Clark-Douglas Debate

This little volume is its own interpreter. It grow out of quite a lengthy correspondence between the undersigned conducted in the summer of 1896. In that correspondence some points of difference between the Disciples of Christ and Missionary Baptists were incidentally discussed. This led us to agree upon the terms stated elsewhere in this volume for a written discussion, to be conducted by private correspondence till finished and then published in its present form.

We claim that the prime object of each of us in this discussion has boon truth and not victory. We also modestly claim to have represented fairly the doctrines held by Missionary Baptists and Disciples of Christ, respectively, on those points involved in this discussion. We earnestly request that the reader consider carefully all the arguments presented on both sides, measure them by God's Word us a standard, and decide for himself which of us has more fully sustained his position by the teachings of the sacred Scriptures.

And now, praying God's blessing upon every effort made by either of us that accords with the truth; and sincerely do-siring the upbuilding of the Messiah's kingdom, we commit to its destiny the result of our conscientious efforts to know the truth and to walk therein.

E. P. DOUGLASS.

N. L. CLARK.

Brookhaven, Miss., October, 1897.

TLC

DEBATE.

We, the undersigned representing respectively the faith and doctrines as held and taught by Missionary Baptist churches and the Disciples of Christ have agreed upon the following terms for a religious discussion:

I. The discussion shall consist of articles written alternately by us on the propositions hereinafter stated.

II. In the discussion of each proposition each disputant shall write not more than four articles, each to consist of not more than tea pages of foolscap paper; Provided, that this rule may be changed by the mutual consent of both parties.

III. Each disputant shall be permitted to use all available helps, such as standard commentaries, histories, translations, lexicons, etc.

IV. Neither writer shall violate the rules of courtesy and fairness usually required in religious discussions.

V. The discussion shall be carried on by private correspondence until finished, and then published if agreed upon by both disputants.

Propositions.

I. The churches composed of members known as the Disciples of Christ are churches of God in faith and practice. Clark affirms; Douglass denies.

II. Baptist churches holding to and practicing the principles set forth in what is known as the New Hampshire Articles of Faith are churches of God in faith and practice. Douglass affirms; Clark denies.

(Signed) N. L. CLARK, Disciple.

TLC

E. P. DOUGLASS, Baptist.

TLC

FIRST PROPOSITION. CLARK'S OPENING LETTER.

PROPOSITION. —The churches composed of members known as disciples of Christ are churches of God in faith and practice.

MY DEAR SIR: —It is with much pleasure that I take my pen in hand to write to you my first letter in support of the proposition stated at the beginning of this page. I sincerely hope that in our correspondence regarding the propositions agreed upon for discussion, we may both boat all times guided by sincerity without a shadow of hypocrisy and be moved to pen only such thoughts as are dictated by the purest motives, via: The love of truth and the welfare of human souls. Any other motive taken as a guide would most surely lead our minds into forbidden paths and the consequence of our efforts would perhaps be to work lasting harm to the reader of these letters. With this brief introductory I will proceed to define the terms of our proposition.

The word church is a translation of the Greek word ekklesia, which means simply the called out. As used by the Greeks the word did not always apply to a religious assembly. The word translated assembly in Acts 19:32 is this same Greek word ekklesia. This was certainly very far from being a church in the ordinary acceptation of that term. In Acts 7:38 we read of the church in the wilderness, moaning those culled out of Egypt by God through Moses. This was more than 1500 years before Jesus said, "Upon this Rock I will build my Church." (Matt. 16:18.) In a certain sense these Israelites constituted a true church— the called out—but not that church which our Savior declared he would build and of which we claim to be members. The Mahometan Church is composed of those 'called out' by the teachings of Mahomet; the church of Christ is composed of those 'called out' by the teachings of Christ. In this broad sense the Church of Christ includes all the true followers of Christ in every age and in every clime. In this sense it is synonymous with "the

TLC

kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 10:19); "the kingdom of his (God's) dear Sou" (Col. 1:13); "the kingdom of God" (John 3:5); or "a kingdom" (Dan. 2:11). In this sense there is but one church; that one is the body of Christ. (Ephes. 1:23.) The word church, as used in the New Testament sometimes, has a more limited application, meaning an assembly of Christians, or disciples at a given place, meeting together at regular intervals; governed by officers Scripturally designated; and working together us a local church government under the guidance of divine teaching. In this sense the word may be used in the plural number. (See Acts 9:31; 15:11; Rom. 16:16.) This is the sense in which the word churches is used in the proposition,

The impression "known as disciples of Christ" designates a people living in this age who call themselves "disciples of Christ." These people may be called by enemies Campbellite, Stonites, or Baptists. This, however, is no more than was done by the enemies of Christ's followers in the first, century. (Acts 24:5.) So then any name opprobriously used and not accepted by those to whom applied, weighs nothing in this discussion. The phrase "in faith and practice" in the proposition has reference to the leading doctrines and general practice in the worship among the congregations of disciples as met with throughout the country. My proposition, therefore, requires me to prove that the local churches, composed of members known as disciples of Christ, at this time believe and practice religiously the same things believed and practiced by local New Testament churches.

The first important item in the faith of the disciples pertains to the establishment of the church or kingdom upon the earth. This is of fundamental importance, since upon this issue depends the correct statement of the law of admission to the kingdom.

The disciples believe that the church of Christ was established upon earth on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. If this can be proved, then 'it follows that the answer given by Peter on that day to the question: "Men and

TLC

brethren, what shall we do?" (Acts 2:37} constitutes the law of admission into the kingdom to such as those there addressed. I shall proceed therefore to prove by the Holy Scriptures that the church or kingdom of Christ was established upon earth on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Jesus. And first we will take a look at the nature of its foundation.

Jesus said in Matt. 16:18, "Upon this rock I will build my church. "Upon what rock? The fact just expressed by Peter, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." "Did ye never read in the Scriptures 'The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner?'" (Matt. 21:42.) Jesus here quoted a prophecy from Ps. 118:22, written several hundred years before he came into the world and referring directly to the foundation of his church. A few days after Pentecost Peter speaking to the Jews in regard to Jesus (Acts 4:11), said that he was the stone set at naught of the builders, which bad become the head of the corner. We learn also from Ephes. 2:19-22 that when people become disciples or followers of Christ as those Ephesians were, that they are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ, himself being the chief corner stone.

These Scriptures prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that Jesus Christ is the chief corner stone in the foundation of his church. When was this foundation laid? Isaiah, looking down the stream, of time wrote concerning this foundation 725 years before the birth of Christ in the following language; "Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation." (Isa. 28:16.) This stone was beyond a doubt the Son of God himself. This being true, we notice that Isaiah says it was to be a tried stone. When was Christ tried? Paul says in Heb. 2:9-10, "But we see Jesus who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor; that be by the grace of God should taste death for every man. For it became

him for whom are all things and by whom are all things in bringing many sons unto glory to make the captain of their salvation perfect through suffering." Paul here teaches very clearly that Christ, who is the captain of our salvation, was made perfect by his death. See also on this point Heb. 5:8. "Though be (Christ) were a son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered, and being made perfect," etc. "Made perfect" how? By the things which he suffered, of course. So then, Christ was made perfect, became a tried stone when he bad overcome death. Never before. The pangs of death on a Roman cross reared on Golgotha's summit— a death suffered alone, for in that hour the Father forsook the Son, constituted the crucial test by which the blessed Lamb of God was tried and made perfect. When he had passed through the charnel house of death and having burst the bars of the tomb, had conquered the power of the grave, he was rightly regarded by God and angels a tried stone, a perfect corner stone, a complete Savior. This battle with the powers of darkness fought and won, we see him returning us a conqueror to the presence of the Father, and lo! as he nears the precincts of eternal light there bursts from the angelic choir, "Lift up your beads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory? The Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle." (Ps. 21:7, 8.)

Now since we have proved that Christ, as a stone, tried and made perfect by his death and resurrection, is the confer stone in the foundation of his church it follows that this foundation was not laid before the resurrection of the Savior. If Christ became the corner stone in the foundation of his church before his resurrection, then be was not a tried stone and Isaiah made a mistake. We learn still another lesson from Isa. 28:16. This tried stone was to be laid in Zion, which was but another name for Jerusalem. Mount Zion was in Jerusalem, and so the name Zion came to be applied to the city. This foundation was not to be laid in the house of Abraham, on the banks of the Jordan, or on the mount of transfiguration, but in Zion, the city of Jerusalem.

TLC

These statements are in perfect harmony with other Scriptures bearing upon the first proclamation of the gospel of Christ to a dying world—a gospel which Paul says (Rom. 1:16) is the power of God to save. Let us hear Isaiah again: "And it shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow into it, and many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob and be will teach us of his ways and we will walk in his paths, for out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." (Isa. 2:2, 3.) We notice first that the mountain of the Lord's house was to be established in the last days. "The mountain of the Lord's house" is a similar expression to "The city of London." "The city" and "London" are the same. "The mountain" and "the Lord's house" refer to the same thing. So Isaiah meant to say that the Lord's house would be established in the last days. But what is the Lord's house? It was something into which all nations should flow. It was something in which people should walk in the paths of the Lord. It must have referred directly to the church or kingdom of Christ.

QUESTION: Does not Isaiah refer to the church when he speaks of the Mountain of the Lord's house? If not, to what does he refer? But this was to be in the last days. When were the last days? Turn to Acts 2:16 (the day of Pentecost), and hear Peter: "But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; and it shall come to pass in the last days," etc. Peter bore quotes from Joel 2:28-30 and says," this is that spoken by Joel," etc. The word 'this' referred directly to the outpouring of the Holy Spirit which was to take place in the last days, but Peter quotes that prophecy as fulfilled on Pentecost; therefore, the day of Pentecost was "the last days'" referred to by Joel and Isaiah. But Isaiah says that the mountain of the Lord's house, or simply the Lord's house, was to be established in the last days. Therefore, the Lord's house—the church, or kingdom—must have been

established on the day of Pentecost. But again, we learn from Isaiah, 2:3 that the word of the Lord should go forth from Jerusalem. What "word of the Lord" is referred to? It was something contrasted with the law given by Moses, for he says, "Out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." It must have been the gospel of Christ. Christ was acting in exact conformity with this prophecy when he used the language recorded in Luke 24:40-48: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name throughout all nations beginning at Jerusalem." When the Savior uttered these last words he had conquered the power of death, and all power had been committed into his hands by the Father. (Matt. 28:18.) These were among the last words be ever uttered before his ascension. Now listen at the 49th verse: "And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high." What promise was be talking about? The Comforter, the Holy Spirit, most assuredly. (See John 14:16-26 and 15:26.) Let us hear Luke again in Acts 1:4-8: "And being assembled together with them commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence. When they, therefore, were come together, they asked to him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? And be said unto them, "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power. But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you," etc. Here they (the Apostles) were promised the power of the Holy Ghost. Seven days afterward we read of them as follows: "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing, mighty wind and it filled nil the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto thorn cloven tongues, like as of fire, and

TLC

it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance."

Here, endued with the Spirit's power, sent by promise of the Father upon them, these hitherto unlearned Galileans spoke forth the glorious gospel of Christ in its fullness in at least sixteen different languages. Peter, to whom the keys of the kingdom had been given (Matt. 16:19), filled with knowledge pertaining to the kingdom of God, stood up with the eleven, and after explaining to his hearers the meaning of the miracle which they there beheld, commenced the first proclamation of the gospel of Christ in its fullness with the blessed name of Jesus, (Acts 2:22). The crucifiers of the Holy One listened for awhile to the truth as proclaimed by Peter. Suddenly, stirred by a sense of guilt, pricked to the heart by Peter's words, they cried out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" The answer, dictated by the Holy Spirit speaking through Peter, contained the terms upon which they were offered remission of sins and citizenship in the kingdom, or church of God. (Col. 1:12.) Here, for the first time, people hoard, believed and obeyed the gospel of Christ, and thus became the first members of the church of Christ. N. L. CLARK,

Springtown, Tex., November 14, 1896.

To Eld. E. P. Douglass, Wesson, Miss.

FIRST PROPOSITION. DOUGLASS' FIRST LETTER.

WESSON, Miss., January 5, 1897.

Elder N. L. Clark, Springtown, Texas:

MY DEAR SIR: —Your first letter has been received, and I now proceed to reply. I join heartily with you in the hope that we may, during this discussion, be guided by the love of truth, and a sincere desire for the welfare of human souls. Truth, not falsehood, is what the world needs above and before everything

TLC

else. Truth in the business, social, civil and religious life. "The first lie was the first death-pang the world ever knew, and when truth reigns, death will be no more." Plato has said of God: "Truth is His body, and light His shadow." John says, "His word is truth." Christ said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." (Jno. 14:6.) Dr. A. Clarke says, "The doctrine which is not drawn from the truth of God can never save souls. "

I did not seek this controversy, have no unholy ambition to be gratified by it, but, as an humble servant of the Lord, pledged to the maintenance of His word, I enter upon the discussion, and shall look to Him, whose cause I defend, for help, and shall leave the results in His hands.

Passing, for the present, your definition of the terms contained in the proposition, I shall proceed to notice your position on the establishment of the church, and the law of admission into it. You said but little about the law of admission into the church. I suppose you have not reached that point yet, and shall therefore, confine myself principally to your position on the establishment of the church. You make the time of the church's establishment upon the earth, "the first, important item in the faith of the disciples." Indeed yon make it a matter of "fundamental importance." You say, "The disciples believe that the church of Christ was established upon the earth on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. If this can be proved, then it follows that the answer given by Peter on that day to the question: 'Men and brethren, what shall we do?' constitutes the law of admission into the kingdom to such as those there addressed." I fail to see by what process of reasoning you reach the conclusion, that the establishment of the church on the day of Pentecost would make Peter's statement on that occasion a more true and correct statement of the law of admission into the church than if established at some previous time. You state your conclusion without giving a reason. Just what you mean, and the use you intend to make of it, I shall not attempt to guess. I do not

TLC

care whether you do or do not prove that the church was established on the day of Pentecost. Yon may prove it if yon can. If you do, I will cheerfully agree with you on that point. But suppose you could prove it, that would not settle the question under consideration. And since you make the establishment of the church on the day of Pentecost a fundamental doctrine, the first important item in your faith, it follows that if you fail to prove your position, your whole. system of faith will go down. I will now notice the Scriptures to which you refer, and the arguments you present in support of your position. The Scriptures which you present are useful, because they teach some important things about the church of Christ, and the plan of salvation, but you have failed to make them prove your position. The declaration of Christ, "Upon this rock I will build my church" (Matt. 16:18), is highly important, for here is found the key to the whole matter under consideration. To start from this Scripture with a correct understanding of what it teaches, and all it teaches, will be very helpful all the way through.

On the other hand, to start with incorrect views will lead to confusion, and consequently erroneous conclusions. Christ said, "Upon this rock I will build my church." You asked, "Upon what rock?" Some answer, Peter. This is the Catholic view. Others answer, Christ. This is true in its general and broad sense, for Christ is the foundation of the church, as he is also the foundation of the Christian's hope. But in its more strict application, the answer you gave, "the fact just, expressed by Peter, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.'" is the correct one. This view does not contradict the idea, that Christ is the foundation of the church, but gives to it an additional meaning, and teaches an important truth. It teaches that believers, and believers only, are the proper material to be used in the construction of a church; that those who can say, as Peter did, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," shall be admitted into the church. A church organized of other materials would not be after the pattern, hence, not a church of Christ. We

also learn another important lesson from this connection." And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." If Peter could not. know that Jesus was the Christ, without Divine aid, neither can we. Peter had accepted Jesus as his master and teacher, and he knew him as such. But the great fact, that Jesus was the Christ, was revealed unto him, not by flesh and blood, that is by man, but by the Father. Peter's was not the exceptional case for some special purpose; the same is true of all men. For Christ, who said to Peter, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father," said on another occasion, "No man can come unto me, except, the Father which hath sent me draw him." (Jno. 6:44.)

And again, "Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father." (Jno. 6:65.) Other passages might be referred to, but those already given are sufficient. They establish clearly and emphatically the fact, that the Father draws men to Christ. Those thus drawn are spiritually enlightened, and can say, as Peter did, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." This is sometimes called an experience of grace, and it is that which constitutes "the foundation of the apostles and prophets." It is the bed-rock upon which the church of Jesus Christ is built. Upon this rock it has stood for more than 1800 years. The gates of hell have not prevailed against it. Upon this rock it will continue to stand, until the blessed Lord shall come again, and take unto himself his own chosen people, that they may be with him forever. I now turn to Matt. 21:42. This is contained in the parable of the vineyard, let out to unthankful and unfaithful husbandmen, and it teaches some plain lessons. But there is not the slightest allusion made to the foundation of the church in this Scripture. You construe the expression, "The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner," as referring to the foundation of the church. But it has no such reference. This and the parallel passages in Mark and Luke, show that the doctors, chief priests

TLC

and other leading men, rejected Christ as the bead of the spiritual temple. A corner stone is angular-shaped, and serves to unite two sides of a building. And the use of corner stones is not confined to the foundation of a building. The temple, which was a symbol of the church of Christ, and from which many of the figurative expressions we find in the Scriptures were taken, had angular, or corner-stones not only in the foundation, but in all the angles of the building, from the foundation to the top. Tradition says, the builders of the Temple frequently rejected an angular stone, which just suited as a key, or head stone in the roof. Zechariah in speaking of this stone calls it "the head stone." (Zech. 4:7.) Christ is the head of the church as well as its foundation. (Eph. 1:22, 4:15, Col. 1:18.) This fact you seem to have overlooked altogether. Acts 4:11, also represents Christ as being the head, not the foundation of the church. You next refer to Eph. 2:19, 20. This whole chapter abounds with precious gospel truths. The 19th and 20th verses are an inference from some of the preceding ones. The present state of these Ephesian Christians is here contrasted with that of their former condition. Verses 11 and 12 represent them as "being in time past Gentiles, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world." From these verses down to 19, the Apostle tells them how that condition was changed, and then adds; "Now therefore 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 an holy temple of the Lord." The foundation of the apostles and prophets is that foundation upon which Christ said, "I will build my church." (Matt. 10:18.) Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, means, that He is the common object of faith, both of the converted Jews and Gentiles. Some of them had exercised this faith in Christ previous to His death and resurrection, believed that He was "the Christ, the Son of the living God." Others had believed on him, after his resurrection

TLC

and ascension. He is the chief corner-stone, the sure foundation, upon whom rested the faith of all the righteous, from "righteous Abel" down to Zacharias, and be is the chief corner stone, upon which has rested the faith of all the thousands who have ever believed in him since he came into the world. The three verses, at the close of this chapter, are an accumulation of architectural terms. The apostle here perhaps sought to impress the minds of the Ephesian brethren by an allusion to their splendid temple, which was the pride and glory of their city. But he had, doubtless, in his own mind the temple at Jerusalem, which was a striking type of the New Testament church. When it was erected we are informed,

"No sound of ax or hammer on it rung,

Like some tall palm the noiseless fabric sprung. "

We read in 1. Kings 6:7, "And the house when it was in building was built of stone made ready before it was brought thither: so there was neither hammer nor ax nor any tool of iron heard in the house, while it was in building." As the materials were all fitted before brought to the spot, and ready to be laid in the building, so those for a church are prepared before they are brought to it. Persons do not enter the church in order to be prepared for it; but after the great agent, the blessed Spirit, has prepared them as living stones, to be cemented with other materials of similar character.

I will now examine the Scriptures upon which your whole argument culminates. But as I have already touched upon and answered your main argument, only a little more needs to be said on that point. Isa. 28:10, Heb. 2:9, 10, and Heb. 5:6 teach that Christ is a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation; that He was made perfect through suffering, and that out of Zion should go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. We will have no controversy about that. I disagree, however, with you in the application you make of these

Scriptures. You place a forced construction on them and push the figure beyond its legitimate meaning. You infer from the expressions, "a tried stone," and "made perfect through suffering," that Christ could not become the foundation stone of his church until after his death and resurrection. You therefore conclude that the church was not established until after the resurrection. You base your argument on the idea of a want of perfection or completeness on the part of Christ. In this you fall into error. There never was a time when there was any lack of perfection on the part of Christ. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him: and without Him was not anything made that was made." (Jno. 1:1-3.) "For it pleased the Father that in Him should all fullness dwell." (Col. 1:19.) "For in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." (Col. 2:9.) When you come to look at the full consequences of your conclusion, I think you will reject it altogether. If Christ could not set up His church until tried by death, and made perfect through suffering; then for the very same reason He could not save any one before His death. Yet Job said, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth." (Job. 19:25.) Was poor old Job deluded, and did be trust an imperfect Redeemer? I think not. Paul did not think so; for he said, "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea: and were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them; and that Rock was Christ." (1Cor. 10:1-4.) Christ is the Rock of all ages, as well as the gospel age. I love that old hymn,

"Rock of Ages, cleft for me,

Let me hide myself in thee. "

For lack of space, I shall close, with only a few briefly stated thoughts on the use you make of the expression, "Last days," as found in Acts 2:17 and Isa. 2:2. This expression was sometimes used by the writers of the Bible, both of the Old and Now Testament, as referring to a given period of time. It sometimes means the whole gospel age, and sometimes the closing part of the Jewish dispensation, and again the closing part of the gospel: age; but is never used to denote some particular day. If yon understand the expression "Last days" to mean some particular day on which the church of Christ was to be established, then you will have to move the time along somewhere this side of Pentecost. For Paul and Peter, both used the expression "last days," as referring to things that were to take place in the future (2 Tim. 3:1, and 2 Pet. 3:3), and they wrote some time after Pentecost. So far you have failed to sustain your position. Try again, my brother.

Respectfully yours,

E. P. DOUGLASS.

FIRST PROPOSITION. CLARK'S SECOND LETTER.

