

DEBATE

ON THE

SECOND COMING OF CHRIST

BETWEEN

A. D. Fairbanks, and E. C. Fuqua.

• Reprinted From the Columns of The Montrose
Daily Press, in which Newspaper the Debate
was Originally Conducted, in the
Month of April, 1918.

*Both Mr. Fairbanks (Congregational Church) and Mr.
Fuqua (Church of Christ) wish it known that this dis-
cussion of the subject is far from exhaustive, but it is
the best that could be done in the limited space at
their disposal, and for said space they are grateful.*

Press of E. C. Fuqua,
Olney, Colorado
1918.

DEBATE

ON THE

Second Coming of Christ:

BETWEEN

A. D. FAIRBANKS

and

E. C. FUQUA.

Reprinted from the columns of the Montrose Daily Press, in which newspaper the debate was originally conducted, in the month of April, 1918.

OPENING ARTICLE, BY A. D. FAIRBANKS:

If space would admit, it would be of interest to many Press readers to get the story of my transformation from the old and generally accepted view of the time, when and how Christ reappears. The ordeal I went through in the twenty-five years of my study of the question before I came to what I now believe, would make an interesting chapter, but I forego that, to me an important part, and come without prelude at once to the question. I affirm that Christ's second coming is a past event and that it was invisible, not literal; and that the period of his reign as king, is spiritual and not spectacular as an object of national vision. I affirm also, that there was to be, and were phenomenal signs attendant, by which the event could be located as to when and how.

First, as introductory to a series of scripture evidences that I shall furnish in the course of this debate, I begin with a prophecy found in the 110th Psalm, 1st, 2d, and 3rd verses. "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength [power] out of Zion [the church]. Rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. Thy people shall be willing in the day of power. Three things in this forecast we need to keep in mind, first, that Christ is not to be here, in the earth, in a visible form, until he has subdued his enemies, and not even then, if Paul's grasp of the question is admissible. See 1 Cor. 15: 22-26. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made

alive, but each in his own order: Christ the first fruits; then they that are Christ's at his coming. Then cometh the end, when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority; and all power. For he must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet." The next three verses are, in wording, the statement of the climax: At this juncture Christ stands over "to God, even the Father," the achievements of his reign; and his office as Lord and Christ is forever at an end. Verse 28, "And when all things have been subjected unto him [Christ] then shall the Son also himself be subjected to him that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all." The second thing noticeable in the prophecy cited is that in the period of Christ's reign he subdues his enemies, by the rod of his strength out of Zion (the church). What are we to understand by "the rod of his strength." See Isa. 11: 1, "And thou shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse and a branch shall grow out of his roots." Omitting the 2nd and 3rd verses, which to the point are instructive, we come to the 4th verse, which is, "But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity [judgment] for the meek of the earth, and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath [spirit] of his lips shall he slay the wicked." As explanatory, I will cite one more scripture, 2 Thessalonians, 2: 8, "And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming." This verse has a setting in a chapter of importance, in significance, relating to Christ's Second Coming. See especially the 2nd notice of the chapter in which is set forth that "Christ's coming was at the time of writing this epistle, at hand." We shall have an occasion to refer to this again in another article. The third thing in the prophecy is that Christ "rules in the midst of his enemies." This is well set forth in the 4th, 5th, and 6th verses. In the 4th verse, Christ is represented "priest forever after the order of Melchizedek," the full explanation of which is found in Heb. 6: 20; also 7: 12, 13. Here Paul sets forth that Melchizedek is both king and priest, at one and the same time; and repeats, three or four times, that Jesus is made high priest forever after the order of this mysterious man who was "without father or mother, beginning of days or end of life." Therefore, Christ is the eternal one, and both king and priest in his day of rule in the earth. That Christ is in heaven, at God's right hand, while he is king and priest,

holding conjointly the two offices, is evident from the following scriptures:

Heb. 6: 19, 20:

19 Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that which is within the veil;

20 Whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made a high priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.

Heb. 7: 14, 15, 16 and 17:

14 For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood.

15 And it is yet far more evident: for that after the similitude of Melchizedek there ariseth another priest,

16 Who is made, not after the law of carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.

17 For he testifieth, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.

Heb. 10: 24:

24 For Christ is not entered into the holy places, made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself; now to appear in the presence of God for us.

Matt. 22: 41, 42, 43 and 44:

41 While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them,

42 Saying, What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David.

43 He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying,

44 The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool?

Acts 2: 32, 33, 34 and 35:

32 This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses.

33 Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear.

34 For David is not ascended into the heavens; but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand,

35 Until I make thy foes thy footstool.

Christ's reign of a thousand years is probably prophetic time. Watch out for the next shot.

A. D. FAIRBANKS.

Reply to A. D. Fairbanks,

By E. C. Fuqua.

It is with supreme delight that I enter into this exchange of views with my honored opponent, A. D. Fairbanks, and especially do I appreciate the occasion, in view of the grand subject we have for investigation—the Second Coming of the Lord. I predict that benefit to all and detriment to none will come of this friendly exchange.

Barring unnecessary preliminaries, I shall enter at once into the discussion, by stating my contention, thus:

Since His ascension to heaven, forty days after the resurrection, Christ the Lord has remained upon His throne in heaven, where He must remain until all His enemies are placed under His feet; after which He will personally and visibly return to earth in what is commonly called His Second Coming. This Second Coming is yet future, and is the only Coming in which He personally is to take part.

This definitely draws the line between Bro. Fairbanks and myself and enables the reader to grasp the subject of this exchange. The reader will please remember the subject of our contention.

Bro. Fairbanks contends that the Second Coming of Christ is now a past event, and as such was invisible, not literal. With these statements before the reader I shall proceed to examine the evidences offered in favor of Bro. Fairbanks' contention.

The 110th Psalm is cited. This is quoted by Peter, in Acts 2: 34, and applied by him to the ascended and coronated Lord Christ. The prophecy was fulfilled when Christ was coronated King in the heavens, which occurred on the Day of Pentecost, and was announced by the apostle, as above cited. Christ still sits upon that throne on God's right hand, where He must sit until after the general judgment; for at this time He will still be seated upon that throne: "When the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all His angels with Him, then shall He sit on the throne of His glory," etc. (Matt. 25: 31.) This will be His last Kingly act—the judgment of men. The climax of this act will introduce eternity to both classes; for upon His fiat will the righteous leave the judgment for their home in heaven, and coincidentally will the wicked be consigned to "eternal punishment." (Matt. 25: 34, 41, 46.) This forms "the end, when He shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when He shall have abolished

all rule and all authority and power. For He must reign till He hath put all His enemies under His feet. The last enemy that shall be abolished is death." (1 Cor. 15: 24-27.)

The reader will note that Christ ascended His throne on the very dawn of Christianity—the very day upon which the church was formed, and that He will still be seated upon this same throne when He comes to finally judge the world and usher in eternity. As this last act has not yet been performed, we conclude that Christ has not yet come, but that He is still seated on His throne in the heavens.

Upon this throne He became and still is both King and Priest—"a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." (Heb. 6: 20.) As King He rules over His subjects, the church of Christ; as Priest He intercedes for them as their Advocate. (1 John 2: 1; Rom. 8: 34.) This double work of His must continue until the end—until He comes again; for His last act will involve both the kingly and priestly functions—the kingly authority to send to perdition the rebellious, and the priestly mission of interceding at the portals of heaven for the admission of the righteous and loyal subjects. (Psa. 24: 7-10.)

