

# What Is The New Testament Church?

A DISCUSSION BETWEEN  
F. D. SRYGLEY and  
J. N. HALL

Proposition: The same process that makes one a Christian adds him to the one body—the Church

---

EDITED BY J. W. SHEPHERD

Editor of "Handbook on Baptism," "Queries and Answers,"  
"Salvation from Sin," and "Baptism and Remission"



GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY  
Nashville, Tennessee  
1954





# What Is The New Testament Church ?

A DISCUSSION BETWEEN  
F. D. SRYGLEY and  
J. N. HALL

**Proposition:** The same process that makes one a Christian adds  
him to the one body—the Church

---

EDITED BY J. W. SHEPHERD

Editor of "Handbook on Baptism," "Queries and Answers,"  
"Salvation from Sin," and "Baptism and Remission"



GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY  
Nashville, Tennessee





## PREFACE.

---

The discussion contained in this volume, between F. D. Srygley, First Page Editor of the Gospel Advocate, Nashville, Tenn., and J. N. Hall, Editor of the American Baptist Flag, Fulton, Ky., was published in their respective journals, 1898-1899. The discussion was widely read, enthusiastically received, and produced a profound impression.

That J. N. Hall was amply able to present the Baptist doctrine has never been disputed by friend or foe. For many years he was the champion of the Baptist Church. His services were constantly in demand to meet the foes of Baptist doctrine all over the country. It might be truthfully said that he gave form to the arguments used by Baptist debaters of to-day.

F. D. Srygley was a forceful writer, and had a good knowledge of the New Testament, which enabled him to present a very strong argument in favor of what he believed the Word of God teaches concerning the apostolic Church, and the way in which it may be entered.

A wide call has been made for the discussion to be published in book form, and it is in answer to this call that we issue the volume.

A copious index has been appended, which will enable the reader to easily find any phase of the subject discussed.

This book ought to take the question discussed out of the realm of controversy, and put it among things definitely settled among candid thinkers. If this be not the case, then it is difficult to see how such a question could be settled.

J. W. SHEPHERD.

NASHVILLE, TENN., OCTOBER 15, 1914.

## SRYGLEY-HALL DISCUSSION

---

### MR. SRYGLEY'S FIRST ARTICLE.

*The American Baptist Flag* quotes from these columns, and comments and proposes as follows:

“‘The same process that makes one a Christian adds him to the one body—the church.’

“This proposition has been and will continue to be made prominent in these columns, because it makes a clear issue between denominationalism and undenominational New Testament Christianity. If this proposition is true, all denominations are wrong and ought to be abolished. If Editor Hall will undertake to show that this proposition is not according to the teaching of the New Testament, I will publish his argument in *The Advocate*, if he will publish my reply in *The Flag*.”—*First-page Editor Gospel Advocate*.

It would be a shame to allow such a bold challenge to pass without notice, and for the sake of asking a question or two we reproduce it. We wish to ask Brother Srygley:

1. Who believes the above proposition?
2. Is it not a logical requirement that the affirmative lead in a discussion?
3. Why do you wish to put *The Flag* in the lead, when we are in the negative?
4. Most heartily do we deny the truth of the proposition; and if an argument can be made to support it, we will reproduce it and expose it on the condition named by *The Advocate*. Your challenge is accepted, Brother Srygley, and you can proceed with any proof you may be able to produce; but look out for the fact that mere assertion will not prove the proposition.

I accept the stipulations of *The Flag*, and will proceed to give the proof of the proposition.



The proof is submitted with the hope that it will be satisfactory, because it has already been examined and accepted by good Baptist authority. After studying the matter carefully, *The Baptist and Reflector* said a few weeks ago:

The word "church" is used in the New Testament one hundred and ten times; in ninety-two instances out of the one hundred and ten it refers to a local congregation; in the other cases it refers to a "spiritual body, over which Christ is Head, and in which every Christian is a member." The trouble with the editor of *The Advocate* lies in confusing these two senses in which the word "church" is used in the New Testament. When used in the sense of the spiritual body, it is true that "the same process which makes one a Christian adds him to that body"; but when used in the sense of the local organization, as it is used in a great majority of instances, it is not true that the same process which makes one a Christian adds him to that body.

If every Christian is a member of the church, it necessarily follows, as *The Baptist and Reflector* admits, that "the same process that makes one a Christian adds him to the one body — the church." According to *The Baptist and Reflector*, this proposition is plainly taught in eighteen of the one hundred and ten passages which contain the word "church" in the New Testament. If *The Flag* admits this much, its point is not well taken against the proposition in question. In that case an issue might be sprung concerning the difference between the church as "a local congregation" and the church as "a spiritual body"; but there would be no issue on the proposition now in hand. This point will be passed till *The Flag* defines its position and indicates where it makes the issue. It is only necessary now to submit the proof which *The Baptist and Reflector* has pronounced satisfactory. The

church is the body of Christ. "And he is the head of the body, the church." (Col. 1: 18.) "For his body's sake, which is the church." (Col. 1: 24.) "And gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body." (Eph. 1: 22, 23.) "Even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the Savior of the body." (Eph. 5: 23.) This body, or church, includes and consists of all Christians. "For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office: so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another." (Rom. 12: 4, 5.) "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." (I Cor. 12: 12, 13.) "But now are they many members, yet but one body. \* \* \* Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." (I Cor. 12: 20-27.) "That in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him." (Eph. 1: 10.) "But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. \* \* \* And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." (Eph. 2: 13-16.) "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling." (Eph. 4: 4.) That one body is the church, and every Christian is a member of it, as passages already cited plainly declare and *The Baptist and Reflector* frankly admits. All Christians are baptized into that one



body, and in that body they all drink into the one Spirit. It is the body of Christ. No man can be a Christian and not belong to the church, any more than he can be a Christian and not belong to Christ, for the reason that the church is the body of Christ. If a man can be a Christian out of the church, he can also be a Christian out of Christ. A man's relation to Christ defines and determines his relation to the church, for the reason that the church is the body of Christ. If a man is in either Christ or the church, he is in both; if he is out of either, he is in neither. The same process which makes a man a Christian puts him in Christ. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." (II Cor. 5: 17.) It may also be remarked that if any man be in Christ he is in the church, for the church is the body of Christ. To be in Christ, therefore, is to be a new creature, and also to be in the church and a Christian. All this is accomplished at the same time and by the same process. The church is the household, or family, of God. "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." (Eph. 2: 19.) "That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God." (I Tim. 3: 15.) Every Christian is a child of God, and every child is a member of the family of God, which is the church. "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3: 26.) No man can be a Christian and not be a child of God, and no one can be a child of God and not belong to the family of God, which is the church. The same process which makes a man a Christian constitutes him a child

of God and adds him to the family, which is the church. That process is a spiritual birth. "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." (John 3: 3.) "For in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." (I Cor. 4: 15.) "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures." (James 1: 18.) "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever. \* \* \*

And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." (I Peter 1: 23-25.) "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." (I John 5: 1.) Every one that is born again is a child of God, and every child of God is a member of the household or family of God, which is the church. The same process that makes one a child of God adds him to the family of God — the church. That process is a birth. A child does not have to "join," or even "put in its membership," after it is born before it is a member of the family. It is born into the family. So also in the second birth. The family of God is the church, and the same process that makes one a Christian or child of God adds him to it. The children of God have been divided into various denominations, sects, and parties in religion, contrary to the plain teaching of the New Testament. All such parties, sects, and denominations are wrong, and no Christian ought to belong to any of them. They ought all to be abolished, and all Christians ought to be one family, one body, one church. The Christian who belongs to anything in the way of a religious party larger than a local congregation of worshippers, but smaller than the whole family, body, or church, which includes and consists of all Christians,



is a member of something which is in violation of the plain teaching of the New Testament and in organized rebellion against God. He ought to get out of it, and the sooner the better.

---

MR. HALL'S FIRST REPLY.

If mere verbosity did but constitute logic and argument, the above article would be entitled to special regard as going far to prove Brother Srygley's newly-invented hobby; but when he undertakes to prove that "the same process that makes one a Christian adds him to the one body—the church," it takes more than mere assertion. In the discussion of such a proposition it is very necessary that we have that wonderful "process" clearly defined, so that we may discover its performance when it saves a man and adds him to the church, both at the same moment. All inventors are proud of their inventions, and think them the one thing the world needs. Brother Srygley is on a level with the common run in this respect. He makes a hobby of his new discovery; he believes it will do the whole business; but, unlike most others with a new patent, he fails to make plain the operations of his "process." He ought at least to cite one instance where this new "process" saved one man and at the same time added him to the church. If he does nothing more, he should tell us what his "process" is. How does it operate? On whom does it operate? Does it operate directly or indirectly? Through the word or through the church? With or without means? Is it of grace or works? Does it belong to the law or the gospel age? Was it good for

Enoch and Abraham? Was it in operation in the days of John the Baptist? Does it require that one be baptized in, shook in, or simply counted in? Can the Baptists and Methodists operate it? What is your "process," Brother Srygley? It is a new thing under the sun, and it may be, if you would fully explain it, that a goodly number of the people who read this discussion would take stock in it, if it will do all you claim for it.

Brother Srygley quotes a goodly number of scriptures referring to the "body" of Christ, the "church," becoming "children of God by faith," through the "gospel," and so on; but not one of them says a word about any "process," nor does one of them say a word about adding people to the body at the same time they are saved. If the reader will take his concordance and trace the word "process" through the Scriptures, he will see the reason why Brother Srygley never referred to the word a single time after he put it in his proposition, and why he spent no time in defining it. The Bible does not say one single word about a "process" that saves people, or adds them to the church, either. If there was such a "process" to be our savior, then to this almighty "process" we would owe the gratitude of our hearts, rather than to the Christ of whom the Bible speaks as a Savior. The truth of the matter is that the proposition of our brother is absurd, and is not capable of Scripture proof. A mere show of quoting Scripture counts for nothing unless the Scriptures say something on the subject; and to show our readers the utter failure of the quotations made, we take a sample or two from the list he quotes and place them beside the proposition he affirms, and everybody can see Brother Srygley's miserable failure.

He quotes: "And he [Christ] is the head of the body, the church" (Col. 1: 18); but he affirms that the "same process that makes one a Christian adds him to the one body—the church." No one denies that Christ is the head of the body, but that has nothing on earth to do with the matter of how one gets into the body. Neither does it give a hint of the way by which one is saved. His text and his proposition have no relation whatever. If they do, he fails to show it.

Try another of his proofs: "Even as Christ is the head of the church, and he is the Savior of the body." (Eph. 5: 23.) Therefore "the same process that makes one a Christian adds him to the one body—the church." Such a thing does not logically follow at all. If it means that the Savior saves only those in the body, then one must be in that body before he can be saved, and therefore in the body before salvation, and of course the "process" of getting in the one body would be one thing, and the "process" of saving him would be another; but if men are to be saved before they enter the body of Christ, which is his church, then they are saved at one time and added at another. In any event, the proposition has no relation at all to the proof. In this same way we might take every passage referred to and show that not one of them has anything to do with the proposition under consideration. Let the reader carefully read over each scripture presented by Brother Srygley and follow it with a statement of his proposition, and it will be easily seen that there is no connection at all between them.

Another class of scriptures he quotes falls equally short of his proposition. He quotes: "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God."

(John 3: 3.) All right. What does "born again" mean? Is it equivalent to the "process" by which one is saved? Is the "kingdom of God" equivalent to the "one body, the church"? If he does not mean this, he can find no support in the passage. What, then, is the meaning of the passage? Why, that one must be born of God first, or he can not see the kingdom of God later. The birth is first, the seeing is after the birth. No one can see before he is born; no one can see the kingdom of heaven until after he is born. So the very passage he relies on to prove his hobby is a contradiction to his "process."

Another fallacy into which our brother has fallen is in the assumption that God's family is his church. Such is not the case. Abel, Enoch, David, and all the ancient worthies were in God's family, but they were not in the church. Brother Srygley himself teaches that the church was not set up until on the day of Pentecost. Would he leave all these people who served God and entered into rest before Pentecost out of God's family? He must be in a desperate strait to save his patent "process."

Not one single passage quoted by our brother has one single word to say on the one point he has undertaken to prove; and, more than that, he does not try to show that there is any such connection. He assumes the point to be proven; but assumption is not argument. Brother Srygley does not try to bring a deduction from his scriptures to his proposition. He must be conscious of the weakness of his cause, else he would have tried to get its jagged ends together in a more tangible form. We especially ask each reader to read each scripture he uses, and follow it with this simple sentence: "Therefore the same process that saves one adds him to the one body —

the church." Do this and you will see the thin bubble burst before your eyes.

Brother Srygley intimates that there is somewhere in existence a great, big, universal church in which all of God's children have membership, and out of which no one can be saved. He holds that to be in this church is to be in Christ, and to be out of the church is to be out of Christ. Now we are very anxious to know where he finds a mention of that great, big church in the Bible. Let him take plenty of time to hunt up the reference to it. It is not mentioned in any of the scriptures he quotes in this article. If it is, let him point it out. We very pointedly take issue with him in the doctrine that to be in the church is to be in Christ, and to be out of the church is to be out of Christ. We deny that there is such a thing as a great, big church composed of all the saved, in an unorganized form, and without a local habitation or name. If there be such a thing, let him point it out. *The Baptist and Reflector* is a good paper, but its utterances are not inspired and not authoritative. A quotation from the Bible that tells of some great, big, universal, invisible church, scattered over the universe generally, will settle the matter; nothing else will. In our opinion, the Scriptures never speak of a church except as a local assembly, a collection of people. Anything bigger than an assembly is a new "process" doctrine, and the Bible knows nothing about it. It will take some scriptures that talk to the subject to prove the case. I could affirm that a hog was immortal, and could quote many scriptures that have either the word "hog" or its equivalent and the word "immortal"; but none of them would prove my point unless I found one with my thought

in it. This is true of Brother Srygley's new "process." You must do all your work over aagin, brother, for not one passage you use has your idea in it. If so, you fail to show it. We wait for another effort on the part of our brother to prove his impossible proposition.

---

#### MR. SRYGLEY'S SECOND ARTICLE.

Brother Hall calls the proposition I affirm "Brother Srygley's newly-invented hobby." It is as old as the New Testament, and I claim no right or honor of invention or discovery in it. *The Christian Standard* and *The Gospel Messenger* have both argued it within the last few months, it was preached all over this country before I was born, and *The Baptist and Reflector* admits that eighteen different passages in the New Testament teach it. Brother Hall wants to know what is the "process" which makes a man a Christian and adds him to the church. It is simply what the New Testament teaches. "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. 28: 19, 20.) "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark 16: 15, 16.) "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Acts 2: 38.) "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and



thou shalt be saved, and thy house. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway." (Acts 16: 31-33.) "And the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing." (Acts 8: 36-39.) "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." (Acts 22: 16.) "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3: 5.) "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." (Rom. 6: 3, 4.) "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." (Gal. 3: 27.) In my first article I quoted scriptures which say the church is the body of Christ: "And gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body." (Eph. 1: 22, 23.) "Even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the Savior of the body." (Eph. 5: 23.) "And he is the head of the body, the church." (Col. 1: 18.) "For his

body's sake, which is the church." (Col. 1: 24.) If a man be a Christian and be saved without being in the church, he can be a Christian and be saved without being in Christ, for the church is the body of Christ. No one can be a Christian and be saved without being in Christ. Salvation and all spiritual blessings are in Christ. "In whom [Christ] we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." (Col. 1: 14; also Eph. 1: 7.) "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." (II Cor. 5: 17.) "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." (Gal. 6: 15.) "Who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ." (Eph. 1: 3.) "And hath raised us up together, and made us sit in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." (Eph. 2: 6.) Redemption, forgiveness of sins, a new creature, heavenly places, and all spiritual blessings are in Christ. If a man can be in Christ and not belong to the church, he can be baptized and not belong to the church, for people are baptized into Christ. "So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death." (Rom. 6: 3.) "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." (Gal. 3: 27.) I do not believe there is "a process to be our Savior," rather than "the Christ of whom the Bible speaks as a Savior." I believe as much as Brother Hall in "the Christ of whom the Bible speaks as a Savior." Does Brother Hall believe that people are saved and added to the church by Christ without any process at all? If so, what becomes of the process Brother Hall uses to make Christians and add people to the Baptist Church?

Brother Hall thinks the quotation that Christ "is the head of the body, the church," "has nothing on earth to do with the matter of how one gets into the body." That quotation shows that a man can not be a Christian without being in the church, unless he can be a Christian without being in Christ, for the church is the body of Christ. If "the same process which makes one a Christian does not add him to the one body — the church," a man can be a Christian and not be in Christ. As to the quotation, "Christ is the head of the church: and he is the Savior of the body," Brother Hall says it "does not logically follow at all" that "the same process that makes one a Christian adds him to the one body — the church." Then one can be a Christian and not be saved. Christ is the Savior of the body, and the body is the church. He does not save those who are out of the body — the church. All who are in the body are saved, and all who are out of the body are not saved. To get into the body is to be saved, and to be saved is to get into the body. The body is the church.

Brother Hall wants to know what "born again" means. It means "born of water and of the Spirit." (John 3: 5.) It is equivalent to the process by which one is saved. "The kingdom of God" is equivalent to the one body — the church. All who are born again are in the kingdom of God, which is the one body — the church — and all who are not born again are out of it. To be born again is the process by which one enters into the kingdom of God, the one body — the church. He is born into it. It is also the process by which he is saved and by which he becomes a Christian. Brother Hall thinks that because a man can not see the kingdom of

God before he is born again he must be born first, and then get into, or see, the kingdom afterwards. He seems to think Christians are born blind. About how long does he think Christians are born before their "eyes are open"? A Christian can see the instant he is born again; in fact, he is enabled to see at the same time and by the same process he is born again. "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." (Acts 26: 18.) To make a man a Christian is to open his eyes and turn him from darkness to light. A man can see the instant his eyes are opened and he is turned from darkness to light. He is born again, his eyes are opened, he is turned from darkness to light, turned from the power of Satan unto God, given "inheritance among them which are sanctified," granted "forgiveness of sins," made a Christian and added to the one body—the church—at the same time and by the same process.