MY DEAR SIR: —Your long looked for reply to my first letter in the discussion came to hand a few days ago. Your introductory remarks concerning the origin and importance of Truth are, I fear, worthy of it better cause than your ecclesiastical associations will permit you to espouse. It would seem that you desire to Impress the reader with the thought that you are in no wise responsible for this discussion, and that I alone am the assailant. In proof of this I invite the attention of the reader to your second paragraph, beginning, "I did cot seek this controversy," etc. It is a freak of human nature to seek the sympathy of the disinterested by making it appear that the "other man" is altogether to blame for the fight. Now, Elder Douglass, you know as well as any other man in America that your actions

TLC

had an much to do with bringing about this discussion as mine. I have no apology to offer for my part in the discussion, and, God being my Helper, I never expect to apologize for anything I shall have written in this debate (clerical errors excepted).

Yes, I consider the time of the establishment of the church upon earth a matter of "fundamental" importance. And I must express my surprise that one of your experience in the study of God's word should regard this question with such seeming indifference. Now, I want to show you the importance of this question. From Acts 20:28, we learn that Christ purchased the church with his own blood. In Ephes. 5:25, Paul says that he (Christ.) gave himself for it (the church). In Ephes. 1:22, 23, Paul calls the church the body of Christ; and again, in Ephes. 5:23, he teaches that Christ is the Savior of the body (the church). Now since Christ is going to save the church, it is a matter of prime Importance to me that I become a member of that church. But how shall I become a member of the church of God? By complying with the law of admission into that institution, of course. But where shall I look to find Unit law? Shall I go back of the beginning of the church to dud how to get into the church? If so, I must be certain that the same rule, which I find, made men members of the church after its establishment. This, of course, as any one can see, makes it necessary to know where and when the church in a complete state first existed. To illustrate: A man comes to the United States from Germany, desiring to become a citizen of our government. He must, of course, comply with the law of naturalization or citizenship of our country. Suppose you Rive him a book containing matter relative to various things concerning our government from the founding of the colonies to the present time. Where would he look to dud what he must do to become a citizen of the United States? Not buck of the Revolutionary War and the adoption of the Constitution, for if ho should do that, and find a law of citizenship in force in one of the colonies ho would have no assurance that his compliance with that law would make him a

citizen of the United States, unless he could find that same law making citizens after the establishment of the-government. But ho could not tell about this unless he could find when the government was established. Some one might then rise up and say that the government had never yet been established; just as porno of our religious neighbors argue that the kingdom or church has never yet been set up on earth. How would you convince him that he was wrong? I would refer him to that time in our history when the colonies, having purchased freedom with the blood of their gallant sons, and having adopted a Constitution and elected a President and other officers, formally assumed their place as a republic among the nations of earth. Thus, in order to the complete establishment of the church of God on earth, certain things were absolutely necessary. Among these it was necessary, in the first place, that Christ, as the foundation, became a tried stone. (Isa. 23:16.) This was effected through the Buffering of death and the resurrection from the grave. (Heb. 2:10; 5:9; Lu. 13:32.) On this point I quote from your letter, page 16: —" Isa. 28:16, and Heb. 2:9, 10; 5:8, teach that Christ is represented as a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation; that He was made perfect through suffering" etc. (Italics mine.) Again, on page 17 you say: "There never was a time when there was any lack of perfection on the part of Christ." How do you reconcile these statements? You first agree with Paul (Heb. 2:10) in saying that Christ was made perfect, etc., then almost in the next breath you say, "There never was a time when there was any lack of perfection on the part of Christ." You then quote John 1:3, Col. 1:19, 2:9, to prove this last assertion. I believe the Scriptures which you quote as firmly as you do, but they do not touch the point to which you apply them. You forgot that a man may be perfect in some respects and yet very deficient in others. Your quotations prove simply that Christ, us a member of the God-bead, was always perfect. As a Savior of fallen humanity, ho was not complete till after his resurrection. If ho could possibly have been a perfect Savior without the suffering of death, he never would have shed his blood; but, "Without shedding of blood is no

TLC

remission" (Heb. 9:22). There was never offered upon earth but one sacrifice that could take away a single sin. That sacrifice was the Lamb of God. All the sacrifices offered on Jewish altars for more than 1500 years served only to roll forward the Bins of the people who offered them till Christ as a lamb," without blemish and without spot," should appear to put away bin by the sacrifice of himself. (See Heb. 10:1-13.)

I do not believe that a single sin ever committed by Adam or any of his posterity was ever atoned for and thus canceled from God's book of remembrance till Christ's blood vat shed and the offering thus made was accepted by the Father, So Christ was not a perfect or complete Savior, even of "poor old Job", till he paid the price of ransom for Job's soul. Again, Christ was not a perfect mediator till he died; if be was, Paul made a mistake. Listen: "And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross," etc. (Ephes. 2:16). How did be (Christ) effect the reconciliation between God and man? Answer: By the cross. Neither was Christ crowned King till after his resurrection. Seven days after his ascension to the Father the Holy Spirit directly from Heaven announced to all the world through Peter "that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ." (Acts 2:30.) "Lord" means ruler, governor, prince. When did God make him Lord? It was certainly after his resurrection. If not, I would like to know where the kingdom, or church was while Jesus was in the tomb? The disciples all forsook him and fled when he was betrayed (Mark 14:50); he (Christ) was held by the powers of darkness for three days and nights. Where was the church at this time, if it had already been established? Had it apostatized? Speaking of the resurrection and exaltation, of Jesus, Paul says: "Which he (God) wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that •which is to come. And bath put all things under his feet, and

TLC

gave him to be the head over all things to the church which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." (Ephes. 1:20-23.) According to this passage, when was Christ set down at God's right hand far above all powers and kingdoms, all things put under his feet (authority) and he made head of the church? After his resurrection, says Paul.

In the second place, before a kingdom can be fully established, there must be given at least the fundamental law, or constitution of the kingdom. This no one, I presume, will deny. The law given to the Jews through Moses on Mt. Sinai constituted the fundamental law of the Jewish kingdom. This law was in force among the Jews by the authority of God till the death of Christ. In proof of this, I submit the following: "Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to his disciples, saying, The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. All, therefore, whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do." (Matt. 23:1-3) This was spoken a short time before his crucifixion and shows that Jesus recognized the Mosaic Law us authoritative at that time. Now bear Paul on the same subject. Contrasting the condition of the Gentiles while the Jewish Law was in force with their condition after the of death of Christ, be says:" Hut now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are undo nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, to making pence; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." (Ephes. 2:13-16.) The wall of partition which bud existed for hundreds of years between Jew and Gentile was the Law of Moses. Christ broke down this wall by his death and thus nailed it to his cross. (Col. 2:14.)

Now I affirm that the Great Commission, given by Christ to the apostles after his resurrection and recorded in Matt. 28:19,

TLC

20; Mark 16:15, 16; Luke 24:46-48, constitutes the fundamental law of the kingdom of Christ. The Mosaic Law bad expired by limitation when on the cross Jesus bad said, "It is finished;" the power of death had been overcome by a risen Savior; all power in heaven and in earth bud been committed to him by the Father (Matt. 28:18); and now just about to leave earth for glory, be assigns to the chosen executors of his will the important part to be performed by them in carrying into effect the will of the Father to provide a plan of salvation for the sons of men. Under this commission Peter, on the day of Pentecost, for the first time in the history of the world, publicly proclaimed a crucified, risen, and exalted Redeemer. Under the same commission the apostles and evangelists of the first century bore the blood-stained banner of King Immanuel to the uttermost parts of the world. Thousands, including alike prince and peasant, beard the wondrous story of the cross, and by yielding obedience to the commandments of this commission, became disciples of the Christ. And from that time till the present no man has ever entered the kingdom of God on earth save by compliance with the conditions specified in this Great Commission. Under the first commission (Matt. 10), the labors of the Apostles were confined to the Jews; neither was there any gospel (glad tidings) in their message except the fact to be proclaimed by them—" The kingdom of heaven is at band." There was no blood of a crucified Savior in that; hence no power to take away sin. On the day of Pentecost—never before—all the prerequisites necessary to the establishment of the, kingdom were present. There was a king (Acts 2:36); An organic law (the Great Commission); Territory (Acts 2:5); Subjects (Acts 1:1); Some one to open the kingdom for the reception of those who wished to become citizens (Matt. 16:19, Acts 2:37, 38); A Spirit to give life to the body and to direct the work of the day (Acts 2:4); and above all, a gospel which has ever since been the power of God unto salvation from all sin. This gospel of Christ (Rom. 1:16), contains three facts essential to it, viz:1. The Crucifixion; 2. The Burial; 3. The Resurrection, of Christ. (1. Cor. 15:1-4.)

TLC

Now, whatever is essential to the complete existence of the church of God today has always been necessary to its completeness. It is necessary to the complete existence of the church today that its members believe: 1. That Christ died; 2. That he was buried; 3. That he rose the third day; 4. That he ascended to the Father; 5. That the Holy Spirit was sent by him into the world. I dare say, that even the Baptist church would not receive into its membership any disbeliever of a single one of these facts. Now, no one believed all these items, an facts, till Pentecost. Therefore, the church could not have existed in a complete state prior to Pentecost; as even Peter, to whom had boon revealed the fact that Jesus was the Christ, did not enter the kingdom till Pentecost. In proof of this, turn to Matt. 18:3, and bear Christ speaking to his disciples, who of course were not in the kingdom at that time. "Verily, I say unto you, Except ye be converted and become as little children ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." This was after John the Baptist's head was cut off, and some time after Peter had received from the Father that revelation upon which you commented at length, and still it is perfectly clear to any one that the persons there addressed were not in the kingdom. "Yes, but perhaps Peter was not there," says some one. Well, turn to Luke 22:32, and hear the Savior saying to Simon (Peter), "When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." This shows that Peter was not converted at that time, and that was after God had revealed to him the fact that Jesus was the Christ (Matt. 10:18). That very night Christ was betrayed and Peter denied him thrice. Peter could not have been in the kingdom at that time, for no unconverted person could enter the kingdom. (Matt. 18:3.) Was Peter in a saved state at that time? I believe that he was. I believe furthermore from all the evidence in the case that, Peter had been baptized at the bands of John for the remission of sins. What conversion then was Christ talking about in Luke 22:32? Until the ascension of Christ from earth the disciples expected him to set up a temporal kingdom and sit on an earthly throne in David's room. (See Acts 1:6.) On the day of Pentecost, baptized in the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven,

TLC

and thus guided into all truth, Peter and the other disciples fully understood at last the nature of Christ's kingdom; were thus converted, or turned in mind, and entered it. It could not have existed before, because the Spirit was not given (John 7:39).

I have not produced as yet more than a tithe of the argument that could be adduced from Holy Writ to prove the correctness of my position on the establishment of the church; but, considering the limits of this debate, I shall not discuss this point further; at least not until you make some show of fight in regard to it. You say you do not care whether I do or do not prove that the church was established on Pentecost. That is as much as to say you care nothing about the question. You then say something about the uninterrupted existence of the church for over 1800 years. That sounds considerably like the rattle of that old Baptist chain of "church succession." Is that what, you mean? If so, where is the farther end of it? Where does it commence? You dare not take any position on the establishment of the church and attempt to defend it; for you have already said that you care nothing about the question. Perhaps, however, you have become a convert to the importance of this question since the debate commenced. You say that if I fail to prove that the church was established on Pentecost our whole system of faith goes down. Granted. And if I prove that the church of God was established on Pentecost and you belong to a church that claims to have been set up before Pentecost, then it also follows that you do not belong to the church of God. See? Do I understand you to admit that Peter's statement in Acts 2:38 constitutes any part of the law of admission into the kingdom? Who are Christ's "chosen people?"

Now since we have found where and when the church of God first existed in a complete state, we are ready to inquire how people got into that mother church at Jerusalem and thus became citizens of Christ's kingdom on earth. We will, therefore, direct our attention in the next place to the conversion of the Pentecostians of whom we read, "Then they that gladly received

his word were baptized" (Acts 2:41).

N. L. CLARK,

Springtown, Tex., January 30, 1897.

Eld. E. P. Douglass, Wesson, Miss. _____

FIRST PROPOSITION. DOUGLASS' SECOND REPLY.

WESSON, Miss., Feb. 14, 1897.

Elder N. L. Clark, Springtown, Texas:

MY DEAR SIR: —Your second letter received a few days since. You say, "your long-looked for reply to my first letter in the discussion came to hand a few days ago." Those who live in glass houses ought not to throw rocks at other people's houses. If you have taken your time in the discussion, you ought not to complain at me for doing the same. You signed the agreement Sept. 19, '96, and at the same time stated that you would have your first letter ready in a few days. That letter when received was dated Nov. 14, '90. My reply was sent Jan. 5, '97. Your second letter is dated Jan. 30, '97. Now, look at these dates, and you will find that your cause for censure is not well founded.

You intimate that my ecclesiastical associations are of such a character, they will not permit roe to espouse the cause of truth. Give yourself no uneasiness about that. The cause which I and my ecclesiastical associates espouse, reaches back through a period of more than 1800 years previous to the birth of your ecclesiastical father. It stood through all these years, notwithstanding the bitter opposition of the Jews, Heathen and false Christianity. It still lives to bless the world and honor God. You need not worry yourself about who is responsible for this controversy, most of those who will read these letters know all about that.

TLC

You again assert, that the time of the establishment of the church upon the earth is a matter of fundamental importance, and you express great surprise that I "should regard the question with such seeming indifference." You then undertake to show me the importance of the question by referring to Acts 20:28; Eph. 5:25; 1:22-23; 5:2. 1 These Scriptures teach some very gracious truths, but they do not prove that the church was set up on the day of Pentecost. Their importance has nothing whatever to do with the question. But you arc anxious to be come a member of the church of God. You ask," shall I go back of the beginning of the church to find how to get into the church?" No, of course not. The institutes of a kingdom were never known to be in existence before the kingdom itself was set up. Therefore, the law of admission into the church was not in existence before the church itself existed. In order to know bow to obey the law of admission into the church, you say, "it is necessary to know when and where the church in a complete state first existed" (my italics). You then make use of an illustration that does not illustrate as you want it to. The United States was formed by the combination of a number of little minor governments, states and colonies, into one general government. But not so with the church of Christ. It was not formed from a number of little minor churches or kingdoms. The first church was the kingdom of God on earth, the church of Jesus Christ. It contained the one and only law of admission ever given. If your man from Germany wishes citizenship in the United States, be must apply to the United States, comply with the law of naturalization, and thus become a citizen. If he should apply to the Republic of Mexico, whose constitution and laws are formed somewhat after the model of the United States, and meet all the requirements of citizenship in that government, he would become a citizen of Mexico, but not of the United States. If you wish to become a member of the church of Christ you must make application to the church of Christ, meet the requirements of its law of admission, and thus become a member. But if you seek membership in the church of

TLC

Christ by making application to some other organization, which is only a clumsy imitation of the church of Christ, you may become a member of that other organization, but not of the church of Christ.

You try to make it appear that I first agree with Paul in Heb. 2:10, and then contradict myself and the Scripture referred to by saying a little further on," there never was a time when there was any lack of perfection on the part of Christ." The reader will please turn to that part of my letter, and read the entire connection carefully. You ask, how I reconcile these statements. Well, turn to 2. Cor. 5:21, and read, "For he hath made him to be tin for us, who knew no sin." Do you understand Paul to teach here that Christ was made a vile sinner, an actual transgressor? You can place no other construction on it if you follow the same rule of interpretation here that you apply to Heb. 2:10. But I think you will say, Paul here teaches that Christ was only regarded a sinner, because be took our place under the law, and because our sins were imputed unto him. Then, it by the imputation of our sins, Christ was made sin, by the imputation of our imperfections, he was in the same sense, made imperfect. Christ was sin and imperfection only, by the imputation of our sins and imperfections. When the atonement was made be no longer rested under that imputation, was free from it. In just that sense Paul teaches that Christ was made perfect through sufferings. Now I reaffirm that in himself considered, "there never was a time when there was any lack of perfection on the part of Christ." His precious blood that redeemed us is represented as being that of "a lamb without blemish and without spot." (1. Pot 1:19.) If ho was in any sense imperfect, except by imputation, then he was not as a lamb without blemish and without spot. Gold is not made gold by being tested or tried, but when tried is found to be gold. Christ was tried, passed through the trying ordeal of suffering, and was found to be a perfect and complete Savior. That is, the fact was proved, demonstrated to the mind of man. But in the mind of God, he was from the very

TLC

beginning regarded as a perfect and complete Savior. He stood as a" Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." (Rev. 13:8.) 'Was it "the sacrifices offered by the people on Jewish altars, that served to roll forward their sins till the coming of Christ?" I rather think it was their faith in the pure and spotless Lamb of God, of which these sacrifices were typical. Because of their faith in Christ, their sins were rolled forward, as you express it, and placed, by imputation, on Christ. God forgave them and saved them through Christ.

All the arguments you have presented, so far, are as defective us those already considered. They do not sustain your position. The birth-day of the church, and the birth-day of Christ have not been revealed to us and any attempt to fix upon some particular day, as the date of either one of these events, is mere guess-work. For some reason, God in his word has not made them known to us." The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children." (Deut. 29:29.) If these events be of the secret things that belong unto God, I choose to let them alone. Enough, however, has been revealed to utterly annihilate your position. The Scriptures show very conclusively that the church of Christ was in existence prior to the day of Pentecost. John urged upon the Jews to repent, because it bad come." Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." (Matt. 3:2.) When Jesus began to preach he said, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at baud; repent and believe the gospel." (Mark 1:15.) And again he said, "The law and the prophets were until John. Since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." (Luke 16:16.) From the reading of these Scriptures we observe three things: 1st. The people were called upon to repent and believe the Gospel: 2d. We are told that from the time of John the kingdom of God was preached; 3rd. We are told that the people pressed into the kingdom. We must therefore conclude, that the kingdom here spoken of was a visible organization, into which the people were received. Yet, you say at the close of your first letter, referring to

TLC

those received on the day of Pentecost, "Here for the first time people heard, believed and obeyed the gospel of Christ and thus became the first members of the church of Christ." If the gospel, which the people were urged upon to believe, was not the gospel of Christ, what gospel was it? Christ said, "The poor have the gospel preached to them." (Matt. 11:5.) What sort of a gospel was that? If that organization designated the kingdom of heaven, or kingdom of God, was not the church of Christ, what sort of an organization was it? And if those who pressed into the kingdom were not members of the church of Christ, what were they members of? The very same conditions, faith and repentance, were urged upon all who sought admission in to the kingdom, that were required on the day of Pentecost, and at all other times afterward. Again, Jesus said, "But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you." (Matt. 12:23.) And again, "Neither shall ye say, Lo here! or lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you." (Luke 17:21.) The accepted rendering of this is, "the kingdom of God is now among you, is now within your nation." The disciples of Christ belonged to an organization of which Judas was treasurer. (Jno. 12:6, 13:29.) Jesus called that organization "the church" (Matt. 18:17). "Tell it unto the church." They could not tell something to a church that was not in existence. The 3, 000 received on the day of Pentecost were not the "first members of the church of Christ," for they were "added." You cannot add 3000 to nothing.

Turn now to the 2nd chapter of Acts and read it carefully through. The account there given of the wonderful events of that day is clear and explicit, —the occasion, the one accord of the disciples, the descent of the Holy Spirit, the devout men out of every nation, dwelling at that time at Jerusalem, the amazement of the people, the disciples accused of being drunk, Peter's sermon, its effect, the 3, 000 added, the four that came upon every soul, the telling of their goods, and the having all things common. These, and other things are stated in detail, but not one word is said about the organization of the church. There can be

but two reasons given why no mention is made of the organization of the church on that day. First, the writer may have regarded it of so little importance that he did not deem it worthy of mention. Second, that no such event occurred on that day. Now, you may take your choice of the two. I prefer the latter.

But suppose I admit that the church was set up on the day of Pentecost, which I do not, that would not help your cause any. The churches, composed of those who call themselves disciples, constitute that body, or sect, which was set up, not "by the God of heaven in the days of these kings," nor "by John the Baptist on the banks of the Jordan," nor by Jesus Christ "on the Mount of Transfiguration," nor yet by Peter on the day of Pentecost, but by Alexander Campbell, in the early part of the present century; thus augmenting the number of religious organizations which have no organic connection whatever with the church of Christ, but are rival and opposing kingdoms. The church of Christ was set up by the God of heaven in the days of the Roman kings. Therefore, that organization sot up about sixty years ego by Mr. Campbell is not the kingdom of God, nor are the churches which compose that organization churches of God. They are Campbellite churches. Now, you can not object to my conclusion in this matter, for I have reached it by following your own method of reasoning. In defining the term church in your first letter, page 3, you say, "The Mahometan church is composed of those called out by the teach lugs of Mahomet, the church of Christ is composed of those called out by the teachings of Christ. If I adopt your rule and reach the ecu elusion that the Campbellite church is composed of those called out by the teachings of Alexander Campbell, you are certainly bound to agree with me.