"The rod of His strength," by which Bro. Fairbanks shows Christ will subdue His enemies, is the Truth or Word of God, called also "the sword of the Spirit." (Eph. 6: 17.) This is His instrument for slaying the rebellious. "For the word of God is living and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart." (Heb. 4: 12.) This is the instrument named in 2 Thess. 2: 8; called "the breath [spirit] of His mouth," and the "sharp two-edged sword" of Rev. 1: 16. In Rev. 19: 15, this same "sword" is the instrument by which He judges the world and rules over men, which settles the question and proves that Christ is now ruling over His people with His blessed Word, and that when He comes again He will judge the wicked by the same Word. "The Word that I spake, the same shall judge him in the last day." (Jno. 12: 48.)

Bro. Fairbanks thinks the coming mentioned in 2 Thess. 2, "was at the time of writing this epistle, at hand." Paul wrote those people, to correct that idea, and positively told them that they should let no man lead them to believe that "the day of the Lord is just at hand." (2 Thess. 2: 1-4.) Read it again, Bro. Fairbanks.

The remainder of Bro. Fairbanks' article is taken up with long quotations proving that Christ is King and Priest in heaven, and that He rules from heaven. That is all granted. Christ will rule from His throne in heaven, until He finishes His rule altogether; but this rule will be through the Word of God or Sword of the Spirit. From heaven He sent forth the Holy Spirit to teach the world. (John 14:26.) The Holy Spirit came upon the Day of Pentecost. (Acts 2:1-5.) He now dwells in Christians (1 Cor. 3:16, 17) and teaches them through the written word of inspired men, the Apostles. (1 Cor. 2:12, 13; 1 Peter 1:12.) This written word is the New Testament—written by the Apostles inspired of God to write for us. All who read and follow the Apostles' teaching, are being led by the Spirit of God, who speaks through them. (Matt. 10:19, 20; Luke 10:16.)

But the Second Coming of Christ is His coming from heaven to raise the dead and judge them, and after judging to consign the two classes—the good and the bad—to their eternal states. This Coming is yet future, as we shall show in a subsequent article. His Coming is the end of all things temporal, as both the living and the dead will be the object of this dispensation of judgment.

E. C. FUQUA.

Second Article, by A. D. Fairbanks.

To make good and compelling the claim of my first paper on Christ's Second Coming, namely, this that it is spiritual, and not literal, invisible, not visible; that the period of his reign as King, is confined to the length of time he occupies the throne with the Father in Heaven. I shall proceed to offer proof that Christ's answer to the question of the Pharisees is in point of evidence, that Christ's coming, in the Kingdom, is spiritual and not discernable, as a location, by boundaries; and that it was an event that transacted in immediate connection with the destruction of Jerusalem. The question of the Pharisees, as recorded in Luke 17th, and Christ's answer when compared with the questions of the disciples on Mount Olivet, and Christ's answer to it, forms a treatise of compelling kind. Three things are made clear, the NATURE, WHEN, and HOW. First the nature, see chapter 17, 20th and 21st verses.

20—And when he was demanded of the Pharisees when the kingdom of God should come, he answered

them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation.

21—Neither shall they say, Lo here! or Lo there! for behold, the kingdom of God is within you.

The Kingdom of God is not a phenomenal show. I will here group a few references to the Kingdom of God, so that we can the more advantageously get its full meaning. Read reflectively the following list.

Matt. 16: 27 and 28: "27—For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works.

"28—Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."

Matt. 21: 31—"Whether of them twain did the will of his father? They say unto him, The first. Jesus saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you."

Matt. 21: 43—"Therefore I say unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."

Mark 4: 30, 31, 32—"And he said, Whereunto shall we liken the kingdom of God? or with what comparison shall we compare it? It is like a grain of mustard seed, which, when it is sown in the earth, is less than all the seeds that be in the earth. But when it is sown, it groweth up, and becometh greater than all herbs, and shooteth out great branches; so that the fowls of the air may lodge under the shadow of it."

Matt. 3: 1, 2—"In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea. And saying, Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

Matt. 4: 17—"From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

Mark 1: 14, 15—"Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came to Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God. And saying, the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand."

It is common practice to bolster up a theory to make a distinction between the two ways of wording, I claim, of the same thing. Full comparison ought to reveal the folly of it. Here is a single example that is in point of illustration:

Matt. 19: 23, 24—"Then said Jesus unto his disciples, Verily I say unto you, that a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven. And again I say unto you, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye

of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." The kingdom of heaven, is the kingdom of God. This is an example of interchangeable use too manifest to admit of question.

These are all references to a kingdom of a present, state kind. See also Luke 22: 29, 30.

"And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me. That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

This, observe, must all transact while Christ has a kingdom, prior to "His coming" to give it up, as stated in 1 Cor. 15: 24. If the quite extensively prevailing idea is correct, that Christ is here bodily in the period of his reign, he is also here at its close, and at this turning point, it being designated, "his coming," it involves a profound mystery, this, namely, from whence does he come? If he is here at this junction, he does not come. It is easy to comprehend; however, if in the period of his reign, "he is in heaven, at God's right hand." But if he is here at the time of his giving up his kingdom, it is meaningless language to call it his coming. But we will now return to Christ's answer to the question of the Pharisees. After stating to his questioners that "the Kingdom of God cometh not with observation" and that neither shall they say, "Lo, here! or Lo, there! for behold! the kingdom of God is within you." Turning to his disciples, he further on the matter in hand, said, "And he said unto the disciples, The days will come, when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see it. And they shall say to you, See here! or, see there! go not after them, nor follow them."

The fact of the repetition, exactly in the 23rd verse of the caution in the 21st, as a part of the reply to the Pharisees, is sufficient to show that Christ continues explanation of the question raised. He first informs his disciples that they will lack ability to recognize the event. Their blindness will be the intervening veil. Then he proceeds to the naming of the signs that shall proceed in immediate connection, and that shall simultaneously occur with the destruction of Jerusalem. At this stage of the argument, I aver, that Christ would not, and could not, answer two quite different questions, of diverse objectives, in the same way. So, far as he discourses in answer to the Pharisees' question, the language with but a shade of difference, is all reproduced in his answer to the disciples' question on Mount Olivet. I will here furnish two parables that

couple: the destruction of Jerusalem with the advent of Christ. Mat. 24: "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth let him understand!)"

16—"Then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains.

17—"Let him which is on the housetop not come down to take anything out of the house.

18—"Neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes."

Luke 17: 29, 30, 31—"But the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all.

30—"Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed.

31—"In that day, he which shall be upon the housetop, and his stuff in the house, let him not come down to take it away; and he that is in the field, let him likewise not return back."

This is an identification that cannot be gainsaid in fairness.

Having prepared this second article before seeing Bro. Fuqua's reply to my first, I simply take additional space to say that the reply was able and gentlemanly, and I only discover a difference between us on the transition point at the close of Christ's term of rule, while at "God's right hand." At this juncture his office as king and priest ceases as I understand it. Then he gives over all to God, even the Father, forever. Bro. Fuqua extends his mission beyond this. With reference to 2 Thess. 2:2, Clark admits that it all depends as to whether Paul is referring to the destruction of the Jewish polity or the final judgment. I think I shall prove that he refers to the former.