Brother Hall thinks God's family is not God's church, because God had a family before he had a church. To be sure, the family was not the church before there was any church; but when God built his church, he built his family into it as material. What does Brother Hall think God built his church of, as material, if not of the family of God? Did he build it of the family of the devil? There was nothing to build it of but the family of God and the family of the devil. From the time the church of God began it has been and now is the family of God. It includes and consists of all of God's people. If this is a fallacy, Paul, and not Brother Srygley, is the man

who has fallen into it. It was Paul, and not Srygley, who said: "The house of God, which is the church of the living God." (I Tim. 3: 15.) Paul also said: "Let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith." (Gal. 6: 10.) Again, Paul calls Christians "fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." (Eph. 2: 19.) The household of faith is the household of God, the house of God, "which is the church of the living God." All Christians belong to that household and are members of that church; all who are not Christians are "strangers and foreigners" from the household of God, which is the church of the living God." (Eph. 2: 19.) If a man can be a Christian and not be in the church, he can be a Christian and not belong to the household of God, or the household of faith, which is as much as to say he can be a Christian without faith and without God.

Brother Hall wants to know where I find a mention of "a great, big, universal church in which all of God's children have membership, and out of which no one can be saved." I find it in Eph. 1: 22, 23; 5: 22, 23; Col. 1: 18, 24; I Tim 3: 15. Some of these scriptures say the church is the body of Christ, and others say it is the house of God. *The Baptist and Reflector* finds "a mention of that great, big church" in eighteen different places in the New Testament. Brother Hall says: "*The Baptist and Reflector* is a good paper, but its utterances are not inspired and not authoritative." Are the utterances of *The American Baptist Flag* inspired and authoritative? It occurs to me the utterances of *The Baptist and Reflector* are about as much inspired and as authoritative as the utterances of *The American Baptist*

*Flag.* What about the utterances of those eighteen different passages in the New Testament which teach, as *The Baptist and Reflector* admits, that "the same process which makes one a Christian adds him to that body," which is the church? Are they inspired and authoritative? In Brother Hall's opinion, "the Scriptures never speak of a church except as a local assembly, a collection of people." Did the eunuch belong to the church after Philip baptized him? (Acts 8: 35-39.) What local assembly or collection of people did he belong to? There was no local assembly or collection of people there for him or anybody else to belong to. Did Lydia and her household belong to the church after Paul and Silas baptized them? (Acts 16: 13-15.) What local assembly or collection of people did they belong to? There was no local assembly or collection of people there for them or anybody else to belong to. However, Brother Hall is partly correct. There is no organization in and through which Christians worked in New Testament times except local assemblies. There is no denominational organization or federation of churches in the New Testament. For that reason all denominational federations, organizations, or institutions are wrong and ought to be abolished. No Christian has any scriptural authority to belong to or work through any denominational institution or ecclesiastical organization "bigger than an assembly." If all denominational institutions and ecclesiastical organizations unknown in the New Testament were abolished, the people of God would be nothing but Christians, belong to nothing but the body of Christ—the church—and work and worship in and through nothing but local congregations, as in New Tes-



tament times. If they would do this, and then be careful as Christians in local congregations to preach and practice nothing but what Christians and congregations preached and practiced in New Testament times, there would be one body now as then, in which Christians could keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, as Paul teaches. (I Cor. 1: 10; Eph. 4: 1-13.) Where in the Bible does Brother Hall "find a mention" of "a great, big" denominational institution with associations, district conventions, general conventions, home missionary societies, foreign missionary societies, all sorts of boards, secretaries, standing committees, and a chronic fracas over theological seminaries, like the Baptist denomination? When the Scriptures speak of a church "as a local assembly, a collection of people," the church includes and consists of all Christians in the locality designated. All the Christians in Corinth belonged to "the church of God which is at Corinth." Paul addressed his epistle "unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints." (I Cor. 1: 2.) This shows that the church at Corinth included and consisted of "them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints." All who were called to be saints and sanctified in Christ Jesus belonged to it. The first letter to the Thessalonians is addressed "unto the church of the Thessalonians which is in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ." (I Thess. 1: 1.) All those who were in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ at Thessalonica belonged to and constituted the church at Thessalonica. They belonged to the church because they were in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ, and they belonged

to the church at Thessalonica because they lived there. If a man is a Christian anywhere at all, he is a Christian where he lives; and if he belongs to the church anywhere, he belongs to it where he lives. The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians is addressed "unto the church of the Thessalonians in God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." (II Thess. 1: 2.) All who were "in God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" at Thessalonica belonged to and constituted the church at that place.

---

#### MR. HALL'S SECOND REPLY.

In this second letter Brother Srygley has done what the man did who swore the horse was sixteen feet high—he stands to it. As our brother has asserted that "the same process that makes one a Christian adds him to the one body—the church," he is determined to keep on asserting it until he persuades himself that it is so. The proposition is absurd and unscriptural, and in the many scriptures he cites he does not even try to make one of them fit the assertion he has made. In fact, nearly every scripture he quotes in this article he quoted before; and as he did not get one single argument out of them before, it would appear reasonable to ask that he should at least reach his proposition with one of them, if no more. It does not signify anything that a man quote a lot of scriptures, unless they have some relation to the question in hand. He omitted to quote two scriptures that were as pertinent as any he did quote, viz.: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth;" and, "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God."

In truth, there are thousands of other scriptures he could have quoted, and it would have looked as if the Scriptures were full of his hobby; but not one word does a single scripture he quoted, or could quote from the entire Bible, say about his "process," or the addition of a man to the church at the same time he is saved. That is what the proposition says, I admit, but that is not what the Scriptures say.

We now have the second article from our friend to prove his proposition, but he has never yet defined the terms of his proposition or given us an exegesis of a single scripture that he claims teaches his doctrine. He seems to assume that we will all accept his assumed definition of these scriptures without asking that the connection with the proposition be made clear; but I may modestly remind the brother that some of us want to see the point before we accept the doctrine. The Scriptures nowhere speak of a man being saved by a "process," nor of being "added to the one body—the church"—by a "process;" and yet the brother has got to find some passage that at least will allow that sort of doctrine, or he utterly fails in his affirmation; and that he has failed so far can be readily seen in the fact that the terms of his proposition are not to be found in the Bible at all. The expressions, "process" and "the one body," are not to be found in the Scriptures, and how can a man prove by the Bible a thing that the Bible does not one single time mention? Of course I know the brother has an impossible task to perform, but, as he assumed it, I must insist that he prove it or give it up. Before he can even start to prove his proposition he must show from the Scriptures that a "process" makes

Christians out of sinners; and when he has done this impossible task, he will have to show that this process adds these converts to such an entity as he calls "the one body," of which the Scriptures do not speak; and then he will have to show that "the one body" of which he talks is the same thing as "the church" of which the Scriptures do speak; and, after this, he must show us the operation of this "process" as it makes sinners into Christians and "adds them to the one body—the church." Our friend has not made a start to do any of this yet. It is time he was getting to the task of showing some connection with his scriptures and his doctrine. Take some one passage and show that it teaches what your proposition asserts. If you will, you will see the impossibility of the task in the proving of your absurd proposition.

Allow me to call attention to the ridiculousness of this proposition by one single observation. Brother Srygley affirms that the "process that makes one a Christian adds him to the one body—the church." He here asserts that a "process" makes Christians. If that is so, then God, Christ, and the Spirit are all left out; for God is not a "process" nor any part of a "process." If the brother intends to teach that baptism makes Christians out of sinners, and adds them to the church, why doesn't he say so? If he dares to say it, our issue will be sharply drawn, for I most positively deny it. If he means to say that faith, repentance, confession, and baptism, all taken together, will make a man a Christian and add him to "the one body—the church," let him say it like a man, and I will deny it. If he even believes that God and Christ save sinners "through a process that at the same

time adds them to the one body—the church,” let him say that, and I will deny it. But beyond all of this he hides himself behind a word that is not in the Bible, and makes sinners depend for salvation on a “process” that has no place in God’s book, and then hope by this unknown “process” to be “added to the one body” of which the inspired writers were all blissfully ignorant. Well, you may seek to hide the impossibility of your task behind a flood of scripture quotations, even though they have no earthly bearing on the question. It serves to keep up appearances, you know. But I challenge the brother to take any scripture he quotes and try to make it fit his assertion, and I will engage to show its utter absurdity in such a service. Ah, this wonderful “process!” Do not slander Paul by charging him with having taught it, for he never dreamed of such a thing. It is also a misrepresentation of *The Baptist and Reflector* to say that it believes any such doctrine; for when the language is produced the reader will see that Dr. Folk has no such idea. This peculiar hobby is the invention of the current reformation, and Brother Srygley is its chief apostle.

I am glad to have my friend so nearly agree with me that a New Testament church is always a local body. These local bodies always included all the Christians in that locality, because all these Christians entered the church in their localities. If some of them had remained out, as John said those did who were in Babylon, then all the Christians of the locality would not have been included in the church. I very fearlessly assert that the only “church” the New Testament knows anything about is the local church—as at Corinth, Philippi, Antioch,

Rome, and such like. If there is any other use of the word "church," I call on my friend to prove it from God's word. To assume the point is not going to be satisfactory, and to prove it by *The Reflector* will not be conclusive. If *The Reflector* can find "eighteen passages" where a universal church is referred to, it is strange that Srygley can not find at least one of them. In a translation of the New Testament by Macknight, Doddridge, and George Campbell, with emendations by Alexander Campbell, the Greek word *ekklesia* (which is the word rendered "church" in our version) is rendered "congregation." I give a few instances: "To the congregation of God, which is at Corinth." (I Cor. 1: 1.) "The husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the congregation; he is the Savior of the body. Therefore as the congregation is subject to Christ, so also let the wives be to their own husbands. Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ loved the congregation." (Eph. 5: 22.) "Ye are come . . . to the general assembly and congregation of the firstborn [ones] who are enrolled in heaven." (Heb. 12: 23.) "On this rock I will build my congregation." (Matt. 16: 18.) "The Lord added daily the saved to the congregation." (Acts 2: 37.) Brother Srygley would have to read it: "The process added daily the saved to the one body." God does not talk so foolishly. "The house of God, which is the congregation of the living God." (I Tim. 3: 15.) This is one of his passages to prove that the church is like a great, big family, including all of God's people; but Paul was talking of a single local congregation. He never did use the word to represent a great, big, invisible church. Dr. Rotherham, of England, in his criti-

cal translation of the New Testament, renders the word *ekklesia* in every place by the word "assembly." The Emphatic Diaglott also rends the pet passage of all the visionary interpreters thus: "And constituted him a head over all things for the congregation, which is his body. (Eph. 2: 22.) Se how differently God's word reads from the vagaries of Brother Srygley! He conjures up in his mind an imaginary something which he calls "the one body," and makes that the equivalent of the congregation, or church; and then he conjures up another imaginary something which he calls a "process," that he says adds sinners to this "one imaginary body" at the same time it makes them Christians; and yet for all of his imaginary doctrine he is not able to quote one single scripture. This version of the New Testament from which I have quoted so many passages to show the proper rendering of *ekklesia* is published by the Disciples themselves, and is good authority in this contention.

I am under no obligation to show that the quotations he makes fail to teach his theory until he makes some effort to prove that they do. He simply assumes his point; I have a right to reply by a counter assumption; but I am not in such a strait as he is, and can afford to put his scriptures to a test and show that they do not help his cause. Take, for instance, this one: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16: 16.) Now, in order to connect that passage with the proposition, we should be able to say: "Therefore, the same process that makes one a Christian adds him to the one body—the church." But how can his quotation prove his proposition when the quotation says not one word about a "process," or "making a Christian," or "the one body"?



Neither does it mention the "church" nor speak of adding anybody to anything. There is not a point in the proposition that is mentioned in the quotation. Yet this man wants us to believe that his patent "process," his ridiculous hobby, has the support of the Scriptures. I can take every passage he refers to and show the same thing. Let each reader try to get the passages and the proposition together, and he will see how utterly our genial visionary has failed in his task.

But Brother Srygley assures me that all his brethren believe as he does on this "process" business, and that it is not an invention of his own. In view of this, I am a little curious to know if any of them really believe the doctrine. I am glad he refers to his brethren as his witnesses in the case, for that enables me all the more confidently to cite a few examples from the speech of his brethren. Let the reader remember that Brother Srygley maintains that "the same process that makes one a Christian also adds him to the one body—the church." He also assures us that his brethren generally agree with him in this idea. In view of this, I ask him, or them, to please explain to us the following statements I gather from their reports of meetings. From *The Christian Standard* I quote:

Four additions—two by baptism, one from the church of God, one restored.—*G. S. Beelos, Chicago.*

Here we have three "processes" of adding people to the "one body."

Again:

One from the Freewill Baptists, one by relation from the Missionary Baptists, two by statement, two by letter from the

Methodists, one by confession, two from the Methodist Episcopal, and two by baptism.

I take every one of these statements from *The Christian Standard*. Here we have seven "processes" of adding people to the "one body." Did these "processes" also save these folks at the same time they were added? If they did, then there are seven ways to save people; but if they were already saved before they were added, then Brother Srygley's proposition is untrue.

But let us try some quotations from Brother Srygley's own paper, *The Gospel Advocate*. From different reports of meetings I gather the following:

Five added to the one body—three by confession, two by baptism; one took membership, three by statement, one by letter, four from the world, two from the Methodists, two from the Baptists, two reclaimed, one by primary obedience, one from the Primitive Baptists, two young ladies obeyed the gospel, one from the Christian Church, etc.

Here are thirteen "processes" by which it is claimed that persons were "added to the one body," and no two of them are alike; and I am constrained to ask why my brother if he really believes that the process by which they are said to have been added to "the one body" was the process that saved them. For instance, those Baptists that are reported as "added to the one body"—were they saved before that addition? If so, your position is false. If they were not saved until they were added, then they were saved at a time when they were not baptized, and that kills your "process." In any event, your "process" is dead and your "one body" is vanished into thin air.

I trust Brother Srygley will get down to his business

in his next, and touch the subject somewhere. As an aid to him in his arduous task, I wish to ask him a few questions, and the answers to them will aid in the development of the proposition:

1. What is this "process" that saves a sinner and at the same time adds him to the church? Give us its name and the details.

2. What is "the one body" you speak of?

3. Does it include all saved people?

4. Does it include any unbaptized people?

5. Is there this "one body" in Nashville?

6. Do the Baptists of Nashville belong to it? Do the Methodists? Do the "Campbellites"?

7. If a Baptist should leave the church of his present membership, and join those known as "Campbellites," would he be leaving the "one body," or would he be uniting with the "one body"?

8. When one is in the "one body," does he still have to unite with some local church?

9. Is it a man's duty to belong to a local church?

10. When a man is a member of one local church, is he therefore a member of all the local churches?

11. Are all the local churches in the "one body"?

12. Does a man have to get into two churches—one a local body, and the other "the one body"?

13. Can a man be saved unless he has membership in a local church?

14. Is it the local church, or the big, universal, unnamed "one body," that is said to be the body of Christ?

15. Do you understand the expression, "body of Christ," to mean that the churches really become saviors of men?

16. Is not Christ the "head of the church" in the same sense that a king is the head of his kingdom?

17. Are the kingdom and the king the same thing?

18. Are Christ and his churches the same?

But I desist for the present. I am sorry for the task our brother has undertaken, because it is untrue, and because he can not prove it by the word of God, if his life depended on it. It is simply and purely a vagary, a hobby, an accommodating convenience in faith to excuse the failure in having no real church, and to seek one amid the myths of a fertile imagination.

Answer these questions, brother, and try to get your proposition to measure with the passages you quote, and every reader will readily behold your confusion.

---

#### MR. SRYGLEY'S THIRD ARTICLE.

Brother Hall says I hide behind the word "process" and fail to define the terms of my proposition. My contention is that the church includes and consists of all Christians. No man can be a Christian and not be a member of the church. If this is true, that which makes a man a Christian adds him to the church. A man does not have to do one thing to become a Christian, and another thing to become a member of the church, for the reason that in becoming a Christian he becomes a member of the church. I suppose Brother Hall admits it takes something to make a Christian. That which makes a man a Christian is what I mean by a process. No matter what it takes to make a man a Christian, it takes that same thing, and nothing else, to add him to the

church. If a man can become a Christian without any process at all, then he can be added to the church without any process at all. If it takes any process at all to add a man to the church, it takes the same process, and nothing else, to make him a Christian.

Brother Hall wants me to tell what it takes to make a Christian, and thus make a clear issue. I am willing to make an issue at this point after we argue the issue already made. Does the church include and consist of all Christians? I say it does; Brother Hall says it does not. This is the issue in this discussion. No matter how Christians are made, so far as this discussion is concerned. The question is: Do they all belong to the church because they are Christians? The New Testament says the church is the body of Christ as plainly as words can say anything. "Gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body." (Eph. 1: 22, 23.) "And he is the head of the body, the church." (Col. 1: 18.) "For his body's sake, which is the church." (Col. 1: 24.) If a man can be a Christian and not be in the church, he can be a Christian and not be in Christ, for the reason that the church is the body of Christ. Brother Hall says the Bible does not mention "the one body." He is mistaken. "There is one body, and one Spirit." (Eph. 4: 4.) "All baptized into one body." (I Cor. 12: 13.) "One body in Christ." (Rom. 12: 5.) This is the body that is called the church in passages already quoted. He says I misrepresent *The Baptist and Reflector*. I simply quoted what *The Baptist and Reflector* said. Here is the language:

The word "church" is used in the New Testament one hundred and ten times; in ninety-two instances out of the one hun-

dred and ten it refers to a local congregation; in the other cases it refers to a "spiritual body, over which Christ is Head, and in which every Christian is a member." \* \* \* When used in the sense of the spiritual body, it is true that "the same process which makes one a Christian adds him to that body."

If Dr. Folk has been misrepresented at all, he did it himself.