The plea by which Mr. Campbell seeks to justify his course can best be stated, perhaps, in his own language. He says: "If Christians were, and may be the happiest people that ever lived, it is because they live under the most gracious institution ever bestowed on men. The meaning of this institution has been

TLC

buried under the rubbish of human traditions for hundreds of years. It was lost in the dark ages and has never been, till recently, disinterred. Various efforts have been made and considerable progress attended them; but since the great apostasy was completed, till the present generation, the gospel of Jesus Christ has not been laid open to mankind in its original plainness, simplicity and majesty, A veil in reading the New Institution has been on the hearts of Christians." (Chr. Sys., page 180; my italics.) This language, written and published by Mr. Campbell, certainly shows very conclusively the conception he had of his own greatness, and the vast ness of the task he had accomplished, or thought be had. Let me state plainly the meaning of Mr. Campbell's words. The meaning of the Christian Institution had been buried under the rubbish of human traditions for hundreds of years. It was lost, its light went out during the dark ages. Various efforts were made, but all these failed to remove the great mass of rubbish and expose to view the "Ancient Gospel." Finally the light streamed forth from Bethany, the great reformer arose, cleared away the ponderous mass of rubbish, disinterred the long lost gospel and took away the veil so long upon the hearts of Christians. Then the New Institution was read in all its original plainness, simplicity and majesty. These were monstrous high pretensions for a man who claimed that he had been converted from a Pharisaic religion. When Mr. Campbell teaches that the church of Jesus Christ was lost for ages, he flatly contradicts the declaration of Christ, "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Matt. 16:18.) That the church would pass through the burning ordeal of persecution, was clearly foretold. "For there shall be groat tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time; no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should be no flesh saved; but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened. Then if any wan shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not. For there shall arise false Christ's and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders: insomuch that if it were possible, they shall

TLC

deceive the very elect" (Matt. 24:21-24.) Through all the dark days of persecution the Lord's people, the elect, stood firm and unyielding. And in the days that followed, when many false teachers were saying, Lo, here is Christ, and many false religions were built up, the church of Christ remained true and faithful, and stands forth in the world today a mighty, living monument of God's power, testifying to the truth of Christ's declaration, "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The gates of hell have never prevailed against the church of Christ, and never will. The church has not only survived and will continue to survive the mighty onslaught of the rival and opposing kingdoms set up by ambitious and scheming men, but it will ultimately overcome and destroy all these. "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven sot up a kingdom, which never shall be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." (Dan. 2:44.) If indeed there was a veil on the hearts of Christians, and there was, I have no doubt, on the hearts of many who earnestly desired to know the true way, it was placed there by those who were actuated more by an ambitious desire for fame and greatness than for the honor of the meek and lowly Christ. Some of these men were indeed great, and in many respects were good men. But they were only men, and had the frailty and weakness of depraved humanity about them. When Luther, in October, 1517, nailed to the church door of Wittenburg his ninety-five Theses against the infamous traffic in indulgences, and setting forth the only way of forgiveness and justification through Christ Jesus, a doctrine that shook the very powers of Romanism; and when in April, 1521, he appeared before the Diet of Worms, nod in the face of all the powers on earth avowed his unflinching adherence to conscience and the plain word of God, be struck a chord, the vibrations of which were heard throughout the religious world. When he and Calvin were assailing the strongholds of Popery, and boldly exposing its corruptions, multitudes of rejoicing Christians, upon whose hearts the veil of

TLC

obscurity had never been placed, came from their quirt, homes in the mountains, and from the distant villages in the rural districts of the surrounding countries to greet those groat reformers, and bid them God speed. They were anxious to help Luther and Calvin, and could, no doubt, have acted admirably the part performed by Aquila and Priscilla in behalf of the learned tod eloquent Apollos, "expounded unto them the way of God more perfectly." But these Christians, who had come to help in what they conceived to be a mighty movement for God and truth, were doomed to bitter disappointment. They were not kindly received. Indeed, they were spurned; so they turned away to the quiet homes from whence they came, and Luther and Calvin, with their great host of followers, fell into the mighty chasm that lies between the "old mother of Harlots and Abominations" and the church of Jesus Christ.

When Mr. Campbell, who came from Scotland to the United States in 1809, renounced his former religious convictions, and manifested a desire to learn the true way, be found a host of Christians who were ready to extend to him a hearty welcome. He seemed to make progress for a time. Indeed, he reached forward and grasped the standard of truth. But he faltered, relaxed his grasp, then turned away, and was swept into the same great vortex that had engulfed Luther and Calvin, his illustrious predecessors in the church-making business.

Respectfully yours,

E. P. DOUGLASS.

FIRST PROPOSITION. CLARK'S THIRD LETTER.

MY DEAR SIR: —Your second letter received and contents fully noted. I meant nothing offensive by using the word "long-looked-for" in regard to my receipt of your former letter. I meant strictly what I said; nothing cutting intended. However, you are at liberty to kick up all the dust you can over such a point as that.

TLC

It serves one purpose. It fills up space.

You claim that the cause espoused by your brethren has stood over 1800 years. If you mean the cause of Truth, I agree with you. Truth has always stood, and it always will stand. But it remains to be proved that your brethren hold the Truth. God's Word is Truth (John 17:17). If you can prove your doctrines by the Bible, then you can justly claim to espouse the cause of Truth. We will see about that when we reach your proposition If you mean to say that the Baptist church has stood over 1800 years, you must be joking. There are several churches which make this empty, boastful claim. You know that you cannot find a Baptist church in history more than about 300 year old, unless you go to the Anabaptists. And I wonder if you are going to claim kin with them. As to Bro. Campbell's writings, he was only an uninspired man like the rest of us. He was, therefore, liable to make mistakes. I believe that Bro. Campbell taught the truth, in the wain. He learned it from the Bible. I learned the doctrine from the same source. Now, because Bro. Campbell happened to live and die before my day, and be and I learned our doctrine from Christ nod his apostles, I am charged with being a Campbellite. If Bro. Campbell had taught his human opinions, instead of the Word of God and I had learned and accepted his opinions, then I would be a Campbellite. If you teach men your human opinions as matters of faith, and a man accepts them, then be is a Douglassite. But if you should happen to preach the gospel of Christ and a man should believe and obey that he would be a Christian, not a Douglassite or Baptist. So the whole thing hinges on the teachings of God's Word. I believe the statements in Dan. 2:44; Matt., 10-18; 24:21-24, as firmly as you do, but if your life depended upon it, you could not prove that Christ net up a Baptist church. Yes, I am anxious about men's becoming members of the Church of Christ. Can a man be saved outside of the Church of Christ? Now, please answer the question. No dodging hero. Tell us plainly. Can a man in this age, who is responsible for his acts, be saved outside of the Church of

TLC

Christ?

No, Christ was not made a vile sinner to save man, for no sinner could save fallen man. But Christ's blood had to be shod before it could save anybody. I quote from your letter, page seven: "Christ was tried, passed through the trying ordeal of suffering, and was found to be a perfect and complete Savior. That is, the fact was proved, demonstrated to the mind of man. But as to the mind of God be was from the very beginning regarded as a perfect and complete Savior." This means that God was entirely satisfied with Christ's offering from the foundation of the world, but Christ had to DIE to SATISFY MAN that be was the Son of GOD!! This is a wonderful discovery to be sure. I wonder how many of your brethren believe that. Why, my dear sir, you must be beside yourself. "Much learning" (or the lack of it)" doth make thee mad. "

Read John 20:30-31 and learn that Christ's miracles were wrought and recorded to convince men that Christ was the Son of God; that is, this was one of their purposes. Bead also Acts 20:28; Rom. 5:3; 14:9; Ephes. 5:25, and any number of other passages, and learn that Christ died for sinners, for the ungodly, to bring us to God, in our room, to save us, etc. Now spend your ammunition. on this point. Yes, it was faith that served to roll forward from year to your the sins of Israel, but it was not faith alone. It was a faith that took God at his Word and did his commandments. The blessing was reached when they obeyed God, not before. So then, in a sense, it was their offerings which served to roll forward their sins. So it is with us. Faith saves, but not faith alone. It takes a living faith, one that does God's will, to reach the promised blessing of salvation.

I hardly know how to take you. You say that God ban not revealed to us the time of the establishment of the church; you then quote Matt. 3:2 to prove that it was in existence at the time John preached in the wilderness; also Luke 16:16, from which you evidently wish to make

it appear that John set up the church. All this, after telling me in private conversation that Christ set up his own church. Please reconcile these conflicting notions if you can. John might have set up a Baptist church; but if so, it was not Christ's church. For after John's head was cut off we hear Jesus saying, "Upon this rock I will build my church. (Matt. 16:18.) Now any man of common souse knows that Christ could not truly have said this, if the church had already been built. John's mission was to prepare a people for the coming of Christ. The persons thus prepared were material out of which the first church watt built. In this respect the establishment of the church was like its type, the building of Solomon's Temple. John did not say "The kingdom has already come." He said it is at hand." This means near by, or nigh. (Luke 10:9.) Jesus taught his disciples to pray for it to come. (Matt. 6:10.) He would not have done this if it had already come. Luke 16:16 teaches simply that

God's method of communicating His will to man was confined to the Law and the prophets until John came. John began to prepare for the new order of things by preaching the gospel of the kingdom (not the gospel of Christ). Men heard his preaching, believed it, repeated of their sins, were baptized in Jordan confessing their sins, and were taught to believe on Christ when he should come; that is, be manifested. (Matt. 3:1-6; Acts 19:4.) Multitudes thronged the banks of the Jordan to hear the glad tiding, that the kingdom was about to be set up. Multitudes also submitted to baptism at the hands of John. But it-appears that of all those baptized by John, only a small percentage accepted the Savior when he came. The reason for this, appears to be found in an evident misunderstanding on the part of the Jews concerning the nature of the kingdom. They thought, it was to be a temporal kingdom. Even the disciples had this idea just before Christ's Ascension, (See Acts 1:6.) It was into this preparatory state of the kingdom that men pressed so eagerly. The word "gospel" means simply "glad tidings," or "good news". It was good news (gospel) to the Jews that the kingdom for which they had longed

TLC

for generations was at hand, near by. That was the gospel preached by John the Baptist, by Christ, by the seventy, and by the apostles before Pentecost. They were not permitted to preach Christ as a Savior till they received power from on high. (Matt. 16:20; 17; 9; Luke, 24:46-49; Acts, 1:5-10.) Can you or I preach the gospel of Christ without preaching his death. burial and resurrection? In view of all the facts here presented, could the apostles have preached the gospel of Christ before Pentecost? If so, by whose authority could they, or did they do it? In Matt. 12:28 Christ had reference to the power of God in His (God's) kingdom as opposed to the power of Beelzebub (Satan) in his kingdom. As a matter of course the Spirit of God belongs to God's kingdom, or realm. It was by this Spirit that Christ cast out devils. But that institution known as the kingdom of heaven or church of Christ, did not receive this Spirit till Pentecost (John 7:39), hence had no living existence before (James 2:26). In Luke 17:21 Christ was trying to show the Pharisees the nature of his kingdom; that is, that his kingdom rules within men, controlling their minds and hearts as opposed to an earthly or fleshly kingdom which rules men outwardly. It had no reference to the condition of the kingdom at that time. You brought forward one other proof-text which I will notice (Matt. 18:17). The word "church" means simply "the called out." As I showed in my first letter, the word church is applied in Scripture to other institutions than the kingdom of heaven. Those called out by the preaching and baptism of John constituted a church in the literal sense of the term; but they, as material for the building of Christ's church, were not arranged, or organized into a living institution till the Spirit came on Pentecost. Just as the material for the erection of Solomon's Temple was all fully prepared before the foundation was laid, so it was with the Church of Christ The material might have been called the temple before it was put in place; so the material prepared by John, and Christ, and the apostles was called the church before it was placed in position and became the abode of God's Spirit. On this kingdom question the reader is requested to study carefully, in addition to what has already been

TLC

presented, the following Scriptures: Mark 9:1; Matt. 11:11; 18:1; Luke 12:32; 22:18; 23:42-51; Heb. 10:9; Col. 2:14.

We now proceed to examine the Law of Admission into the kingdom. Since Paul teaches that salvation is in Christ's church, not out of it (Ephes. 1:22-23; 5:23-25; Acts 20:28), the Law of Admission into the church is the same as an inspired answer to the question, "What must I do to be saved?" This is the practical question of the Christian religion. All other questions, in themselves considered, sink into insignificance when compared to this one in importance. "What mutt I do to enter the body, or church of Christ, where I may have salvation, or remission of sins?" (Col. 1:13-14.) We have seen how John prepared material for the establishment of this church by teaching the sinful Jew? to repent of their sins, confess their sins, be baptized for the remission of their sins (Mk. 1:4), and then believe on him (Christ) who should come after. We now inquire, "How shall we who are Gentiles after the flesh, living in the full blaze of the Gospel Light, enter the kingdom which now exists in the world?" I propose to affirm that men and women become children of God, disciples of Christ, or Christians by taking the following steps in the order here Driven:

I. Hearing God's Word, or the Gospel of Christ.

II. Believing the Gospel of Christ with all the heart.

III. Repenting of all past sins.

IV. Confessing Christ with the mouth.

V. Being Baptized into the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Before proceeding with the argument, I wish to ask a few plain, practical questions; and I earnestly desire the reader to have the benefit of plain, practical answers to my questions. 1. In the conversion of a sinner, who takes the first step, God or the sinner? 2. What is the first step taken in the heart of a sinner toward his salvation? 3. Is it not a fact that the same process that

TLC

makes a man a Christian adds him to the church of Christ? If not, please state what things are necessary to make a Christian a member of Christ's church? 4. If a sinner should take the five steps already given, viz: Hearing, Believing, Repenting, Confessing and Being Baptized, would he become a Christian, a Campbellite or a Baptist? 5. In the conversion of a sinner which precedes, Faith or Repentance? But to proceed with the argument. In the Great Commission (Mark 16:15-16) Christ said, "He that believeth not shall be damned?" Believeth not, what? I answer, the gospel. For he had just told them to preach the gospel, and added: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." But "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." (Rom. 10:14-17.) Since faith in Christ is essential to salvation—and Paul here teaches that faith comes by hearing God's Word—it follows that hearing is necessary to salvation. The word "hearing" is not here restricted to hearing with the physical ear, but includes all those processes by which the mind receives a knowledge of the facts of the gospel. For instance, before the New Testament was written it was necessary to hear the gospel from the lips of some one; but now we may hear by reading or hearing read the New Testament, and thus we may hear the inspired followers of Christ. Since faith comes by hearing God's Word, it follows that faith, or belief of the gospel is the next item in the gospel plan of salvation. But what is faith? In Matt 10:5-13 we have an account of the healing of the Centurion's servant in verse 8, we hear the Centurion saying, "Speak the Word only and my servant shall be healed," Again, verse 10—"When Jesus heard it he marveled and said to them, that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." Now, verse 13: "And Jesus said unto the Centurion, Go thy way and as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee." The Centurion's belief was evidently what Christ, in verse 10, calls his faith. Again, in Rom, 4:3 we read that Abraham believed God and it was counted (reckoned) unto him for righteousness. In the same

TLC

chapter, ninth verse, we learn that faith was reckoned (counted) unto Abraham for righteousness. So then it follows that to believe God is faith such as Abraham had. Question. Does God require me to believe anything more than the gospel of Christ contained in the New Testament in order to my salvation? If so, what is it? It may be claimed that a man is a child of God, justified or pardoned the instant he believes. By reference to John 1:12 we learn that the believer has power to become a son of God. "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name?" If, as this Scripture teaches, the believer has power to become a son of God, then it follows that the mere believer is not a son of God, but only has power to become a son of God. Again, in Romans 9:31-32, Paul teaches that Israel failed to attain to the law of righteousness because they sought it not by faith. From this it follows that if a man seek the law of righteousness by faith he will find it. But he must have the faith when he seeks it, therefore he had not attained to the law (way) of righteousness when be received the faith. To illustrate. If I seek a lost coin in a dark room by the light of a lamp I certainly have not found the coin when I obtain the lamp. So when a person comes into possession of faith, be only bus that with, or by which to seek salvation. Once more (James 2:24), "Ye see then how that by works A man is justified and not by faith only." "God's order" is faith seeking salvation. The sectarian order is, seeking faith-salvation. In the days of the apostles, people were required to repent of their sins in order to be saved. In Luke 13:3, Christ said to certain persons; "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." In Luke's record of the Great Commission (Luke 24:40-48), Christ commands the apostles to preach repentance and connects it with remission of sins. On the day of Pentecost, when the Jews, who had taken part in the crucifixion of the Savior, were pricked to the heart by Peter's words, and cried out saying, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" They were told to repent for remission of sins. (Acts 2:37-38.) But Paul settles the whole thing, in Acts 17:39, when he says, "The times of this ignorance

God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." No man with this Scripture before him can deny that to repent is a commandment given by God for man to obey. James touches that if a man keep the whole law and yet offend in one point he is guilty of the whole. (James 2:10-12.) So if a man should do everything else required of him and should fail to repent, it would profit him nothing. But, what is repentance? Jesus says (Matt. 12:41), that the people of Nineveh repented at the preaching of Jonah. By reference to Jonah 3:10 you will find that those Ninevites were sorry enough for their sins to turn away from them. This was a genuine case of Bible repentance, Jesus himself being the witness. So then when a man's faith in Christ is strong enough to lead him to forsake sin and turn from it he has repented. But is this all that is required of man in order to his salvation? I answer, no, for Jesus said in Matt. 10:32, "Whosoever, therefore, shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father which is in heaven." The eunuch confessed that he believed with all his heart that Jesus Christ is the Son of God (Acts 8. 37). From these Scriptures we learn: 1. That in order to have the assurance that Christ will confess us in the Great Day, we must confess him before men. 2. That this confession consists in acknowledging that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, But what is this confession for? Paul (Rom. 10:10) says it is unto salvation; that is in order to salvation, not because of salvation. We must, therefore, confess Christ, not our feelings, and this confession is unto (not because of) salvation. The man who says to the preacher, "I believe that God, for Christ's sake, has already pardoned my sins and I want to be baptized because I am a child of God," does not confess Christ unto salvation as the eunuch did, and as the Spirit requires, and hence is not following the law of the Spirit.

We now come to examine the design of baptism. Right here let me say that everything made by the hands of God—every ordinance of his kingdom—has a design in it. Baptism is no exception to this rule. Hence baptism is either in order to

salvation—that is, has something to do with man's salvation—or it is because of salvation already obtained and hence has nothing whatever to do with man's salvation. Dear reader, which position will you take? As for me, I am perfectly willing to refer the decision of the question to God's Word. And what does it teach on this subject? In Acts 4:12 we read, "Neither is there salvation in any other" (than Christ). Salvation then is in Christ (not out of him), and, therefore, to reach salvation a man must get into Christ. But how do we get into Christ? "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." (Gal. 3:26, 27.) This settles the question. It shows that we are justified by a living faith in Christ Jesus when we are baptized into him; not before. So then men are baptized into Christ where atone is salvation. Is it necessary to obey God in order to be saved? Hear Jesus: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." (Matt. 7:21. Also see Heb. 5:8, 9; Rev. 22:14). Is baptism a commandment? Yes. "He commanded them to be baptized;" etc. (Acts 10:48.)

Jesus taught that there is a broad way and a narrow way (Matt. 7:13-14). Question: On which of these two ways is baptism? Again, Jesus said to Nicodemus (John 3:5), "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, be cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Can a man be saved outside of the kingdom of God? All answer, No. Then he cannot be saved unless be is born of water and of the Spirit, for he cannot enter the kingdom without these. But what is it to be" born of water?" I answer to be baptized. This passage is so applied in the Methodist Discipline, the Presbyterian Confession, and the Episcopal Prayer Book; showing what the learned men who prepared those works understood it to mean. Every commentator of the first rank, regardless of denomination, agrees that "born of wafer" means baptism. There is, so far as I know, only one other interpretation of the passage held, and that is, that "born of water" has reference

TLC

to the natural birth. Now, if this be true, I respectfully submit that surely Jesus thought Nicodemus a very great fool. Let us read the sentence substituting "born into the world" for "born of water." "Except a man first be born into the world and then born again (of the Spirit) he cannot enter the kingdom of God." This does not make respectable nonsense. It makes Christ guilty of telling Nicodemus something that a child ought to know. Nicodemus certainly knew that unless a man be born into the world he cannot go to heaven, hell, or anywhere else. If "born of water" in John 3:5 has reference to baptism, no man can enter the kingdom of God without baptism, Jesus himself being the witness. In the Great Commission (Mk. 16:15-16), Christ says, "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but be that believeth not shall be damned." Christ here connects faith and baptism with the word and, and places them both before salvation. Who will deny the Master's own words? Who, that loves Jesus can, in the face of this declaration, say in word or practice: "Jesus, you are mistaken. You should have said, 'He that believeth and is saved may or ought to be baptized?'" Any people who baptize a man because be is already saved, have changed God's order in this commission; and that is a dangerous thing to do. Christ's order is: 1. Believe; 2. Be Baptized; 3. Saved. The Baptist order is: 1. Believe; 2. Saved; 3. Be Baptized. On the day of Pentecost, when believers cried out and said, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" they were told to repent and be baptized in the Dame of Jesus Christ for remission of sins (Acts 2:38). Repentance and Baptism are here connected by and, and stand in the same relation to salvation. If baptism in Acts 2:38 is became of remission of sins, repentance is too. A schoolboy ought to know that much. But all agree that repentance is toward, in order to salvation; hence baptism is too. In Matt. 26:28 Christ says his blood was shed for many "for the remission of sins. The words "for the remission of sins" are the same in this passage in both Greek and English as those used in Acts 2:38. If "for" in Acts 2:38 means "because of" then in Matt. 26:28 "for" means

"because of," and hence Christ shed his blood because the sins of the people were already forgiven. Are you prepared to accept this? I know you will say, no. So will every other thoughtful person who reads this. The Holy Spirit, therefore, speaking through Peter on Pentecost, commanded men to repent and be baptized in order that their sins might be forgiven. So long as Acts 2:38 remains in the Book, and so long as men live who are honest in dealing with God's Word; just so long will there be found believers of the truth, that baptism is in order to the remission of sins.

Questions: 1. Is for in Matt. 26:28 prospective or retrospective? 2. Is for in Acts 2:38 prospective or retrospective? 3. Is baptism essential to membership in Christ's church? 4. Does God in the Scriptures offer salvation to man on conditions to be complied with by man?