A. D. FAIRBANKS.

Second Reply, By E. C. Fuqua.

In view of the esteemed kindness of The Daily Press in giving us space, I think we should economize with it and confine our discussion to the exact difference between us. I regret that Bro. Fairbanks did not read my last article before writing his "reply," as this would have saved all the space his last article occupied.

If I should ever need someone to assist me set forth the Biblical truth, that Christ reigns in heaven, where

His throne is, I should need no better assistance than the above by Bro. Fairbanks. But, unfortunately, this is not the issue between us, and hence it is a waste of time and space to write further upon this phase. Let us settle upon our exact difference and give our limited time and space to the settlement of that alone.

As this difference hinges almost solely upon the question, "When was Christ's Second Coming to take place?" I shall proceed to set forth the teaching of the Scriptures on this point, requesting Bro. Fairbanks to please confine himself to this in his reply.

I shall first note how He shall come, and what is to take place when He comes, thus:

✓ 1. He will come visibly. (Acts 1: 11.) Just as He was seen depart from the earth, so shall He be seen on His return.

✓ 2. He will come in the glory of God. (Matt. 16: 27.) This glory will be visible to all mankind.

✓ 3. When He comes "every eye shall see Him." (Rev. 1: 7.) Therefore His appearance will be universal: the wicked will mourn at the sight of Him, and the righteous will rejoice, universally.

✓ 4. He will come in His own glory. (Luke 9: 26.) His infinite Royalty will astonish the universe; His Kingly authority will strike awe to every human heart.

✓ 5. He will come "in flaming fire." (2 Thess. 1: 7.) The superb grandeur of this exhibition will eclipse every previous sight witnessed by mortal eye. This is the fire that is to devour the elements "with fervent heat" (2 Peter 3: 10): the earth and the heavens will literally be on fire, when He appears again. "What a wonderful sight that will be!"

✓ 6. He will come accompanied by all the angels of His power. (Matt. 25: 31.) An innumerable host of angelic warriors, armed with infinite power, will accompany Him: No wonder "every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess" before Him on this occasion! (See Rom. 14: 11.)

✓ 7. The sight of His coming will be marvelous to the righteous. (2 Thess. 1: 10.) How could this be if it were invisible?

✓ 8. The sight of His coming will strike dread to the wicked. (Rev. 1: 7.) This will be the greatest day of mourning the earth or heavens ever witnessed.

✓ 9. He will come "with the shout of the archangel, and with the trump of God." (1 Thess. 4: 16.) This trump will be actually heard by all the dead, and they shall arise at its fearful blast. Most appalling will be the noise of that hour.

10. When He comes, every righteous man in all the earth will be caught up unto Him in midair, to meet the resurrected dead in Christ. (1 Thess. 4: 16, 17.) Has this occurred?

11. When He comes both the righteous and the wicked of both the dead and the living will in one grand company stand before Him to hear the pronouncement of judgment. (Matt. 25: 31, 32.) Another wonderful sight, which neither Bro. Fairbanks, nor I have seen as yet! At the sound of the trump the righteous dead will arise first, to be immediately joined by the transformed righteous living, and together they will march with Him to the judgment—a mighty triumphal procession—where the destiny of all mankind will be authoritatively pronounced. (Read 1 Thess. 4: 14-18, in connection with Matt. 25: 31-46.)

12. When He comes all His servants will be "manifested . . . with Him in glory." (Col. 3: 4.) Both He and all the redeemed will alike be visible—"manifested." The "glory" will be that of their new or glorified bodies; or as Paul says, "He shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of His glory." (Phil. 3: 21.) Indeed shall the righteous "shine as the brightness of the firmament" on this occasion! (Dan. 12: 3.)

13. "Ten thousand of His holy ones" shall accompany Him. (Jude 14.) Or, as told by the prophet, "Thousands of thousands" will minister unto Him. (Dan. 7: 10.) These are His "holy angels," the "angels of His power." Woe to the wicked man who is left to face that fierce array!

14. At His coming He will "execute judgment upon all." (Jude 15.) If this judgment of all the wicked has yet occurred, will Bro. Fairbanks tell us, how the *kaiser* has been overlooked?

15. The effect upon the wicked, of His coming, will be that every one shall be "cast into the furnace of fire," where "there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth." (Matt. 13: 41, 42.) His mission to them will be to dispatch them into this their final state: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels." (Matt. 25: 41.) "And these shall go away into eternal punishment." (Verse 46.) Has this occurred?

16. When He comes He will hold in His hand the rewards for both the righteous and the wicked. (Rev. 22: 12); and as these rewards are known to be eternal, His coming will usher in eternity and the banishment of time. Has this occurred?

17. When He comes, "THEN" shall He render to all classes their just deserts, which will close the drama of human existence. (Matt. 24: 27.) Who will affirm that this time has come?

18. At His Second Coming Christ will be seen "as the lightening cometh forth from the east, and is seen even unto the west." (Matt. 24: 27.) What could be more visible than this!

19. He will come with "power and great glory" amid the tomb-rending blasts of the last trump and the shout of the mighty angels as they flit to and fro throughout the earth gathering together His elect "from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." (Matt. 24: 30, 31.)

20. All "the tribes of earth" shall moan over His appearing. (Matt. 24: 30.) This could not be if His coming were invisible.

21. "All nations"—every man of them—shall assemble before Him as He sits upon His throne in judgment. (Matt. 25: 32.)

22. At this time He will be both visible and approachable, as all will address Him as man to man. (Matt. 25: 37, 44.)

23. He will come with "the clouds of heaven." (Mark 14: 62.) As He departed through a rift in the clouds (Acts 1: 9), so shall He be suddenly revealed through the clouds; and the clouds rending, the fire roaring, the trump blasting, and the mighty angels shouting, will announce the Coming of the Victor over Death. A sight unseen till now!

24. Added to these scenes august will be the rending of the tombs and the resurrection of the general dead: "All that are in the tombs shall hear His voice, and shall come forth." (John 5: 28, 29.) Thus will earth be once more literally depopulated, as before the creation, and ripe for annihilation. This has hardly occurred.

25. When He comes again, "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat, and the earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up." (2 Peter 3: 10.) Certainly that will be visible!

Now, as all of these twenty-five wonderful things and events are to occur when Christ comes the second time; and as not one of them has yet occurred; we conclude that the Second Coming of Christ is yet future. If our conclusion is erroneous, will Bro. Fairbanks please set us right in his next article?

In our next article we shall see what it was that

came at the destruction of Jerusalem.

E. C. FUQUA

Third Article, by A. D. Fairbanks.

The third and perhaps the last assault that I shall deem necessary to make against the literal, visible Second Coming theory, and the no less erroneous claim of its being an event still to come. There will be, however, ample Bible matter left for attack, unused as good and strong as I shall have given, when this third invasion is concluded. In fact, all Bible matter relevant to the question can be conserved in support of the claim, herein made, without violence to any passage of Scripture relating to question. I have incontrovertibly made good my claim thus far, having driven a nail in a sure place. I now, propose to clinch it, and climax my argument with much more of the unanswerable.

If, while Christ was here, in the flesh, he did not know when and how he would return, I am sure that present-day guessers will only get and deserve the honor of falling in line with the ever recurring, reappearing army of hypothetical Bible diviners. We will let Christ and his immediate followers dispose of the question, and thus relieve ourselves of any responsibility, except the plain and simple task of reproduction. When Christ chose his disciples, the first commission given was in a restricted field of operation, thus stated: See Matt. 10: 5, 6, 7. "The twelve Jesus sent forth and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go, preach, saying, The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand."