I did not agree with Brother Hall "that a New Testament church is always a local body." I distinctively disagreed with him at this point, and cited the case of the eunuch (Acts 8: 35-39) and the case of Lydia (Acts 16: 14, 15) to prove that a person can be a member of the church and not be in a local body, else these people were not members of the church when they were baptized. There was no local body where they were baptized for them to be in. What I did agree to was that *there is no organization but local bodies in the New Testament for religious work or worship.* For this reason I oppose all denominational organizations and belong to none of them. There is no such thing as the Baptist denominational organization in the New Testament. Brother Hall admits that in the New Testament "the local bodies always included all the Christians in that locality, because all these Christians entered the church in that locality." When did they enter it? The church in any locality is the body of Christ in that locality. If a man has to enter it after he becomes a Christian, he is a Christian out of the body of Christ. No one can be a Christian and not be in the body of Christ; and if a man is in the body of Christ at all, he is in it wherever he is. He belongs to the church because he is a Christian, and he belongs to it where he lives because he lives there. A man can no

more live at one place and belong to the church somewhere else than he can live at one place and be a Christian, or be in Christ, somewhere else. If a man is not in Christ where he lives, he is not in him anywhere; if he is not a Christian where he is, he is not a Christian anywhere; if he does not belong to the church where he is, he does not belong to it at all. In New Testament times Christians belonged to the church—the body of Christ—because they were Christians, and they worked and worshiped in the local congregations wherever they were because there was no other organization to work and worship in. Brother Hall says it would not have been that way “if some of them had remained out, as John said those did who were in Babylon.” Sure enough! That is to say, the church in a locality would not have “included all the Christians in that locality,” “if some of them had remained out.” I should say as much. But some of them did not remain out. But he thinks some of them are in Babylon now. Just so. They are therefore in two things: they are in the church because they are Christians, and they are in Babylon because they have departed from the New Testament. This Babylon they are in is the thing I oppose. It is denominationalism. Every Christian ought to get out of it and remain in the body of Christ, which is the church. The denomination itself is unscriptural and ought to be abolished. There is no such thing as the Baptist denomination or any other denomination in the New Testament. The word translated “church” is *ekklesia*, and Brother Hall cites versions of the New Testament which translate it “congregation,” “assembly,” etc. It is of no consequence how it is translated, so far as this issue is con-

cerned. The passages already quoted say it is the body of Christ. Translation can not make it anything else than the body of Christ. Suppose the word "church" does always mean a local congregation—which I do not admit—what then? It is the body of Christ, anyhow; and if a man can be a Christian and not belong to it, he can be a Christian and not belong to the body of Christ. Brother Hall thinks I fail to make a case unless we are "able to say: Therefore." Very well. No man can be a Christian and not belong to the body of Christ; the church is the body of Christ; therefore no man can be a Christian and not belong to the church.

Brother Hall says I assure him that all my "brethren" believe as I do on this question. I have never assured him anything of the kind. Quite to the contrary, many of my brethren do not believe as I do, "not knowing the Scriptures." The children of God are all my brethren. "For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother." (Matt. 12: 50.) I have no partisan brotherhood smaller than the family of God. Many of my brethren do not understand this question any better than Brother Hall. Division among Christians is a sin plainly condemned by the New Testament. The Bible teaches that God cuts people off from the body of Christ, which is the church, for sin. I do not know exactly how long God bears with a man in sin before he cuts him off for his wickedness. If a man sins in going into a denomination to the point that God cuts him off, of course he has to be added, and added from the denomination into which he entered. If *The Gospel Advocate* and *The Christian Standard*, in their reports of meetings, meant this, they are right; and



in this sense there are as many ways to add folks to the one body as there are denominations to add them from. If, however, those people were Christians in Babylon, they were in the church because they were Christians, and in Babylon because they had departed from the New Testament. In that view of the case, they were not added to anything. They simply came out of the unscriptural denominations into which they had entered, and remained in the church, which is the body of Christ. The reports of meetings, in that case, are not correctly worded; they merely indicate whence the persons came who left denominational Babylon.

As to Brother Hall's questions:

"1. What is the 'process' that saves the sinner and at the same time adds him to the church?" *The texts of scripture which tell what a man must do to be saved, to be born again, to get into Christ, to receive remission of sins, etc., state what the process is. I quoted several of them in my second article.*

"2. What is 'the one body' you speak of?" *The "one body" is the church. (See passages quoted on pages 6, 7, 8, 15, 16.)*

"3. Does it include all saved people?" *It includes all saved people.*

"4. Does it include any unbaptized people?" *In the New Testament it does not include any unbaptized people.*

"5. Is this 'one body' in Nashville?" *There is this one body in Nashville, but it is confused by denominational Babylon, and not in scriptural order. Nothing short of the abolishment of all denominations can bring it into the harmony of fellowship and unity of faith plainly taught in the New Testament.*

"6. Do the Baptists of Nashville belong to it?" *All Christians, and none but Christians, belong to it. As many Christians as there are among the Baptists, Methodists, and "Campbellites" of Nashville belong to it. No Christian has any scriptural authority to belong to the Baptists, Methodists, "Campbellites," or any other denomination, in Nashville or anywhere else. The New Testament plainly requires Christians to abandon and abolish all denominations, be nothing but Christians, belong to nothing but the church (which is the body of Christ), and preach and practice nothing but what Christians and churches preached and practiced in New Testament times. If they will do this, they will be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment, and will be in perfect New Testament order in all matters of religious work, worship, and organization.*

"7. If a Baptist should leave the church of his present membership, and join those known as 'Campbellites,' would he be leaving the 'one body,' or would he be uniting with the 'one body'?" *If a Baptist who is a Christian should leave the church of his present membership, he could not join the one body, because he is already in it. All Christians are in the one body because they are Christians, and no Christian has any scriptural authority to join anything else. Every Christian who is in any denomination ought to leave the denomination he is in, be nothing but a Christian, belong to nothing but the one body, and preach and practice nothing but what Christians preached and practiced in New Testament times.*

"8. When one is in the 'one body,' does he still

have to unite with some local church?" *He is a member of the local church wherever he lives because he lives there and belongs to the one body. He ought simply to worship and serve God exactly as Christians did in New Testament times in the local church wherever he is.*

"9. Is it a man's duty to belong to a local church?" *It is as much a man's duty to belong to some local church as it is his duty to be a Christian. He can not be a Christian and not belong to the church, and he cannot belong to the church and not belong to the local church wherever he is.*

"10. When a man is a member of one local church, is he therefore a member of all the local churches?" *When a man is a member of the church he is a member of the local church wherever he is.*

"11. Are all the local churches in the 'one body'?" *Every local church is the one body in the locality where it is.*

"12. Does a man have to get into two churches—one a local body and the other the 'one body'?" *A man can not scripturally get into two churches, because there is but one church in the Scriptures for him to get into.*

"13. Can a man be saved unless he has membership in a local church?" *A man can not be saved unless he has membership in the church, unless he can be saved out of Christ, for the church is the body of Christ. If he has membership in the church at all, he has membership in it wherever he is. No man can scripturally have membership in anything but the church.*

"14. Is it the local church, or the big, universal, unnamed 'one body,' that is said to be the body of Christ?"

*The church is the body of Christ.. When it is located by a geographical term, it is the body of Christ in the locality designated.*

“15. Do you understand the expression, ‘body of Christ,’ to mean that the churches really become saviors of men?” *I do not “understand the expression, ‘body of Christ,’ to mean that the churches really become saviors of men.” Paul says Christ is “the Savior of the body.” (Eph. 5: 23.) I understand, therefore, “the expression, ‘body of Christ,’ to mean” that the church is the thing which Christ saves; and if a man is not in the church, Christ does not save him. This is why the same process which makes a man a Christian adds him to the church.*

“16. Is not Christ the ‘head of the church’ in the same sense that a king is the head of his kingdom?” *Christ is not the head of the church in the same sense that a king is the head of his kingdom, for the reason that the church is a spiritual body, and a kingdom is not a spiritual body.*

“17. Are the kingdom and the king the same thing?” *The kingdom and the king are not the same thing.*

“18. Are Christ and his churches the same thing?” *Christ and his church are not the same thing. The church is the body, Christ is the Head, and every Christian is a member of the body. Are the head and the body the same thing?*

## MR. HALL'S THIRD REPLY.

Our readers will bear in mind that Brother Srygley has affirmed that:

The same process which makes one a Christian adds him to the one body—the church.

I call attention to this because the reader of his third article would be unable to detect the real point in our contention from anything he says. In fact, he surrenders the proposition and introduces another issue entirely. Here are his words:

Does the church include and consist of all Christians? I say it does; Brother Hall says it does not. This is the issue.

Well, well! I had no idea of driving my opponent entirely off his proposition and into a new issue inside of three articles, but such is manifestly the case. But I deny that his last proposition states the issue at all. If I should grant that "all Christians are in the church," it would not follow that "the same process which makes one a Christian adds him to the one body—the church." This last proposition can not be proven, and has been abandoned. Neither can he prove his second statement on his new issue; but I do not propose to turn aside to the new issue until I more thoroughly expose the hopelessness of my friend's contention on his hobby. Let each reader remember that my friend affirmed that "the same process which makes one a Christian at the same time adds him to the one body—the church." That is the issue. Let Brother Srygley please address himself to it in his next article, for he has evaded it completely so far. Incidentally, many other matters may be alluded

to; but the "issue" is in the above proposition, which I unhesitatingly and most emphatically deny. Brother Srygley does not affirm that "God saves sinners by a process," but he affirms that the "process" itself not only does the saving of sinners, but also "adds them to the church." No wonder my friend wants to change the issue. He sees clearly that he can not meet this issue, and, as any port in a time of storm is better than no port, he takes refuge in his all-Christians-in-the-church doctrine. Brother Srygley, I am not flush of cash, but I will agree to give you a dollar for every time you will find your "process" in God's word; and another like sum for every time you find the expression, "the one body," in the Bible. Just put "the one body" in quotation marks, and draw a line under the phrase, and give us chapter and verse, and I will hand over the dollar. You seemed to quote such an utterance in your last article; but if the reader will examine the scriptures quoted, he will fail to find the words that my friend has in his proposition. Neither the words nor the idea can be found in the Bible. The expression, "the one body," as referring to a church of Christ, is not in God's word; neither is the "process" that is said to save sinners and add them to "the one body"; and as neither of the points in the proposition can be found in the Bible, how can the brother do otherwise than forsake his proposition and seek to change the issue?

In what Brother Srygley says about the wickedness of having denominations, and his own determination not to be in such a thing, there is a deal of dust throwing. Everybody knows that the Campbellites are as truly a "denomination" as anybody. Webster says the word

“denominate” means “to name,” and “denomination” is “a general name for a class of individuals.” Baptists constitute a “class” of religionists, and are properly referred to as a denomination, which merely means “a class of people with a name.” The Campbellites also constitute a class of religious people. They are not Baptists; they do not belong to that list; they have a name for themselves, and a fellowship within themselves, and are as truly a denomination as any other people. Why, the Campbellites have raised more of a racket about the name by which they desire to be known than anybody else on earth, and yet their champion now desires to have himself and the people he represents considered as a nondescript, vague, empty nothing. Why, I have more respect for you than that, and must insist that you are guilty of the “wickedness” of adding another human denomination to the long catalogue of the organizations that now antagonize the churches of Christ. Mr. Campbell, Mr. McGarvey, your Year-book, and many others of your leading lights speak of you as “a denomination.” So I guess you will have to go in a gang to yourself, or take stock in your confessedly wicked “Campbellite denomination.” And may I not ask if that great, big “body, the church,” has any name? Is it a denomination? Is it also wicked?

Brother Srygley says:

No matter what it takes to make a man a Christian, it takes that same thing, and nothing else, to add him to the church.

That is a mere assumption of the point. I question the correctness of the statement, and again call for the proof. The reader will notice all the way through the article that Brother Srygley assumes his points, just as

in the above. A mere assertion is not an argument, and needs to be met with no more than a simple, flat denial.

Another fallacious statement is often repeated by the brother, as follows:

If a man can be a Christian and not be in the church, he can be a Christian and not be in Christ, for the reason that the church is the body of Christ.

To make that statement true, he must assume that Christ and the church are the same; and in answering question No. 18 he declares they "are not the same." If Christ and the church are not the same, then one may be in Christ without being in the church, and one may be in the church without being in Christ. It is the quintessence of religious nonsense to insist that to get into the church is to get into Christ, for "they are not the same," Brother Srygley being judge. His answer to question 18 contradicts his assumption in the above statement quoted from him, and we leave him to devour himself on that point.

But let us see a little further about the contradictions and absurdities of our friend's untenable position. He says:

There is no organization but local bodies in the New Testament for religious work and worship.

Very well; that point is clear. If Brother Srygley succeeds in proving to the satisfaction of anybody that "the one body—the church" is composed "of all Christians, and none but Christians," as he says in answer to question 6, it will not be a "local body," and hence will not be a New Testament church for "religious work and worship." There is "no organization but local bodies



in the New Testament for religious work and worship," for Brother Srygley says so. Therefore "the one body—the church," to which he says his "process" adds a man at the same time it makes him a Christian, is not a church for "religious work or worship." His big church, he tells us, is not a local church; and he also says there is "no organization but local bodies in the New Testament for religious work or worship." Then, in the name of common sense, I ask: What do your big church and patent process amount to? It is not for work or worship, for you say so. It neither works for God nor worships God, you being judge. Local churches do this, you admit, and there is no organization in the New Testament but local churches that do so. Then I shall stand by the local churches, where "religious work and worship" are maintained, and you can fly away to dreamland with your church, of which "all Christians are members," but in which there is neither "religious work nor worship." Great heavens! What is the good of such a church? Who needs it? What can it do? The very idea is a travesty on the church idea of the New Testament.

Now, to show I have not taken advantage of a reckless statement from the pen of the brother, I quote these words:

I did not agree with Brother Hall "that a New Testament church is always a local body." I distinctly disagreed with him at this point.

That shows that "the one body—the church," into which he asserts people entered by his patent process, was not a "local body." It must, therefore, be that big church that **neither works for God nor worships God**. If

he ever finds such a church, I want to deed to him all my right and title to it; for I would not belong to a church, if I could help it, that does not work for God nor worship God.

Again, Brother Srygley says the eunuch and Lydia were not in any local body, because there were no local bodies where they were baptized for them to be in. All right; we understand that point. They were not in a local body. Were they in a general body? If so, we have two bodies—one a general body, the other a local body. Now, can one be saved out of the general body? Brother Srygley says he can not. It is this general body that he says is "the one body—the church—composed of all Christians." Well, can one be saved out of the local body? See his answer to question 9: "It is as much a man's duty to belong to some local church as it is his duty to be a Christian. He can not be a Christian and not belong to the church, and he can not belong to the church and not belong to the local church where he lives." There you have it. You must get into the big church by the "process," but that will not make you a Christian unless you are also in the "local church" without the "process." The eunuch and Lydia were not in a local church, he says, and yet one "can not be a Christian unless he is in the local church where he lives." Then the eunuch and Lydia were not Christians. They had the "process," and it "added them to the one body," so he thinks; but they must be in "the local church" to be Christians, and they were in no local body; therefore they were not Christians. If that is not a mess to set before the intelligent world!

Brother Srygley has probably repeated twenty times

the statement: "The church is the body of Christ." But I ask: Which "body" is he talking about? Is it the local church? He says there is "no other in the New Testament organized for religious work or worship." Or is it the big church, which he says includes all Christians? This big church seems to me to be the one that he is talking about; but it never has any "religious work or worship," and I have my doubts about Christ being the head of such a church. All Christians are not in any local church, and our friend is therefore obliged to invent his big, universal church as a place to hold all Christians. But this big body is only for convenience. It never can work or worship; hence the necessity for the local churches to do that. What is your big church for, Brother Srygley? What good does it do? Who can get any good out of it? Who is in it? Are you in it? How do you know you are? Am I in it? Tell me how I can find out. If I am in it, I notify you now that I want to get out of it; for it was clearly an accident that I got in. I did not know it, and did not intend it, and do not yet know it, and do not believe you know it. I want my membership in a church that has "religious work and worship," and you frankly tell me the local church is the only organization in the New Testament that can do this. So I say frankly that I do not intend to get in, nor stay in, your ghostly nothing, that serves neither God nor man, and does neither good nor bad.

But there is another beauty in this dreamy theology I wish to notice. In answer to query 12, Brother Srygley says:

A man can not scripturally get into two churches, because there is but one church in the Scriptures for him to get into.

Please note the sentence: "But one church in the New Testament for him to get into." Now we read a few scriptures in the light of that sentence: "Then had the churches rest." (Acts 9: 31.) "Confirming the churches." (Acts 15: 41.) "Churches were established." (Acts 16: 5.) "Neither robbers of churches." (Acts 19: 37.) "Churches give thanks." (Rom. 16: 4.) "The churches of Christ salute you." (Rom. 16: 16.) "In all churches." (I Cor. 7: 17.) "No such custom, neither the churches of God." (I Cor. 11: 16.) "Keep silence in the churches." (I Cor. 14: 34.) "The churches of Asia." (I Cor. 16: 19.) "The churches of Macedonia." (II Cor. 8: 1.) "Chosen of the churches." (II Cor. 8: 19.) "Messengers of the churches." (II Cor. 8: 23.) Now in the very face of these numerous references to numerous churches, Brother Srygley asserts that there was "but one church in the New Testament for him to get into." Then who were in these churches? Who were in the "seven churches of Asia"? How did they get in? Were all the seven churches just one church? Then why did the Spirit say there were seven? Does the Spirit say they were all one church? No, sir; Srygley says that. Does Srygley say there were seven churches into which people could enter? No, sir; the Spirit says that, and Srygley denies it by saying there was but "one church" into which people could enter. Is any reader so blind as not to see the utter absurdity of such teaching?