In Acts 8:26-39, we have an account of the conversion of the eunuch. We read, in verse 30, "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 (the eunuch) went on his way rejoicing." Why did be rejoice? Because he had the assurance that he was a child of God. When did he rejoice? After he had confessed Christ and been baptized.

The same is true of the Philippian jailer (Acts 16:33-34). Why did he not rejoice before baptism? Paul and Silas taught him the necessity of being baptized before he had just cause to rejoice.

N. L. CLARK,

Springtown, Texas, March 6, 1897.

To Elder E. P. Douglass, Wesson, Miss.

TLC

FIRST PROPOSITION. DOUGLASS' THIRD REPLY.

WESSON, Miss., March, 1807.

Elder N. L. Clark, Springtown, Texas:

MY DEAR SIR: --Your third letter has been received and carefully considered. There are some things contained in your second letter, to which I intended giving some notice at this writing, but it is altogether unnecessary now, as you have virtually given up your position on the time of the church's establishment. In your second letter, page 4, you say: "It is necessary to know when and where the church in a. complete state first existed." This is an admission that the church existed, in an incomplete state, previous to the day of Pentecost. Out in your third letter, page 8, you make a still more Important admission. You say, "So the material prepared by John, and Christ, and the apostles was called the church." Well, if the material prepared by John, ami Christ, and the apostles was called the church, it was the church. Though it may have been in an incomplete state, still, it was the church. The preparatory department of a school does not embrace the entire course of education; yet, it is an indispensable part of and belongs to the system of education. Infancy and childhood, though lacking in the completeness of manhood and womanhood, belong to the period of human life. So the infancy of the church, however incomplete its state and destitute of that power afterwards attained, is a part of its existence.

Before following you to your second position, I will notice one or two things more. You quote from my second letter, page 7, "Christ was tried, passed through the trying ordeal of suffering," etc., and then you say, "This means that God was entirely satisfied with Christ's offering from the foundation of the world, but Christ had to DIE to SATISFY MAN that he was the SON OF GOD!! This is a wonderful discovery to be sure." Indeed, it is

TLC

a most wonderful discovery? No one but you, I presume, will ever be able to discover that my language is susceptible of any such meanings as you give it. You conclude that I am beside myself, though, whether from much learning, or the lack of it, you seem unable to determine. O no, "I am not mad, most noble Festus, but speak forth the words of truth and soberness." What you have said in this connection is but a vain effort upon your part to turn the mind of the reader from the main issue. You try to make the impression that I hold to some strange and unheard of ideas about the object and purpose of Christ's death. The importance and object of the atonement of Christ in the plan of salvation will be fully considered when that point has been reached in the discussion. That is not the question we were discussing, except in an incidental way. Come back to the point, sir.

In just what sense was Christ made perfect through sufferings? This was the point under consideration, and to which my language applied. I did not say, nor mean, that Christ had to die to satisfy man that he was the Son of God. Christ died to atone for the sins of men. I do say, however, that the manner of Christ's death, as well as that of his life, carried conviction to the hearts of men. Yes, miracles were wrought and recorded to convince men that Christ was the Son of God. But this was not the only way in which men were impressed with that fact. Read Luke 27:47, 48. "Now when the centurion saw what was done, he glorified God, saying, certainly this was a righteous man, and all the people that came together to that sight, beholding the things which were done, smote their breasts and returned." Matthew gives the same testimony. "Now when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake and those things that were done, they feared greatly, Haying, Truly this was the SON of GOD." (Matt. 27:54.) You cite several passages to prove that "Christ died for sinners, for the ungodly, to bring us to God, to save us," etc. No one, claiming to believe in the Christian religion, disputes that fact, that I know of. That

TLC

Christ died to save me, has always made a deeper and more solemn impression upon my mind, than all the miracles ever recorded of him. This is true, I believe, of every Christian. The miracles of Christ bore testimony to the fact that he was the Son of God. lint in his death, the crowning testimony of that, fact was given. The fact, that Christ died for sinners, proves that he was the Son of God. I have shown that my language, not your perversion of it, is in perfect harmony with the word of God, and I still have an abundant supply of "ammunition" on hand.

I will now examine your arguments on the law of admission into the kingdom. I would not word the question as you have, if I were to name it. But, anyway, it will bring us to a consideration of the plan of salvation. This is the real issue between us. And, as you have stated, is the most important question that presents itself to the human mind. It is an old question. "How then can man be justified with God for how can he be clean that is born of a woman?" was the question asked in Job's day. It has been the burning question of the ages. The answer to that question is found in the gospel of the Son of God. "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. 5:1). "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you." (John 15:3.) These are clear and explicit statements. They answer fully that anxious inquiry of the human heart, "What shall I do to be saved?" Many like passages are given, to show men the way of salvation. God bus made the way plain and easy in his word, yet men differ in their views about the way to be saved. Professing Christians do not agree. All of them cannot be right, some are wrong. That this state of things exists, is a fact greatly to be deplored. That it is so, is not because of any defective statement of the plan, as found in the void of Divine truth. The fault lies somewhere else. Many, I have no doubt, are sincere, though holding to wrong views. On the other hand, many who profess Christ are really "enemies of the cross of Christ." (Phil. 3:18.) Tares, as well as wheat, have been sowed. This has tilled the world with confusion. The way seems dark and difficult

TLC

to many anxious souls. A fearful reckoning awaits all who have been sowing the tares of confusion. When the harvest time comes. "The Son of Man shall send forth his angels and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity." (Matt. 13:40.) You say, "Paul teaches that salvation is in Christ's church (not out of it)." A little further on you say, "What must I do to enter the body, or church of Christ where I may have salvation, or remission of sins?" You then proceed to affirm that men and women become the children of God by taking five steps, hearing, believing, repenting, confessing and being baptized. You make these five steps essential, that is, conditions to salvation. The first three steps, hearing, believing and repenting are conditions that lead to salvation. The other steps, confessing and being baptized, are not conditions of salvation, but acts of obedience on the part of the saved, which give evidence of salvation. Children render obedience to their parents, not that by so doing they may be made children, but because they are their children. Your acts of obedience to your father were not performed as conditions to sonship, but because you were his son. Baptism is not the means, or condition of obtaining the remission of sins but it is the means of declaring, or confessing the remission of sins previously obtained by faith in, Christ. It is an evidence of faith. and the outward sign of inward grace. Baptism is called a figure. "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus from the dead." (1 Peter 3:21.) Again, it is called a likeness. "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." (Rom. 6:5. See also Rom. 6:4.) "Into death;" in conformity to his death, a striking emblem of death. "Hence the baptized are often said to be dead and buried, and resuscitated into a new life." —Rosenmuller. "There was in baptism, as administered in former times, an image both of the burial and resurrection."— Ignatius. "We represent our Lord's sufferings and resurrection by baptism in a

TLC

pool. "—Justin Martyr. It is faulty logic to contend that the figure or likeness or emblem of a thing is the means or condition of accomplishing that thing. The eagle has been adopted as the emblem of American independence. Yet no one claims that the eagle helped, in any way, to gain the freedom and independence which the American people now en joy. Your interpretation of the Scriptures and your logic are both at fault in this matter. Paul does not teach that "salvation is in Christ's church (not out of it)." The expression, "And he is the Savior of the body" (Eph. 5:23), does not teach that the church is the savior of the souls of men. They are saved before they become any part of the church. It simply means that Christ protects, defends and supplies his church with every needed good; just as the husband protects, defends and provides for the comfort of the wife. The apostle is here urging the relative duties of husband and wife. "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord." The wife is required to render obedience, not in order to become a wife, but because she is a wife. No woman is under any obligations to obey any man, as her husband, until she in fact becomes his wife. No man has any right to demand obedience of any woman, as his wife, until he in fact becomes her husband. It would be a violation of the law of God and man to do so. Those who are made the children of God, through faith and repentance, are required to submit to baptism, and conform to all the duties en joined upon believers. This they are to do, not that by so doing they may become the children of God, but because they are the children of God. No unpardoned sinner is under any obligations to submit to the ordinance of baptism and become a member of the church of God. God does not require it of him; but he does require of all men everywhere to repent. This command is universal. The command to be baptized is restricted to believers, and those who bring forth fruits meet for repentance. You quote Rom. 4:3. "Abraham believed God and it was counted unto him for righteousness." This is a strong point, but it is against your position. It proves conclusively, that righteousness which is salvation, is obtained by faith. And the fact that Abraham's faith

TLC

was counted unto him for righteousness, "was not written for his sake alone, but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed if we believe on him who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead." (Rom. 4:23, 24.) Just as no act of Abraham's intervened between his faith and his justification as a means, or condition of his justification, so Paul teaches of all believers. "To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness," (Rom. 4-5.) We learn from this, that no act of ours is to intervene between our faith and our justification, as a means or condition of our justification. Following your remarks on faith, and your reference to Abraham's justification by faith, you ask, "Does God require me to believe anything more than the gospel of Christ contained in the New Testament in order to salvation? If so, what is it?" Well, you seem to think bo. Baptism and church membership, as conditions of salvation, are not found anywhere in the New Testament. From Alpha to Omega, the book teaches no such doctrine. Yet you claim that baptism and church membership, in addition to faith and repentance, are essential to salvation. I am sure you have not examined the hearing and consequences of this doctrine, which you are promulgating to the world. Permit me, sir, to call serious attention to the tendency and consequences of this dangerous dogma. If salvation is obtained only through the conditions which you have stated, or in other words, if the church and its ordinances are made the only appointed means, through which the cleansing efficacy of the blood of Christ is applied to human souls, then the salvation of men, however penitent and believing they may be, depends altogether upon the will and pleasure of those who claim authority to baptize and receive members into the church. Popish priests have claimed the power of remitting sins.

Rome has always claimed that salvation is through, and only through the divinely appointed means of the church and its ordinances (sacraments). Protestants have generally been pretty well united in their opposition to this claim, and have denounced

it in unmeasured terms as an unwarranted, presumptuous and arrogant assumption. According to this theory, the salvation, even of an humble, penitent believer, depends, not on the wilt of God, but on the will of man. If a penitent, believing sinner makes application to the church, or priest, or ad administrator, and is not received and baptized, his sins are not remitted, because he has failed to carry out the necessary steps to secure remission of his sins, though be has made an earnest, anxious effort, and failed, not from any fault of his own. Yet he must die and go to heaven with his sins unpardoned, or he must be lost, though a penitent believer in Christ. This is a logical conclusion of the matter, from which there is no escape,

I heartily agree with much of what you any about the importance of faith and repentance. But when you make void faith and repentance by insisting that baptism and church membership are essential to the remission of sins, I must dissent I therefore take issue with you on that point I contend that as soon as a sinner becomes a penitent believer in the Lord Jesus Christ, his sins are remitted, and that without the intervention of baptism or anything else. In support of this view, I call attention to the following passages: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth: to the Jew first and also to the Greek, For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith; as it is written, The just shall live by faith." (Rom. 1:16-17.) Paul here quotes from Hab. 2:4. When the prophet wrote, "The just shall live by faith," be knew and thought nothing about baptism. Paul, evidently, had not found out that baptism was necessary to the remission of sins, when he quoted the prophet, or be would have written, the just shall live by faith, provided they are baptized. Hear Paul again: "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference, for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God: being

TLC

justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay, but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude, that a man in justified by faith without the deeds of the law. Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: seeing it is one God which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uucircumcision through faith. Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." (Rom. 3:21-31.) I have quoted at length because of the important bearing this Scripture has on the subject under consideration. It expressly sets forth God's method of justification. Everything necessary to it, both on God's part and man's, is fully stated. Yet there is not one word about baptism in this chapter, nor in the chapters that precede, nor in the two that follow. The first mention made by the apostle of baptism in this epistle, is in the 6th chapter, and is there used as a figure, or likeness of death and the resurrection, and not as a condition of salvation.

I will now consider one of your questions, which you seem anxious to have answered. You ask; "Can a man be saved outside of the church of Christ?" I will answer by asking some questions. Consider them carefully. Perhaps they will help you to get a solution of your question. One of the malefactors, crucified at the same time with Christ, said, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." Christ said in reply, "Verily I say unto thee, Today thou shalt be with me in paradise." With that malefactor a member of the church of Christ? Was he saved? Was any one ever saved before the church of Christ was established upon the earth? If so, how were they saved? Is it Christ or the church that saves? if Christ saves, what has the church to do with it? If the church saves, what has Christ to do

TLC

with it? You are not in the church of Christ; how do you expect to be saved? May I not be allowed to indulge the hope, that you, and others who profess to love Christ, will be saved through Christ, in spite of the fact that you do not belong to the church of Christ? Now, you may answer these questions or not. Do just as you like about that. I hope, however, they may be helpful to you.

In my next I shall consider further the main point at issue, namely, the conditions of salvation.

Respectfully yours,

E. P. DOUGLASS.

FIRST PROPOSITION. CLARK'S CLOSING LETTER.

MY DEAR SIR: —I received your third letter yesterday, and now hasten to reply. I have not given up my position on the establishment of the church, as you think. Here is what I said in my last letter: "Just as the material for the erection of Solomon's Temple was all fully prepared before the foundation was laid, so it was with the church of Christ. The material might have been called the Temple before it was put up. So the material prepared by John and Christ and the apostles was called the church before it was placed in position and became the abode of God's Spirit." Before Pentecost ibis church was but a mass of material, as a pile of lumber prepared for the erection of the spiritual temple, or church of God. As such, it had no head. (Ephes. 1:19-23); it had no spirit, (John 7:39); it was a dead body, (James 2:26). Having no life, it had no power, hence no gospel to save, (Rom. 1:6); it had no blood, (Ephes. 2:13; Acts 20:28); it had no foundation, (Isa. 28:16; Heb. 2:10). It was, therefore, a headless, lifeless, gospelless, foundation less, bloodless something—nothing. Perhaps that is a true picture of the Baptist church, but not of Christ's church. Your illustration about the school and the growth of the child from infancy contains a concession that the church did not exist in a complete state prior to Pentecost. Hence you

TLC

have conceded all I asked for.

Now, the reason why I have been so persistent in my arguments on the establishment of the church is this: I find a complete New Testament church at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. I examine the actions of that church as they are given in Acts of Apostles and thus obtain a correct picture of a complete church. I then turn to the church of which I am an humble member and by observing its actions I find it to be identical with the mother church at Jerusalem in faith and practice. Thus I find the church of God in this age. Any church claiming to be the church of God which does not bear the characteristic marks of the Jerusalem church founded on Pentecost, is not the church of (tod. I think that you will concede that much to be true. The first murk or brand which I sought, to discover was the way into the New Testament church. I chose to call this way "The Law of Admission into the church." How, then, did men get into the church on the day of Pentecost? Turn to the second chapter of Acts and learn that when the Holy Spirit came upon the disciples, and the multitude came together, the murderers of Jesus were pricked in their hearts by Peter's words and cried out saying, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" (Acts 2:37). Why did they ask that question? Nobody doubts their earnestness. They had heard the gospel of Christ preached by the Spirit through Peter and they had believed it too. But according to your teaching they did not believe in Christ when they asked the question, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" You may deny this, but I shall prove it on you. On page 13 of your last letter, you say, "We learn from this that no act of ours is to intervene between our faith and our justification, as a means, or condition of our justification." Again, on page 8, you teach that repentance is an essential condition of salvation. Now, when these Pentecostians asked the preacher, "What shall we do?" they were told to repent. Were they told to repent because already saved by faith, or did they have no faith in Christ when they asked the question?

TLC

Elder Douglass, you are in a dilemma. Which horn will you take? Either ad nut that those Pentecostians had something to do between faith and justification, or deny that they had any faith in Christ when they asked the question. It is a fact that they believed in Christ. Else why would they, having crucified him as an impostor, ask such a question as they did ask? They had been made to believe that they had crucified the Holy and Just One whom God had raised up. Turn to Acts 15:9 and learn that faith purifies the heart. It is faith then that reaches the heart. Now, Luke says that these men were pricked in their hearts (Acts 2:37). Therefore, they had faith, for it had reached their hearts. They were told to repeat and be baptized for the remission of sins, with the promise that they should then (after baptism) receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. God here joined repentance and baptism together and placed them both before remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost. "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder." How dare you separate what God hath joined together? I asked you several questions along this line which you ignored entirely. Why did you not answer them? It is a violation of the rules of honorable controversy to refuse to answer a reasonable number of pertinent questions.

But to proceed with the Pentecostians. We learn in Acts 2:41 that three thousand persons gladly received the commandment to repent and be 'baptized for the remission of sins and upon their baptism were added to the church by God (Acts 2:47). For some time this church at Jerusalem was the only one in the world, but finally a great persecution arose against the disciples (Acts 8:1) and they went everywhere preaching the Word (Acts 8:4), The apostles, however, remained at Jerusalem (verso 1). These disciples were not all ordained Baptist preachers either. Still they went everywhere preaching and baptizing the believers. One of them (Philip, a deacon,) went down to Samaria and preached the gospel. And when the people, including Simon the sorcerer, believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men

TLC

and women (Acts 8:5-13). In the name chapter, verses 20-30, we have an account of the conversion of the eunuch, the most picturesque of all the New Testament conversions. As they went on their way Philip preached to him Jesus. The next thing we hear of him be is demanding baptism. How did he know it was his duty to be baptized? Philip in preaching Jesus to him had told him of the necessity of obeying this commandment. You argue that one man may hinder another's baptism and so shut him out of Heaven, if baptism is for remission of sins. The eunuch wanted to know what hindered his baptism. Only one thing, viz: to confess with the mouth the Lord Jesus. That is the only hindrance that a child of God would put into the way of any one desiring baptism. Now, if Philip had been a Baptist preacher he would have told the eunuch "You will have to turn round, go buck to Jerusalem, let me call a conference of the church, and then if you can tell a satisfactory experience, lifter a unanimous vote of the church to receive you, you may be baptized." No true disciple of Christ who preached the unadulterated gospel of Christ ever thought of opposing any other hindrance to a man's baptism than the one which the Holy Spirit, through Philip, placed in the eunuch's way, viz: to make the Good Confession. Von seem to think that a man's salvation does not depend at all on the actions of other men. As this is a point over which some one in liable to stumble, we will examine it a little. Turn to I. Cor. 1:21 and read that it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. Is not man required to do this preaching? Can any one be saved without this preaching? Why do you send missionaries to China to preach to the heathen? Suppose the fathers had failed to preserve and transmit to us the Bible, could we have been saved? If one man has nothing to do with another's salvation, why don't you quit preaching and engage in a more paying business? Does your preaching have anything to do with the salvation of sinners? Perhaps your preaching is a non-essential. If so, your church is non-essential, and I am almost tempted to declare that you, yourself, are a non-essential. Any one who can answer the questions just stated must

TLC

admit that God, for some unknown reason, has made the salvation of human souls to depend, to some extent upon the actions of others.

The next conversion recorded in Acts is that of Saul of Tarsus. Christ appeared to Saul to make him an apostle, a minister and a witness to the Gentiles to testify to them that Jesus was of a truth the Son of God. This was Paul's call to the ministry (Acts 26:16-18), and he saw Christ face to face (I. Cor. 15:8). But Saul had been a persecutor of the church and it was necessary before entering upon his work as a minister that he become a child of God. To this end be asked, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Christ answered, "Go into the city and there it will be told thee what thou must do." (Acts 9:6.) Saul went into the city and there tarried in blindness, hunger, and penitence for three days. Then Ananias was sent to tell him what Christ and said he must do. Now what was it he must do? Notice it was something Saul was to do, not God for him, and it was moreover something that Christ said must be done. What did Ananias tell him to do? "Bro. Saul, receive thy sight," says one. That is true, but God did that for him. Nobody, I presume, believes that Saul was able of his own power to restore himself to sight. But there was something to be done by Saul that Jesus told him he must do. "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord" (Acts 22:16). Saul could arise and be baptized. Hence that is what Christ had said he must do. So one of the last messages ever received from Jesus tells a man that he must be baptized. This is in perfect harmony with what Paul, afterwards wrote to the Romans. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." (Rom. 6:3-5.) Paul tenches in the first verse here quoted that we are baptized into Christ. You argue

TLC

that a man can be saved outside of Christ's church. You will hardly argue that a man can be saved outside of Christ. "Neither is there salvation in any other. " (Acts, 4:12). Now, if salvation is only in Christ, as this Scripture teaches, then no man can obtain salvation outside of Christ. Now, Paul says in Rom. 6:3 and also in Gal. 3:27, that we are baptized into Christ. Therefore no man can obtain salvation till be is baptized into Christ. Again, in Rom. 6:4, Paul teaches that having been buried in baptism, we rise to walk in newness of life. "Now 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). So then, having been buried in baptism, baptized into the benefits of Christ's death, we put on Christ, outer into Christ, are translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son (Col. 1:13-14); becoming new creatures, we rise to walk in newness of life, just as Christ rose from Joseph's new tomb to enter into another state of existence. Let us learn another lesson from the sixth chapter of Romans. In verses 16-18 we read, "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey, whether of sin unto death or of obedience unto righteousness, But, God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." Paul here draws the line between God's servants and Satan's, at obedience. Furthermore, he teaches that those Romans had been made free from sin by obeying a form, or type of the doctrine delivered them. So then their obedience brought deliverance from sin. Hear Peter on the same point: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit," etc. (1. Pet 1:22). What was the doctrine Paul preached unto them? Well, he preached the same doctrine everywhere he went, so we will turn to I. Cor. 15:1-4, where he states plainly what he preached first. "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures (item No. 1): and that he was buried (item No. 2); and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures" (item No. 3).