This last sentence quoted is followed by instructions as to how they should conduct themselves, what they should do, in case of acceptance, or rejection, etc.; and then, in the following language restates the same thing in the way of clear explanation, of what he meant by, "And as ye go, preach, saying, The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." It is this: "But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come."

Now, less than one year from this time, Christ restated his first utterance on the question of his early return. See Matt. 16: 27, 28: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels;

and then shall he reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Now, that class of people designated "evil servants," who say, "My Lord delayeth his coming," are guilty of all sorts of subterfuge to nullify this plain wording. Bible men, by the thousands, have all of this fulfilled in six or eight days following the forecast, in an event that in no way but vaguely answers to the prediction. The version is ridiculous from the standpoint of "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." There were none of that company that did taste of death before the transfiguration. But on this particular point, we are here with the unquestionable solution. On the third occasion of Jesus' showing himself to his disciples as risen from the dead, he directs his conversation to Peter. First, in sounding him in his intensity of love for him, giving him pointers as to what real love means; and follows this with endeavor to enlighten Peter concerning his futurity. He said: "Verily I say unto thee, When thou wast young, thou girdest thyself, and walkest whither thou wouldst: but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldst not. This spake he, signifying by what death he should glorify God. And when he had spoken this, he saith unto him, Follow me. Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple, whom Jesus loved following: which also leaned on his breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee? Peter seeing him saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me."

Second Coming twisters of the Scriptures have turned this plain language into a farce by closing their eyes to plain statements in the case, and guessing that Jesus went through all of this to school Peter into a state of indifference concerning the affairs of others. Dodgers find nothing in it but that. But, notice, the recorder provides against an evasion of that kind, by re-inforcing the intended purpose of the last part of the address to Peter, thus: "Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die: yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die: but, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?"

Turning now to the 24th chapter of Matthew, and noting that the destruction of Jerusalem is called "the

great tribulation," and that immediately following it (not remotely) there is named a series of events that enact in immediate connection, all of which the disciples were to witness themselves. Rigorously adhering to the rule of construction, the science of composition, a contrary view is inadmissible. Here we give the text entire covering this point. First, the tribulation located, see Matt. 24: 20, 21, "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day: for then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be." Second, that which followed immediately, see Matt. 24: 29 to 34 inclusive: "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in Heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of Heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of Heaven to the other. Now, learn a parable from the fig tree: When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh: so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is nigh, even at the doors. Verily, I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." Notice, following the four first events, the next two is located by "And then." "And then"—When?—not remotely from the first, but "THEN." The 35th verse is in proof of the claim that the disciples were to "see all these things," and the last verse in the list is the conclusive support of the point made.

We'll close argument with the testimony of four of Christ's immediate followers; prominent is one of the New Testament writers: Phil. 4: 5, "Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand." 2 Thess. 2: 2, "That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand." Heb. 10: 37, "For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry." The American version reads, "And yet a very little while."

1 Peter 4: 7, "But the end of all things is at hand: be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer."

James 5: 8, "Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh."

1 John 2: 18. "Little children, it is the last time, and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time."

This is much less than half of all I have.

Brother Fuqua thinks I do not hold myself to the point in question. I claim that in opening the discussion, I led out with the proposition that Christ's Second Coming is a spiritual, invisible coming, not a material appearance subject to boundaries. I have strictly held myself to the task of proving it with an abundance of Scripture references, in single passages and in groups; and as yet, I have looked in vain for a refutation of my position. I think Brother Fuqua is in the same fix as are the great multitude of Bible students, namely this, the fault of calling Christ's Second Coming his second and last advent, and thus without distinction, employing all scriptures relating to his coming to one single event, unconscious of the fact that a second and a third coming is the plain teaching of the New Testament. Right here, without lengthy argument, I can do no better than to revert to a scripture I have already cited in proof, see the 15th chapter of 1st Cor., 22nd to the 28th verse, inclusive, in which is this plain statement of the occasion being the general judgment: Christ's coming, the end of his reign, the triumphant results, the "giving up, or over, his kingdom to God, even the Father," at which time he is to be subjected to God, who at this juncture is to be "all in all."

At Christ's Second Coming he set up his kingdom; at his third and final he gives it up. I would like to have my dear Bro. Fuqua take as much pains to explain away my proof texts as he wants me to take in refuting his position. If The Press will allow us further space, I am confident that I have got the goods, good and plenty.

A. D FAIRBANKS.

Third Reply, By E. C. Fuqua.

As was anticipated by me at the outset of this discussion, Bro. Fairbanks is confused regarding the distinction between the providential ushering in of the spiritual Kingdom, the Church, and the Visitation of the Lord Himself, which we style His Coming. The Second Coming of Christ is precisely stated, in Acts 1: 11, and upon this statement I took my stand, at the outset, emphatically denying that Christ has SO COME since His ascension to heaven. Here is where the fight

is. If Christ has SO COME, as is here stated He would, where is the proof? In my last reply I gave twenty-five reasons why this Coming has not yet taken place. Bro. Fairbanks ignores them all. Will Bro. Fairbanks kindly answer this query:

In the very hour of Christ's ascension, the apostles were assured by the heavenly messengers: "This Jesus, who was received up from, you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye beheld Him going into heaven." (Acts 1: 11.) Where is the proof that Jesus has yet "so come in like manner" as He here ascended?

This, mind you, was to be His next or second appearing after His ascension. It was to be like the ascension—precisely. Such an event has never come, and hence, is yet future.

The coming of the Kingdom—the establishment of the Church—is figuratively styled His coming, to be sure. To prove this I shall appropriate Bro. Fairbanks' own texts, thus:

"There are some of them that stand here, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in His kingdom." (Matt. 16: 28.) Now note the parallel in Mark:

"There are some here of them that stand by, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power." (Mark 9: 1.) The parallel in Luke:

"There are some of them that stand here, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God." (Luke 9: 27.)

These all teach the same, and from them we learn that the coming of the Kingdom, or Church, is figuratively styled the coming of Christ, which occurred, in this sense, on the Day of Pentecost, when He was represented by the Holy Spirit sent forth from heaven. (See Acts 2: 33.) This Holy Spirit was both "seen" and "heard" by the disciples, as is here stated, and is the very fulfillment of the promise made in the above passages presented in parallel. They should "see the Kingdom of God come with power" (or, figuratively, the coming of Christ in the inauguration of His Kingdom, or Church), which was also styled "seeing the kingdom" itself.

If I remember correctly, it was Bro. Fairbanks himself who, in a former article, warned against forcing parallel scriptures to establish contradictory theories. Let him take his own physic. He has done the very thing he himself condemned. He makes "seeing the kingdom" a distinct act from "seeing the Son of man

coming in His kingdom," when the Scriptures show them to be identically the same.

Indeed, there were persons then standing before Him, who would not taste of death, till after the Day of Pentecost, when the Kingdom should be inaugurated by the visible descent of the Holy Spirit. On this Day of Pentecost Christ was to come to His throne at God's right hand, be given the scepter of government, inaugurate the Kingdom, and send forth the Holy Spirit, in visible form, to announce that fact to the disciples. The descent of the Holy Spirit is what they "saw," and all they saw, but in seeing that, they saw "the Son of man coming in His kingdom."