But the beauties (?) of this system of error have not all been seen yet. Brother Srygley teaches, in his answer to query 6, that Baptists may be Christians, and thus be in the big body, and says, further: "He [a Bap-

tist] could not join the one body, because he is already in it." Very well. Baptists are in this big church. They are as complete deadheads in it as any one else, I suppose, for it can neither do "religious work nor worship." In fact, the Baptists are so completely in the thing already that they could not join if they wanted to. In answer to query 6, Brother Srygley also says the Methodists and Campbellites (the Christians among them) are also in this big church. Baptists, Methodists, and Campbellites, all in "the one body—the church!" And, of course, they all were added by that wonderful "process." Behold the majesty of the "body" over which Elder Srygley places Christ as "Head," and out of which no one can be saved! Now I ask if the "Christians" among the Baptists, Methodists, and Campbellites, who are said to constitute this big church, can worship God in that big church. Have they any scriptural right to belong to this big church? For an answer, I refer to Brother Srygley's second article, where I find these words: "No Christian has any scriptural authority to belong to or work through any denominational institution or ecclesiastical organization bigger than an assembly." This "big church" to which he says all "Christians" belong is "bigger than an assembly," and, according to Srygley, "no Christian has any scriptural authority to belong to or work through it;" yet he has a patent "process" that unconsciously and inevitably puts all of us into it at the same time it saves us, so that we could not afterwards "join it" if we wanted to—and all of the whole thing without "scriptural authority," and no "religious work or worship" in it after we are thus kidnaped into it! **In the name of the dear Lord, do let me get out**

of it, if I am in it; for I most solemnly avow that I have no respect on earth for a thing that has caught me unawares in its "unscriptural authority," and holds me where I can perform neither "religious work nor worship." Reader, did you ever hear of anything more ridiculous?

But look again at this monstrous invention. Srygley says all the Christians among the Baptists, Methodists, Campbellites, and the balance of the world, are in this big church, "the one body," of which Christ is the Head. This "body" has in it the doctrines of close communion **vs.** open communion, final perseverance **vs.** apostasy, infant baptism **vs.** the baptism of believers, affusion for baptism **vs.** immersion, episcopacy **vs.** congregationalism, baptismal regeneration **vs.** spiritual regeneration, unconditional election **vs.** free moral agency, and every other conceivable distinction of faith that goes to make up the religious vagaries of Christendom; but all these things are believed and taught by "Christians," and all "Christians" are in this big body, and Christ is said to be "head over it." No wonder Brother Srygley says, in answer to query 5: "It is confused by denominational Babylon, and not in scriptural order." I should say as much. Can it have Christ over it as "head" when "confused" and "not in scriptural order"? Is he the "head" of an unscriptural confusion? Is that the thing that saves us? Is that the "body of Christ" we have to be in or be lost? If you can think of an enormous beast, as high as the sun, as deep as the bottomless pit, as boundless as space, as incomprehensible as the milky way; its head a lion, its neck a lamb, its right fore foot a kid, its left fore foot a hyena; its body a combination

of serpents, insects, birds, and babies; its right hind foot a bear, its left hind foot a fawn, and its tail a venomous scorpion whose sting is death to itself—if you can think of such a devouring, destroying, monstrous beast, every part mutually and voraciously consuming every other part until there is not a vestige of itself left, you will have an exact picture of this great, big, universal, confused, disorganized, invisible, intangible, incomprehensible, nonsensical, ridiculous nothing, that you could not join if you wanted to, and yet you got in it and did not know it, and still do not know that you are in it, and you do not know who else is in it, and if everybody was in it they could neither do “religious work nor worship” in it, and those who are in it are “confused” and “not in scriptural order”! Do, Brother Srygley, let me get out of this “one body,” if I am in it. Can you tell me if it has me fast? I most seriously assure you that the man must be crazy or an infidel who will charge the blessed Son of God with being the “head” of such a monstrous “body,” or who will assert that such a conglomerate mess constitutes “the church, which is his body,” and out of which no one can be saved. I am awfully glad to know that this whole ridiculous dream is but a denominational phantom, invented from the pit as an excuse for the human substitutes men have invented to take the place of the local assemblies, the divinely constituted churches of Jesus Christ. I am glad I do not have to believe such puerile stuff in order to be saved. God’s word does not have one single sentence in it to indicate such doctrine as Brother Srygley seeks to foist upon us as his dreamland hobby, and in which he amasses a stock of contradictions such as I never saw equaled.

In truth, the brother is as badly "confused" as is his "one body" in Nashville. As a sample of his confusion, I group some of his statements: 1. "When one is in 'the one body,' he does not have to unite with some local church." 2. "It is as much a man's duty to belong to a local church as it is his duty to be a Christian. He can not be a Christian and not belong to the church, and he can not belong to the church and not belong to the local church where he lives." Smack! he slaps himself in the face. 3. "No Christian has any scriptural authority to belong to or work through any ecclesiastical organization bigger than an assembly." 4. "There is this one body in Nashville (composed of the Christians among the Baptists, Methodists, and Campbellites), but it is confused by denominational Babylon, and not in scriptural order." 5. Yet he says the "eunuch and Lydia did not belong to the local churches where they lived, because there were no local churches there"; and by statement No. 2 he has them lost. Those in the "big church" are without "scriptural order"; those in the "little churches" can not be saved unless they get into the "big church"; and those in the "little churches" can not join the "big church" for the reason they are "already in it." But why should I not spare my friend? He is hopelessly swamped already. He could not prove his proposition from the Bible to save his life. Its absurdity is so apparent that all his friends will be ashamed of his weakness in his effort to maintain it. Not an argument or a scripture so far to sustain his dream!

But, on another line, he seems to be frantic in his desire to have everybody "come out of Babylon, and be simply Christians, and belong to 'the one body -- the



church.'” That is a plaintive appeal. It seems a pity to puncture this bubble also, but I must do it. I must say that the “one body” business has already been made ridiculous in the light of reason and scripture. I now say that the idea of being “only a Christian” is of the same sort. Take Baptists, for instance. Baptists are simply and only “Christians.” They are “nothing else.” To be a “Christian” is to be a follower of Christ. When a Baptist trusts God, he is a Christian; when he is baptized, he is still a Christian, just a step in advance of his condition as a believer; when he puts his light on a candlestick, joins a Baptist church, he is still a Christian, but just a step in advance of his baptism; when he sits scripturally at the Lord’s table, he is yet a Christian, but a step in advance of his membership; when he is faithful unto death, he is still a Christian, an advancing Christian, and he has also been a Baptist at every step. Every scriptural step is a Baptist step and a Christian step. A believer is a Baptist as far as he has gone; a baptized believer is a Baptist as far as he has followed the Scriptures. So with every step. Baptists are “only Christians,” nothing else. They belong to “the body of Christ,” nothing else. They meet the demand. Of course Brother Srygley has a right to speak for the Campbellites, and I agree with him that they should forsake their denominational Babylon and be “Christians only,” which is another way of saying they should be Baptists. The Campbellites are the worst confused and the most completely environed sectarians in the land. Their denominationalism is a sin, and I do not blame Srygley for repudiating it and trying to get out of it. But Campbellism, pure and simple, is a sight better than

that great, big bundle of nonsense he is trying to tack on to Christ as a head; and if he is determined to do no better, he might as well stay with his Campbellite brethren.

Space forbids an extended comment I have in mind on this word "Christian." The use of it that is made by Brother Srygley and his denomination is a begging of the question. When a man insists that I must refer to him as an "honest man" every time I call his name, I am sure to suspect he is a conscience-smitten thief; and when the Campbellites demand of me that I shall always refer to them as "Christians," I am at once impressed with the thought that they are conscience-troubled sinners, and I never comply with the demand.

I have begged and defied the brother to make a logical deduction that would connect his proposition and any single scripture together; but up to this time he has not dared to risk such a test; but he does use a "therefore" by merely repeating his proposition and assuming the point. In the two principal points of his logic he forgets to mention either his "one body" or his "process," and yet reaches his "Therefore no one can be a Christian and not belong to the church." Shades of Whatley! But I would ask: Which "church" must he belong to—his big one or his little one? He had the eunuch and Lydia saved outside of the little church, but said all Christians must be in the local churches where they lived or they could not be saved.

The apostles and early disciples were saved, were they not, Brother Srygley? They were baptized; they had received your "process." Did that "process" save them like you say it saves people now? Did it at the

same time add them to "the one body—the church"? You know that the Campbellites teach that there was no church until on Pentecost, and that was some time after this "process" had gone into operation. Now I am curious to know if the "process" added the apostles and disciples to "the one body—the church." If not, why not? If you say it did not, you surrender your proposition; if you say it did, you surrender the pet dogma of Campbellism that asserts that the church was organized on Pentecost. Which one do you give up, Brother Srygley? Will you tell us how the apostles and disciples got into "the one body," if the process did not put them in?

In Luke 7: 47 we find a woman "whose sins are forgiven"; but she was not baptized, nor is she added to the church. Will you tell us how she was saved?

In Mark 2 we read of a paralytic whose sins are forgiven; but he did not have your "process," neither was he in "the one body—the church." Can you tell us how he got the blessing?

Then there are the thief on the cross, and the justified publican, and praying Cornelius, and repenting Saul, and the thousands on Pentecost, and five thousand a few days after who believed, but could not receive the "process" because they hurried off the preachers to the lockup; but they were justified, received the Spirit, were receiving the word gladly, all without any "process" and without being added to "the one body." How was all this done, Brother Srygley?

But I must state a few plain propositions and close:

I. If there is any such a thing as Srygley's "big church," it is neither for "work nor worship," he being

judge. Praying, singing, preaching, communing, baptizing have no part or lot in it. It can not even work the "process." It would be ridiculous to talk of such an arrangement as Christ's body.

2. Disorganized particles of matter can not constitute a body. Bricks and stones are frequently wrought into organic structures, called buildings; but all the bricks in the world do not constitute one great, big brick; neither do all the buildings in the world constitute one great, big, universal building, outside of which there are no buildings. Republicans may constitute a republican government; but all the republicans in the world, scattered promiscuously throughout kingdoms, empires, monarchies, etc., do not constitute one great, big, republican party, outside of which there are no republicans. Masons may constitute a lodge or lodges; but all the Masons in the world do not constitute one great, big Masonic lodge, out of which there are no Masons. So God's people may constitute a church or churches; but all of God's people in the world do not constitute one great, big church, out of which there are no children of God. The very idea is ridiculous.

3. If there is a great, big church, out of which there is no salvation, then Christ has two kinds of churches—one big and many little ones. One kind has preaching, singing, prayer, work, and worship; while the other kind of a church—his big church—has none of these things. How absurd!

4. If, in addition to the local churches (whose existence Brother Srygley concedes), there is a great, big church, out of which no one can be saved, then the same individual may have membership in two churches at the

same time. In one he may work and worship, and in the other he may hold open communion and apostatize, I suppose.

5. If there is a big church, it must include immersed Mormons, Unitarians, Catholics, Presbyterians, Methodists, Campbellites, and every other sort. They are all full-fledged members in this imaginary hallucination, while at the same time they are all O. K. with their respective denominations. Such a conglomerate mess would make angels weep if it had to be called Christ's body.

6. The members of this big church are not agreed as to how a man is to get into it. Some say we are born into it; some, baptized into it; some say we have been eternally in it; some say we enter by the law of Moses; some, by the consecration of the bishop; some say we are sinners until we get in, and some say we are sinners after we do get in. Brother Srygley says his patent "process" puts all of us in so completely that we could not join the thing, if we wanted to. I have made up my mind to stay out of the monstrous invention until I can learn something more definite about it.

7. If this big church has any commission to the world, it can never fulfill it. If one of its ghostly preachers should brawl out his sepulchral doctrine to an ordinary congregation, there would not be even the sexton left to close the door when the preaching was done. And who would have the bony fingers of the invisible administrators fumbling around his neck and waist to baptize him? The thing is too ghostly for me.

8. There is no use for such a thing as Srygley's big church. It could not honor God nor bless mankind. It

is impractical, unscriptural, nonsensical, chimerical, and impossible.

9. There never was such a thing in heaven or on the earth as that big church. No angel ever spoke of it, no apostle ever dreamed of it, the Son of God never made it, no man ever saw it, and no man ever will see it. If anybody was ever in it, he did not know it, neither did any one else ever know it. It never did any good to anybody, and never will. It has no church record, no discipline, no list of its membership, no gospel, no ordinances, no work, no worship, no place in heaven, earth, or hell, except in the religious hallucinations of theological dreamers.

10. God's word never speaks of any church except a local assembly. I defy Brother Srygley to point out a passage in the Bible that has his patent "process" adding people to "the one body—the church," as he asserts in his proposition. He has not yet found a passage, and he never will. There are local churches in the New Testament, but there is no other sort, and never was. For these local churches I stand; to one of them I belong; their membership I love; they work and worship and honor their Lord; but I have profound contempt for the monstrous invention of men that seeks to take from Christ's bodies—his churches—the honor he conferred upon them. I resent such high-handed assumption with uncompromising antagonism.

I close with a few questions, an answer to each of which will help us to arrive at the real truth in the case:

1. If one is saved in the big church, why should he join a local church?

2. If he joins a local church, does he at the same time join the big church?
3. Are the local church and the big church the same?
4. Wherein do they differ?
5. What is the big church for?
6. What is the local church for?
7. Were the apostles in this big church?
8. Did the "process" add them to it?
9. When was the big church organized?
10. When did the apostles get into it?
11. Did the "publican," the "thief on the cross," the "paralytic that was healed," get into the big church?
12. Were these saved?
13. Is there any salvation out of the big church?
14. Was it in existence in Christ's day?
15. Was the "process" in operation during Christ's personal ministry on earth?
16. Did it add people to "the one body—the church"?
17. Does a man know he is in the big church?
18. How does he know it?
19. Do you know you are in it?
20. Can you tell if I am in?
21. Can you tell if any one else is in?
22. How can you tell it?
23. Do people have to be of one mind in the big church?
24. Do they have any sectarianism in it?
25. Is it a denomination?
26. Has it a name?
27. What is its name?
28. If you say it is "the church of Christ, which is his body," please prove that that refers to your big church.

29. You say you have this "one body" in Nashville, but it is in "confusion and scriptural disorder." Is "the one body" also able to save people when it is in "disorder"?

30. Can an "unscriptural" body be the body of which Christ is head?

Please answer and give us light on this dreamy church universal subject.

---

MR. SRYGLEY'S FOURTH ARTICLE.

Brother Hall's statement that I surrender the proposition and introduce another issue is not correct. He complained that I was hiding behind the word "process," and asked me to define the terms of my proposition. I complied with his request, explained what I meant by the word "process," and stated the issue without using that word. He says if he should grant that all Christians are in the church, it would not follow that "the same process which makes one a Christian adds him to the one body—the church." If a man can become a Christian without becoming a member of the church, those who have become Christians are not in the church till they are added to it, and all Christians are not, therefore, in the church. He says I do "not affirm that God saves sinners by a process," but that "the process itself not only does the saving of sinners, but also adds them to the church." This statement is not correct. I have told him plainly that I do "affirm that God saves sinners by a process," and that I do not affirm, and do not believe, that the process itself, without God, saves anybody



or adds anybody to the church. I have explained repeatedly, and now explain again, that by "process" I mean that which God requires to make one a Christian. I quoted several passages of scripture which speak of "one body," but he evades them by saying they do not speak of "the one body." If he wanted to affirm anything about the one body mentioned in those passages, how would he do it? Could he do it without referring to it as "the one body"? He says: "Everybody knows that the Campbellites are as truly a denomination as anybody." Suppose they are; what then? I am as strongly opposed to the "Campbellite denomination" as the Baptist denomination or any other denomination. All denominations are wrong. The New Testament condemns them all, and no Christian has any divine authority to belong to any of them. It was not Srygley, but Paul, who said the church is the body of Christ. "Head over all things to the church, which is his body." (Eph. 1: 22, 23.) "Even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the Savior of the body." (Eph. 5: 23.) "And he is the head of the body, the church." (Col. 1: 18.) "For his body's sake, which is the church." (Col. 1: 24.)

The only effort Brother Hall has made to meet these and other passages of the same kind is to say they refer to the local church. Well, suppose they do. The church is the body of Christ, even if it is the local church, and a man can not be a Christian and not belong to it unless he can be a Christian and not belong to the body of Christ. He says that "to make that statement true," I "must assume that Christ and the church are the same, and in answering question No. 18" I declare "they are not the same." His statement is not correct, because he

quotes only part of what I said in answering question No. 18. My answer to that question is: "Christ and his church are not the same thing. The church is the body, Christ is the head, and every Christian is a member of the body. Are the head and the body the same thing?" Because I said, "There is no organization but local bodies in the New Testament for religious work and worship, he says:

Therefore the one body — the church — to which he says his process adds a man at the same time it makes him a Christian. is not a church for religious work and worship. \* \* \* It is not for work nor worship. \* \* \* It neither works for God nor worships God. \* \* \* In which there is neither religious work nor worship. \* \* \* Neither works for God nor worships God. \* \* \* Does not work for God or worship God. \* \* \* It never has any religious work or worship. \* \* \* It never can work or worship. \* \* \* Serves neither God nor man, and does neither good nor bad. \* \* \* It can neither do religious work nor worship. \* \* \* No religious work or worship in it. \* \* \* Can perform neither religious work nor worship. \* \* \* Could neither do religious work nor worship in it. \* \* \* Neither for work nor worship, etc.

These and other expressions of the same kind are scattered through his whole article, and, with their contexts, they constitute a large per cent of all he says. When I dispose of them, therefore, there is little of his article left.