This was the doctrine that Paul preached. In Rom. 6:17, he thanks God that they had obeyed from the heart a form of this doctrine. How did they do this? Here it is. 1. Christ died for sins; they (the Romans; died to the love and practice of sin by repentance. 2. Christ was buried in the tomb; they were buried in baptism.

3. Christ came out of the tomb; they came out of the waters of baptism to walk in newness of life. This is all very plain, and Paul teaches that this obedience made the Romans free from sin. But you urge the objection that men obey God because they are sons, and not to make them sons. You admitted that Faith and Repentance are essential conditions of salvation. Faith in Christ and Repentance are both commandments given by God for men to obey. Listen: "And this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ," etc. (I. Jno. 3:23). "'The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." (Acts 17:30.) Now, Elder Douglass, you are placed in another dilemma. Either admit that a man obeys God in order to become a son, or take the position that a man believes and repents because be is already a Son of God. Either horn will gore the life out. of your position. Von are caught in a trap between God's Word and the opinions of men. What will you do? I will help you out of your trouble if you will accept my assistance. Here is the solution: I am the begotten son of my earthly father, hence I obey him because I am his son. But I am the adopted son of God. (See II. Cor. 6:17-18; Gal. 4:5; Ephes. 1:5.) Christ in the only begotten Son of God. (Jno. 3:16.) Now, children are adopted into certain families usually on conditions to be compiled with by the child, or by the parents for the child. A failure on the part of the child to comply with the conditions specified deprives the child of sonship. So we are adopted into the family of God when we comply with the law of adoption laid down in God's Word. True, we are said to be "born again," "begotten of God," etc. But it is by the Word of God, the seed of the kingdom. (I. Pet. 1:23.) The commandments

TLC

contained in this Word constitute what Paul calls the law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus, which makes men free from the law of sin and death. (Rom. 8:2.) All men who hear this Word are invited to believe it, obey it, and enjoy its promises, (Isa. 55:1; Matt. 11:28; Heb. 5:8-9.) Again you argue that the wife obeys her husband because she is his wife. Very true, but you forget, that she had to comply with the law of marriage in order to become his wife. In this she was a free agent, having choice of becoming his wife or of refusing to do so. Having agreed to become his wife and loving him perhaps with her whole heart, the marriage rite must be performed before she is recognized as his wife or is entitled to his patrimony. Now Paul represents us as being married to Christ (Rom. 7:4). When did we become wedded to Christ? While we were in Satan's kingdom? No. It was when our faith in Christ and our love for him led us to obey the law of marriage laid down by the Holy Spirit by being united with him in the act of baptism. But after marriage, if the wife commit fornication every law, human and divine, teaches that the husband should put her away. So after we have become married to Christ, if we fail to do our duty by observing the instructions of the bridegroom and thus commit fornication with the God of this world, we will be put away by the Bridegroom in the Great Day. There is nothing more clearly taught in God's Word than the doctrine that men and women, as children of God, must continue faithful unto death if they would enjoy eternal salvation. Jesus said to his disciples in Matt. 10:22: "Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that endureth to the end shall be saved." (See also Matt. 24:13.) In the tenth chapter of I. Cor. we have some lessons based on the deliverance of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage. In the 6th verse, Paul teaches as that the things that happened unto the Israelites were written for our instruction; very clearly showing that although the Israelites had been freed from the Egyptians by being baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, still many of them fell in the wilderness and never, reached the Promised Land. So he teaches that we, having been freed from our old enemies, our sins, by being

baptized unto Christ, are still in danger of falling by the wayside and thus full to reach the Promised Canaan of Eternal Rest (On this point see also Heb. 3:819.) Paul said to the Galatians who had accepted Christ and then turned away to Judaism, "Ye are fallen from grace." (Gal. 5:4.) I cannot see how it is possible to make an argument on this plain statement. Paul teaches in the moat direct way possible that some had fallen from grace. Peter lays down the law of the Spirit for the government of the Christian. Hear him: "And beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that be was purged from his old sins. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall." (II. Pet. 1:5-10.) Elder Douglass, where is baptism and church membership in this passage? If Peter meant faith alone when he said, "Add to your faith," then he left no room for baptism or the Baptist church either. For he said add to your faith "virtue" (courage), and then goes on and makes a chain of seven links ending with charity (love), and winds up by saying in the 11th verse, "For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." Do you teach men that just as boon as they are saved by faith outside of the church they should go to work adding to their faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge, etc? Or do you teach them when saved by faith alone to add to their faith a public profession, and to a public profession baptism, etc? What about this question anyway? It in all very plain in the light of inspiration. In Rom. 4th and Gal. 3rd chapter, Paul teaches that Abraham was justified by faith. Now turn to. lames 2:20-24, and learn that Abraham's faith was made perfect by works. Was Abraham justified by an

imperfect faith? James says not. The works here spoken of are not the works of the Jewish Law to be sure, which Paul teaches have nothing to do with our justification, but the works of obedience which God enjoined upon Abraham. So with us. We are as far as anybody from touching that the works of the Jewish Law assist in bringing us to Christ, but the works required at our hands as acts of obedience to God, ore necessary to perfect our faith and bring us to God, Therefore, Peter was talking about a penitent, confessed and baptized faith when be wrote. "Add to your faith," etc. After enumerating those seven Christian graces to be added to faith, Peter says that the Christian who lucks these things is "blind" and "hath forgotten" that he was ever freed from his old sins. He then admonishes them to give diligence to make their calling and election sure; and then says, "If ye do these things, ye shall never fall." Why did Peter use the word if? No reason can be given except that Peter thought there was danger of their fulling. Peter was not a Baptist preacher when be wrote that epistle to be sure. If be had been, be would have said, "Never mind, brethren, about your souls. You have committed them to God, and all the devils in bell cannot dispossess you of your crown. ""Be thou faithful unto death and I will give thee a crown of life." (Rev. 2:10.)

Another mark of identity which I shall notice briefly is the obligation to meet around the Lord's Table every Lord" Day. By studying carefully Lev. 24:5-10, we learn that under the Jewish dispensation, the priests ate the shew bread every Sabbath. The Table of shew bread was placed in that part of the Tabernacle called the Holy place or sanctuary, representing the church in this age (Heb. 9:1-13). That table wan beyond any doubt God's appointed type of the Lord's Table in the church. There were then twelve loaves representing the twelve tribes of Israel, now there is but one loaf, as we are all one in Christ (Col, 5:11). The Jewish priests partook of the shew bread in the typical age; now all Christians are priests of God. (I. Pet. 2:5; Rev. 1:6.) No Jewish priest could claim God's blessing when be failed to eat the shew

TLC

bread every seventh day; no Christian priest, or child of God can claim God's blessing if be fails to meet with the brethren around the Lord's Table on the first day of every week. The Jewish priests performed this service on the seventh (Sabbath) day; the early disciples did so on the first, or Lord's Day. (Acts 20:7.) The obligation to observe the Lord's Supper drawn its support from the fact that it is a positive commandment of the Savior, "Take, eat;" "This do in remembrance of me." (I. Cor. 11:24.) All church historians of the first rank concur in the statement that the disciples of the first century met every Lord's Day to show the Lord's death by observing the Eucharist or Supper. (Acts 2:42; Heb. 10:25.) Any church claiming to be the church of God that fails to observe this ordinance every Lord's Day is lacking in one of the most important characteristics of a New Testament church.

We will now briefly consider the polity or government of a New Testament church. In Acts 20:17 we learn that Paul sent to Ephesus and called the elders of the church. This shows that there were more than one elder or overseer (Acts 20:28) in the Ephesian church. Phil. 1:1 teaches that there were bishops and deacons in the Philippian church. These were the officers of that church. Not one bishop and several deacons, but bishops (plural) and deacons. Read Titus 1:5 and learn that be (Titus) was left in Crete to ordain elders (plural) in every city. The qualifications of these officers are given by Paul in his letters to Timothy and Titus. From a careful study of these Scriptures it is clear that so far as official work in the church was concerned, elders and bishops were the same. The bishops were the overseers of the congregation, or local church. (Acts 20:28; 1. Tim. 3:5.) Now any church that has only one elder, or bishop to one or more churches is not modeled in that respect after the New Testament church.

Another very important mark of identity is the name of the thing identified. The New Testament church was called the church of Christ (Rom. 16:16); church of God (1Cor. 1:1

2.). The members of the church were called saints (Rom. 1:7); children of God (Rom. 8:16); brethren (Rom. 12:1); disciples or Christians (Acts 11:26; 1Pet. 4:16).

My work is now done. I claim that I have proved by the Bible in this discussion that the church of God was established on earth on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Jesus; that men and women got into that church, which is Christ's body, by hearing the gospel, believing it, repenting of their sins, confessing Christ unto salvation, and being baptized by immersion in water for remission of sins; that, having thus entered Christ's body, they were taught to grow in grace, and that there is all the time danger in this life of falling from the grace of God; that the members of the church met every Lord's Day to observe the Lord's Supper; that the local church was governed by a plurality of elders, or bishops and deacons; that the church was called the church of God, or church of Christ, and the members, disciples or Christians. These points I have abundantly proved by God's Word. The churches composed of members known as disciples of Christ in this country now believe and practice the things here set forth. Therefore I conclude, that bearing the same brands or marks as the New Testament church, they are truly churches of God. We believe, moreover, that divisions among Christ's people are inimical to the cause of the Master; and therefore, that sectarianism is a gross sin in the sight of God. We belong to no sect or party that does out include all Christians; hence we are non-sectarian, and undenominational. No Mich party or sect, as Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian or other body that does not include all Christians has any standing-room in the Bible. And those who aid in the formation of parties among professed Christians do. so in the face of Christ's prayer that his people might be one (John 17:21). To be one in this important sense requires unity in religions faith and practice among the followers of Christ. This unity can be attained only by laying aside all human creeds and inventions of men that serve as partitions between sectarian bodies, and by returning to the New Testament

TLC

without addition to, or subtraction from, its teachings. In doing this it is necessary to give up all party names and henceforth wear no name but Christian or disciple. Then with the Bible, and the Bible alone as our rule of faith and practice; with a Bible name for God's church and his people; with a "Thus saith the Lord" for every net performed in the name of religion, we can bid farewell to party lines and exult in the triumph of God's people over sectarianism--the work of the Devil. True, this would not destroy all differences among professed Christians, but it would be a mighty stride in the right direction, and we might then hope to see the day when those who profess to love our Savior would present a solid phalanx to the enemy of souls and march in triumph to the Millennia! Day.

I shall now answer your questions, and I most respectfully ask that you answer the questions already asked you. Questions: 1. In what sense was Christ made perfect by suffering? Answer, —He was made a perfect Savior. No sin was actually blotted out till his blood was shed (Heb. 10:3, 11, 17). 2. Was the thief saved? I don't know; neither do you. If he was saved, it was by a dispensation of Christ's mercy before his last will was made. The thief was never required to obey the gospel, but you are. 3. Were any saved before the church was established? The Jews who kept God's ordinances had their si as rolled forward till Christ died, then their sins were blotted out. The Gentiles were not required to keep the Jewish Law, except the moral precepts contained in it (Rom. 2:14). 4. Is it Christ or the church that saves? Christ saves people in his church, his body. If you don't come on board the Old Ship of Zion (the church of God), you will be left when the trumpet sounds. The others are answered already.

May we all learn the Truth, love the Truth, and obey the Truth is my prayer.

N. L. CLARK,

Brookhaven, Miss., May 13, 1897.

TLC

To Elder E. P. Douglass, Wesson, Miss.

FIRST PROPOSITION. DOUGLASS CLOSING LETTER.

WESSON, Miss., May 28, 1897.

Elder K. L. Clark, Brookhaven, Miss.:

MY DEAR SIR: --Your cloning letter on the first proposition received. I did not expect you would be willing to agree that you had given up your position on the establishment of the church. Your admission, however, that the material for the church, prepared by John and Christ and the apostles, was called the church, amounts, virtually, to that, whether you are willing to admit it or not. It is said, that "a drowning man will catch at straws." This is certainly true of you in this matter. You first admit that the material gathered by John and Christ and the apostles was called the church. You then try to evade the force of your admission, by saying afterwards, that "it was a headless, lifeless, gospelless, foundationless, bloodless something-nothing." Your language shows the extremity to which you have been driven, in trying to sustain an unscriptural position, Your assertion is as baseless as the position you have labored so hard to sustain. That which Christ called "the church," but which you call "something-nothing," was not headless, for Christ, who is the head of the church, was with it, and was its head. It was not lifeless, for Christ was with it, and "in him was life, and the life was the light of men." (Jno. 1:14.) It was not gospelless, for Christ said, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at baud: repent ye, and believe the gospel." (Mark 1:15.) was not foundationless, for Christ, who in the foundation of the church, as well as its head, was with it, and was its foundation. It was not bloodless, for the atonement of Christ was proclaimed. "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him

TLC

should not perish, but have everlasting life." (Jno. 3:14-16.) You say, "It had no Spirit" Christ, the second Person in the Trinity, was with it, to teach and guide it. The Holy Spirit came when Christ went away. There was no need of his coming before. Again you say, "It was a dead body." It seems to have displayed a good amount of energy and activity for a dead body. We read, "And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples, he gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease. These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go, preach, saying, the kingdom of heaven is at band. Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils: freely ye have received, freely give." (Matt. 10:1-8.) "After these things the Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place, whither he himself would come. And the seventy returned again with joy, saying. Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through thy name." (Luke 10:1-17.) That "headless, lifeless, gospelless, foundationless, bloodless something-nothing," you say, "perhaps is a true picture of the Baptist church." You misrepresent Baptists, and cast a slander upon them they do not deserve. You slander your honored grand father, who was a Baptist minister and a faithful servant of the Lord. You do yourself no credit. If there was any truth or argument in what you say, it would be perfectly admissible, but there is neither. You cannot name a single Baptist church that corresponds to that picture, which in your fevered imagination, you have drawn. I write with a feeling of sorrow. A sad thought comes to me. I have grandsons. Will any one of them ever be so wanting in filial esteem, as to misrepresent and throw contempt on me and my religious faith? I am convinced that such is not among the things impossible.

You say, that I have conceded all you asked for, with reference to the state of the church prior to Pentecost. You may call it a

COD cession if you wish. I will be generous in the matter, and concede (?) more than you have asked for. I have never maintained, that the church existed in a complete state prior to Pentecost, nor at any subsequent period of time. But on the contrary, I affirm, that the church has not yet reached a state of completion. You say" I find a complete New Testament church at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. I examine the actions of that church as they are given in Acts of apostles and thus obtain a correct picture of a complete church." That you find a church at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost is unquestionably true. And, if your creed was out of the way, you could find that same church existing before, as well as on, and after Pentecost, but at no time in a complete state. On the day of Pentecost a great blessing was poured out upon the church, and it was greatly strengthened, but not made complete. It was not complete in its organization. This was made manifest in the murmuring and complaint of the Grecians, whoso widows were neglected in the daily ministration. To meet this want, and further strengthen the church for, its grand work, the deacon's office was established. As the cause made progress, now material was gathered, and now churches were organized, some of which developed into strong and efficient bodies. These churches were the products of the first church, and like it in faith and practice, also in tribulations. That the same incomplete conditions of things existed in these churches that existed in the first church, is seen all through the letters written by the apostles to them, urging them to higher and grander attainments in the spiritual life. Emergencies were continually arising. False teachers rose up, and false doctrines crept into the churches. All these things go to show, that there was not a complete state of things in the churches. It could not be otherwise. It was according to the very nature of things. But you will say, the church of Christ is a divine institution, and therefore perfect and complete. The institution is divinely appointed, but the material of which it is composed is human, and is not perfect. This imperfect and undeveloped human element, that flowed continually into the first church, and all the churches, kept them

TLC

in an incomplete state. All along the 1800 years of the church's existence, it has had to contend with oppositions from without, and dissensions from within, The wheat and the fares have been growing together. The little mustard seed has been growing into a great tree. "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." The stone has been growing into a great mountain, and is destined to fill the whole earth. Completion is drawing on. The church of Christ is, at this time, stronger and better equipped, than over before. Ultimately she shall "look forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners." Your "correct picture of a complete church" vanishes into the shades of utter oblivion, and the whole structure of your argument, and your entire system of faith goes with it

"Next I will consider your interpretation of Acts 2:38. You claim, that the words of Peter, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," constitutes the law of admission into the church. The substance of your position is, that the Pentecostians, though believers, were required to repent and be baptized, in order to the remission of slue. Elsewhere, you have stated it on this wise, "that sins are not remitted before, and without baptism." Your position contains two errors. The first, to which I now call your attention is, that the Pentecostians, though believers, were still required to repent. This is erroneous, because it implies that one can be a believer in impenitence. You. construe the expression, "pricked in the heart," to mean faith in Christ. Faith in Christ means, trust in Christ. If they were trusting Christ, why were they alarmed and made to say, "What . shall we do"?" Pricked in the heart," means pierced, penetrated, filled with grief, anguish, sorrow—but not faith. Sherwood says, "the word rendered pricked, would be better, freer from objection, if rendered vexed, stung, tormented: the Latin is compuncti—compunction seized their hearts." The Pentecostians were convinced of their guilt in that cruel tragedy of putting to death one who was holy, harmless and undefiled,

TLC

one, whom Pilate had declared innocent. They asked, "what shall we do?" to escape punishment for a crime of Mich magnitude and enormity. They did not. understand, that faith in Christ, as the Savior of men, would make that innocent blood they had shed efficacious in cleansing them from their sins, Therefore, they had not exercised faith in Christ as their Savior, I maintain, that there is, and can be no such thing as an impenitent believer. His faith may be defective, weak, but if he has saving faith, he has repentance. He cannot have faith without it. Repentance and faith, though distinct doctrines, are inseparably connected. When one has been exercised the other has been exercised. It is impossible for us to conceive of a repenting soul, vim has nut exercised faith in Christ, or, of a believing heart, that has not repented. If there is any testimony in the Scriptures, showing the priority of the one, or the other of these exercises, the preponderance of that testimony is in favor of repentance. It is a fact, that in every passage in the New Testament, where repentance and faith are spoken of, repentance is put first. I will cite just a few instances: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel." (Mark 1:15.) Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." (Acts 20:21.) "For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not; but the publicans and harlots believed him: and ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward, that ye might believe." (Matt. 21:32.) Here Christ represents repentance as necessary to faith. You constructed a dilemma for me, and have fallen into it yourself. By placing faith before repentance—1st, you reverse God's order of things; or, 2nd, you separate repentance and faith, that which God has joined together. You have no authority for doing either. Let me repeat, with emphasis, your Scripture quotation, "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder. "

The second error in your position is, that baptism, with repentance, is necessary or in order to the remission of sins. It

makes baptism and repentance equally necessary—that is, in the same sense essential to the remission of sins. This is not true. Such a construction of Peter's language at Pentecost does not agree with his declarations made elsewhere. Take his words at Caesarea: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." (Acts 10:43.) Peter here states the testimony of all the prophets on this question, which is, that remission of sins is through faith in Christ. Here you are in another dilemma. To sustain your view of Peter's words at Pentecost, you must add to his words at Caesarea, or pronounce them false, Either admit that Peter's words at Caesarea contradict his statement at Pentecost and are false, or admit that, your interpretation of his words at Pentecost is wrong. In your last letter you were kind enough to help (?) me out of a supposed difficulty. I will now return your kindness by helping you out of your difficulty. And now, let us look for the best way out. Sun 11 we force Peter's statement at Caesarea, so as to make it agree with your interpretation of his words at Pentecost, or shall we reject your interpretation, and seek such an explanation of Peter's words at Pentecost as will make them harmonize with his declaration at Caesarea? If we choose the first method, we put ourselves in opposition to the testimony of all the prophets, who have declared with one accord that the remission of sins is procured by exercising faith in the name of Christ. And this testimony of the prophets agrees with the teachings of Christ and all the apostles. So, we will find ourselves in opposition, also, to them. If we take the second plan —that is, reject your interpretation, and take a fair and reason able interpretation of Peter's words at Pentecost, such as will make them agree perfectly with all of the other Scriptures, the way will be clear and easy. For no prophet over testified that baptism was essential to the remission of sins. Christ and the apostles never so taught. The second method, then, is evidently the best and only way out of your difficulty.

And now for an interpretation of Peter's words at Pentecost,

TLC

that will harmonize with what he says at other times, and that will agree with the entire Scriptures. That Peter does not make repentance and baptism sustain the same relation to remission of sins, is seen in the grammatical construction of his words. "Repent" and "be baptized" do not take the same nominative. "The word repent is independent of the remainder of the sentence. It is not, Every one of you repent and be baptized. The nominative to "repent" is not "everyone," but "ye." The Greek is an imperative in the plural. It cannot, therefore, have a singular nominative. The word rendered "be baptized," while a mild imperative, is not plural. "Everyone" is its nominative. Hence, the literal and correct translation would be: Repent ye, and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins. "For remission of sins," then, whatever may be its meaning, is stated as a reason for the latter command and not for the former. The command to repent is given imperatively, without a reason. Repent ye. There was reason enough for this found in their conscious guilt and consequent alarm. But the reason why they should be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ is not so apparent, hence a reason is given: "For the remission of sins." This rendering, I think, is fair and correct. Your view of Peter's words is based on the hypothesis, that "repent" and" be baptized" take the same nominative, when they do not. Evidently the apostle had some design for not using the same nominative and number for both verbs in his words at Pentecost. In his words. Acts 3:19, both "repent" and "be concerted" are commands of universal obligation, hence they take the same nominative. In his words at Pentecost, "repent" is a command of universal obligation, but "be baptized" is restricted to penitent believers. That baptism is for the remission of sins no one will deny. The significance of Peter's words here, turn cm the force of the term "for." For is a word of wide application indicating generally the reason for an action or the object sought. The Standard, by the Funk and Wagnalls Co., gives the following: 1st. "Because or by reason of." 2nd. "With a view to: in order to effect, reach, benefit," &c. "Webster's Unabridged gives the

TLC

following: 1st. "The antecedent cause or occasion of an action; the motive or inducement accompanying and prompting to an act or state; the reason of anything; that on account of which something is done." 2nd. "The remoter and indirect object of an act; the person or thing to be effected or effected by a given act or condition," etc. My view of this passage takes the first and direct meaning of the word. Your view takes the second, which in the remoter and indirect meaning of the word. The Greek word from which the word "for" in this passage is translated, is rarely rendered for, in the sense of "in order to." and certainly not in the passage under consideration. It is sometimes rendered unto, as in Matt. 3:11; 1. Cor. 10:2; Acts 19:3. Us usual rendering is info. The import of this term, wherever used, may be ascertained by observing the distinction between its literal and figurative uses. In your comment on Rom. 6:3, and Gal. 3:27, you ignore this distinction and represent Paul as teaching that we are actually, literally baptized into Christ. That is not true. Faith puts our souls actually into Christ. The baptism of our bodies in water figuratively represents that fact. You might, with just as much propriety, argue that we actually, literally, eat the body and drink the blood of Christ in the Lord's supper. Both ordinances are highly important and should be duly observed, but strictly in their proper sense. Any other use of them dishonors God and is hurtful to the souls of men.