Jesus told Judas (not Iscariot): "If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." (John 14: 23.) They abide in us by dwelling in the Spirit which dwells in us." (See Eph. 2: 22; 1 Cor. 3: 16; 17.) In this sense only did Christ come into the disciples on the Day of Pentecost, and when they saw the Holy Spirit in the form of "tongues parting assunder" (Acts 2: 3), they saw the Kingdom coming—they saw the Son of man coming in His Kingdom. They actually saw neither Christ nor the Kingdom; but they saw what was sent to represent these—the Holy Spirit in the above form.

But the Second Coming of Christ, as we learn from Acts 1: 11, was not to be represented by a figure, but was to be a literal sight of His actual Person. Let Bro. Fairbanks deny this if he will. What I claim, is that what was here promised as the next Coming of Christ, has not yet occurred—neither on Pentecost, nor at the destruction of Jerusalem; hence is still future.

Now for Matt. 16: 27, 28: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels; and then shall He render unto every man according to his deeds. Verily I say unto you, There are some of them that stand here, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in His kingdom."

Two distinct events are here mentioned. One is the Coming of Christ (1) in His Father's glory, (2) with His angels, (3) to judge "every man." This is known to be the final Coming and the end of all things, as my twenty-five references, in my last article, clearly show. The other is the coming of the Kingdom with the descent of the Holy Spirit, which came on the Day of Pentecost. Can't Bro. Fairbanks see this?

Now for Mark 8: 38-9: 1: "For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and

unfaithful generation, the Son of man also shall be ashamed of him, when He cometh in the glory of His Father with the holy angels. And He said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There are some here of them that stand by, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power."

Two distinct events are here mentioned. The Coming of Christ (1) in the glory of the Father, (2) with the holy angels, (3) and to judge men. This is His final Coming. The other event is the coming of the Kingdom.

It is superfluous to quote Luke 9: 26, 27, which is a parallel. Here are three passages which clearly distinguish between the Coming of Christ as an event, and the coming of the Kingdom. Why is the former always attended with GLORY, ANGELS, and JUDGMENT, while the latter is always without any of these? Did Matthew, Mark and Luke just happen to make this distinction? or is it significant? Let Bro. Fairbanks answer, since he positively ignores the distinction here made.

Bro. Fairbanks makes this same blunder in interpreting Matt. 24: 34. The expression, "all these things," refers to the things that were related to the destruction of Jerusalem. (Verse 8.) In verses 33 and 34 we have the same expression. "All these things," says He, shall be accomplished in "this generation." (Verse 34.) But in verse 33 He speaks of an event that is to come AFTER "all these things" should be seen: "When ye see all these things, know ye that He is nigh, even at the doors." After "all these things," then this other thing was to be in the future; and this other thing was the Coming of Christ. See that, Bro. Fairbanks?

Another phrase is similar—"those days." It is found in verses 19, 22, and 29. Its significance is stated in verse 22: "And except those days had been shortened, no flesh would have been saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." The expression, then, refers to the destruction of Jerusalem and her calamities, as both of us agree. That is plain.

Now, in verse 29, we have this: "But immediately after the tribulation of those days . . . shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven . . . coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And He shall send forth His angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together His elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." (Verses 29-32.)

This clearly places this Coming AFTER the destruction of Jerusalem, and associates with it the familiar "glory," "angels," and "judgment" so clearly distinguished in Matt. 16: 27, 28; Mark 8: 38-9: 1, and Luke 9: 26, 27. No matter what was to occur at the destruction of Jerusalem, the Coming of Christ was to be "immediately AFTER" all that, and NOT AT THAT TIME. The term "immediately" does not mean that it was to follow in the next moment, but the next immediate event, which was to be the Coming of Christ, and which has not yet occurred. This verse forever settles the fact, that Christ did not come at the destruction of Jerusalem, but was to come "immediately after" that event; and as the scenes which were to accompany His Coming are such as to make us know they have not yet occurred, we therefore know the meaning of the term "immediately" to refer to a subsequent event, and not to a moment of time. What was to transpire "immediately after" the destruction of Jerusalem, happens to be catalogued precisely after the order of the things I showed, in twenty-five counts, to accompany His final Coming. Therefore Christ did not come at the destruction of Jerusalem.

Final query: Has Christ come since He ascended to heaven? If so, was He seen "in like manner" as when He ascended? If not, how could He have come the Second time? When Bro. Fairbanks answers this query, he will annihilate his own cause and acquiesce in mine.

E. C. FUQUA.

Fourth Article, by A. D. Fairbanks.

If Brother Fuqua is logical in relating up scriptures, or, in divorcing them, in case when I think they are joined together in support of a single claim; I am not going to charge up the blame to him for my lack of comprehension in the case.

If my comparisons fail, in proper distinctions, I am at fault myself. But relative to this matter I propose to leave it with the reading public, especially, to those who are interested, and have some ability to judge of relative merits or demerits of the biblical argument. I fail to see how a transaction, in fact, like the Pentecostal occasion, can be construed to answer to Christ's Second Coming. The particulars of the occasion do not in any feature answer to the forecast, and are as really lacking in correspondence to it, as did the transfiguration event fail to answer to the same prophecy.

Bro. Fuqua states that the kingdom of God is the church, and thus unconsciously concedes to the claim I make. One has only to read studiously the 21st chapter of Revelation to understand this fully. Christ's Second Coming, is well set forth in 2 Peter, 3rd chapter, in which is represented the transition of the old heavens and earth state, to the new heavens and earth state, "wherein dwelleth righteousness." This new heaven and earth condition, referred to in Rev. 21, is called the Bride and the Lamb's Wife, the Church. There can be no mistake in the definition herein given. The bride, the Lamb's wife, is called a house, a temple, the new heaven and new earth state, the Church. The old and new states of the Church are set forth in Gal. 4: 22-31, in the persons of Hagar, the bondwoman, and Sarah, the freewoman. This represents the Church both in its bride and marriage state.

This temple, or house, is ONE in two parts, the old Jerusalem and the new. Bro. Fuqua, don't overlook this reference, (see Rev. 21: 9-14, inclusive). Notice, Peter said, that this new heaven and earth state eventuates according to promise. (See 2 Peter 3: 13.) The promise is in Isaiah 65: 17-25, AT WHICH TIME is building, planting, advance in years, old age, presence of both saints and sinners, and death.

This transition is quite extensively elaborated in Isa. 24th, 25th and 26th chapters, also the 34th and 35th chapters. I advise that anyone interested should read 2 Peter, and the then above separate forecasts, as cited. This house is the one David conceived should be built unto the Lord. (See 2 Sam. 7: 1-29.) This treatise is too lengthy to reproduce here. But one verse in the contract, between David and the Lord, is this: "He [David] shall build an house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever." The Lord in another place, told David that he should never "lack him a man to sit upon the throne forever." See Solomon's dedicatory prayer in which is this reference to the Lord's promise to David. (See 1 Kings 8: 25.) "Therefore now, Lord God of Israel, keep with thy servant David, my father, that thou promised him, saying, There shall not fail thee a man in my sight to sit on the throne of Israel." This promise is four times repeated. (See also Psa. 132: 11.) Now at this stage we may find additional light on this point in the 89th Psalm. More than one-half of this Psalm, from 1st to the 37th verse, is devoted directly and indirectly in reference to this promise. Read it attentively. Here is one part of the whole: "My covenant I will not

...eak, nor alter the thing that has gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure forever, and his **THRONE AS THE SUN** before me. It shall be established **FOREVER AS THE MOON.**" This is perpetual, for all time, if language is dependable for conveyance of ideas. To Mary (see Luke 1:31)—"Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb and bring forth a son, and shall call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give him the throne of his father David." It is as clearly set forth in Isa. 9: 6, 7. When David was deposed, *i. e.*, his kingdom or throne ended, which was in A. D. 70, and the transition took place from the old to the new state, from the shadow to the substance, from the literal to the spiritual, it was then that Christ took the throne of David; took the government upon his shoulder, to administer it to the time of his final coming, when he is to deliver it up to God even the Father; after which time, it no longer is his throne or his kingdom. (See 1 Cor. 15: 24, 25.) If David's throne continues so long as the sun and moon endure, it can only be true in the occupancy of his throne in the person of the Second David, Christ.