Every Christian belongs to the church, which is the body of Christ, because he is a Christian. No man can be a Christian and not belong to the church, unless he can be a Christian and not belong to the body of Christ, for the church is the body of Christ. Every Christian works for God and worships God as a member of the

church, which is the body of Christ, wherever he is; but Christians have no authority in the New Testament to form any "organization but local bodies for religious work and worship." For this reason all denominational and ecclesiastical organizations are wrong, and no Christian has any divine authority to belong to or work through any of them. A local congregation is not a denominational or ecclesiastical organization; neither is the church, which is the body of Christ, such an organization. There is no such denominational organization as Baptists have, for instance, in the New Testament—associations, district conventions, State conventions, general conventions, home societies, foreign societies, boards, secretaries, theological seminaries, etc. The New Testament idea is one body—the church—of which every Christian is a member and in which there is no organization but local congregations. The brother can not understand how there is but one body, if Lydia and the eunuch were in the one body, but belonged to no local congregation when they were baptized. Were Lydia and the eunuch members of the church when they were baptized? If they were not, then a man can be baptized and not belong to the church. If they were members of the church, then a man can be a member of the church and not belong to any local congregation. There was no local congregation there for them to belong to. They would have belonged to the local congregation because they were Christians, and therefore members of the one body—the church—if there had been any local congregation there. No man can be a member of the church without belonging to the church wherever he is. There is but one church in the New Testament for any one to

belong to. It is the body of Christ. A man who belongs to it at all belongs to it wherever he is and everywhere he goes. That church, or body, is the same in every locality, and what constitutes a man a member of it anywhere makes him a member of it everywhere he goes. There is no organization in it for religious work and worship but local congregations, and every local congregation is the same in organization, work, and worship. God requires every Christian to work and worship in and through the local congregation wherever he is and everywhere he goes because there is no other organization in the New Testament for any Christian to belong to or work and worship in and through. The same process which puts a man into what Brother Hall calls "the big church" puts him into the local church wherever he is and everywhere he goes. The conditions of membership in the church of God are the same everywhere. What makes a man a member anywhere constitutes him a member everywhere he goes. If a Christian is in a place where there is no local, New Testament organization, he is none the less a member of the church. As a Christian and member of the church, his duty is to work for God and worship God; but he must either form a local, New Testament organization or else work and worship without any organization, for the reason that the New Testament does not authorize any one to form or work and worship in and through any organization but a local congregation. Brother Hall would readily and easily understand this if I should say all Baptists, instead of all Christians, constitute the one body. He admits that all true Baptists of his kind are one body—one denomination—but argues, as I understand, that the New Testa-

ment authorizes no organization but local congregations, or churches, in that one body, or denomination, for religious work or worship. If he will widen his vision till the one body includes and consists of all Christians, instead of all Baptists, teach exactly what God requires people to do to become Christians, and then apply his reasoning to the destruction of all denominational institutions and organizations, leaving no organizations but local congregations for Christians to conduct religious work and worship in and through, he will have the exact New Testament idea.

Against the statement that "there is but one church in the Scriptures," Brother Hall quotes several passages of scripture which speak of "churches." All these passages refer to local congregations, of which there ought to be as many in the one church as there are different localities with Christians enough to constitute a local congregation. It is the one body—the church—composed of all Christians, with a local congregation or organization exactly the same in kind in every locality for religious work and worship. Each local congregation is the church, which is the body of Christ, in that locality. Brother Hall says: "If all the Christians among the Baptists, Methodists, Campbellites, and the balance of the world, are in this big church, the one body," then this body has in it the doctrines of every "conceivable distinction of faith that goes to make up the religious vagaries of Christendom." He ignores or overlooks the fact that God rejects people for "religious vagaries." "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." (Matt. 15: 9.) Christians probably do not hold as many "religious vagaries" as he

supposes. Holding "religious vagaries" beyond all question causes God to regard people as vain worshipers, and not Christians. There is no doctrine in the church but the teaching of inspired men in the Holy Scriptures. How far God will bear with people who hold error before he regards them as vain worshipers, and not Christians, I do not know; but a man is a member of the church as long as God regards him a Christian. Why not? If men can hold "religious vagaries" and still be Christians, why can they not hold such vagaries and still be members of the church? Must a man be better than a Christian to belong to the church? A Christian is one whom Christ accepts. If Christ accepts a man, is he not good enough to be in the church? If Christ can stand all the "religious vagaries of Christendom," surely the church can endure them. Ought the church to be more exact and exacting than Christ? Brother Hall will admit that all Christians belong to Christ. Does a man have to be better to belong to the church than to belong to Christ? Is the church better than Christ? Brother Hall will admit that all Christians are in Christ. If a man is good enough to be in Christ, is he not good enough to be in the church? All Christians will go to heaven when they die. Is the church purer and better than heaven? Should a man be excluded from the church for that which will not keep him out of heaven? I admit that "religious vagaries" will exclude a man from the church; but it must be such vagaries as will make him a vain worshiper, and not a Christian, and will ultimately exclude him from heaven. Any vagaries a man can hold and be a Christian worthy of heaven, he can hold and be a member of the church.

Brother Hall describes "an enormous beast; . . . its head a lion, its neck a lamb," etc., as representing the one body — the church — over which Christ is the head, and in which every Christian is a member. In this he draws on his imagination to ridicule the New Testament. Every member of the body of Christ—the church—is a Christian, and every Christian is a member of the body. Does Brother Hall think one Christian is "a lion"; another, "a lamb"; another, "a kid"; another, "a hyena"; others, "a combination of serpents, insects, birds, and babies"; another, "a bear"; another, "a fawn"; and another, "a venomous scorpion whose sting is death to itself"? If not, his enormous beast is an enormous misrepresentation of his opinion of Christians. If this is his idea, he has peculiar opinions of Christians. The body of Christ is all Christians, and nothing but Christians. With all of his efforts at ridicule and denunciation, it is a fact that the New Testament says in several places, as plainly as words can say anything, that the church is the body of Christ. That may be a very absurd thing to Brother Hall, but no amount of ridicule and denunciation can change the fact that God said it.

Brother Hall says the man who would preach this doctrine "must be crazy or an infidel." The late Dr. John A. Broadus, of the Baptist Theological Seminary, of Louisville, Ky., who is a much better Baptist authority than Brother Hall, said:

In the New Testament the spiritual Israel, never actually assembled, is sometimes conceived of as an ideal congregation or assembly, and this is denoted by the word "ekklesia." So in Eph. 1: 22, and often throughout that Epistle; in Col. 1: 18, 24;

Heb. 12: 23, etc. This seems to be the meaning here. All real Christians are conceived of as an ideal congregation or assembly, and this is here described as a house or temple (Commentary on Matt. 16: 18.)

This is the word that is translated "church" and he cites the same passages I have repeatedly quoted in this discussion to prove that the church is the body of Christ, and every Christian is a member of it. Was he "crazy or an infidel"?

In *The Religious Herald* of April 27, 1899, Professor A. T. Robertson, of the Baptist Theological Seminary, quotes the same passages I have quoted to prove that the church is the body of Christ, and every Christian is a member of it, and says:

When I no longer believe in the universal spiritual church, my connection with the Seminary ceases; for I have sworn to teach it in signing the Seminary creed. (Art. XIV.)

Again, he says his position "rests on all Baptist creeds and scholars." Is he "crazy or an infidel"? Are "all Baptist creeds and scholars" crazy or infidels'?

*The Baptist and Reflector* says:

The word "church" is used in the New Testament one hundred and ten times; in ninety-two instances out of the one hundred and ten it refers to a local congregation; in the other cases it refers to a "spiritual body over which Christ is Head, and in which every Christian is a member." The trouble with the editor of *The Advocate* lies in confusing these two senses in which the word "church" is used in the New Testament. When used in the sense of the spiritual body, it is true that "the same process which makes one a Christian adds him to that body."

This is exactly the doctrine I affirm and Brother Hall denies on the point now at issue in this discussion. Is



the editor of *The Baptist and Reflector* "crazy or an infidel"?

Edward T. Hiscox, D.D., in 1868, published "The Baptist Directory: A Guide to the Doctrine and Practice of Baptist Churches." Before he published this book he claims that he submitted it to leading Baptists in various parts of the country, and they indorsed it. On the point at issue between me and Brother Hall, this high Baptist authority says:

Though the church is sometimes spoken of in distinction from the world as the church universal, embracing all the people of God everywhere, yet by "churches" are meant separate, visible congregations of Christians, disciples, etc. (Page 14.)

Are Edward T. Hiscox and leading Baptists in various parts of the country "crazy or infidels"?

*The Baptist Argus* says:

The Scriptures recognize two uses of the word—the local church and the general spiritual church. \* \* \* To speak of "the Baptist Church" as meant by our Lord in Matt. 16: 18 is an utter mixture of ideas. Either the spiritual church is there meant or some local church. To hold that when Christ said, "On this rock I will build my church," he meant local Baptist churches, is to put him in conflict with our polity. We do not believe he could ever have called our denomination a church. No local church has existed till now. It is the spiritual church of all the saved that is on the rock. No single denomination can monopolize the rock. No visible organization was meant, evidently, but the continuance of believers on earth. Not all church members are on the rock, but all true Christians are.

Here again is the doctrine I affirm, preached by higher Baptist authority than Brother Hall. Is the editor of *The Baptist Argus* "crazy or an infidel"?

A. Malone, who will probably admit he is as good

Baptist authority as Brother Hall, has preached the same doctrine in debate as follows:

In the debate at Epley, Ky., December 6-9, 1898, A. Malone, Baptist, admitted that the church of the New Testament includes and consists of all Christians. He read from the Philadelphia "Confession of Faith" to prove this proposition, and said the Baptists have been teaching this doctrine for two hundred and fifty years.—*F. B. Srygley.*

Is Brother Malone "crazy or an infidel"? Were the makers of the Philadelphia "Confession of Faith" "crazy or infidels"? Have the Baptists all been "crazy or infidels" for two hundred and fifty years?

The doctrine I affirm and Brother Hall denies is taught in a book of high authority among Baptists, entitled, "Ecclesiology: A Study of the Churches, by Edwin C. Dargan, Professor of Homiletics and of Ecclesiology in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky." This book is used as "a text-book from the Baptist point of view" in the Baptist Theological Seminary, and it is, therefore, standard Baptist authority. On the point at issue between me and Brother Hall, I quote as follows:

We come, then, to notice those few, but interesting, passages in which the word "church" is used, in its broadest sweep of meaning and denotes the whole body of true believers in Christ on earth and in heaven and in all ages. The two passages just mentioned may be taken as belonging here. It is interesting to notice that our Lord is reported as using the word only twice—in Matt. 16: 18 and 18: 17—in one place referring to the church universal; in the other, to the church local. This use of the word is found more especially in the Epistle to the Ephesians (1: 22; 3: 10, 21; 5: 23-32); it also occurs in Col. 1: 18, 24, and in Heb. 12: 23. It is remarkable that in the Epistle to the Ephesians, the word is used only in this general sense; but this coincides

with the view held of that Epistle, that it was addressed to no local church, but was a sort of circular letter to all the churches. The broad and wonderful sweep of the apostle's thought in this noble passage is remarkable. He says that Christ "is head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all," and in another place that "the many-colored wisdom of God was made known through the church"; and in beautiful language the church is described as the bride of Christ, whom he loved and sanctified and intends to present to himself without spot or wrinkle. \* \* \* As has appeared from the discussion of the passages, the church in the New Testament senses of the word is a local body of believers in Christ; and then, more generally, the collective number of professing Christians; and then, most generally of all, the sum total of all true believers everywhere. (Pages 33, 34.)

The passages cited in the foregoing excerpt to show that the church in the most general sense is "the sum total of all true believers everywhere" are exactly the same passages I have quoted repeatedly to establish the same proposition in discussion with Brother Hall and others. That these passages mean what I affirm and Brother Hall denies in this discussion is admitted by all competent Bible scholars, so far as I know. Is Professor Dargan "crazy or an infidel"? Are all the students and faculty of the Baptist Theological Seminary "crazy or infidels"?

Pendleton's "Church Manual, Designed for the Use of Baptist Churches," is standard Baptist authority. It says of the original word translated "church":

In every other place in the New Testament it is translated "church." In its application to the followers of Christ it refers either to a particular congregation of saints or to the redeemed in the aggregate. It is employed in the latter sense in Eph. 1:22; 3:21; 5:25, 27. \* \* \* In those passages and a few more like

them it would be absurd to define the term "church" as meaning a particular congregation of Christians meeting in one place for the worship of God.

This is the doctrine I affirm and Brother Hall denies, and this standard Baptist authority quotes the same passages I have quoted to prove that the church is the body of Christ, and includes and consists of "the redeemed in the aggregate." Are Pendleton and all the Baptists who indorse his Manual "crazy or infidels"?

In a recent issue of his paper Brother Hall frankly admits the weight of authority is against him, as follows:

*The Flag* does not believe for one minute in this late invisible or universal church idea for which *The Baptist Argus*, the Louisville Seminary, and all Campbellites and pedobaptists contend.

Are *The Baptist Argus*, the Louisville Seminary, and all "Campbellites" and pedobaptists "crazy or infidels"?

Brother Hall's fight in this discussion is with the New Testament and standard Baptist authorities. I am merely acting as moderator.

Brother Hall says: "Baptists are simply and only Christians." Then why call them Baptists? Strange that it takes some other word than "Christian" to designate people who are "simply and only Christians." If Baptists were simply and only Christians, no man could be a Christian and not be a Baptist. There is some difference between Baptists and Christians, else no man could be either without being both.

As to the brother's questions:

"1. If one is saved in the big church, why should he join a local church?" *A man who belongs to the church is a member of the local church wherever he is.*

"2. If he joins a local church, does he at the same time join the big church?" *When a man becomes a member of the church, he becomes a member of the local church wherever he is.*

"3. Are the local church and the big church the same?" *The church is the body of Christ; the local church is the body of Christ in the locality designated.*

"4. Wherein do they differ?" *See answer to question 3.*

"5. What is the big church for?" *The church is the body of Christ, every Christian is a member of it, and there is no organization in it but local congregations.*

"6. What is the local church for?" *See answer to question 5.*

"7. Were the apostles in this big church?" *The apostles were in the church from the time it began.*

"8. Did the 'process' add them to it?" *God added them to it.*

"9. When was the big church organized?" *There is no such expression as the "church organized" in the New Testament. "Beginning at Jerusalem." (Luke 24: 47.) 'As on us at the beginning.' (Acts II: 15.)*

"10. When did the apostles get into it?" *When it began.*

"11. Did 'the publican,' 'the thief on the cross,' 'the paralytic that was healed,' get into the big church?" *No.*

"12. Were these saved?" *The Bible does not say they were saved.*

"13. Is there any salvation out of the big church?" *There is no salvation out of the church since the church began, because the church is the body of Christ, and there is no salvation out of Christ.*

"14. Was it in existence in Christ's day?" *No.*

"15. Was the 'process' in operation during Christ's personal ministry on earth?" *People were not saved during Christ's personal ministry on the same conditions on which they are saved now.*

"16. Did it add people to 'the one body—the church'?" *See answer to question 9.*

"17. Does a man know he is in the big church?" *Yes.*

"18. How does he know it?" *The same way he knows he is a Christian.*

"19. Do you know you are in it?" *Yes.*

"20. Can you tell if I am in it?" *No.*

"21. Can you tell if any one else is in?" *No.*

"22. How can you tell it?" *The same way I can tell he is a Christian. Men sometimes deceive us, and we can not tell, therefore, beyond the possibility of mistake, that any man is a Christian and a member of the church.*

"23. Do people have to be of one mind in the big church?" *God requires them to be; but, against God's requirement, there were contentions, divisions, and strife among Christians in the church in New Testament times.*

"24. Do they have any sectarianism in it?" *God condemns sectarianism in the church, but all Christians do not always obey God in all things.*

"25. Is it a denomination?" *No.*

"26. Has it a name?" *Yes.*

"27. What is its name?" *The church, which is his body.*

"28. If you say it is 'the church of Christ, which is his body,' please prove that that refers to your big church." *Proof: The Baptist and Reflector, Professor Robertson, "all Baptist creeds and scholars," Dr.*

*Broadus, Pendleton's "Manual," The Baptist Argus, Professor Dargan, the Baptist Theological Seminary, A. Malone, the "Philadelphia Confession of Faith," the teaching of Baptists for two hundred and fifty years, and, in fact, any first-class Baptist authority. See quotations from Baptist authorities in this book.*

"29. You say you have this 'one body' in Nashville, but it is in 'confusion and scriptural disorder.' Is the 'one body' able to save people when it is in 'disorder'?" *God is able to save to the utmost all who put their trust in him, regardless of the disorder in the one body.*

"30. Can an 'unscriptural body' be the body of which Christ is the head?" *No; but the body which includes and consists of all Christians, and none but Christians, is not an unscriptural body, though it may be in an unscriptural order.*

---

#### MR. HALL'S FOURTH REPLY.

It has been apparently a peculiar pleasure to Brother Srygley to refer to our correspondence in this debate in such a way as to impress his readers that I felt to have a big job on my hands; in fact, I think some of them got the idea that I had been really knocked out by the first two articles Brother Srygley wrote. But all such readers have had ample time to disabuse their minds of such an impression, and many of them probably feel like a Campbellite acquaintance said to me recently: "I really believe it would have paid Brother Srygley to be a little more tardy with his articles, and he could have possibly made them stronger." Suffice it to say that I have prepared

these articles under a great stress of work, and the constant care of an invalid wife, and have taken my own time to complete the task, because I had entered into no agreement to have them ready by any given time. I am now penning the last of the series while I watch beside the sickbed of my loved companion, who is rapidly passing out into the beyond; and I most confidently send it forth in the assurance that my contention against Brother Srygley's proposition is just and true.

In a self-reliant and boastful manner Elder Srygley vaunted before the public his new hobby, which, according to his own ideas and tastes, he put into the form of a proposition, and persistently challenged any one to deny it. Never did a peacock display his plumage with greater delight than did Elder Srygley parade his patent "process." With him it appeared that there was little else in religion; it seemed qualified to do the whole work—both to save a man and to add him to the church.

As I had some doubts about the working of that "process," I timidly (?) and hesitatingly (?) accepted the challenge, and determined to examine that wonderful "process," to ascertain just what there was in it. So Brother Srygley very confidently put his affirmation into the following words: "The same process that makes one a Christian, adds him to the one body—the church." Of course I expected the brother to define his proposition so as to make his issue clear. All skilled debaters seek to do this, and are required to do it, in the interest of truth and fairness; but for some reason Brother Srygley failed at this point, and has continued to fail all the way through, though I have repeatedly asked him to give us a succinct statement of just what his "process" is, and



how it operates in saving people and adding them to the church at the same time. Can the reader imagine why the brother should be so shy of this very proper analysis of his question? My guess is, that he was afraid of the consequences.