You complain that I have ignored your questions. All that were of any importance have been answered in the general line of my argument, if not in the detail given. They were evidently intended to side track me from the main issue, hence ignored. You have based your claims, mainly on two propositions. The existence of a complete church on the day of Pentecost and baptism with repentance for the remission of sins. You have utterly failed to sustain them. The apostolic churches did not hold to, nor practice, such a faith as you contend for. If your brethren hold the same faith you do, I do not hesitate to affirm that the churches, composed of members known as disciples of Christ are not

churches of God in faith and practice.

May the Lord bless all who read what I have written on this question.

Respectfully,

E. P. DOUGLASS.

TLC

SECOND PROPOSITION. DOUGLASS' OPENING LETTER.

PROPOSITION. --Baptist churches holding to and practicing the principles set forth in what is known as the New Hampshire Articles of faith, are churches of God in faith and practice.

DOUGLASS affirms; CLARK denies.

WESSON, Miss., May 28, 1897.

Elder N. L. Clark, Brookhaven, Miss.:

MY DEAR SIR: —I now proceed to affirm the above stated proposition. First, I will define the terms of which it is made up. The term, Baptist churches, means churches composed of those known as the regular or Associated Baptists. By the term, New Hampshire Articles of Faith, is meant the Declaration of Faith adopted by the Regular Baptist churches of the State of New Hampshire, and were published in the minutes of the Baptist State Convention of New Hampshire, also in the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. This Declaration of Faith expresses, with but little variation, the general sentiments of Baptists in the United States, and in all the world. These terms are sufficiently understood and need no further explanation. The term, faith and practice, means the things believed and practiced by the churches. This is also understood and needs no explanation. The term, church, however, requires a more extended notice. It is taken from the Greek word ekklesia. We must therefore learn from the Greeks its meaning. "The noun ekklesia is compounded of the verb kaleo, to call, and the proposition ek, out of; and it must therefore designate a body of persons called out of a multitude," The government of the Greeks consisted of three judicial bodies. "The Senate of 300, the Ecclesia or public Assembly and the Dikastries--Jury Courts." The Greek Ecclesia was a lawful assembly of qualified citizens, elected out of the multitude of people, for the transaction of public affairs. The

TLC

members of it had to possess certain qualifications. When elected their names were enrolled or registered, and they were called together at stated times by a qualified officer, were presided over, and their acts duly recorded by a clerk or scribe." (See Smith's History of Greece.) Archbishop Trench says, "We have ekklesia in three distinct stages of meaning—Heathen, the Jewish and Christian. In respect to the first, ekklesia, as all know, was the lawful assembly in a free Greek city of all those possessed of the rights of citizenship for the transaction of public affairs. That they were summoned is expressed in the latter part of the word. That they were summoned out of the whole population, a select portion of it, including neither the populace, nor yet strangers, nor those who had forfeited their civic rights, this is expressed in the first. Both the calling and the calling out are moments to be remembered, when the word is assumed into a higher Christian sense, for in them the chief part of its peculiar adaptation to its auguster uses lies." We find the Greek Ecclesia was a body of persons elected, that is chosen and called out from the multitude at large, separated and distinguished from it, by the special qualifications of its members, and the authority and privileges vested in it. The Greek Ecclesia was a permanently organized body, and was an Ecclesia at all times, whether in session or adjourned, and all its members were upon an equality.

Having ascertained the meaning of the word as used by the Greeks, I shall now consider its meaning as used by Christ to designate that organization which he established here on earth. When I turn to the New Testament, I learn that the Ecclesis (church) of Christ is composed of those chosen and called out from the world at large, separated and distinguished from it, because of the authority and special privileges granted to its members. Christ says of the members of his church, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you. Ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world." (Jno. 15:16-19.) The church of Christ is not of the world, yet, it is in the world, and sustains an important relation to it. Christ, said, "Ye are the salt of the

TLC

earth. Ye are the light of the world." (Matt. 5:13-14.) A church of Christ, like the Greek Ecclesia, is a permanently organized. body, and is composed of those who possess the scriptural qualifications of membership, which are repentance and faith, shown by a manifest willingness to obey Christ as their Lord, and who have associated themselves together on terms of perfect equality, in a covenant, implied or expressed, to take the New Testament as their only rule of faith and practice, and to be governed, not by officers scripturally designated, but by the word of their Lord.

I do not claim that I have given a full and complete definition of the term church. What I have given, however, embraces the main features of a church of Christ And as I am now considering the question embraced in the 11th item of the New Hampshire Articles of Faith, I will give that item, which is as follows: "OF A GOSPEL CHURCH. That a visible church of Christ is a congregation of baptized believers, associated by covenant in the faith and fellowship of the Gospel; observing the ordinances of Christ; governed by his laws, and exercising the gifts rights and privileges invested in them by his word; that its only proper officers are bishops, or pastors and deacons, whose qualifications, claims and duties are defined in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus." This, I think, is a very clear and correct definition of the term church, an applied to an organized body of believers. The word visible implies that there may be mi invisible church. We have nothing to do with that in this discussion. We are considering the church Christ organized here on earth, which is a visible body. There are two theories held by Christians with respect to the church of Christ. One is that each local organization in an independent body, and receiving its authority directly from Christ, it is accountable to him alone. The other theory is that the church is universal, embracing all the local organizations of all ages and climes, and in co-extensive with the kingdom of God. This theory IN THE outgrowth of an improper and indiscriminate blending of the terms, kingdom and church,

TLC

without observing the distinction between them. Confusion of ideas has followed, and various creeds have been formulated, bused on a misconception of those. To avoid confusion, and consequently erroneous views of this question, it is necessary to observe the proper distinction. The word kingdom is an abbreviation of the term "king's domain." Kingdom of God, therefore, means God's domain, and it in universal, extending over all his creatures, and enduring through all ages, for it is said, "Jehovah is a great God, and a great king above all Gods. His throne is established in the heavens. and his kingdom ruleth over all." "His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his dominion is from generation to generation." The expressions, "the kingdom of God," "the kingdom of heaven" and "the kingdom of Christ," designate God's spiritual kingdom, which God is ruling in heaven and on earth. Angels in heaven and men on earth are subjects of this spiritual kingdom. Observe now, the difference between the kingdom of God and the church of Christ. Men and angels are subjects of God's kingdom, but angels are not subjects of Christ's church. The kingdom of God is universal, the church of Christ is local. There is no such organization on earth as "the church universal," and if there ever will be, it is yet to be established, or the present organization become universal when made complete. It is the general opinion of com in en tutors, that the word "church," as used in Eph. l:22-23, also Eph. 5:23-27, embraces the entire number of the redeemed, the aggregate of all the saved. I have no desire to appear as opposing or underrating the opinions of learned theologians, yet I will bore remark that the term church, as used in these passages, will apply to a local church of Christ, with as much force, if not more, than to the aggregate of all the churches. For a local church of Christ is a body within itself, and contains in it all the elements of the Divine kingdom. Hence the terms, "kingdom of God" and" kingdom of heaven" are frequently employed to designate the church of Christ, But admitting that the aggregate is meant, the idea of a visible, organized, universal body is not admissible. That the local or congregational idea of the church of Christ is

TLC

the true one is apparent for the following reasons; First, the word "church," when used in the singular, is nine out of ten times, used in the common congregational sense. Second, twelve, times, the more saints, than are in one congregation are spoken of, ami not a single time is there a stretch of the singular, "church," to take them all in, but in each case the plural, "churches," is used. Third, only one church was organized at first, Thin was cot an organization composed of minor and subordinate organizations, from Jericho, Bethany, Bethlehem, Decapolis, Nazareth and other places where Christ traveled and preached, having Jerusalem as the head or center of the organization; but it was a local organization coin-posed of a congregation of individual believers in Christ. Fourth, when other churches were organized, they were each separate and independent bodies. There was no sort of an ecclesiastical organization, binding all the local churches together into one universal body, known among the apostolic churches. Meetings, such as mentioned in the Kith of Acts, were sometimes held to settle questions of dispute, and to arrange, for the missionary work of the churches. These meetings were voluntary gatherings for the purpose of counsel and advice, and were in no sense dictatorial. Fifth, Christ's method of perpetuating his church furnishes still further evidence of the peculiar character and formation of that organization, which is different from that of a kingdom in the ordinary and general sense. An earthly kingdom must be destroyed before another can take its place. Kings and Popes must die or be dethroned before others can succeed them. The perpetuation of an earthly kingdom is by enlargement, and the succession of its kings. The method by which the church of Christ is perpetuated would destroy all earthly kingdoms. One church does not die that another may succeed it. That is, not the plan. Instances, however, are on record where the scattering of a church, by persecution and from other causes, has facilitated the building up of a number of churches in other localities. When the church at Jerusalem was bitterly persecuted, its members scattered, but it did not die. They "went everywhere preaching the Word." The outcome was the

TLC

gathering of churches at many other places.

Thus we find that the perpetuation of the church of Christ is accomplished by the process of multiplication, and not by succession. I do not hold to the succession theory. The idea is a false one. The true idea is, that a church of Christ is a business-doing body, organized on principles that make it indestructible from outside forces or internal strifes. When Paul and Barnabus disagreed, and had sharp contention, they parted asunder. Paul and Silas went one direction, while Barnabus and John Mark went another. The result was two preaching tours instead of one. The terms "kingdom of God," kingdom of heaven" and "kingdom," sometimes apply to the church of Christ on earth, and sometimes they do not. Many overlook this fact, and are led into confusion and error. When these phrases apply to the church of Christ, they denote the spiritual reign of Christ over His disciples. For this reason some claim that they should be translated reign when the connection relates to the earth, and kingdom, when the place of future blessedness is the subject of discourse. "Why," asks Dr. Clarke, speaking of the church, "call it a kingdom?" He then adds, "because it has Jaws, subjects, and a king, Jesus Christ" Matt. 3:2, Mark 1:15, and several other passages furnish instances. where the connection relates to the reign of Christ in his church on earth. Lake 22:16-17, 29-30 give an instance where the subject of discourse relates to a future phrase of the kingdom, and cannot be applied to the church on earth. Christ never did eat the passover with His disciples on earth after that night, when He said, "I will not anymore eat there of until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God," The apostles never did, while on earth, "sit on the thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Other instances could be given, but these are sufficient Another phase of the kingdom of God in its relation to men is, that it does not manifest itself by outward show. "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation." (Luke 17:20.) "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." (Rom. 14:17.) The kingdom

TLC

of God does not consist of a tangible, visible organization having forms and ceremonies and ordinances; but of righteousness, peace and joy. The church of Christ is a visible organization, a tangible body, boon ami known by its outward form, and its ordinances The ordinances of the church of Christ are also expressions of its faith. This feature of the question will be more fully discussed hereafter. Men on earth, who are subjects of the kingdom of God, are the only proper subjects of the church of Christ. Having "first given themselves to the Lord, and afterward to one another according to the will of the Lord." First to the Lord, then to one another in the formation of a church. First become subjects of God's kingdom, then of the church of Christ. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness," This is God's plan. But some have reversed God's order in this matter. They say, seek ye first the church, and its ordinances, as a means of getting in to the kingdom of God. This idea puts the kingdom of God within the church in that sense which makes it necessary to get into the church, in order to reach the kingdom of God. It might be argued with just as much truth, that the United States is contained within the State of Mississippi, and that foreigners desiring to become citizens of the United States, must come into the State of Mississippi and become Citizens of the State in order to obtain citizenship in the United States. The very opposite of that is true. No one, though he may reside in the State of Mississippi, can be a citizen of the State without first, becoming a citizen of the United States. The same is true of the kingdom of God, Putting men and women into the church, or a church, regardless of God's plan, does not make them citizens of God's spiritual kingdom. Let us not forget that" the kingdom of God is not meat and drink," is not outward, does not consist of ordinances of any exterior kind, "but is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." The kingdom of God is spiritual and consists of spiritual things. When men are brought into God's spiritual kingdom, it is by spiritual exercises. "That which

TLC

is born of the flesh is flesh," and it remains flesh; "and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." Christ did not tell Nicodemus how to get into the church, but he did tell him how to get into the kingdom of God. "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." The subjects of God's kingdom are not naturalised into it, but are born into it. "Not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and then hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth. So is every one that is born of the Spirit. "

Respectfully,

E. P. DOUGLASS.

SECOND PROPOSITION. CLARK'S FIRST REPLY:

MY DEAR SIR: --It is with much pleasure that I enter into a discussion of the claims of the Baptist Church. However, as you have so far made no claim for the divine origin of the Baptist Church, not even so much As to assert that your proposition is true, I shall avail myself of an opportunity thus afforded me to answer your lust letter on the first proportion. You have unwarily given ma the opportunity of making the closing argument on the first proposition by your failure to make an attempt at argument in defense of the second proposition. If you or any other Baptist can find, in the twenty pages written by you in the last letter, a single attempt to establish the claims of the Baptist church, then I must admit that your faculty for discerning arguments is touch more acute than mine. You argue that Christ was the head of the church before his death. Turn to Ephes. 1:19-23), and learn that God raised Christ from the dead, put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over the church. "All things," here includes the power of death. Paul being the witness, these things were put under his feet before he was made head of the church. Christ said after he rose from the dead, "All power is given unto me in

TLC

heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18). Christ did not give the keys of the kingdom to Peter, till after he rose from the dead, for he said, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom," etc. (Matt. 16:19).) The keys of the kingdom, that is the means of entrance into the kingdom, is the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation (Rom. 10), and salvation, as you admit, is in the kingdom. This gospel, in fact, commandment, and promise was not given until after Christ rose from the dead, and not proclaimed till Pentecost (Matt. 28:18-20; Acts 2); hence, no one ever entered into the kingdom by means of the keys till Pentecost.

Again, you say that Christ was the foundation of his church before. be died. I have repeatedly called Isaiah (Isa. 28:16) to witness that the foundation of the church was to be a tried stone. You have admitted that Christ is this stone. I showed also from Heb. 2:10 that Christ was made perfect, through his suffering. Hence, if Christ became the foundation of the church before his death, the foundation was not tried and Isaiah made a mistake. John the Baptist did not set up the church, for after John's death Christ said, "Upon this rook I will build my church. (Matt 16:18.) Christ here said that he (not John) would build his church. You argue that because Christ was with the church it had the Spirit To be sure Christ was a member of the Godhead, but we are talking about the spiritual body or church of Christ. Any body without a spirit is a dead body. The Holy Spirit now dwells in the church of God (John 14:15-17.) Why did Jesus tell the disciples that it was expedient that he go away (John 16:7)? If his presence in their midst was sufficient for the work of the church, how could it be to their advantage for him to leave them? He told them in John 14:12 that they should do greater works than he did and gave a reason, "Because I go to my Father." He evidently meant that when he should go to his Father he would enable them to do something never done by him. He sent the Holy Spirit and through Him opened the door of the kingdom and people actually received remission of sins, something never given

TLC

before. You say it was unnecessary for the Spirit to come while Christ was with the disciples. What was the condition of the church during the seven days intervening between Christ's Ascension and Pentecost? Was it a living body; or did it merely apostatize? You say the church displayed a good deal of activity for a dead body. You then quote several passages showing the power of certain disciples to work miracles. Did all those persons baptized by John and Christ and the apostles prior to Pentecost work miracles? You claim that they were all members of the church. If they did not all perform miracles it was not by virtue of their church membership that the miracles were wrought and hence not the church that did the work. In Luke 9:1, we read, "Then he called his twelve disciples together, and gave them power and authority over all devils and to cure diseases." Also in Luke 10:1-9. we read of the sending of the seventy with power to work miracles. Here was activity, to be sure, but it was an activity imparted to special individuals for special purposes. These were not the only disciples the Master had before his death, for we read of "above five hundred brethren" who saw him after he rose from the dead (1. Cor. 13:5). Hence all your talk about the activity of the church as an institution before Christ died is unfounded. You claim that the gospel was preached before Pentecost. The gospel of the kingdom was, but the gospel of Christ was not You next argue that the church is yet incomplete. So far as numbers are necessary to its completion, I agree with you. But as a living, active institution, having a foundation, a head a spirit, ordinances, laws, officers, members, and territory it is complete. What I contend for is that before Pentecost the church had not been founded. The foundation not laid, the head not appointed, the Spirit not given, (ho Jaw not proclaimed. True, the deacon's office was a later addition to the church polity, but the reason is that at first there was no necessity for it. Deacons were appointed to minister to the wants of widows. At first all property was held by the disciples in common, hence no widow was without the means of supplying her wants. (See Acts 2:44-45.) And I have "slandered" the

TLC

Baptist church, and with it my "honored grand father"!! To make out a case of slander against me, you must prove that I have told a falsehood on the Baptist church and also on my grandfather. You were evidently very much excited when you wrote that charge. In what way did I slander the Baptist church? I said that the church, prior to Pentecost, was a headless, lifeless, gospelless, foundation less, bloodless, something northing"--and then added, "Perhaps this is a true picture of the Baptist church." I suppose this is the basis of your charge that I have slandered the Baptist church. I am going to be plainer in the matter and say that this is a true picture of the Baptist church. Christ is not the head of the Baptist church, neither is he its foundation. Hence it is "headless" and "foundationless." Christ died for his church, not for a Baptist church; hence his blood is not in the Baptist church. In fact, you all teach that the sinner must come to the blood of Christ before he is lit to come to the Baptist church. This is equivalent to an admission by every Baptist in the land that the blood of Christ is not in the Baptist church. The Holy Spirit, as you teach, does not dwell in the Baptist church, but works on the outside. Hence the Baptist church is "bloodless" and Spiritless. Baptist preachers, as a rule, refuse to preach the gospel authorized in the Commission, hence the Baptist church is "gospelless". Now when you prove that Christ placed on the rock a Baptist church; that God the Father made His Son Head over the Baptist church; that Christ died for the Baptist church; that the Holy Spirit was given to the Baptist church; that Baptist preachers proclaim the pure gospel of Christ, then I will gracefully retire from the contest and concede what you seem disposed to think I should concede, viz: that the Baptist church is the Church of Christ. Until you prove these things, your charge that I have slandered the Baptist church must be unfounded. Your allusion to my grandfather was evidently made to array the prejudices of a certain class of readers against me. Weak, indeed, must be the cause that leans for support upon popular prejudice. What you said on this point betrays a poverty of argument on your part that is a graceless characteristic of Baptist doctrine. My

TLC

grandfather (Clark) was a thorough Calvinist in faith. He believed that a certain definite number of the human family were unconditionally elected to salvation through Christ from all eternity; that Christ died for those unconditionally elected individuals only. Will you indorse his doctrine? Just be man enough for once in life to say yes, or no. My mother's father is and has been for years a Methodist preacher. He believes that all men have the privilege of becoming heirs of glory. If I had been even disposed to follow blindly the teaching of my ancestors, which grand-father should I have followed? Paul walked after the traditions of his fathers in persecuting the church till be learned better. Christ said, "I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father; and the daughter against her mother; and the daughter-inlaw against her mother-in-law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household." (Matt 10:34-36.)