Bro. Fuqua says: "No matter what was to occur at the destruction of Jerusalem, the Coming of Christ was to be immediately AFTER all that, AND NOT AT THAT TIME."

"The term 'immediately' does not mean that it was to follow the next moment, but the next immediate event, which was to be the Coming of Christ." These words are his. Reader, how is that for a rebuttal of my claims?
A. D. FAIRBANKS.

Fourth Reply, By E. C. Fuqua.

I have withheld a full refutation of the position of Bro. Fairbanks, because I wanted him to place before the reader the full array of his proof-texts. This he has now done, and hence the time has come for me to fully expose his theory, which I undertake with all becoming respect for him and his convictions.

1. The root of Bro. Fairbanks' difficulty lies alone in his misapprehension of the time of the setting up of the Kingdom. His words are: "At Christ's Second Coming he set up his kingdom; at his third and final he gives it up." Then he makes the "Second Coming" take place at the destruction of Jerusalem, and hence

...icates the setting up of the Kingdom at that time. According to that theory, Christ had no Kingdom till the destruction of Jerusalem, when it was set up, or established. This theory flatly contradicts the New Testament, which shows that Bro. Fairbanks is (unconsciously) trying to force the New Testament to bend to his erroneous idea of the Coming of Christ. Let us see: In 1 Thess. 2: 12, we read: "To the end that ye should walk worthily of God, who hath called you into His own kingdom and glory." This was written eighteen years before the destruction of Jerusalem; hence, according to Bro. Fairbanks' theory, eighteen years before the Kingdom was established. How does he account for the Kingdom being in existence eighteen years before it was set up or inaugurated? Again: "Who delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of His love." (Col. 1: 13.) This was eight years before the destruction of Jerusalem, and eight years before Bro. Fairbanks says the Kingdom came; and yet Paul and all the Colossians were already in the Kingdom at this time! Once more: "I John, your brother and partaker with you in the tribulation and kingdom and patience which are in Jesus, was in the isle that is called Patmos," etc. (Rev. 1: 9.) Revelations was written a little over one year before Bro. Fairbanks says the Kingdom came; yet John and "the seven churches which were in Asia" were all in that Kingdom! Let Bro. Fairbanks harmonize his theory with these indisputable facts—a thing he can never do! These facts prove that the Kingdom came before—and years before—the destruction of Jerusalem; and if it is true, that Christ came the Second Time when the Kingdom came, then both Christ and the Kingdom came years before the destruction of Jerusalem. I leave this very sick patient, No. One, to be doctored by Bro. Fairbanks, while I bring in the next.

2. He tells us that "David was deposed, *i. e.*, his kingdom or throne ended," "in A. D. 70, and the transition took place from the old to the new state," and that "it was then that Christ took the throne of David," etc. That challenges the testimony of Peter to the Pentecostans, where he tells them that Christ ascended David's throne at His resurrection and consummate ascension. After quoting David's prophecy concerning Christ sitting on his throne, Peter adds: "He [David] forseeing this spake of the resurrection of the Christ, that neither was He left unto Hades, nor did His flesh see corruption." (Acts 2: 29-32.) In the 33rd verse, he continues: "Being therefore by the

right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise the Holy Spirit, He hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear." That is, the proof that Christ is seated upon David's throne in fulfillment of David's prophecy, is in this visible descent of the Holy Spirit, "which ye see and hear." Bro. Fairbanks has admitted that Christ, before the destruction of Jerusalem, was both King and Priest. He could be neither until He ascended His throne in the room of David. This He did on the Day of Pentecost, as the outpouring of the Holy Spirit as His Representative on earth proves beyond all contradiction. But what becomes of Bro. Fairbanks' idea, that Christ did not become David's successor until Jerusalem was destroyed? Here is another very sick patient, No. Two, for Bro. Fairbanks to doctor.

3. In a former article, Bro. Fairbanks told us, that in the expressions, "at hand," "draweth nigh," "a very little while," and such like, relative to Christ's Coming, an immediate advent was meant. I took the position, that though these expressions are thus stated, the span of time is in them measured, not by man's limitations, but according to God's measure of time. Peter tells us, that "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day" (2 Peter 3: 8), and this he says in explaining the delay of Christ's Coming. It is a thorough answer to all those scriptures quoted by Bro. Fairbanks, showing His Coming to be "at hand," etc. But that it may be placed beyond the reach of cavil, I respectfully call his attention to those statements regarding the final Coming of Christ, in Revelations, thus: After describing the eternal Kingdom which will be ushered in at Jesus' final Coming, John says: "The Lord . . . sent His angel to show unto His servants the things which must shortly come to pass. And behold, I come quickly. Blessed is he that keepeth the words of the prophecy of this book [Revelations]." (Rev. 22: 6-8.) Again: "Behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to render to each man according to his works." (Verse 12.) "He who testifieth these things saith, Yea: I come quickly. Amen: come, Lord Jesus." (Verse 20.) So closes the Bible—with the promise of the final Coming of the Lord to judge all men; and of this Coming He says, "I come quickly." Has He come yet to "render to each man according to his works"? He has not; yet it was to be "quickly." This answers every quotation Bro. Fairbanks has made, and it shows that they every one refer to the final Coming of the Lord. But

eter settles it, in these words: "But the end of all things is at hand;" (1 Peter 4: 7.) Have "all things" ended yet? Then let Bro. Fairbanks adjust his theory to the Bible's own comment upon the phrase before us, namely, that the final Coming of Christ was then, and is now, "at hand," for there is no place in all the Bible, where the final Coming of Christ is declared, or intimated to be a great way off. This is another serious case that needs doctoring—No. Three.

4. He quoted Matt. 24: 29, 30, where Christ's Coming is declared to be an "immediate" event, and said this took place at the destruction of Jerusalem, and was the "Second Coming" of the Lord. But in his first article, if I remember rightly, he told us that this Second Coming was "invisible." He has said this several times in this debate. Yet he quotes the above passage and applies it to this "invisible" coming, as he styles it. Now note how the passage contradicts him: "And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and THEY SHALL SEE the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." (Matt. 24: 30.) How can a Coming, that is to be SEEN BY ALL THE TRIBES OF EARTH, be an "INVISIBLE" Coming? This shows that Bro. Fairbanks is taking passages out of their legitimate connection and trying to force them into the support of a theory they were not written to teach. Thus No. Four needs a doctor quickly!

