride—church—you say it had been established; then I wanted you to answer your own question. Why didn't you? To his seventh question I answered "No." He wants to know if a man could have a certain woman for a bride if she did not exist? "No." I showed according to Hensler's contention, Jesus had the church a year before it existed. He was silent about it. That is his shortest way out of trouble.

I have always known that the church was established before the three thousand were added to it. It does not take the Lord all day to add three thousand, does it?

You did not prove that the one hundred and twenty were in church capacity the day before Pentecost. You only asserted it.

Christ made his will to all who accept and obey Him. No doubt you think you were included in it. Were you in existence during the personal ministry of Christ? He gets into trouble. He agrees that the will of Christ was not in force till after his death. Without the will you cannot inherit the blessings it provides. Hensler you are hard on that church you say was established before the Lord died. I passed none of your arguments. I called attention to some of your assertions that you called arguments, and requested proof beyond your assertions that they were typical of the church. When I showed the difference between the type— Israel and the anti-type—church, he says that is not the point. There was no point about what you said; you asserted.

He complains I did not answer his "cedar tree" argument. You didn't make it. You said the "cedar tree" and "mustard stalk" were the same. Do they resemble? No. Did you prove that they were the same? No. Did you try? No. You only asserted.

He attempts to answer my questions, and forgets what he has said at other points. On the 7th he says: When Christ died the

church was left a widow—actually a widow. Commenting on the priesthood he said Christ was a spiritual priest, and death did not affect His priesthood. Then He was not a spiritual husband of the church, eh? Shucks. It is true, Christ was to be priest on His throne if the church was a widow, Christ was dethroned—had to be—and there was no priest—the priest did not continue by reason of death. Christ was priest on the throne—nowhere else —when the throne is abdicated there is no priest. Make the church a widow and you dethrone Christ and His priesthood ends. There is no difference between "Kingship" of kingdom and "Headship" of church. Remove the King and you destroy the head and the priesthood ends. Your arguments do not harmonize with themselves. It is not pleasant to show up such absurdities, but they are offered as arguments, and I guess he has done his best. I am disappointed. I knew he would fail, but I expected a strong effort.

He says the death of the "Head" caused the body to be inactive. That is all.

Commenting on "all things to the church" he says, "Smith's farm is one thing and all things to his farm is quite another." Then when Smith dies he loses the farm and continues to own the horses, plows, etc., eh? Such folly.

He tries to play around my argument on Spirit, Power and Kingdom coming together. He knows the Spirit came on Pentecost. I never said nor intimated that the spirit was not in the world till that time. Why didn't he examine the argument?

He says the apostles believed in the resurrection of Christ, but did not believe the witnesses that told them. Are you serious, what did the witnesses tell? Christ has been raised from the dead, he is alive. The apostles disbelieved them. What was it they did not believe? That which the witnesses told. What did they tell? Christ had been raised from the dead. Then what did they disbelieve. That Christ had been raised from the dead. So I contended, and Hensler knows I am correct. Hensler I would be ashamed of such attempted perversions.

Now to his "summary." I number as he did to save space. Please read his numbers with this.

1st. This was not denied, but it does not prove your proposition.

2nd. You asserted that Jesus was God of heaven.

3rd. This does not prove that the church was set up during the personal ministry of Christ.

4, 5, 6th. You asserted that Zerubbabel was Jesus. Zerubbabel was one of the men to whom God entrusted the rebuilding of the temple; he laid the foundation and finished it. I showed that this was what the prophet said. Ez. 2:8-13, 5:1-2, 6:14-15. Zech. 4:8-10. You were eloquently silent about this.

7th. I begged Hensler to name one thing that was done on the mount of Mk. 3 and Lk. 6. that hinted at building a church. He opened not his mouth. All the prophesies he quoted refer to Zion, and he says that church was not builded on Zion. I insisted that he give the name and location of the mount of Mk. 3. He said it was in Judea, but when I show that it is in Galilee, he says he meant to say Palestine when he said Judea. You proved. Pshaw. You did nothing of the kind.

8th. You did nothing that looks like it.

9th. You gave the scripture on which you based this assertion and then I showed that as much was done before you say the church was set up, you switched from it and refused to defend your position.

10th. Yes, Jesus was a priest on His throne—He was raised to sit on that throne. Paul says: "If he were on earth He should not be a priest." You give Paul the lie by your argument, and set yourself up as Sir Oracle. The offering of the body on the cross was not a priestly act. You proved. Yes, you proved how little regard you have for the word of the Lord.

11th. You asserted it. Jesus is Mediator of the New Testament Covenant or Will, (Heb. 8:16, 9:15, 12:24), and we agree it was not of force till Christ died. Jesus made reconciliation for us in His death, (2 Cor. 5:18-20, Col. 1:21, Heb. 2:17) still you have the temerity to say you proved it was done during His personal ministry. Who did you prove it by? A. A. Hensler.