Your position that the Pentecostians did not believe in Christ when they asked, "Men and brethren, what shall we do!" is entirely untenable. Peter preached Jesus crucified and Jesus resurrected (Acts 2:22-24); that he was the Holy One of Israel, that is, the Promised Messiah; and that God had made him both Lord and Christ This covers all that any man was ever required to believe about the character of Jesus. The Pentecostians heard these words preached by Peter, and, as faith comes by hearing, they must have believed them. There is nothing in Peter's answer requiring them to believe, or even to trust Christ, for the remission of sins until after baptism. You will not say that they were saved without faith, but there is not a word said about faith in Peter's answer. Remission of sins, however, is promised. At what point were they told to expect remission of sins? I answer, after baptism. You say, before baptism. I will leave it to the conscientious judgment of the reader to say who is right But Peter at Caesarea contradicts Peter at Pentecost, so you seem to think. Well, let's see about it Acts 10:43 says, "To him give all the prophets witness that through his name whosoever believeth in

him shall receive remission of sins." Peter here teaches that believers receive remission of sins "through his name." How then are believers saved "through his name"? In the 47th verse he commands the same persons to whom he was talking in verse 43, to be baptized in the name of the Lord. In the Great Commission (Matt 28:19), Christ told the apostles to teach people and baptize them in his name. We read in Acts 8:5-13 of the conversion of the Samaritans. We learn that after hearing Philip preach the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ they believed and were baptized (verse 16) in the name of the Lord Jesus, Luke in giving the Commission (Luke 24:46-48), says that Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name, etc. Peter, on the Day of Pentecost, connected remission of fins with his name when be said, "Be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." In Acts 22:16 Saul was commanded to arise and be baptized and wash away his sins calling on the name of the Lord. We see from all these Scriptures, that remission of sins through his name is inseparably connected with baptism. Yes, Acts 10:43 is one of the strongest proof-texts in the New Testament in favor of baptism for remission of sins. Your grammatical analysis of Acts 2:38, though it be correct as to the subject of each of the verbs, "repent" and" be baptized," amounts to nothing against my position. For the same persons who asked, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" were told to repent and also to be baptized. Remission of sins was placed after baptism. To suit your theory it should have been placed before baptism. I challenge you to prove, in accordance with your theory, that the Pentecostians ever believed in Christ. As to the meaning of the Greek preposition, eis, translated for in the phrase, "for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38), I will introduce the testimony of Dr. John A. Broadus, for years Professor of Greek in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and beyond question one of the greatest men the Baptist church in America over had. Here is what he says: "The Greek phrase is certainly the same in Matt. 27:28 and Acts 2:38. The Greek preposition (eis) in its local sense

TLC

commonly signifies "into"; in figurative uses it is commonly represented by 'unto.' Frequently, though not always, it introduces the design or object of the previous action. It certainly has this sense in Matt. 26:28, and would very readily have the same sense in Acts 2:38. But it sometimes introduces a variety of other ideas which may be summed up under the general notion of 'in reference to' or 'as regards. '" Here we have the leading Baptist of the South saying on his honor as a scholar, that "for the remission of sins" in Matt. 26:28 and Acts 2:38 is from the same expression in the original. He further says that "eis" (for) in Matt. 26:28 introduces the design of the previous action and that it very readily takes the same meaning in Acts 2:38. I am satisfied to rest the point here.

I will now offer a few thoughts on the order of Faith and Repentance in the gospel plan of salvation. You quote Mark 1:15, "Repent ye and believe the gospel." This was spoken to the Jews who were thus commanded to repent of their wickedness, turn to the God of their fathers and believe the gospel of the kingdom. The Jews to whom John and Christ and the Apostles preached before Christ's death were taught to repent toward God, be baptized for remission of sins and then believe on Christ when he should come. (Acts 19:4.) Of course they had to believe what was preached to them before they would repent, but they were required to believe on Christ only when he should coma. So then even their faith came by hearing, and when they believed what was preached to them, viz: that the kingdom was at baud and that Christ should come, they repented. It was necessary that they repent before baptism. and only those baptized were prepared to accept the Savior when he came without any other condition imposed upon them save to believe on him. In Matt. 21:32 Christ was talking to the chief priests and elders who like the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God, not being baptized by John. They refused to repent and be baptized, hence were not prepared to believe on Christ when he came. This explanation is applicable to all similar passages. In every instance where

TLC

repentance is mentioned before faith it is easy to see that the persons so repenting believed what was preached to them first. "Without faith it is impossible to please God" (Heb. 11:6). If a man should repent, pray, or do anything else without faith it would be displeasing to God.

I have now answered over and over again every objection you have ever urged against my arguments on the identity of the church. On the other band, four-fifths of my arguments stand untouched by anything like a respectable effort on your part to answer them. You claim that my questions were intended to "sidetrack you." No, you are already either on a sidetrack or in the bushes. It is difficult to tell just where you are. So it would be impossible for me to sidetrack you. I sent out my questions an searchers to see if I could find you. But alas! they met with no response from you. I know why you refused to answer them. You were afraid of the consequences. However, I will be patient and so give you another chance. I will now submit for your consideration fifty practical questions in addition to those already given, promising to assist you in answering them before this discussion closes, should my services be needed.

1. Where do you read of a Baptist church in the Bible? In answering this question you will please bear in mind that to be a Baptist church it must bear the following characteristic brands; (a) It must teach that men are born in a state of hereditary total depravity. (b) That by virtue of this inherent depravity all men are utterly helpless before God, totally unable to hear, believe, repent, or do anything else toward salvation till quickened by the Holy Spirit, (c) That, God answers the prayers of Baptists and also of these dead and helpless sinners in the conversion of sinners, (d) The members must believe that salvation in its "beginning, continuance and completion is the gift of God," and hence that man has nothing in the world to do with it. (e) They must also believe that when a man is once converted he is put on a road which is so securely walled in that be cannot any more got

TLC

off the road and hence must go to Heaven then whether he wants to or not. (f) They must believe that baptism is a "mere church ordinance," "a figure" which indeed serves belligerent theologians pretty well as a bone of contention in discussions with Pedobaptists, affusionists, and others, but which weighs nothing in the work of saving souls, (g) The local church must assume control of the ad ministration of baptism and permit no one to go into the water unless he has related a satisfactory experience showing that he is already a child of God, and is then admitted to baptism by the unanimous vote of the church. These and many other peculiarities of faith and practice must be shown to exist in a local New Testament church before any one can safely claim that he bus found the Baptist church in the Bible. Question 2: Where was John the Baptist authorized to set up a church? 3. Was John the Baptist a member of the church? 4. Was Peter a member of the church before the Day of Pentecost? 5. Is the verb "will build" in Matt. 16:18 in the future tense? 6. What did John mean by saying to the Pharisees and Sadducees who came to his baptism, "Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" (Matt 3:7.) 7. Where did they go when they desired to flee from the wrath to come? Did they not go to John for baptism? 8. Do Baptists now believe that in fleeing from the wrath to come the sinner must go to baptism? 9. Is it not a fact that Baptists teach the sinner that he must escape all danger from the wrath to come before he comes to baptism? 10. Is it not a fact that modern Baptists take an entirely different view of baptism from that held by John the Baptist? 11. Your creed says that salvation is wholly of grace; where did any apostle ever so teach? 12. Arc grace And faith one and the same thing? If so, prove it. If not, please harmonize the following statements found in your "Articles of Faith": "We believe that the salvation of sinners is wholly of grace "(Art. 4). "That it (justification) is bestowed.... solely through faith in the Redeemer's blood" (Art. 5). 13. What process makes a man a Christian? What process make a man a Baptist? Are the two processes the same? 14. Is a man saved the instant he is regenerated? 13. Are believing and repenting acts of

TLC

the creature or gifts of God? 10. Is salvation to be found in the Baptist church, or on the outside of it? 17. If salvation is outside of the Baptist church, as your practice shows you to believe, is the individual any safer in the Baptist church than on the outside of it? 18. Will you name one spiritual blessing to be enjoyed in the Baptist church that cannot be had outside of it? 10. Were not all disciples in the clays of the apostles members of the church? If not, please mention one that was not? 20. Are there any disciples of Christ outside of the Missionary Baptist Church? 21. Is membership in the Baptist church essential to salvation? If not, to what is the Baptist church essential? 22. IN baptism essential to obedience? 23. Is obedience to God necessary to salvation? 24. Can a man become a member of Christ's church without baptism? 25. Can a man got into Christ without baptism? (Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27.) 20. What . are your evidences of a special call to the ministry? 27. Where did God delegate to the church the authority to examine those whom he had called to the work of the ministry before permitting them to preach? 28. Is it not a fact that God always furnished those whom He called to preach with sufficient words for their work? 29. If so, and if Baptist preachers claim to have received a special call to the ministry, why do Baptists have theological schools for the education of preachers? 30. Is man born in a state of hereditary total depravity? 31. If so, does it not follow that all men are by nature utterly unable to hear, believe, or do anything toward their salvation? 32. Since all are equally dead in sin will out the same Divine power quicken all alike? 33. Is it true that God is no respecter of persons? 34. If all are utterly dead in sin and God is no respecter of persons, will He not quicken or regenerate all men? 35. If I am unconverted and it is necessary for the Holy Spirit to operate directly upon my heart before I am converted, what can I do to bring the Spirit to me? 30. If I am utterly helpless, as you teach, who will be responsible for my damnation, if God never regenerates me so that I can believe? 37. If a man should come to you demanding baptism upon the confession made by the eunuch (Acts 8:37), assuring you that after baptism he would wear no name but

TLC

Christian, would you baptize him? 38. Has man the right to change the name of an institution which God has named? 30. If not, and if the Baptist church is the church of Christ, what right has any one to call it a Missionary Baptist Church? 40. IB THE Missionary Baptist Church the only church of Christ, or is it merely a branch of the true church? 41. Do you indorse what is known as the "Philadelphia Confession of Faith"? 42, Do you believe that certain persons were chosen in Christ personally, or individually, from eternity; and hence that those not chosen are eternally and unchangeably reprobate? 43. Do you teach that a child of God cannot possibly fall away, or that be will not voluntarily go away, from God? 44. Were the chief rulers mentioned in John 12:42-43, saved when they believed on Christ? 43. How do you know that you are a Christian? 46. What is the "washing of regeneration" mentioned by Paul in his letter to Titus (Tit. 3:5)? 47. Why did Paul rebaptize the twelve at Ephesus (Acts 19; 1-7)? 49. Give us Bible authority for voting persons into the church. 49. Why do you require candidates for baptism to relate what you call an "experience of grace"?—Book, chapter, and verse, please. 50. What is the design of baptism?

Now, if you will answer all or any considerable part of these questions plainly, we shall have an issue clearly defined on which to debate. No, I am not trying to side-track you; I am only trying to find you. You have already taken at least three different positions on the establishment of the church; you have never said whether God or man takes the first step in the conversion of a sinner; you have never said plainly whether the sinner has any thing to do as a condition of salvation before having what you call "an experience of grace" wrought in his heart by the direct impact of the Holy Spirit. Besides these there are several other points about which your language is rather misty. So I must admit that your position is difficult to locate. I am going to state the main issue between us as I understand it, and if you too understand it as I do, please say so. Quit fighting in the clouds, come up to the task, and let us have some debating. Here is the

TLC

issue: I believe that obedience to God's positive commandments is essential to salvation; you do not. You believe that the sinner before conversion is wholly dead by virtue of inherited sin, totally unable to hear, believe, or do anything else toward his salvation. Hence it follows, as you believe, that Repentance and Faith are not the cause but the effect of salvation; that salvation is the tree and Faith and Repentance the fruit. This is the main issue, clearly stated, between my brethren and the leading representatives of the Baptist church, men whom I suppose you will endorse. To prove this I will quote from a few Baptist authorities on this point. "An unconverted man can do nothing pleasing to God, An unconverted man can do no act acceptable to God." These are the words of W. A. Jarrel, Missionary Baptist, in his book entitled, "Gospel in Water" (p. 361). Next we will call J. R. Gambrell, for years editor of the Baptist Record, now of the Texas Baptist Standard. Here is his testimony: "Does regeneration precede repentance and faith? This in a much discussed question. The Scriptures declare that in a state of nature we are dead in trespasses and si us. The mark of death is insensibility. In nature a person has no spiritual life, no sensibility to spiritual things. In this case he can neither repent nor believe,. degeneration gives life, and repentance and faith, together with all good deeds, are the fruits of a regenerated heart. Yes, regeneration precedes repentance and faith. Spurgeon said Predestinarians had been accused of many foolish things, but they have never been guilty of the folly that a man helps to born himself." (J. B. Gambrell in Baptist Standard.)

I will now quote from the New Hampshire Confession of Faith, which you are defending in the debate on this proposition. "Of Repentance and Faith." "Art. 8. We believe that Repentance and Faith are sacred duties and also inseparable graces, wrought in our souls by the regenerating Spirit of God." This quotation represents Baptists as believing that Repentance and Faith are wrought (worked, planted) in the soul by the regenerating Spirit of God. It also says that Repentance and Faith are sacred duties.

TLC

Now, just how anything that is wrought in the soul by the Holy Spirit can be a duty imposed upon man, I, for one, am unable to see. This must be one of those mysterious things that none but the spiritually enlightened can comprehend. But I will call one more witness to testify concerning Baptist principles. Hear R. A. Venable, unquestionably one of the leading Baptists of the State and of the South; "And in common with a large body of evangelical Christians, nearly all Baptists believe what are usually termed 'the doctrines of grace'; the absolute sovereignty and foreknowledge God; His eternal and unchangeable purposes or decrees; that salvation in its beginning, continuance, and completion is the gift of God (Italics mine]; that in Christ we are elected or chosen, personally or individually, from eternity, saved and called out from the world, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, through the sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth; that we are kept by his power from falling away, and will be presented faultless before the presence of his glory." (Baptist Layman's Handbook, p. 30.) This is in substance the same as the following which I quote from the Philadelphia Confession, or Primitive Baptist Creed: "By the decree of God for the manifestation of his glory some men and angels are predestinated, or foreordained to eternal life through Jesus Christ, to the praise of his glorious grace, others being left to act in their sins to their just condemnation, to the praise of his glorious justice. These angels and men thus predestinated, or foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished" (chap. 3). And "nearly all Baptists", according to Dr. Venable, believe this. The sinner, according to Dr. Gambrell, receives life in regeneration and then repents and believes. According to this there may be a time when a man is a child of God without either faith or repentance! And this is the glorious doctrine of salvation by faith alone! Saved without and before FAITH, yet saved by FAITH!! Wonderful mystery I Stupendous conception!!

TLC

N. L. CLARK,

Brookhaven, Miss., June 19, 1897.

To Elder E. P. Douglass, Wesson, Miss.

SECOND PROPOSITION. DOUGLASS' SECOND LETTER.

PROPOSITION. —Baptist churches holding to and practicing the principles set forth in what it known as the New Hampshire Articles of Faith, are churches of God in faith and practice.

DOUGLASS affirms; CLARK denies.

WESSON, Miss., June, 22, 1897.

Elder N. L. Clark, Brookhaven, Miss.:

MY DEAR SIR: —Your reply to my first letter on the second proposition, or rather your reply to my closing letter on the first proposition, was received this morning. The first proposition has been closed. Your letter, therefore, is not a part of this discussion. I shall now continue my argument.

Having considered, in my first letter, the relation of "the kingdom of God" and "the church of Christ," and the distinction between thorn; I shall now proceed to consider the faith and practice of the first church, and of the early churches planted by the apostles and others sent out by the first church. By the term faith is understood the things believed, which are sometimes denominated doctrines. These relate to the belief of the existence of an infinite and holy God, the Trinity, the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, man's condition in his sinful and lost state, the atonement of Christ, and those that grow out of these— regeneration, conversion, repentance, faith, justification, sanctification, etc. The term practice signifies the course of conduct, the manner of living and acting, because of the things believed. Their practice was the result of their faith, not a

TLC

condition to it. I take it, for granted, that there is no disagreement between us with reference to the existence and character of the infinite God, the doctrine of the Trinity and the inspiration of the 'Sacred Scriptures. So I shall pass these and consider first, man in his sinful and lost state.

The term, total depravity, usually employed to express the condition of all men in a state of sin, has been the subject of no little controversy. This will probably continue to be the case, at least, until the close of the present dispensation. One reason why wen, even Rood men, differ in their views on this question, is because some give the term depravity a much wider range of application than others. Those who employ the term total depravity to express their views on this question, use it strictly in its application to the moral nature of man in his relation to God. It does not apply to man's intellectual nature. The mental powers, though greatly impaired by the depraved condition of the moral nature, have in some degree been retained. It does not apply to man's moral nature in his relation to his fellow-man. This relation, however, has been very greatly disturbed. Of this fact, the history of man fully testifies. "Man's ingratitude to man," and the manifest Jack of that principle which constitutes the Golden Rule, "Do unto others an you would have them do unto you," is indeed a sad commentary on the moral status of the human family. Vet, that men fool, in some measure, an interest in the welfare of their fellow-men, is a fact that gives cause for rejoicing. And while it may be true, that the interest men take in each other's affairs, is more often prompted by a feeling of self-interest than otherwise, yet it is not always the case. There may be what is termed good dispositions in our nature, which prompt feelings and acts of kindness toward our fellow-men, but this is only mural goodness. It is commendable, and brings blessings to those who possess it. But moral goodness, as it applies to men in their relation to each other, is not moral holiness, as it applies to man in his relation to God. I shall use the term total depravity in its application to man's moral nature as it relates to God. That

TLC

there may be no misunderstanding about my position, I will here state it plainly. Man, in his sinful state, is so utterly alienated in heart from God and holiness, that he is incapable of rendering to God any acceptable worship and service. This, in substance, constitutes one item of the faith of Baptists, and is usually expressed by the term total depravity. I shall now proceed to show, that the same doctrine was held and taught by Christ and the apostles and was therefore a doctrine of the apostolic churches, I will first give the testimony of Christ. "He that heareth my Word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life" (Jno. 5:24.) These words of our Savior are not used in any comparative or figurative sense, but they express actual conditions. The terms life and death, are placed in opposition to each other, and represent two distinct conditions.

The term death means to be totally destitute of any spiritual life, or it means nothing. The term life denotes the very opposite of death, and weans possession of life, or it means nothing. If this Scripture teaches anything, it certainly teaches that men are totally unable to render any spiritual service to God, previous to the reception of spiritual life. Again, Christ says, "But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you." (Jno, 5:42.) To be destitute of the Jove of God, is to be filled with hatred to God, which is depravity in its deepest and worst form. I will next give testimony from the apostle Paul. In his letter to the Romans he taught that men in their natural, or dead state could not do anything to please God. "For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that ore in the flesh can not please God." (Rom. 8:5-8.) I will pass this without further comment. Turn now to the third chapter of Romans and read

TLC

from the ninth to the eighteenth verse, and see if you can overthrow the doctrine of total depravity. "What then? Are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one. There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable: there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulcher; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness. Their feet are swift to shed blood: Destruction and misery are in their ways: And the way of peace have they not known: There is no fear of God before their eyes." This needs no comment. The language is emphatic and is susceptible of but one construction. In the apostle's letter to the Ephesians he teaches the same doctrine. "You hath be quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others. (Eph. 2:1-3.) Here the term dead is again employed to denote the state or condition of men while in sin. The phrase "in trespasses and sins" defines the term dead. It does not apply to the mental faculties, nor to the moral affections of men, as they relate to their fellow-men, but to the carnal nature, which "is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Language cannot be more explicit. Men are "by nature the children of wrath." They "walk according to the course of this world," are under the power and influence of the world, and "the whole world lieth in wickedness." It is ruled and controlled by" the prince of the power of the air." "The spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience, "which is the very opposite of the spirit of holiness, controls and holds men, who are in a state of nature to the powers of win. "Ye are of your

TLC

father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." (John 8:44.) I wilt present one other passage of Scripture, and with some few additional remarks will close my argument on this point. I quote Paul again: "Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, (because of the blindness of their heart: who being past feeling have given themselves over to lasciviousness to work all uncleanness with greediness." (Eph. 4:18-19.) This, with the other Scriptures given, establishes, beyond any reasonable doubt, the doctrine of man's total depravity. This wretched, helpless condition of men has long been a recognized fact. In Job's time the question was asked, "How then can man be justified with God? or how can he be clean that is born of a woman?" (Job 25:4.) When we examine the Word of God we find that man's sad and deplorable condition has been richly and amply provided for, in the Atonement of Christ. I will, therefore, now give that subject some consideration.

My limited space will not admit of anything liken discussion of the question, and for my present purpose it is not necessary. I shall therefore limit myself to a few brief statements. The word atonement is of frequent occurrence in the Old Testament, but is used only once in the New. It is found in Rom. 5:11, and it is generally agreed, should here be translated reconciliation. Some writers confound atonement with reconciliation and redemption. The two latter are results of the former, By the atonement, reconciliation and redemption were provided for. I will now give a few extracts from different authors defining the nature and design of the atonement. "It is the expiation of sin through the obedience and death of the Lord Jesus." "The design of the atonement is to render God propitious, as the Sovereign Ruler." "In a word, atonement is the price paid for the redemption of the church. "Atonement being made to God, and made by a sacrifice of inestimable value, is in its own nature infinite." "The expiation of sin and the propitiation of God by the incarnation, life, sufferings and death of the Lord Jesus Christ the obedience and

TLC

death of Christ in behalf of sinners as the ground of redemption: in the narrow sense, the sacrificial work of Christ for sinners. Another writer discusses the atonement under three heads, which are as follows; 1. "The nature of the Atonement as consisting in its three provisions, Reconciliation, Propitiation, and Expiation, which secure Justification. 2. The ground of the Divine Atonement The sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ, offered for man's redemption. 3. The Efficacy of the Divine Atonement, as Expiation for redeemed men. Propitiation for unredeemed men and Reconciliation for all beings." These three statements may be taken as the writer's definition of the atonement, with its provisions. I do not agree with the writer's second heading, altogether. I think it could have been worded better, but I shall raise no serious objection. The ideas embraced in the three statements give a pretty correct view of the atonement and its provisions, and agree, in the main, with the preceding statements given.