5. In his last article, Bro. Fairbanks admits that the Kingdom of God and the Church are the same thing. Yet he tells us that the Kingdom was set up at the destruction of Jerusalem, when David "was deposed," at which time, of course; according to Bro. Fairbanks, the Church was set up. Now, will Bro. Fairbanks help us to understand how, in view of his theory, the Church existed on the Day of Pentecost, when three thousand members were added to it (Acts 2: 41, 47), which was thirty-seven years before Jerusalem was destroyed and the Kingdom was set up, according to him? The Church existed in all its organic completeness thirty-seven years before Jerusalem was destroyed; and as the Church was the Kingdom, the latter was in full force on the Day of Pentecost. So what becomes of Bro. Fairbanks' idea, that there was neither Kingdom nor Church till "David was deposed" at the destruction of Jerusalem? The truth is, "David was deposed" when Christ ascended up on high as "Lord and Christ" ("Anointed Ruler").

His reference to Gal. 4: 22-31, where Hagar and Sarah are contrasted, is misdrawn. Paul says that Hagar refers to the Sinaitic Covenant, the Old Mosaic Law, while Sarah refers to the New Covenant or Church of Christ. The former was abrogated at the death of Christ, when the "veil of the temple was rent in two from the top to the bottom" (Matt. 27: 51), and the dwelling place of God was removed to heaven forever. (See Eph. 2: 14, 15; Col. 2: 14, where the "handwriting of ordinances" was "blotted out" and "nailed to the cross" of Christ.) Since the Day of Pentecost, not one change has been made in the Church, nor will one ever be made, till Christ's Second Coming, when He will deliver the Church or Kingdom over to God forever.

Finally, as Bro. Fairbanks urges me to notice Rev. 21: 9-14, I shall gladly do so. This merely shows us the Church in her glorified state, made ready for her Husband. During time, the Church is undergoing those preparations that will fit her for the appearing of the Husband, and this passage gives us a view of her after her preparations have been accomplished—after our earthly bodies shall have been transformed into the "glorious bodies" promised us. Until the rending of the veil of the temple, at Christ's crucifixion, Old Jerusalem had been the capital city of God's people; but since the ascension of Christ, the New Jerusalem has been their capital city. (See Phil. 3: 20.) "The Jerusalem that is above is free, which is our mother." (Gal. 4: 26.) Paul wrote that in A. D. 52, which was eighteen years before Jerusalem was destroyed and the change which Bro. Fairbanks claims was made at that time. Bro. Fairbanks, will you please tell us when the New Jerusalem became our mother, according to your contention, and harmonize your claims with the passage I have just quoted? If you do that, you will be indeed a great physician.

E. C. FUQUA.

Fifth Article, by A. D. Fairbanks.

One of the things of which I can boast on the question of Christ's Second Coming is my pronounced unlikeness to the general sentiment in all the Protestant churches. Bro. Fuqua has the honor of being with the great crowd in which, unfortunately, as I see it, there is the greatest confusion of ideas, cross-wise diversities, yielding a product so chromatic, that at every turn of this theological kaleidoscope there is produced

an altogether new pattern. In my more than fifty years' study of the subject, I have ever found, on examination into any one of the multitude of versions given, an absence of ability to put harmoniously together all in Revelation that relates to this profound question. I have the same difficulty with the Rev. [?] Fuqua's theory. Of course the Bro., as he sees it, comes back with "Thou Art the Man," but let us get down to business. One of the things that Bro. Fuqua says I cannot do is to reconcile the prophecy in Matt. 16: 27, 28, to the spiritual, invisible, coming of Christ. I think the task is anything but taxing. When we remember that the Glory of a thing, creation, or being, is not in its external appearance, but in its essentiality, its utility, its serviceable character. The glory of God consists in his attributes and moral perfection. He said to Philip: "If ye have seen me ye have seen the Father," etc. The external appearance was only a man. The Jews said: "Is not this the son of Joseph?" What more? Let Jesus answer: "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not." If, essentially, I am not what my Father is, discredit my claims. His attendants, in his coming, are his angels, messengers, gospel ministers. Reward immediately follows service. "Then shall he reward every man according to his works," and eventually endow him with life eternal. This view of the 27th verse most naturally and logically connects up with that which follows in the next, the 28th verse, "Verily, I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Bro. Fuqua thinks I have on my hands some invalid cases that I have no antidote for. For example, my idea of "at hand"—shortly to come to pass—behold, I come quickly—these last days—last times—or hours—yet a very little while—the coming of the Lord draweth nigh—with other similar representations, HE CLAIMS are not expressively correct.

To escape the force of this plain language, Bro. Fuqua flees to a covering like this, "One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." That is, if the Lord tells us that an event is only a day in the future, he may mean that it is a thousand years distant. If he says a thousand years, it may mean only a brief twenty-four hours. Bro. Fuqua fails to see that this is not what God represents of man on the question of time. In dealing with man he is not thus evasive or misleading. The simple meaning is we cannot apply time-measure to God. With Him it is ONE ETERNAL NOW. Duration with God

does not begin, progress, or end. In this Bro. Fuqua is like the pursued ostrich that immerses its head in the sand to escape the notice of his pursuer. This does not go. Simple-minded people can discover this infective subterfuge. Relative to Bro. Fuqua's criticism of my position on the time of Christ's setting up his kingdom, the first reference he makes is to 1 Thess. 2: 12, which is, "To the end that ye should walk worthily of God, who hath called you into his kingdom." Then his own words are: "This was written eighteen years before the destruction of Jerusalem, hence, according to Bro. Fairbanks' theory, eighteen years in advance of Christ's coming. How does he account for the kingdom being in existence eighteen years before it was set up, or inaugurated?" I am astonished that Bro. Fuqua has, in so brief a space of time, forgotten that I cited the following: "Therefore, I say unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." I have already made it clear that the kingdom of God is perpetual. It has always been and always will be. In Daniel 2: 44 it reads: "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom. It shall not be given to other people," etc. I do not take this to mean that God is to set up his reign, or rule, in the earth as a new thing, but in a new order; therefore, when I am setting forth my doctrine of Christ's rule or reign I am thereby claiming only that a prior government order is to change. When Jesus ascended to the throne of God in Heaven, that must be distinguished from his taking the throne of David. He could not succeed to that till David was deposed, or, in other words, till David's throne, house or kingdom ceased to be, which after an earthly kind did cease at the destruction of Jerusalem. However, this same kingdom called David's, did not end at this juncture, only in its external form. It transposed, or went over to the new form or order. If Bro. Fuqua will turn to the 8th and 9th chapters of Hebrews he will clearly get my viewpoint. Here, it will be seen that the earthly tabernacle sanctuary, ALL of the ordinances of divine service, EVERY THING under the old covenant, transfers to a new under the new covenant. I do not undertake to deny that Jesus was king, even before the destruction of Jerusalem. He was on the throne of God in Heaven, but not on the throne of David. He could not have been there until the opportunity came by the deposal of David. The first order must cease, to give place to the second. All under the first (old) covenant, was after, or by the law of carnal command-

ments. This is ALL followed by a new order, spiritual. Here is another point that Bro. Fuqua does not seem to comprehend. The difference between seeing, as we ordinarily do, by observing objects outlined materially, and perceiving, which is the recognition of things not seen. Paul is a reliable, comprehensive reference on this point. He advises that we look upon things not seen, rather than upon things seen, as the former things abide and the latter perish. I have already made this clear by reference to what Jesus at one time told his disciples they would see, and then again told them that they would not see, i. e., would not perceive. Just as the Jews saw Christ in the flesh and knew him not, for the lack of perception. Thus they, the disciples, did and did not see him.