The reader will also note that Brother Srygley has not so much as repeated his proposition since his first article. He seemed not only to be afraid of it, but ashamed of it, as well. He has quoted many scriptures, and multiplied his assertions enormously, but not one single time has he ever tried to get his proposition and proof together. The truth is, he left his proposition with its simple statement, in his first article, and has been dodging, hiding, and discussing all sorts of propositions, with the apparent intention of getting everybody away from that awkward, unscriptural proposition. Yea, more: Brother Srygley really abandoned and surrendered the proposition he started to defend, and gave us altogether another one, and before he had time to square himself for the issue on the second one, he changed again to a third proposition. We have had four articles each in this discussion, and Brother Srygley has been on three distinct propositions, besides numerous other questions that have no relation whatever to any of the propositions. He began in his first article with this affirmation:

1. The same process that makes one a Christian adds him to the one body — the church.

I wrote a reply to that, and in the third article Brother Srygley changed his issue to the following:

2. Does the church include and consist of all the saved? I say it does. Brother Hall says it does not. This is the issue.

In this proposition the original issue is left out of the contention, for there is no mention of a "process" saving any one or adding them to the church. I pressed Brother Srygley so hard on the idea that he had a mere "process" acting as a Savior, that in his last article he again charged his affirmation to the following:

3. I do affirm that God saves sinners by a process.

In this he leaves out both his former propositions and merely assumes that God saves sinners by some sort of a process, and to find out what that process is he makes no attempt—merely quotes some scriptures that would seem to indicate by his use of them that he thought God's process was to save sinners by baptism. But he doesn't believe that himself.

Here we have a champion controversialist dodging about over three propositions, inside of four articles, and without taking time to define either one of them, or to make one single argument in support of either one of them. What is the matter with you, Brother Srygley?

Yet, he begins his last article by saying that my charge that he had changed his proposition was incorrect. The readers will judge of that, as it is in black and white.

I also made a strenuous effort to get Brother Srygley to apply some of his scriptures to his proposition, but utterly failed. Not one single time has he tried to show a connection between his assumption and his scriptures. I begged him to take any single scripture, or any number of them, and show that his idea was in the passage; but he never did try it. He has truly quoted many scriptures, but he has not applied one of them to the case in hand. What advantage is it to a man in court to have a thou-

sand witnesses, if not a single one bears testimony on the case in hand? So it is with the scriptures. A man could reproduce the entire Bible, but if no single passage says a word on the subject we discuss it fails to be any proof on that point. Many scriptures speak of the church as Christ's body. I believe that; I do not pretend to deny it. But what sort of a church is it that is Christ's body? Is it a great, big, universal church comprehending thousands of little churches, or bodies, and all considered together as one body? No; a thousand times no. There never was any such a "body," and there never was any such a "church." I can speak confidently on that point, because Brother Srygley has utterly failed to quote a single passage from God's word that speaks of such a body, or church; in fact, he admits that the only real church we have in the Bible is the local church, and it is not universal nor invisible. So I take my stand within these local churches and say Christ is the Head of every one of them; and every one of them constitutes a business-doing body, under his Headship. I know I am safe inside the local church, Brother Srygley being the judge, for there was such a thing in Scripture times. Now, every passage of scripture that speaks of the church as Christ's body I heartily accept, and apply it to the church, the local church, to which it was addressed, and have no draft on my imagination as I try to idealize the church into a great, big, intangible, inconceivable something, that is good for nothing in heaven, earth, or hades. So I claim every passage in the Bible that mentions the church as a body as referring to the particular local church addressed; and as Brother Srygley has failed to show a

single one had a different meaning, he loses his proposition entirely.

Besides, if I should grant his spiritual, invisible, universal church, his proposition would not be established. Why, I can admit all he claims from the scriptures, and yet his question would not be proved. He says in his proposition: "The same process that makes one a Christian adds him to the one body—the church." Suppose I grant there is one body, and that all Christians are in it, would it follow that the same process that saved them added them to the church? Of course not. They may have been saved by repentance and faith, and added by baptism to the church. One "process" may save a man, and another "process" add him to the church, so far as any argument of Srygley's goes to show. The truth is, he has missed his mark entirely, and has been talking at random on anything that came in his way.

Now, in this controversy two issues should have been clearly prominent: (1) That all of God's people, in heaven and earth, constitute "the one body of Christ—the church"; (2) that the making of a man a Christian, or child of God, at the same time makes him a member of this "one body, or church." But—I say it deliberately—Brother Srygley has not quoted one single passage of scripture, nor made one single argument, that sustains either point. As to the first point, he concedes that God's children did not belong to "the one body, the church," until after Pentecost, for the reason there was no church before that time. So he has God's people without a chance of salvation for four thousand years of the world's history; for, be it remembered, he now teaches that men can not be saved unless they are in this big church, and

as there was no church then into which they could be inducted by a process, it follows that they were all lost. If he says people could then be saved through Christ without a church, then I say people can now be saved through Christ without a church, and for that reason his entire argument falls to the ground.

Besides, not one single scripture has been quoted by Brother Srygley that makes mention of this "big church." He is not to blame for this omission, however, because there is no scripture he can quote on that point. He would have produced it if it could have been found. The church is referred to as "Christ's body," but this is true of every gospel church. He is the "Head" and every gospel church is subject to his authority, so as to make it proper for Paul to use the familiar analogy of "head" and "body." But no church sustains the relation to Christ that would make the church Christ's actual body, and make Christ its actual Head, in such a literal sense as my head and my body are joined together. Any such a literalizing of these figures of speech would be gross materialism, and a palpable perversion of the Scriptures. When Elder Srygley so frequently repeats that "If one can be saved without being in the church, he can be saved without being in Christ, for the reason the church is the body of Christ," he exhibits his materialistic idea of these scriptures. But the New Testament idea is that each church of Christ is under his authority, as a body is under the authority of its head, and he is thus Head over every such church, and every such church is his business-doing body as an organization. But to enter one of these bodies is not to enter Christ, for the body, as such, is not Christ, nor any part of Christ. Judas

entered the church, but he did not enter Christ; Demetrius was in the church, but not in Christ; the false apostles of II Peter and of Revelation were in the churches, but they were not in Christ; so, also, "the other sheep" of John 10 were in Christ, but not in the fold, the church. Those John commanded to "come out of Babylon" were the Lord's people; they were in Christ, but not in the church. Thus we see that to be in Christ is one thing, and to be in the church is altogether another thing. It follows, therefore, that the "process that makes one a Christian" does not "add him to the one body—the church." It also follows that there is no great, big body into which people are inducted by this newly-invented "process"; for if there was, there could be no unconverted people in "the body, the church"; and there could be no converted people out of "the body, the church"; when, in fact, we find unconverted people in the church in the New Testament, and also find converted people out of the church, and in Babylon, in New Testament times. Surely, surely, I need not press the matter further. It seems to me—and I speak it modestly—that if there ever was an utter demolition of a proposition, we have it in the case of Brother Srygley's poor, pitiful, abandoned affirmation.

But there is one little nook into which our friend has run for refuge, and I must see what there is in it. He thinks he finds some "better" Baptists than I am who agree with him about that great, big, monstrous "church." He really seems to take comfort in this thought, and I grant that it does look cruel not to allow him this poor defense; but I want to teach Brother Srygley, and all his school of dreamers, a lesson never to be forgotten on

this question. He and some of his sort have been riding this hobby so long that they need to "right about," and believe the truth a while.

Suppose I should grant that each Baptist quoted by Brother Srygley means by the quotation just what Srygley means in his proposition. Would that prove his proposition to be true? Are the Campbellites ready to believe any special point to be true just because some Baptists believe it? The very best that could be said from such an argument would be that all Baptists do not have the same view of the matter. The question as to which one is right in his view would still be to settle. Now, I don't presume to be wise and great like Drs. Broadus and Hiscox and Dargan; but I think I may, without reflecting on their wisdom or greatness, modestly say that neither one of these men is infallible in judgment. They are liable, therefore, to be mistaken; and, too, there is a bare possibility that I, myself, feeble and weak as I am, might stumble on the infallible truth, when they might possibly miss it. Is this not true? It most clearly follows, then, that in case of an issue between myself and these brethren, it would not necessarily follow that I would be wrong, and they be right; hence the insinuations made by the brother in his comparisons do not settle the issue.

But, as a matter of fact, I emphatically deny that Broadus and others cited agree with Srygley's proposition; I deny that they give any testimony at all for his support in this contention. Now, reader, please bear in mind the proposition. It reads: "The same process that makes one a Christian at the same time adds him to the one body—the church." That is the proposition I deny.

Now look back over his quotations, and you will find but one of the whole lot that even refers to the issue between us, the one from *The Baptist and Reflector*. The issue we have under discussion is not in the mind of a single writer he quotes. How, then, can he prove his proposition by what they say? He can no more do it than he can prove it by the Bible, and every reader of this discussion knows he has utterly failed to prove it from that source.

But the reader may say: "These writers speak of a great spiritual, universal body, and this you deny." Well, let's see what they say about it. Have they expressed Srygley's notion about it? Do they really believe there is any such a body, as an actual fact? We will examine Dr. Broadus first. He says:

In the New Testament the spiritual Israel, never actually assembled, is sometimes conceived of as an ideal congregation or assembly, and this is denoted by the word "ekklesia." \* \* \* All real Christians are conceived of as an ideal congregation or assembly, and this is here described as a house or temple.

Please remember that Brother Srygley is trying to prove that "the same process that makes one a Christian adds him to the one body—the church." But Dr. Broadus does not say one word about the "process," nor "the one body," nor "adding to" any body, nor about "making Christians," nor anything else that Srygley affirms. There is neither a thought, idea, nor suggestion in the quotation that is in Srygley's affirmation, and Srygley does not bring his "therefore" to connect the quotation with the proposition, any more than he did to connect the scriptures he quoted with his proposition. So I am safe in saying **that** whatever else Broadus



taught, he did not teach that "the same process that makes one a Christian adds him to the one body—the church."

But what does Dr. Broadus teach? He says: "The spiritual Israel never actually assembled." Well, then, it was never an actual assembly, was it? Dr. Broadus says it never was actually collected together. How, then, can he call it an *ekklesia*? That word always means an assembly. He answers: "It is sometimes conceived of as an ideal congregation or assembly." Again, he says: "All real Christians are conceived of as an ideal congregation or assembly." The thing never did "assemble," Dr. Broadus says, and hence the whole invisible church business is merely a mental conception, an ideal congregation, that exists only in the brain. What does the word "ideal" mean? "Ideal—intellectual, mental, visionary, fanciful, imaginary, unreal, impracticable, utopian." (Webster.) There it is. The great Dr. Broadus tells us that the great, big church we have been reading about is a mere "mental, visionary, fanciful, imaginary, unreal, impracticable, utopian" conception, that never did actually assemble, and therefore never was actually a church. Yet, Srygley parades Broadus as being a great Baptist authority that believed in his great, big church, out of which no one can be saved! Srygley, Dr. Broadus says the thing is just a visionary, mental conception, and has no real being at all. Don't you think the man that would try to make Broadus indorse your great, big nothing, as though it was something, is "either crazy or an infidel"? Broadus is all right, but what of you?

Another great Baptist authority quoted by Srygley is Edward T. Hiscox. I grant you that he is good

authority, and his opinion is entitled to much credit. He is quoted by Srygley as follows:

Though the church is sometimes spoken of in distinction from the world as the church universal, embracing all the people of God, everywhere, yet by churches are meant separate visible congregations of Christians, disciples, etc.

Please remember, reader, that Srygley ought to be trying to prove his proposition, which says: "The same process that makes one a Christian at the same time adds him to the one body—the church." But Dr. Hiscox doesn't say a word about any of that. So, whatever else he may say he does not give one grain of comfort to Srygley's proposition. Now let us look to see if he even believes in Srygley's big church as being anything more than a mental conception, a practical nonentity.

I quote above all that Srygley quoted, but it was his misfortune not to quote quite enough. Please note what Dr. Hiscox does say:

In the "Christian sense" the word "ekklesia" has a two-fold signification in the New Testament: (1) It is used in its primary and literal sense, to designate a visible, local congregation of Christian disciples, meeting for worship, instruction, and service; (2) it is used in a secondary and figurative sense, to designate the invisible, universal company, including all of God's true people on earth and in heaven.

Surely that is a stronger statement than Srygley quoted. But, please notice, that is not Hiscox's personal view of the matter. He says this is the "Christian sense," and puts it in quotation marks. Now let me give you what Hiscox himself believes about it. As a conclusion to the above he says:

There is, then, the visible, local church, and the invisible, universal church. In the latter case (in the invisible, universal

church) the word represents a conception of the mind, having no real existence in time or place, and not a historical fact, being only an ideal multitude without organization, without action, and without corporate being. (Church Directory, page 24.)

Again he says, on page 26:

There is no such thing as a universal church on earth embraced in one grand communion.

Now, how do you like Hiscox? No, he is not "crazy," nor an "infidel"; but the man that tries to make him favor Srygley's proposition in this debate must be "either crazy or an infidel." Dr. Hiscox and Dr. Broadus both tell us that this "universal, invisible church" fad is a mere hallucination, a mental conception, "having no real existence in time or place, and not a historical fact, being only an ideal multitude without organization, without action, without corporate being." Is that the thing you say we must all get into if we are saved, Srygley? Is that "Christ's body" you have been telling us about? "A mental conception, having no real existence in time or place, and not a historical fact!" That is what Dr. Hiscox says, and he is one of your own witnesses. Will you stand by your guns, Srygley? If you do, then I have demonstrated that the only "body of Christ" in which you say we can be saved is no real body at all. It is nothing. It has no "real existence in time or place," and is not even a "historical fact"—is a mere "mental conception," a "utopian" idea, a hallucination of your brain. Do you think you can prove to me that I have got to get into such an infinite vacuum in order to be saved? Pshaw! The man that believes such stuff "must be crazy or an infidel." Broadus and Hiscox don't believe it. They are too nearly walking on the lines of Baptist truth to

consider this universal church hallucination as anything else than a mere dream, a utopian imagination. They know, and so does everybody else, that it has no real "existence in time or place," and is not a "historical fact." Then let the thing go to the moles and bats, where all hobgoblins ought to be. I want a church that is something, and that has a place, a time, a history, and can be something and do something. You offer me a mere travesty, a burlesque, a mockery, a nothing, in this universal church, this great, big "one body," and I indignantly spurn your mockery of my desire. You fail to even give me a stone for the bread I ask, or a serpent for the fish I crave. You give me nothing! Get out with your dream that has not reality, and never can have!

Brother Srygley quotes at length from Professor Dargan. I do not have Dr. Dargan's book, so I wrote him a private letter, making a statement of Srygley's proposition, and asking him if anything he had ever written could be fairly construed as favoring that proposition. I quote from his reply:

I believe the whole number or sum total of true believers are properly spoken of in a general way as the "church universal," and that for this view there is some suggestion in Scripture, though the term itself is not scriptural, but only a convenient designation which it is proper to use.

Thus Dr. Dargan yields the point that this "universal church" is a mere "convenience," without any scripture warrant. It merely has a "suggestion" in the Bible. So it has the "suggestion" of being a house, a field, a vineyard, an army, a family, a race course; but it is none of these in fact, and such terms are mere "conveniences"

in speaking of Christ's churches. Dr. Dargan does not indorse Brother Srygley's proposition, and considers his "universal church" as a mere "convenient designation," "though the term is not scriptural." Brother Srygley, is that the best you can do for the Baptist proof?

Brother Srygley also quotes Brother A. Malone, as agreeing with him in his proposition. He seems to quote from some verbal report made by his brother, F. B. Srygley. The reader need not be told that such a source of proof is very uncertain, to say the best for it. In order to ascertain the truth about it, I wrote Brother Malone a copy of Srygley's pretended quotation, and asked him if it correctly represented him. In answer, he said:

I do not think there is an invisible, universal church in the world, nor do I ever use any such language. The process that saves a man does not add him to a congregation or church of Christ. This I understand to be done by a vote of the church.

How is that for Malone, another one of his Baptist witnesses? He is as unfortunate in his proofs from the Baptists as he is in his proofs from the Bible. These witnesses do not speak of the "universal church" in any other sense than that of a mental conception, a mere figment of the brain, for there is not such church in fact. It is a "convenient designation," as Dargan says; but has no "real existence in time or place and is not a historical fact," as Hiscox says. The other Baptists referred to would probably agree with the four we have examined, but space forbids a further review. It is enough to say that Srygley utterly fails to prove his "one body" has any real existence by these Baptists, and as for his proposition, it is not in it at all. The propo-

sition has been abandoned by Srygley, and is not believed by any one else he refers to as a witness. So we may tearfully bid his visionary vagary an eternal farewell, for it does not exist in time or place, in heaven, earth, or hades, and is not now, never was, and never will be an actual fact, so far as this world is concerned. I believe there will come a time, in the end of the world, when all of God's people will actually be assembled into one congregation, and they may then be properly called an *ekklesia*, in the sense of an actual assembly; but that is not true now, and will not be true until the judgment of God shall come; and, even then, the "same process that made them Christians will not add them to that one body," for there will be other processes employed to bring them to glory. It is only in this sense that all the people of God will ever be considered as a "universal kingdom or church." And when that time comes, the *ekklesia* will be both "local and visible." I absolutely deny that there ever was or ever will be a universal, invisible church, and I know I can say with the utmost assurance that Srygley has not found any such a church in this discussion. Pray, what would an invisible, universal church do? Does it sing around God's throne in heaven? If it does, it is a local church. Can it render service to God in either heaven or earth? Srygley himself admits it could neither work for God, nor worship God. It does not preach, nor pay, nor pray, nor sing, nor exhort, nor obey, nor live for God, nor work for God, nor worship God, nor do good to men, nor give terror to Satan; it has no time or place, no historical fact, no organization, no corporate being. All of this has been admitted by Srygley, or his witnesses, in this discussion. It is an

"ideal," a "mental conception," a "convenient designation," a "utopian" dream. It is nothing, absolutely worse than nothing. It is an outrage on the word of God to charge it with teaching such a hallucination; and an actual reflection on every church of Jesus Christ to thus minimize their divine significance by an evaporation into this eternal emptiness; and a disgrace to Jesus Christ to charge that such a monstrous nothing is his body; and it means ruin to every soul that trusts its salvation to this ridiculous chimera, vainly imagining he is in "the one body, the church," when he is in neither a "body" nor a "church." But why chase the bubble any farther? It is already and eternally bursted. Look into infinite nothingness if you want to find the "invisible, universal church," the "one body," about which Srygley has been dreaming, but of which you will hear but little more, if he has any respect for the truth I have preached to him.