Having now before us man's condition, "dead in trespasses and sins," and the atonement, which provides for this condition; we may proceed to consider what man needs to have done for him first, that he may receive the benefits of the atonement. It is not intellectual culture, but life, spiritual life that is needed. That a change in the hearts and minds of men is necessary in order to salvation, is generally admitted by all the professed followers of Christ. But all are not agreed as to the nature of this change, and the order in which it is brought about. "When we look into the old Testament we find that God made two promises to men as sinners. The first is that his son would be given to redeem them. The other is that the Holy Spirit would give spiritual life to them. These two promises contain everything that relates to the plan of salvation. The order in which these two great promises stand related to each other is, or ought to be, apparent to every Bible student. The Son of God, the second person in the Trinity, came and performed the work of the atonement by which the claims of the Divine law were fully met, the wrath of God appeased, and

TLC

the redemption of men secured. This was the special work of the Son of God. He made full and complete satisfaction for the sins of men. Having accomplished this, he returned to the Father from whence be came. Next in order in the grand scheme of salvation comes the special work of the Holy Spirit, the third person in the Trinity. The first work of the Holy Spirit is to make men spiritually alive. This is the first thing a sinner needs, and without which he cannot be saved. The work of regenerating the hearts of men, and making them the willing subjects of God's spiritual kingdom, belongs emphatically and exclusively to the Holy Spirit, I use the term regeneration in its common theological sense to denote that change which takes place in the moral natures of men. The necessity for this change is absolute and imperative. Men in their carnal state are naturally averse to God. And this aversion must, in the very nature of things, be mutual, for God cannot do otherwise than hate the sinfulness of man's nature. A change then must be wrought that will put men's natures in harmony with God's holy nature before there can be any salvation for them. As nothing can change its own nature, it is, therefore, impossible for men to work this change in themselves. Holiness is what men need, and as all holiness is derived from the Holy Spirit, he alone can perform for men that which they need ana must have in order to salvation. This change is called a birth, and is said to be of the Spirit. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (Jno. 3:5.) And again, verse eighth, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." Being born of the Spirit, evidently means that spiritual change which men undergo when brought from a state of sin to grace, or in other words, it means that spiritual life is received when born of the Spirit, just as men receive physical life when born of the flesh. The causes of physical birth and life do not emanate from the one in possession of that life. No one ever had anything to do with the causes or conditions which brought about his physical birth and life. When that life has been received

TLC

there is then power to perform physical acts, and that power increases its the physical man develops. The name is true of the spiritual birth and life. The Holy Spirit is the author and sole cause of the spiritual birth and life of men. When spiritual life has been received there is then power to perform spiritual exercises, and never before. The apostle calls it being quickened. "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." (Eph. 2:1.) Quickened means to be made alive, and if is ascribed to Divine power. Again he calls it a creation. "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works." (Eph. 2:10.) Creation is a work which God alone can perform. David felt the need of a heart made clean by the touch of Divine power, and he prayed, "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me." (Ps. 51:10.) The Old as well as the New Testament abounds with expressions of equal force with those already given. We find that all the terms employed to denote that great and radical change are acts which belong exclusively to Divine power. Hence it is said, "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature. Old things are passed away; behold all things are become new." (2Cor. 5:17,) One writer on this subject says, "The definition to be given of regeneration must depend on the point of moral observation we occupy. If, for example, we contemplate the sinner as the enemy of God, regeneration is the subdual of his enmity and the creation of love in its stead. If we consider the sinner the "child of the devil," regeneration is the change which makes him the "child of God." If we regard the unregenerate as totally destitute of the moral Image of God, regeneration consists in stamping that image upon them. Or, if we view them as "dead in trespasses and sins "regeneration is the impartation of divine life. Thus various definitions, not conflicting, but harmonious, may be given of regeneration according to the points of moral observation of which we avail ourselves. The instrumentality employed by the Holy Spirit in the accomplishment of this work of regenerating men's hearts is the word of God, which is said to be the "sword of the spirit." (Eph. 6:17.) Observe also the following passages:

TLC

"In Christ Jesus have I begotten you through the gospel." (1. Cor. 3:15.)" Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth." (James 1:18.) "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." (1 Pet. 1:23.) Ministers of the gospel who proclaim the word, and faithful, pious men and women, whose consecrated and consistent Christian lives exemplify the word of truth, are also instrumentalities employed by the Holy Spirit in the grand work of regenerating ami saving men.

In my next letter I shall consider Conversion, Repentance, Faith and Justification as they stand related to Regeneration, and to each other, and the relation of each to the plan of salvation.

Respectfully,

E. P. DOUGLASS.

TLC

SECOND PROPOSITION. CLARK'S SECOND REPLY.

MY DEAR SIR: —Your second letter on the second proposition has been received. I must say that I appreciate the spirit which you manifest in your last effort. You seem to be taking my advice to come up to your task and do some debating. The question of man's hereditary total depravity, of which you have so much to say, is really the foundation stone of the differences between my brethren and yours in regard to the Plan of Salvation. It is also, I might say, "the bed-rock of your denominational fabric." If it be true that an unregenerated person is totally depraved is his relations to Gods by virtue of which depravity he is wholly indisposed and utterly unable to render acceptable obedience to God, then your position in regard to the plan of salvation has at least a foothold. However, I contend that if the doctrine of hereditary total depravity be correct, then Universalism and not Calvinism must bear the palm for consistency in the light of Bible teaching. For if it be true that all men are totally depraved by nature, then it must be true that all men are equally depraved by nature; since the word "totally" can have no comparative degree. One cannot be either more or less than "totally" depraved. Now since all are equally depraved, equally dead, and since God is no respecter of persons (Acts, 10:34), it follows that God's power exercised in the regeneration and salvation of one man must save all alike. From your standpoint, viewing man as utterly dead and wholly passive in regeneration and salvation, there is no possible escape from Universalism unless you impute to God the work of saving special individuals unconditionally. This, of necessity, forces upon the God of Heaven the responsibility of the salvation or damnation of the individual. Christ taught (Jno. 6:44) that no man can come to him except the Father draw him. He also said, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me" (Jno. 12:32). Now since all men are drawn to Christ, and since all men are not going to be saved, it must be true that all men WILL

TLC

not come to Christ. If I am never drawn to Christ it will be because I refuse to come and not from any failure in the drawing power of God, or Christ. This drawing power of Christ is exercised in the hearts of men by touching them. "It is written in the prophets, and they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me" (Jno. 6:45). To this agrees the language of Paul: "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us", etc. (Tit. 2:11-12). This grace that teaches men, bringing salvation to them, is the gospel of Christ For it is the power of God unto salvation to all men who will believe it (Rom. 1:16). I maintain that the gospel of Christ in itself contains all the power necessary to the regeneration and salvation of man. You claim that a special, miraculous work of the Holy Spirit in the heart is necessary to prepare the individual for the reception of the truth. This doctrine you base upon the supposed inability of the natural man to hear and believe the gospel. If an unconverted man be dead in the sense of helplessness, utterly unable to obey God and live, then it follows that God must do a direct work upon the heart of the sinner to enable him to believe. Now if God thus imparts life to the sinner it is reasonable to suppose that he will continue to supply this same sinner with spiritual life each day, and so will finally save all whom he has ever regenerated. Thus we reach the doctrine of the Final Preservation of all saints. On the other hand, if the unconverted man has power to hear, believe, and obey the gospel of Christ without the direct enabling influence of the Holy Spirit, he must do so or be lost. This throws the burden of responsibility for a roan's salvation, in a country such as ours, upon the man himself. The theory you advocate places the responsibility upon God. I have sought to make this point of difference between us clear to the mind of the reader, for upon it hinges the most important consequences. Now, I ask, what is the natural condition, spiritually, of all men? You answer, "Dead in sin, wholly unable to render acceptable obedience to God". Your first proof in support of this affirmation is drawn from John, 5:24. Here the Savior says, "Verily, verily, I say unto

TLC

you. He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life". The next verse reads, "Verily, verily, I Kay unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live ". You argue from this passage that the unconverted are dead, whereas, the converted are alive. Agreed. But did you not notice that these dead persons were able to hear and believe? I admit that the Bible represents the unconverted as being dead and the converted, olive; but I do not admit that because a man is dead in sins, be is, therefore, unable to obey God, You next quote Jno. 5:42: "But I know you that ye have not the love of God in you ". This proves simply that those addressed were alienated from the love of God; that they were unconverted. Not a single hint that they were unable to come to Christ and live. He had just told them in verse 40, "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life". Christ here lays the blame to them. "Ye WILL not come ", etc. Why did be not say, "Ye CANNOT come"? Simply because be could not bare told the truth in saying so. Your next proof-text is Rom. 8:5-8: "For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit, the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are hi the flesh cannot please God." You quote this to prove man's utter helplessness in sin. Let us see what it does prove. I believe just what it says. To be "after the flesh" is the same thing as to be "carnally minded". The word "carnal" is derived from the Latin carnis, which means "flesh ". Now if we can ascertain what constitutes the carnal mind, we will have a key that unlocks the meaning of the entire passage. In Rom. 7:21-23, Paul says, "I find then a law, that when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man. But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in

TLC

my members". Paul here teaches that man has a dual, or two-fold nature, the one part warring against the other. The one is the carnal mind, the other is the spirit. To allow the spirit to be brought into subjection to the carnal mind will lead to death; but if through the spirit the individual mortifies the deeds of the flesh, and thus brings the carnal mind into subjection to the spirit, the end will be life and peace. The carnal mind is possessed by all species of the animal kingdom. The horse, ox, dog, and all other animals have it. In man it is composed of those elements of his nature which he holds in common with the brutes. Some of these are, appetites for food, drink, sexual gratification, disposition to protect one's self and others of the species, etc. These are constitutional elements of man's nature, implanted in his very being by the God of Heaven. Adam had these before be disobeyed God. This part of man's nature is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can it be. The law of God does not address this part of man's nature. No one would think of reading the Decalogue to an ox or a horse with the expectation of his understanding it, for he has nothing but the carnal mind. In addition to this carnal mind, man has a spiritual nature. This was given him when God breathed into the nostrils of Adam the breath of life and man became a living soul. This part of man's nature is composed of such elements as Hope, Veneration, Spirituality, Benevolence, etc. These constitute the spirit in man. The spirit may be subject to the law of God, and it must be if he who ban it is ever saved. This spirit of man is the direct gift of God to every man who comes into the world. We inherit from our parents our physical peculiarities, features, form, etc. One man has a bright intellect, another is an idiot. Thin is not because the intellectual man has a larger or better spirit than the idiot, but it in because the brain which the mind uses as a tool is more perfectly adapted to mental labors in the one than in the other. These differences are due to conditions of generation, birth, and education.

TLC

A man is born in the heart of Africa among cannibals. This was not his fault but his misfortune. God gives to him a spirit just the same as he does to the one born in our country, but his environments are such (hut the carnal mind is developed and the spirit brought into subjection to it. I shall now prove that God gives the spirit to man. In Zech. 12:1 we read, "The burden of the word of the Lord for Israel, saith the Lord, which stretcheth forth the heavens and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him". Again, Solomon says, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it" (Eccles. 12:7), Paul says in Heb. 12:9, "We have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us and we gave them reverence; shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits and live?" Paul here teaches as clearly as language can teach anything that the fathers of our flesh and the Father of our spirits are cot the same. The God of Heaven is the Giver of all men's spirits. The spirit of man is the seat of sin, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (Jno. 3:6). This shows that the now birth affects the spirit, and an the purpose of the new birth is to remove sin, it follows that the spirit of man is the Beat of sin. I have proved that God gives the spirit to man, hence there can be no such thing as inherited sin. unless, forsooth, God be the Author of that sin.

So away goes your pet theory of inherited depravity, as it affects man's relationship to God. You roust either admit that man is not spiritually depraved by nature, or take the position that God is the author of evil. We will now paraphrase Paul's statements in Rom. 8:5-8 thus: "For they that are led or ruled by the flesh, or carnal mind, do the things dictated by the flesh; but they that are ruled by the Spirit, do the things taught by the Spirit. For to mind (obey) the flesh leads to death; but to mind (obey) the Spirit leads to life and peace. This is true because the carnal mind (animal nature) is not subject to the law of God. So then they that walk after the dictates of the flesh cannot please

TLC

God".

You next quote a lengthy passage from Rom, 3:9-19, and then ask with an air of triumph if I can overturn the doctrine of total depravity in that passage. I admit that Paul was here describing the state of the sinner. I admit also that he presents a true picture of man's depraved condition; but I cannot admit that this was "total depravity" in any sense, much less "inherited total depravity ", Paul says that evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. (II. Tim. 3:13). I believe that the persons described by Paul in the passage under consideration could wax worse, hence they were not "totally" depraved. But was this condition of those described by Paul inherited or acquired? If inherited, as you teach, then all those things attributed to them must be attributed to infants also. Let us see. In the 10th verse he says, "There is none righteous; no, not one". To be righteous is to do righteousness. An infant can do neither righteousness nor unrighteousness; hence this verse cannot apply to an infant, and, therefore, does not relate to anything inherited. Verse 11: "There is none that uuderstandeth, there is none that seeketh after God ". An infant cannot understand anything, neither can it seek after God or Satan either. The next verse says, "They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable". This says that they had become unprofitable, not born that way. Let anybody read the next six verses and ask himself the question, "Can these things be affirmed of an infant?" Certainly not. For example, it could not be said of an infant, "Its feet are swift to shed blood", or "With its tongue it has used deceit." Hence Paul was not talking about inherited sin at all, but was showing simply how wretched may become the state of the man who willfully becomes the servant of sin. There is not a word said in the passage about total depravity or man's inability to return to the Father. As this seems to be the stronghold of your position, I might devote more attention to it were it necessary. I will ask you a question bused on this passage which you will please answer in your next letter.

was Paul, in Rom. 3:10-19, describing an inherited, or an acquired condition of the sinner?

You next refer us to Ephes. 2:1-3, where Paul reminds the Ephesians that they had once been dead in trespasses and sins. You will observe that Paul says "dead in trespass" (pl.) and sins" (pl.) This, therefore, could not have reference to Adam's sin (sing.) which they had inherited. Paul says that these Ephesians had in times past walked in these sins; that they at that time were under the dominion of the same spirit that works in the children of disobedience; that being born away from the tree of life, we are thus subjected to death as children of God's wrath, although we may have never sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression. It is very clear that Paul had direct reference to their own sins, and not to any inherited depravity. By reference to the 10th chapter of Acts we learn how some of these Ephesians were "quickened, saved by grace." Paul, finding about twelve men, who had submitted to John's baptism some twenty-five years after it had ceased to be valid, asked them if they had received the Holy Ghost since they believed. When he was told that they had not so much as heard of the Holy Ghost, be explained to them the mission of John and when they heard of Christ they were baptized in (into) his name. Paul then laid bands upon them and they received the Holy Ghost. These men heard the gospel of Christ, believed it, and obeyed it. They were therefore quickened by the Word of God. This is in harmony with the language of David, "Thy Word hath quickened me" (Ps. 119:50). But these Ephesians were once "dead" in sins. You infer from this that they were utterly helpless, unable to render acceptable obedience to God till quickened by miraculous power.

Let us examine the Bible a little for the meaning of the words dead and death. In the third chapter of Genesis we hear God saying to Adam; "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." What did this mean? Adam ate the forbidden fruit, was cast out of the Garden and lived about 800 years afterwards, making

TLC

his bread" in the sweat of his face." The death pronounced upon him then, did not mean "wising to exist," neither did it mean "inability," or "helplessness. "Paul in speaking of certain widows (1Tim. 5:6) says, "But she that liveth in pleasure, is dead while she liveth." Here is a character both dead and alive at the same time. The fact that she is dead means simply that she is separated from the love of God by reason of her love for the world. Not that she is unable to obey God. When the prodigal son returned to his father's house, the father said, among other things, "This my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found" (Luke 15:24). While engaged in devouring his father's goods with harlots the boy was dead, so far as the father was concerned, but be was still able, after spending All, to return to his father. Death, therefore, means simply separation. When at your bedside the watchers' shall say, "He is dead" they will mean that your spirit and body have separated. Again, Paul said to the Romans, "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 6:11). These persons were separated from sin and united to God by the blood of Christ. Dead and alive at the same time! Now, if death means utter helplessness, inability to act, these Romans were unable to sin!! This is sufficient to show clearly that a man may be dead in or dead to sin and still be able to do either righteousness or unrighteousness.

I shall now introduce a few objections to the doctrines of hereditary total depravity. To these objections, I invite your prayerful consideration. I. If I was born into the world in a state of hereditary total depravity, by virtue of which I am wholly inclined to evil, and utterly unable to hear and obey the voice of God, it necessarily follows that I am in nowise responsible to God for my acts, or words. All the efforts of learned theologians can never harmonize the doctrine of man's utter inability to do good with emu's accountability. II. If I inherited a depraved nature spiritually from my father, be from his father, and so on, I would like to know where Adam got his depravity. God made

him, and then said he was "very good." Certainly there was no depravity in Adam then. If so, God put it there. This makes God responsible for Adam's sin. The truth is, Adam had a nature which rendered him capable of sinning. When the tempter came, he yielded. I had at birth the same nature Adam had at his creation, with the exception perhaps that my carnal nature was depraved, and when the tempter came to me, by yielding, I sinned as did Adam. The very same cause that led Adam to sin leads men to sin now. Of course there are more temptations offered to induce men to sin now than were offered to Adam. There is no sin except "transgression of the law" in some sense (1Jno. 3:4). No infant ever transgressed the laws of God, hence an infant is as sinless as was Adam when God put him into the Garden. You quoted from Job 25:4, to show that to be born of a woman is to be unclean before God. The words you quoted are those of Eliphaz, one of the wretched comforters of Job. If you will read the next chapter you will see how sharply Job reproves him for his words. You should be careful whose language you quote. You might borrow language from the Devil. If to be born of a woman is to be unclean before God, then Christ was unclean, for be too was born of a woman. The doctrine of hereditary total depravity slanders the Son of God. II I. God do OR not love sin. God does love sinful man (Jno. 3:16). Now, if man is totally depraved by nature, it follows that there is nothing about him but depravity. Hence the doctrine of total depravity places God in the attitude of loving a mass of corruption, a being in whom there is nothing good. IV. If corruption of spirit is transmitted from parent to child, why is not purity of life and spirit so transmitted? To illustrate, A and B are husband and wife, both of them sinners. C and D are husband and wife, both of them are Christians. If the child of A and B is a sinner by nature, why is not the child of C and D a Christian by nature? This, of course, is nonsensical, but it shows how absurd it is to talk about the transmission of sin from parent to child. V. An infant is not totally depraved, for Christ said in Luke (8; 16), "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the

TLC

kingdom of God." Christ says that the kingdom of God is composed of such characters as little infants. The kingdom of God is not made up of totally depraved beings. Baptists and others say that infants must be regenerated before they can enter Heaven. Christ did not say so. Well, if the infant gets life in regeneration as God in no respecter of persons, he will regenerate every infant born into the world. According to Baptist doctrine this regeneration, imparts spiritual life, and as no regenerated person can ever apostatize so as to be finally lost, all mankind will necessarily be saved. Hence I drive you to Universalism on that score. I believe it was Benedict who said that a man could be both a Baptist and a Universalist at the same time, and I almost believe it. There would be. just as much justice in God's sending an infant to torment as there would be in sending to that place a man eighty years of age who never obeyed God because he could nut; who was never washed in the blood of Christ because he could not get to it; who was never saved because God would not regenerate him. Man can obey God and live. This is true for the simple reason that God commands him to do so. God never commanded a man to do the impossible. Neither will the God of my Bible ever punish me in, hell for a failure to do something that he alone could do for me. The prophet Isaiah, looking down the stream of time, wrote, concerning the way of salvation, through Christ: "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come buy wine and milk without money and without price." (Isa. 55:1.) Christ said, "Come unto we all ye that labor, and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." Did Christ invite the weary and heavy laden of earth to come to him knowing that they could not come? Believe it who can. I cannot. The Bible closes with a universal invitation to the sons of men, "And the Spirit and the bride say, "Come, and let him that heareth say, come, and let him that is athirst come, and whosoever will, lot him take the water of life freely" (Rev. 22:17.) The simple fact that God invites men to come to Him is proof high as Heaven that they can come.

TLC

You quoted two or three other proof-texts along the same line as those already explained, hence it is unnecessary to notice them. There is one passage, however, to which I will pay a passing notice, because it is such a popular passage with Baptists. That passage is John 3:8--"The wind bloweth where it listeth and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth. So is every one that is born of the Spirit." This is quoted to prove that that the work of the Spirit in regenerating a sinner is as mysterious as the blowing of the wind. Without any attempt to parry the supposed force of the passage by an appeal to the original, we will regard the translation correct, as quoted. Now, what is compared to the wind? Christ said, "So is every one that is born of the Spirit." The man, then, not the Spirit, is in some sense compared to the blowing of the wind. To suit Baptists the passage should have read, "The wind bloweth where it listeth..... So is the work of the Spirit. "

It means simply that as we cannot with the physical eye see the course of the wind, so we are unable to see that any change has taken place in the man who has been born of the Spirit. For example, a man becomes a Christian by birth of water and Spirit. This birth does not change the color of his hair, eyes or skin. He has the same physical appearance he had before. Christ was contrasting the birth of flesh with the spiritual birth. A birth of the flesh produces a change perceptible to the physical eye; a birth of the Spirit does not. In this respect the new birth resembles the action of the blowing wind. Of course, we can see in the godly walk of the Christian the result of his having been born of the Spirit So we can likewise see the result of the wind's blowing.

Well, I have done on this point all that I think necessary to convince the candid inquirer for Bible truth that the doctrine of hereditary total depravity is anti-Scriptural and positively pernicious, dangerous and detrimental to the progress of the

Master's cause. Perhaps, you have some other arguments to support your favorite doctrine; it so, bring them on. I challenge you to produce a single argument in support of this doctrine that cannot be logically used to prove universal salvation.

I have said that the doctrine of hereditary total depravity is "the bedrock of your denominational fabric". Yea, and when this doctrine goes down before God's Truth, the boat of Baptistism sinks with it. Every step that a Baptist church takes to get a man into its membership is directly opposed to New Testament teaching. In the first place, they teach the sinner that he is helplessly dead in sins, totally depraved from the womb. Next they teach him, helpless as be is, to pray for pardon and also to ask their assistance in praying for God to convert him. They teach him that God sends his pure, clean spirit into the totally corrupt heart to regenerate it, although Jesus said that the world could not receive the Spirit (Jno. 14:17). Having been thus regenerated, he is

TLC