If Bro. Fuqua can grasp this important distinction he will be in the way of understanding the nature of Christ's Coming and his kingdom. Bro. Fuqua and myself may have to resort to oral debate for an exhaustive canvass of this great question. I fearlessly declare that all advocates of the literal, Second Coming of Christ, are short, to desperation, in proof-texts for the support of their theory. A. D. FAIRBANKS.

Fifth Reply, By B. C. Fuqua.

The orthodoxy of my contention, as relates to this question, and the heterodoxy of that of my worthy opponent, should carry no weight in his mind, since questions of right or wrong are to be decided, not by the number of excellent people allied with them, but by the Divine Standard alone. To this I have appealed, and with this I plead to stand or fall. The fact that a man appears on the side of the majority, no more argues that he is on the side of right, than the crucifixion of Christ by the majority proves that His crucifixion was righteous. Truth is usually on the side of the minority; but there is an exception in Bro. Fairbanks' case in relation to the question in debate.

Bro. Fairbanks is not the man to charge me with inability to "put harmoniously together all in Revelation that relates to this profound question," so long as he leaves untouched the discrepancies I enumerated as created by him in setting forth his theory in this debate. I pointed out, in my last reply, at least five difficulties, which I challenged him to remove, as follows:—

1. He told us that Christ set up His Kingdom at the destruction of Jerusalem, A. D. 70. I showed that

the Kingdom was set up many years BEFORE that time and named many who were in that Kingdom; therefore his theory, that it was set up when Jerusalem was destroyed, is erroneous.

2. He told us that Christ dethroned David and occupied David's throne at the destruction of Jerusalem. I showed that Christ ascended that throne when He ascended up on high and sat down at the right hand of God, which occurred thirty-seven years before Jerusalem was destroyed. Therefore his theory is again proved defective.

3. He told us that in the expressions, "at hand," "draweth nigh," etc., an immediate event, according to man's count, was meant. I showed that the final Coming of Christ to judge all men and reward them, and the "end of all things," were declared to be "at hand" two thousand years ago; which proves that the time was measured by God's count or reckoning, and I showed that Peter so taught us, in the expression that "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years," etc. We know Christ has NOT judged the world and rewarded every man, and we know "all things" have NOT ended; yet all this was "at hand" when the Apostles wrote the New Testament. Therefore Bro. Fairbanks' theory is at fault on this point.

As these three points make the foundation of Bro. Fairbanks' theory, and all three of them are at variance with the plain and positive statements of the Bible, we concluded that the entire theory of his was erroneous, and kindly asked him to harmonize it.

4. He also told us that Matt. 24: 29-32 referred to the Second Coming of Christ, and that that Coming was "invisible." I challenged him to tell us, how a VISIBLE Coming could be INVISIBLE. This Coming was to be literally SEEN BY ALL MEN, and as nothing of the kind has ever been seen by all men, we rationally conclude that such an event has never yet occurred. He cannot dodge this by claiming that the "seeing" here is a mere comprehension, or perception of Him. If this universal sight of Him coming with His angels and power and fire and glory, is not LITERAL, then there is no passage in all the Bible that teaches a literal, visible Coming of the Lord. If language does not mean what it says, who is to know what it does mean? This thing of spiritualizing and figurating all the elements of truth stated in the New Testament, is exactly what breeds such inconsistencies as the theory of Bro. Fairbanks on this question. Notice how he "explains" these things. He says: "His attendants, in His Coming, are His angels, messengers, gospel minis-

ters," and, "Reward immediately follows service." Then, we who are looking for Christ to come with real ANGELS, are henceforth to believe that there are no such personages, but they are merely earthly preachers who shall accompany Him! Christ told the Apostles—ministers, preachers,—that THEY would SEE ANGELS coming with Him; but He only meant, it seems, according to Bro. Fairbanks, that they would merely SEE THEMSELVES on this occasion!! Ah! Christians are by faith looking for an actual APPEARING of the Lord with His literal angels, and they have been assured (in that passage, Acts 1: 11, which I have not succeeded in getting Bro. Fairbanks to notice,) that such an event will usher in the Second Coming of their Lord from heaven: "For our citizenship is in heaven; whence also we wait for a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ." (Phil. 3: 20.) Bro. Fairbanks, do we look in vain for such a Coming? If not, in what words is the assurance given us, if not in the very words contained in Matt. 24: 29-32, and other like references?

5. It is unfortunate that he dodges behind the PROMISE of the Kingdom, to escape its REALITY before the destruction of Jerusalem. We are agreed that God had a kingdom before Christ sat down upon David's throne; but I showed that Christ was on David's throne, and His Kingdom in full sway, thirty-seven years before Jerusalem was destroyed. To escape this truth, Bro. Fairbanks reverts to the Regime of Heaven in its preparatory state, and claims that he had already asserted that the Kingdom of God "is perpetual." That is far from answering the argument I made, and leaves his theory in a tangle that no assistance can remedy forever.

It is true, as he asserts, that all things under the Law were typical of the things under Christ—both the Tabernacle and all the vessels and ordinances of the Ministry. These typified the order and service of the New Institution, the Church of Christ. But this New Institution, or Church, or Kingdom, was set up in its completeness on the Day of Pentecost, A. D. 33, when the first members, or citizens, were admitted (Acts 2: 41, 47), which was thirty-seven years before Bro. Fairbanks' theory will allow him to locate it.

Therefore his whole theory is diametrically opposed to the revealed Truth accessible to mankind, which is our only Criterion. It is by a misapprehension of Truth, most inexcusable, that Bro. Fairbanks has hit upon his theory. It is no wonder it required him fifty years to get it fixed in his mind!

In conclusion, I will add, that I would be delighted to

meet Bro. Fairbanks in an oral debate upon this subject, or upon any other subject over which we differ, provided that subject is vital to the interest of the soul. I have for many years tried to induce some polemic to meet me upon the following subject: "*The Scriptures clearly teach, that the division of Christian people into denominational churches is sinful, and that those who, unwittingly or otherwise, may have committed this sin, must repent of it, by withdrawing from the denomination, or pass into death in rebellion against God.*" Such a subject, publicly discussed, would do more genuine good, than any other subject in the catalogue. I submit this to Bro. Fairbanks, or anyone else whom the denominations would endorse to meet me.

I desire to thank *The Daily Press* for the courtesy extended Bro. Fairbanks and me in allowing us to come before its many readers with the question we have now partially discussed. It has set an example that has made it more than ever esteemed; and for this, and for other broad-minded enterprises, it deserves the appreciation and loyal support of all intelligent and aggressive and Christian people.

My esteem for Bro. Fairbanks has grown with each installment of his excellent articles; and though I have never seen him, I love him, and I shall always cherish the memory of this Exchange with him.

E. C. FUQUA.

THE END

ERRATA

[THE FOLLOWING CORRECTIONS IN HIS ARTICLES
ARE MADE AND INSERTED BY A. D. FAIRBANKS:]

On first page, 18th line from bottom, the word "national" should be read *natural*.

On first page, 6th line from bottom, it should be "in the day of *thy* power."

On the 8th page, bottom line, the word "parables" should be read *parallels*.