You did not. You asserted. I have tried to impress that we wanted some reliable (inspired) one to corroborate your statements.

12th. You said the church of Moses was typical of the church of Christ. I asked for just one line of scripture to sustain you in the assertion. The proposition says the "scriptures" teach.

13th. Assertion number 13. To call it more is to misrepresent.

14th. You did not and cannot show that the apostles saw Jesus coming in the kingdom in Mt. 17, for it is not true. You said the law was changed there, but when I pressed you on it you said the change did not come until the death on the cross.

15th. You said the apostles could not be first in the church if it was not set up until Pentecost, but you did not give one reason why.

16th. No one denies that the church had a small beginning, but that it began during the personal ministry of Christ is the proposition.

17th. I am glad we can agree on some things, but it grieves me to hear a man say twelve could perform the official acts of the kingdom before the kingdom was established.

18th. The kingdom was in preparation, and into the preparatory state the people did enter. You did not try to meet the argument.

19th. You showed that you did not know the difference between a "cedar twig" and a "mustard stalk," that's all.

20th. If you proved a thing by Jno. 3:24-30, you proved Christ had the church a year before you say it was established.

21st. You asserted that the church was in existence and became a widow—grass widow—when Christ died. It is true your argument demands the dethroning of Christ and the end of His priestly office.

22nd. You asserted as much, but he who finds the proof will have to look elsewhere.

23rd. I can stand a whole lot, but patience will become threadbare and forbearance will cease to be a virtue after a while. Turn and read his 23rd then read Mt. 28:18-20. Now strain your charity to the breaking point in trying to believe that he was only mistaken.

24th. Yes, you showed one hundred and twenty in Solomon's Temple and "about" one hundred and twenty in Acts 1; but you failed to show that they officiated in church capacity, or that one was type and the other anti-type.

In his "Summary" you note he has omitted his "Song," "at hand" and argument on "Chronology," with several others. A more perverted mass of bald-faced assumptions, a greater exhibi-



tion of colossal gall and monumental brass I have never seen. It was the best he could do. He attempted the impossible, and failed. "He done his best."

He admits most of the objections I filed in my last to be true. See his position. He claims the church was established before the Lord died and was first composed of the twelve. Look at them. Jesus said to them, "except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Mt. 18:3. This was said after the time Hensler says they entered the kingdom; but he says Christ was speaking of a kingdom in heaven and into that kingdom they could not enter without conversion. Then the church or bride as he contends, was not in that spiritual attitude that would admit them into the kingdom of heaven. This was the Baptist church too says Hensler; then they need to be converted before they can enter the kingdom of heaven. Look at the twelve a little closer, and remember Mr, Hensler they were the bride, the spiritual body of Christ at that time. Judas betrayed the Lord, Peter cursed, swore and lied about knowing the Lord, the others became discouraged, lost their hope and declared they were going a fishing. These men says Hensler at that very time were the bride—the spiritual body of Christ. He says the church then became a widow, and when the bridegroom returned they—it—was in a bad condition. One twelfth had committed suicide and he had to substitute another man to compliment the number required, the bride failed to recognize him, and none of them believed that he had been raised from the dead and they declared they were going a fishing; still Hensler says they had been "set and fixed firmly or unalterably;" settled "permanently" in the kingdom. Pshaw.

Hensler says the kingdom was built in 31, recorded in Mt. 10 and Mk. 3. Jesus says in 32. "Upon this rock I will build my church." Mt. 16:18. Jesus says I will build. Hensler says it has been built for a year. Strange. Of course Hensler knows better than the Lord. The very night of the Lord's betrayal he says: "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine till the kingdom of God shall come." Lk. 23:18. But Hensler says the kingdom came more than a year before the Lord used this language.

I have shown from Zech. 1:16 that the church was built in Jerusalem, not only so but that it was built on Zion, that the throne

of David is in heaven and that Christ was raised from the dead to sit on that throne; that the kingdom was to be established from the time that He took that throne, "henceforth," that it could not be established until He took that throne and God had sworn that He would raise Christ to sit on that throne, then the kingdom could not be established before the resurrection of Christ. Again, Christ declared that the kingdom and power would come together and that the power and the Spirit would come together. That the Spirit came on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ; then the power came at that time, but the kingdom was to come when the power came, but the power came on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, then the kingdom came at that time.

According to Hensler the church was established, under the law of Moses, before the death of the Testator, before it was in force, before the atonement, before the death and resurrection of Christ could be preached as an accomplished fact, before they were permitted to tell that Jesus was Christ, before Christ said "I will build my church."

I submit the argument. Beyond serving the King and contending for the truth, I am not conscious of another ambition in my breast.