I have now met all the points made by the brother that were even in the neighborhood of the proposition, and I conclude with some brief references to other related matters that were suggested by Brother Srygley:

1. He began by saying: "The same process that makes one a Christian also adds him to the one body—the church." This proposition has been irretrievably lost.

2. That which makes a man a Christian is his Savior. If the "process" saves him, then the "process" is his savior. It is the duty of all men to praise their savior. That may account for Srygley's love of his process.

3. We have clearly seen in this discussion that there is no passage of scripture that speaks of a "universal

church," else Srygley would have been sure to have quoted it, for he needed it mighty bad.

4. We have also seen that the great Baptist authors he quoted did not believe in such a church, as anything more than a mental conception.

5. On the other hand, I quoted from the version of Macknight and Doddridge, which was revised by Alexander Campbell, where all the references to the word "church," relied on by Srygley so far as he relied on anything, so as to make every one of them a congregation or assembly. This version of the New Testament may be called the Campbellite Bible, as they publish it now. But it is against Srygley.

6. I also proved by Rotherham's translation of the New Testament, the best emphatic translation in the world, that the word "church" always referred to an assembly of people; never to a mere conception of the mind.

7. The Emphatic Diaglott joined in with the others in saying the same thing.

8. Dr. J. W. McGarvey, one of the brightest lights in the Campbellite Church, said in an interview last May that the word "church" in Matt. 16: 18 evidently referred to a local church.

9. Drs. J. J. Taylor, Jesse B. Thomas, S. H. Ford, and a host of living writers have taken part in the contention over the "invisible church," and they all say Christ's churches are local and visible.

10. Brother Srygley contends he is not a Campbellite. If he is not, he should doff his ecclesiastical goatskin and dress up in a different gown.

11. **He says there are no such organizations in the**



New Testament as Baptist conventions, associations, and such like. Suppose I grant it, would that establish the proposition he set out to prove?

12. The Campbellites have conventions, boards, and such like, just as Baptists do, and if there is not authority for them I guess they are as bad off in the case as we are. But couldn't we squeeze them into the "universal church," Brother Srygley?

13. Srygley says he is "opposed to the Campbellite denomination." Why, then, doesn't he get out of it?

14. He says he is opposed to "all denominations." I am not surprised at that. A man that can be content with that infinite thing he calls the "universal church" could hardly be expected to favor what is tangible and real.

15. But what is a "denomination"? It is simply the aggregate of the people that accept a definite system of faith, and that receive a name by which they are known. The Campbellites have had a big fight, ever since they were organized, over their name, and they haven't decided it yet. Until some other name is found, I denominate them "Campbellites," which simply means a name for the people Mr. Campbell gave to the world.

16. The Campbellite yearbook shows that there are about 10,000 Campbellite churches—little, local churches—in the world. All these little churches belong to Srygley's great, big church, I reckon. Then, don't they make a denomination?

17. Srygley thinks that I would admit that "all Baptists constitute one big body," even if I deny that all Christians do. No, I do not. There is no Baptist church on earth bigger than a local assembly. The many Bap-

tist churches make one denomination, or class, of people; but they do not constitute "the one body" you have been trying to find. All postage stamps of a certain kind and value constitute a denomination, or name; but they don't all make one big postage stamp. All money of a kind and value constitutes a denomination, but all this money put together doesn't make one great, big bill. So all Baptist churches taken together don't make a great, big Baptist church; and all Christians taken together don't make a great, big Christian church, either. Brother Srygley knows that Baptists have no bands or ligaments that bind all their churches together into one big church.

18. Srygley thinks that monstrous beast I described in my third article is a reflection on the New Testament idea of a church. That is a mistake. It was Srygley's idea of a church I was after. The New Testament doesn't know anything about his great, big church. All the churches the New Testament speaks about are local churches, and that monstrous beast has no likeness to a local church.

19. He also thinks I overdraw the picture about so many conflicting doctrines entering into "the one body." He thinks some of these doctrines may turn out to be such vagaries as to make "vain worshipers," and then those believing them would not be in the church. But they have these conflicting doctrines in Campbellism itself; yet I suppose he will grant that his own people are all Christians. Why, the Campbellite Church itself would make a monstrous beast. If you take the "landmarkism" of *The Gospel Advocate* folks and join it to the liberalism of *The Christian Standard* people, and then add the rebaptism hobby of *The Firm Foundation*, and

stir in the sore-finger theology of *The Christian Leader*, and sugar-coat it with the goody-goody *Christian Evangelist*, and then paint the whole thing red with the blood and thunder of *The Octographic Review*, and if you don't have a time of it with your big Campbellite Church I am mistaken in what I see. Now, add to that mess all the thousand foolish doctrines entertained by otherwise good people, and your great, big "one body" will surely be a beast of monstrous proportions.

20. But he says these false doctrines will exclude people from the church and from heaven. If they are real Christians their false doctrines will not exclude them from heaven. Paul says of such people: "Their works will be burned, but they will be saved, yet so as by fire."

21. He thinks that a man that is unfit for the church is unfit for heaven. That is a mistake. I am glad to know that we enter heaven through the worthiness of Christ, and not on our own merit. For that reason all that enter heaven will enter it through grace, and not by works. But my membership in the church depends on my personal conduct. If I walk contrary to the doctrines, I should go out of the church, though I may still be in the reach of grace. Lots of people will enter heaven through God's mercy that believed such heresies as to exclude them from a gospel church.

22. He says: "The body of Christ is all Christians, and nothing but Christians." Such was not true in the apostolic ages. They then had some in the church that had "crept in privily to spy out our liberties," Paul said. Christ said the kingdom of heaven was like a net that "gathered of every kind," and some of the fish they caught were "bad." I grant you that all church members

ought to be Christians, but they are not, and have never been.

23. That hobby about a man's being in the body where he lives, and wherever he goes, is so transparently absurd as to refute itself. He can not know he is in the one body, at home or abroad, for the reason the thing has no "real existence in time or place," and has no "corporate being" anywhere, so says Dr. Hiscox. How, then, can a man be in this body anywhere?

24. He thinks that from my view a Christian must be "born blind," because I say he can't "see" the kingdom until after he is born. Why, bless you, he stays "blind" always, so far as the kingdom is concerned, from Srygley's standpoint; for he says the thing is "invisible." How, then, will he ever see it? What is the difference if a man has eyes? He can't see what is invisible. But the word "see" is used in the sense of "enjoy," and no man can enjoy the kingdom of God till after he is born again. The process of his birth is one thing; his enjoyment of the kingdom is another.

25. He says: "If Baptists are simply and only Christians, why call them Baptists? For the same reason we call your people Campbellites. We thus distinguish them. Besides, the name "Baptist" is a scriptural name, given by the God of heaven, and is a synonym for the name Christian. We always mean to speak of a Christian when we speak of a Baptist, for the names refer to the same character.

26. In conclusion, I desire the reader to compare the questions I asked in No. 3 with Srygley's answers in No. 4. I have not space to show the confusion of the brother as he crosses himself and stabs his pet hobby

to the heart with contradictions. He has been telling us that all Christians were in the church, but in answer to question 7 he dare not say the apostles were in it before Pentecost. Of course no one else was, if they were not, and, as no one can be saved out of his church, they were all in a lost condition. I asked him if his "process" added the apostles to the church, and he replied, "God added them." But he said in his proposition that his "process" added people to "the one body," and I have shown him that God is not a "process," or any part of a "process." So, up goes his proposition again. I asked when was the church organized, and he said there is no such expression as "organized" in the New Testament. But there is such a fact. The very word *ekklesia* means to "call out," and is an orderly assembly, an organization. In question 10 he refuses to say when the apostles got into the church, and in answer to 11 he says the publican, the paralytic, and the dying thief all failed to get into his big church; and as he says there is no salvation out of it, it follows these were all lost. My, what a system! He even says: "The Bible does not say these were saved." The Bible says of the paralytic: "Thy sins are forgiven thee." Of the publican, Christ said he "went down to his house justified." Of the thief, Christ said: "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." I will accept all that as salvation, and shall be disappointed in heaven if these three are not there. What a system that must be that consigns to hell those that Christ forgives, justifies, and takes with him to paradise! But Srygley's system does it. He says the church was not in existence in Christ's day. That leaves Jesus out of his own church. Christ thought there was a church

in existence, and told his church members how to manage their church business. (Matt. 18: 17.) He also says people were not saved during Christ's ministry on the same conditions they are saved now. Peter said: "We believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, in like manner as they." (Acts 15: 11, R. V.) God never did have but one plan of saving people. They had the gospel, the preacher, the church, baptism, the Lord's Supper, repentance, prayer, faith, love, following Christ—all while Christ was here. What have we since more than these? It seems that Srygley would not only send the forgiven and justified ones to hell, before Pentecost, but he would exclude Christ from his church, and nullify his preaching and destroy the four gospels—by giving us a plan of salvation now that differs from the one they had then. Who gave us our modern "process"? No wonder Christ knew nothing about it. Srygley had not yet invented it. The difference is so great that I prefer the conditions Christ preached rather than those Srygley preaches.

But I must leave the reader to regale himself in the beauties of the other answers to those questions. If you can get into the "big church," and at the same time be in all the little churches, and feel at home whether you are at home or abroad, and feel that you know you are in, and don't know anybody else is in, then if you don't feel rich you must certainly be "crazy or an infidel." And, after all, when you look around to see what your possessions really are, and you find that your church is all a dream, a "mental conception," an "ideal" of the mind, with no real "being in time or

place"; not a "historical fact"; without "corporate being"; just a "convenient designation"; a vagary, a fancy, a phantom, a will-o'-the-wisp, a nothing; and that you are in nothing, always have been, and always will be while you stay in that thing—if, after you survey your surroundings and see how badly left you are, you don't feel like you have been badly fooled, like you are full of husks, like you have been living on the apples of Sodom, then you won't feel natural.

In the name of common sense, and of the truth of God's word, let me beg you, Srygley, to come out of this Babylon of confusion and nonsense. Stand with me on the visible platform, where real churches have their being, as they work and worship and serve God. God sent John as a Baptist preacher to prepare material for such a church as I contend for, and by his providence I feel called upon as another Baptist preacher to call to repentance those that are now following the dreams and fables and phantasies of a system of religion that leads back into the ritualism and spiritual death of the old Jerusalem that was awakened by John's first call. So I end as he began: "Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." (Matt. 3: 2.) "For the law and the prophets were until John, since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it" (Matt. 11: 13), said Christ.

Wishing for every reader a happy escape from the dream of a monstrous church that is nowhere, has nothing in it, and never will have, I close.

MR. SRYGLEY'S FINAL ARTICLE.

Brother Hall's articles have exceeded mine in length by more than two pages of *The Gospel Advocate*. I have published all he has written, and in fairness I am now entitled to as much space as his articles have exceeded mine in length. If he is unwilling to grant this, he ought to have limited each of his articles to the space occupied by the article to which he replied. If he is unwilling to do either of these things, he is not disposed to be fair in division of space. In oral discussions the disputants are entitled to an equal division of time; and in written discussions, to an equal division of space. I tried by lengthening my articles to prevent inequality in division of space as the discussion proceeded, but failed. My second article is longer than my first, my third is longer than my second, and my fourth is longer than my third. Nevertheless, each of his replies is longer than the article to which he replied, and his fourth exceeds my fourth in length by more than a page of *The Gospel Advocate*. No matter how long I might have made my articles, he could make his replies longer, if disposed to be unfair in division of space. If he is disposed to be fair and give me an equal division in space, he will publish this article in his paper; but whether he publishes it or not, he can not object to my publishing it at my own expense.

Readers of *The Gospel Advocate* need no reply to what Brother Hall says about the way I have referred "to our correspondence in this debate," because they have seen the correspondence and all I have said about it. His statement may mislead the readers of *The*



*American Baptist Flag*, because they have seen neither the correspondence nor anything I have said about it. If Brother Hall will publish in his paper the correspondence and all I have said in reference to it, I will be satisfied. His statement that he has prepared "these articles under great stress of work and the constant care of an invalid wife" is entitled to consideration as an apology for his work and an appeal for sympathy in the discussion, but on any other ground it is irrelevant and unworthy of notice. He accuses me of "a self-reliant and boastful manner," and refers to himself as "feeble and weak," and says he "timidly and hesitatingly accepted the challenge." My reply to all this is that the readers are competent judges as to the bearing of each disputant in this discussion. I have said nothing about his manner and bearing, and I shall make no reply to what he says about me, because I consider the readers competent to form their own opinion on this point. Brother Hall still says I have not defined the proposition and have not made the issue clear. I have defined it in every article I have written, and every time I have defined it he has said I surrender the proposition and introduce a new issue. He now states three propositions I have affirmed, and says I have changed the proposition three times. The three propositions he says I have affirmed are as follows:

1. The same process that makes a man a Christian adds him to the one body—the church.
2. The church includes and consists of all Christians.
3. God saves sinners by a process.

These statements are not three different statements, but merely efforts to keep Brother Hall from confusing

the readers by misrepresenting my position. God saves sinners by a process, and the same process by which God saves a man adds him to the one body—the church—because the church includes and consists of all Christians. Brother Hall says I have not so much as repeated the proposition since my first article, but left it with its simple statement in my first article, and have been “dodging, hiding, and discussing all sorts of propositions, with the apparent intention of getting everybody away from that awkward, unscriptural proposition.” This is Brother Hall’s statement against the facts in the case. I have made no effort to dodge, hide, or change the proposition. I have several times stated the issue clearly, so as to keep Brother Hall from confusing the readers by misrepresenting my position. He says he made a strenuous effort to get me to apply some of my scriptures to my proposition, but failed. This is another effort of his to set aside facts by an assertion. I have applied all the scriptures I have quoted to my proposition. The proof of this is in the articles where the scriptures are quoted.

Brother Hall thinks “one process may save a man, and another process may add him to the church,” because “they may have been saved by repentance and faith, and added by baptism to the church.” If the New Testament teaches that, why has he not tried to show it in this discussion? This would have been a conclusive argument against my affirmation, and he would have made it if he could sustain it by the New Testament. If people are saved by repentance and faith without baptism, Christ made an egregious mistake when he said: “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” (Mark 16: 16.)

If they are saved without baptism, they are saved without remission of sins, for Peter said, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins" (Acts 2: 38); and "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." (Mark 1: 4.) If people are saved without baptism, they are saved out of Christ, for they are baptized into Christ. (Rom. 6: 1-6; Gal. 3: 27.) They are also saved out of the kingdom of God, for Jesus says: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3: 5.) Brother Hall thinks if people can not be saved out of the church, then they were all lost before there was any church. Why so? Noah and his family were saved in the ark, and no one was saved out of the ark. (Heb. 11: 7; I Peter 3: 20.) Does it, therefore, follow that all who lived before there was any ark were lost? Because God saved people before there was any ark, it does not follow that people were saved out of the ark after the ark was prepared and God ordained that they should be saved in the ark. Because God saved people before there was any church, it does not follow that people are saved out of the church after the church is established and God ordains that they shall be saved in the church.

Brother Hall still says all the scriptures which say the church is the body of Christ refer to "the local church." Suppose they do; what then? Can a man be a Christian and not be a member of the body of Christ? To say the body of Christ is the local church does not change the fact that it is the body of Christ. Christ is the head of the church, and no man can be a Christian

without being a member of the church, unless he can be a Christian without having Christ as his head. Every man over whom Christ is head is a member of the church because Christ is head of the church. To say a man can be a Christian and not be a member of the church is to say he can be a Christian and not have Christ as his head. Christ is "the Savior of the body." (Eph. 5: 22, 23.) That which Christ saves is the body over which he is the head, the church. If a man can be a Christian and not be a member of the church, he can be a Christian and not be saved. To be saved, one must be a member of the church—the body—of which Christ is the head, because he is "the Savior of the body." If a local Baptist church is the only body of which Christ is the head, as Brother Hall argues, then Christ is head over no one but members of local Baptist churches. If a local Baptist church is the only body over which Christ is head, as Brother Hall argues, then Christ saves nothing but local Baptist churches, and no one can be saved without being a member of a local Baptist church. If there is no church but a local congregation, then no one is a member of the church who does not belong to a local congregation. In that case, a Baptist who receives a letter dismissing him from a local congregation does not belong to the church at all till he "puts in his letter" and joins some other local Baptist church. If this point is well taken, Lydia and the eunuch were not members of the church at all when they were baptized, for there was no local congregation there for them to belong to. I have pressed this point on Brother Hall in every article I have written since my first. He has referred to it several times, but has never said whether they were

members of the church or not when they were baptized. Brother Hall's assertion that the only body of which Christ is the head is a local Baptist church does not harmonize with the following scriptures: "As we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office: so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another." (Rom. 12: 4, 5.) The one body here referred to could not have been the local Baptist church at Rome or anywhere else for two reasons: (1) There was no local Baptist church at Rome or anywhere else; (2) Paul and "all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints" (Rom. 1: 7) were "one body in Christ." (Rom. 12: 5.) They were not all members of the same local congregation, for Paul had never been to Rome when he wrote this. (Rom. 1: 10-16.) They were "one body in Christ," and every one which is in Christ is a member of that one body. "For to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." (Eph. 2: 15, 16.) The one body in Christ made of two, in this passage, could not have been a local congregation, because the two of which it was made were Jews and Gentiles. It included and consisted of all, both Jews and Gentiles, who were in Christ. "Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ: that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but speaking the truth in love, may grow up into

him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." (Eph. 4: 13-16.) The "perfect man" and "the whole body" of this passage included both Paul and "the saints which are at Ephesus," and they were not all members of the same local congregation. Unquestionably the "perfect man" and "the whole body" included and consisted of all Christians, and each Christian was a member of it wherever he was and everywhere he went. The local congregation in each place was "the perfect man" —"the whole body"—in that place, and there was no organization or assemblages but local congregations in it. Every Christian belonged to it, and that which made him a Christian constituted him a member of it. He belonged to it because he was a Christian, and he was a member of it wherever he went. No one could be a Christian and not be a member of it, and no one could belong to it anywhere without being a member of it everywhere he went. The terms of membership in it are the same everywhere. That which makes a man a member of it anywhere constitutes him a member of it everywhere he goes. That which prevents this unity of faith in one body in Christ now is denominationalism, which is plainly condemned by the New Testament. If there were no denominational organizations now, Christians would all be one body in Christ, as in New Testament times, and every one members one of another, with no organizations or assemblages but local congregations. The local congregation would be the same in every place

in organization, doctrine, work, and worship, and would include and consist of all Christians in that place. Brother Hall says: "The Campbellites have conventions, boards, and such like, just as Baptists do; and if there is no authority for them, I guess they are as bad off in the case as we are." To be sure they are; but what of it? Any other denomination is "as bad off in the case" as either the Baptists or the "Campbellites," and the Baptists and the "Campbellites" are both "as bad off" as any other denomination. He says he calls them Baptists "for the same reason we call your people Campbellites. We thus distinguish them." Whose people? I have no people but the people of God. "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother." (Matt. 12: 50.) As long as there are different denominations there must be different denominational names to "distinguish them," of course; but by what authority do Christians form denominations which make denominational names necessary? There are no denominational names in the New Testament because there are not denominations there. "For we are members one of another" (Eph. 4: 25), and not members of different denominations. "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling." (Eph. 4: 4.) "That the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body." (Eph. 3: 6.) "I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." (Eph. 3: 14, 15.) "Ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-

stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit." (Eph. 2: 19-22.) "Head over all things to the church, which is his body." (Eph. 1: 22, 23.) "Even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the savior of the body." (Eph. 5: 23.) "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." (Eph. 5: 30.) "Your bodies are the members of Christ." (I Cor. 6: 15.) "He that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit." (I Cor. 6: 17.) "And he is the head of the body, the church." (Col. 1: 18.) "For his body's sake, which is the church." (Col. 1: 24.) "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many." (I Cor. 12: 12-14.) "But now are they many members, yet but one body." (I Cor 12: 20.) "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." (I Cor. 12: 27.) If the foregoing passages do not teach that Christians are all "one body in Christ," and that one body is the church, then that doctrine can not be taught.

Brother Hall says I have not quoted "one single" scripture "that makes mention of this big church" which includes and consists of all Christians. This is Brother Hall's assertion against facts again. In every article I have written I have quoted numerous scriptures which say the church is the body of Christ, and in my fourth article I quoted a long list of the highest Baptist authori-



ties which say the very scriptures I have repeatedly quoted in this discussion do "make mention" of the church which includes and consists of all Christians. No one but Brother Hall, so far as I know or so far as has appeared in this discussion, says the word "church" in the New Testament never means anything but a local congregation. Brother Hall says the Baptist authorities I have quoted "do not agree with Srygley's proposition." Brother Hall has said repeatedly in this discussion that the word "church" in the New Testament never means anything but a local congregation. "Srygley's proposition," when he quoted that long list of eminent Baptist authorities, was that Brother Hall's statement is not true. They unanimously agree with that proposition. Brother Hall makes much ado over Dr. Broadus' statement that the spiritual Israel which is frequently called the church in the New Testament is "never actually assembled." Who has said it is ever actually assembled? Nobody. I have said repeatedly in this discussion that the only assemblies or organizations in the one body are local congregations. Christians have no divine authority to actually assemble for religious work or worship in anything but local congregations. For this reason they violate the plain teaching of the New Testament every time they actually assemble in such denominational bodies as Baptist associations and conventions. The issue is not as to whether the spiritual Israel is ever actually assembled, but whether it is the church of the New Testament. It is not necessary for spiritual Israel to actually assemble in order to be the church of God. The church at Jerusalem was all scattered abroad. (Acts 8: 1-4.) They that were scattered abroad were none the less the

church of God because they were not actually assembled. "If therefore the whole church be come together into one place." (I Cor. 14: 23.) Coming together into one place did not make it the whole church. It was the whole church when scattered abroad as well as when it came together. Because Broadus says "it is sometimes conceived of as an ideal congregation," and Webster says "ideal" means "intellectual, mental, visionary, fanciful, imaginary, unreal, impracticable, utopian," etc., Brother Hall says it "never was actually a church." Broadus and everybody else but Brother Hall, so far as has appeared in this discussion, say God calls it the church in the New Testament, and Brother Hall ridicules God for calling it the church when it is "a mere mental, visionary, fanciful, imaginary, unreal, impracticable, utopian conception, that never did actually assemble, and therefore never was actually a church." Brother Hall evidently has a very small opinion of God because he calls something besides a local Baptist congregation the church. Brother Hall says:

Dr. Hiscox and Dr. Broadus both tell us that this universal, invisible church fad is a mere hallucination, a mental conception, having no real existence in time or place, and not an historical fact, being only an ideal multitude without organization, without action, without corporate being.

Dr. Hiscox and Dr. Broadus "tell us" no such thing. Brother Hall tells us all this, and evidently regrets that Hiscox and Broadus did not tell it. What Hiscox and Broadus both do "tell us" is that God in the New Testament says spiritual Israel, which includes and consists of all Christians, is the church. (See quotations from Hiscox and Broadus, on pages 83-86.) Brother Hall says

“that is not Hiscox’s personal view of the matter,” because Hiscox says “this is the Christian sense, and puts it in quotation marks.” Nevertheless, Hiscox says this “Christian sense,” which he puts in quotation marks, is “in the New Testament.” Brother Hall’s effort to show that Hiscox’s “personal view of the matter” differs from what Hiscox says is “in the New Testament” is not complimentary to Hiscox. If Brother Hall succeeds in making this distinction between Hiscox’s “personal view of the matter” and what Hiscox says is “in the New Testament,” I shall stand by what is “in the New Testament” and let Hiscox’s “personal view of the matter” go. Brother Hall tries to break the force of two other Baptist authorities which I quoted by writing them private letters. He does not publish what he wrote to them or what they wrote to him. Nobody knows from what Brother Hall has revealed what he wrote to them or what they wrote to him. Why did he not publish in full his letters to them and their letters to him? Would he have failed to do this if such publication would have strengthened his case? Hardly. He quotes one sentence from Professor Dargan, and three sentences from A. Malone. I represented A. Malone as admitting in the debate at Epley, Ky., that the church of the New Testament includes and consists of all Christians. He read from the Philadelphia Confession of Faith to prove this, and said the Baptists had been teaching it for two hundred and fifty years. But the following from the pen of Elder A. Malone to F. B. Srygley gives his position relative to the point in controversy:

Lafayette, Tenn., September 12, 1899.—Elder F. B. Srygley, Allensville, Ky.—Dear Brother: Your favor of the 8th inst. was

forwarded to me at this place, where I am now engaged in a meeting. In reply, I wish to say this: My memory would not serve me, to state verbatim all I said concerning the church of Christ in the discussion to which you refer; but I believe now just what I did then, and beg leave to state my position concerning this mooted question. This is it: The term "church" in the New Testament generally denotes a congregation of saints or disciples, but in a few passages — definite and clear — it is a collective noun in the singular number, and denotes all of the saved. A few of the passages are: Eph. 5: 23; Col. 1: 24; Rev. 21: 2, 3; Heb. 12: 22, 23. Yes, I quoted the Philadelphia Confession of Faith in the discussion to which you refer. This Confession of 1742 is but a reprint of the London Confession of 1689, which is but a reprint of the London Confession of 1643. I have before me at this writing Spurgeon's edition of this Confession of 1689. Concerning the church it says: "The catholic or universal church, which (with respect to the internal work of the Spirit and truth of grace) may be called invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ, the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all." (Page 38.) This is the first section. The second and fourth are equally strong. The fourth section begins by saying: "The Lord Jesus Christ is head of the church," etc. Again, the terms "church" and "kingdom" are often synonymous, but not always. Brother Hall wrote me to know what I said in our debate at Epley, Ky., last December, concerning this question, and asked a brief reply, as he wanted it for *The Flag*, and I shall expect it next week; but as I was unexpectedly drawn into this discussion, I shall write an article for *The Flag* as soon as I shall get home from this meeting. This I shall do that I may be fully understood by my brethren and all concerned. My views are clearly and satisfactorily defined in my own mind, but have not yet been elaborately given. In a word: We are born into the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ — that is, his spiritual kingdom. This kingdom and the church, when the term "church" is employed as a collective noun in the singular number, are synonymous, and embrace all of the saved; and I understand the London Confession to clearly teach

this doctrine. The Philadelphia Confession of 1742 is but a reprint of the London Confession; but the New Hampshire Confession of 1833 does not contain the quotations which I have made from the London Confession. I hope this will answer your purpose till you see my article in *The Flag* on this question, which will be determinate, as I do not wish to discuss the question. I might add a word before I close. I regard the local congregations of Christ as so many units of power in the church of Christ, of which he is the head. Fraternally,

A. MALONE.

P. S.—I never use the term “invisible” as descriptive of the church of Christ. I see no reason why it should be annexed to the term “church” when employed as a collective noun in the singular number.

A. M.

I have Professor Dargan’s book, and I have quoted it correctly. If he teaches a different doctrine in a private letter to Brother Hall from that which I quote from his book, that is his business. If Brother Hall wanted to show that I misquote or misrepresent the book, why did he not write for a copy of the book? It would have been as easy to get a copy of the book as to get a private letter from Professor Dargan, which he would not publish after he got it. I may as well say in this connection that most of the Baptist authorities I have quoted were furnished me by a Baptist of higher rank and better ability than Brother Hall, who assured me that no Baptist of recognized ability takes any such position as Brother Hall argues in this discussion. If I have misunderstood, misquoted, or misrepresented any of these weighty Baptist authorities, it is the fault of the eminent Baptist assistance I relied on in the preparation of that part of the discussion.

## INDEX TO MR. SRYGLEY'S ARTICLES.

- American Baptist Flag, The, 5, 19.  
Babylon, are there Christians in? 34.  
Baptist Argus, The, 68.  
Baptist and Reflector, The, 5, 14, 19, 20, 32, 67.  
"Beast, an enormous," 66.  
"Big church, a great," in which all God's people have membership, 19, 64, 107.  
Body, the one, 6, 17, 60, 64.  
Born again, every one that is, is a child of God, 8, 17.  
Broadus, John A., 66, 108.  
"Campbellite conventions," 106.  
Child of God, no one can be a Christian and not be a, 7.  
Christian, a, is one whom Christ accepts, 65; if a man can be a, and be saved out of the church he can be saved without being in Christ, 16; to make a man a, is to open his eyes, 18; a man is a, where he lives, 24, 62; every Christian belongs to the church, 61.  
Christian Standard, 35.  
Christians have no right to form any but local congregations for religious work and worship, 62.  
Church, the, is the body of Christ, 6; no man can be a Christian and not belong to, 7, 19; includes and consists of all Christians, 32, 108; the New Testament, not always a local assembly, 33, 35, 61; universal, never assembled, 108.  
Churches, there may be as many, in the one church as there are different localities, 64.  
Conditions, the, of membership in the church of God are the same everywhere, 63.  
Corinth, all the Christians in, belonged to the church of God, 21.  
Dargan, Edwin C., 69, 110, 112.  
Denominational, no, organization in the New Testament, 20, 33, 34.  
Divisions among Christians a sin, 35.  
Eunuch, to what local assembly did the, belong? 20, 62, 103.  
Family of God, the church is the, 7, 8, 18.  
Gospel Advocate, 35.  
Hiscox, E. T., 68, 109.  
"Hobby, Brother Srygley's newly invented," 14.

- Household, the church is the, of God, 7, 19.  
 "Ideal congregation," 109.  
 Join, a child does not have to, after it is born, before it is a member of the family, 8.  
 Kingdom, the, of God is equivalent to the one body, 17.  
 Letter, if a Baptist is granted a, of dismissal from a local Baptist Church he is not a member of the Baptist Church till he puts it in another, 103.  
 Local assembly, 20, 33, 60, 63, 102; to what, did the Eunuch and Lydia belong? 20, 62, 103.  
 Lydia, to what local assembly did, belong? 20, 62, 103.  
 Malone, A., 68, 110.  
 New creature, to be in Christ is to be a, 7.  
 Pendleton's Church Manual quoted, 70.  
 Process, the same that makes one a Christian puts him into Christ, 7, 14, 16, 31, 59, 63, 101.  
 Propositions, did not affirm three, 100.  
 Questions answered, 36-39, 71-74.  
 "Religious vagaries," 65.  
 Robertson, A. T., 67.  
 Saved, were people saved before there was any church? 102.  
 Saves, that which Christ, is the body over which he is head, 102.  
 Sects, all, are wrong and no Christian should belong to any of them, 8.  
 Vagaries, holding religious causes God to regard people as vain worshipers, 65.

## INDEX TO SCRIPTURES QUOTED.

	PAGE		PAGE
Matt. 12: 50.....	35, 106	Acts 16: 13-15.....	20, 33
28: 19, 20.....	14	16: 31-33.....	15
Mark 1: 4.....	102	22: 16.....	15
16: 15, 16.....	14	26: 18.....	18
John 3: 3.....	8	Rom. 1: 7.....	104
3: 5.....	15, 17, 102	1: 10-16.....	104
Acts 2: 38.....	14, 102	6: 3, 4.....	15, 16, 102
8: 1-4.....	108	12: 4, 5.....	6, 23, 104
8: 36-39.....	15, 20, 33	I Cor. 1: 2.....	21

	PAGE		PAGE
I Cor. 1: 10.....	21	Eph. 3: 6.....	106
4: 15.....	8	3: 14, 15.....	106
6: 15.....	107	4: 4.....	6, 32, 106
6: 17.....	107	4: 13-16.....	105
12: 13.....	6, 32, 107	4: 25.....	106
12: 20-27.....	6, 107	5: 23...6, 15, 19, 39, 60, 103, 107	
14: 23.....	109	5: 30.....	107
II Cor. 5: 17.....	7, 16	Col. 1: 14.....	16
Gal. 3: 26.....	7	1: 18....6, 15, 19, 32, 60, 107	
3: 27.....	15, 16, 102	1: 24....6, 16, 19, 32, 60, 107	
6: 10.....	19	I Thess. 1: 1.....	21
6: 15.....	16	II Thess. 1: 1.....	22
Eph. 1: 3.....	16	I Tim. 3: 15.....	7, 19
1: 7.....	16	Heb. 11: 7.....	102
1: 10.....	6	James 1: 18.....	8
1: 23....6, 15, 19, 32, 60, 107		I Peter 1: 22-25.....	8
2: 6.....	16	3: 20.....	102
2: 15, 16.....	104	I John 5: 1.....	8
2: 19.....	7, 19, 107		

## INDEX TO MR. HALL'S REPLIES.

- American Baptist Flag, The, 4, 5, 19.  
 Babylon, confused by denominational, 49, 51, 81.  
 Baptist and Reflector, 13, 25, 26.  
 Baptists are simply and only Christians, 52.  
 Beast, an enormous, 49.  
 Big church in which all of God's children have membership, 13, 26, 44, 46, 48, 51, 54, 78; Srygley says Methodists, Baptists, etc., are all in this, 49.  
 Born again, 11.  
 Campbell's rendering of the word "ekklesia," 26.  
 Christ, one may be in, and not be in the church, 43, 80.  
 "Christian," the word, 53.  
 Christian Standard, 28.  
 Church, big, in which all God's children have membership, 13, 26, 44, 46, 48, 51, 54, 78. New Testament always a local body, 13, 25; one may be in Christ and not in the, 43.



- Churches, the New Testament speaks of, 47.  
 Dargan, Edwin C., 82, 87.  
 Denominations, 41, 49.  
 "Ekklesia," Campbell's translation of the word, 26; Rotherham's translation, 27; Emphatic Diaglott's, 27.  
 Eunuch, the, 45, 51.  
 Family, God's, not the church, 12.  
 Gospel Advocate, 29.  
 Hiscox, Edwin T., 82, 84, 85, 86.  
 Ideal church, 84.  
 Local assembly, the New Testament always a, 13, 25, 43, 57, 89.  
 Lydia, 45, 51.  
 Malone, A., 88.  
 "One body, the," 41, 44, 46, 50, 79.  
 "Process," 9, 13, 22, 24, 27, 40, 53, 75.  
 Questions, 30, 57.  
 Rotherham's translation of the word "ekklesia," 26.  
 Sinners, must show that process makes Christians of, 23.  
 Summing up, a, 90.  
 Surrenders proposition and introduces another issue, 40, 76.

## INDEX TO SCRIPTURES QUOTED.

	PAGE		PAGE
Matt. 3: 2.....	98	16: 16.....	47
11: 13.....	98	I Cor. 1: 1.....	26
16: 18.....	26	7: 17.....	47
18: 17.....	97	11: 16.....	47
Mark 16: 16.....	27	14: 34.....	47
Luke 7: 47.....	54	16: 19.....	47
John 3: 3.....	11	II Cor. 8: 1.....	47
Acts 2: 27.....	26	8: 19.....	47
9: 31.....	47	Eph. 2: 22.....	27
15: 11.....	97	5: 22.....	26
15: 41.....	47	5: 23.....	11
16: 5.....	47	Col. 1: 18.....	11
19: 37.....	47	I Tim. 3: 15.....	26
Rom. 16: 4.....	47	Heb. 12: 23.....	26



