



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

*BX 750*  
Chap. .... Copyright No. ....

Shelf ..... *B75*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.









# BROWDER'S PULPIT;

OR,

## THE LOGIC OF THE NEW COVENANT.

BY

U. M. BROWDER, V. D. M.

17  
1705a

---

*"Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers  
of your joy."—PAUL.*

---



ST. LOUIS :  
CHRISTIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY,  
1888.

1887

EX 7321  
B75



Copyright, 1887, by  
U. M. BROWDER.

LC Control Number



tmp96 026529



## PREFACE.

---

WE are conscious of the fact that we live in a fast age of the world, an age of science, discoveries, inventions and progress. This is an age of religious doubts and political vacillation. There never has been in our history a period so full of doubt and uneasiness, as to the virtue of the old creeds, in both religion and politics, as the present one. This is also an age of great men, who, perhaps, never entertain any fears of exhausting the patience of the reading public, nor their own store of knowledge. This is an age of literary growth and development. We live in an age of the world when it is popular to write books for the public eye, provided the author is novel in his choice of subjects and sensational in his manner.

This is our first book, and we are certain that it is not free from mistakes. We believe that the merit of a book of this kind should depend not so much upon its bulk as the thoughtfulness of the writer. However, the author knows that among the things that float down the stream of time, the largest is the least likely to sink and the most likely to be seen.

It is popular in writing books to prelude them with an apology for having done so; and also to speak of the many difficulties the authors labored under during their preparation. But the author of these pages has neither apology nor complaints to offer, but he has good and sufficient reasons, he thinks, for offering to the reading public this work.

It is because the author believes that the subjects discussed in this work are very important, and therefore interesting, that he has undertaken to prepare it for the press. He also believes he can reach a certain class of readers who are generally neglected in the works of the Brotherhood, because they are over-shot. The aim of the present volume is to set forth, in a plain and simple style, Jesus Christ as the Savior of men, and the New Testament as the only means of his appointment in order to the accomplishment of that end. It is proposed, also, to expose some of the more prominent, glaring misrepresentations heaped upon our people by ignorant sectarians.


This book will be found perfectly innocent of polish, free from much learning, and not a single rhetorical flight will be found in its pages. The work was produced, therefore, not to make a show of much learning, nor to sell ink and paper, but to aid in the conversion of sinners to God, and to build up and strengthen the Disciples of Christ in their most holy work of faith and love. These

pages were written amidst a press of other labors, besides the cares and anxieties and duties of a pastor and temperance worker.

And if, in this feeble effort, we have shed some light upon the great subject of man's salvation from sin, we are satisfied. As it is, we commit this work to the reading public, hoping thereby to do some good in the way of leading sinners "from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God."

THE AUTHOR.

*Macomb, Ill, July 4, 1887.*



## CONTENTS.

---

PREFACE . . . . .	3
JESUS THE CHRIST . . . . .	9
THE MINISTRY OF RECONCILIATION; OR, GOD'S METHOD OF SAVING SINNERS. . . . .	31
THE PROCESS OF REGENERATION . . . . .	53
THREE BAPTISMS—IN WATER. IN HOLY SPIRIT, AND IN FIRE . . . . .	93
BAPTISTS ON THE DESIGN OF BAPTISM . . . . .	103
TRUE LOYALTY . . . . .	147
THE SABBATH . . . . .	135
THE ETERNITY OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT . . . . .	117



# BROWDER'S PULPIT.

---

## JESUS THE CHRIST.

*"I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."*—Acts 8:37.

We enter upon this discussion with more than ordinary anticipations of real and lasting pleasure; because it is delightful and soul-inspiring to contemplate, in the light of the Christian Scriptures, the distinguished Personage represented in our text as the Son of God.

Where shall we begin with this investigation? You may travel back through the centuries of the past, and he is the enigma of history and the wonder of all the ages. You may continue this journey till you reach the silent morning of creation, and there you will find him with the Father decorating the sky with heavenly lights and setting bounds to the waters.

The Scriptures teach that the Son of God existed before the creation of the material universe. It is, of course, difficult for us to understand in what form he existed before creation began, yet John

tells us that before the world was he was the Word, with God, and separate from God. As the Word of God, he is represented as being the medium through which the exhibition of God's creative power was made in the formation of the material world and the creation of man. We acknowledge, on the start, that our conceptions of his boundless perfections are poor and limited; that our distorted pictures of his perfections and character, when compared with what angels know of him, are but little better than a caricature. But we know something of his manifold graces and his nature from what we read of him in the Word of Eternal Truth; and of these we love to speak and write in our humble way.

We will consider the Lord Jesus Christ in his relations to the *purpose* of God, the *promise* of God, the *prophecies* of early times, and the *facts* of the New Testament.

- I. Christ in Purpose.
- II. Christ in Promise.
- III. Christ in Prophecy.
- IV. Christ in Fact.

#### CHRIST IN PURPOSE.

What we mean by Christ in *purpose* is, what God intended, or designed to accomplish, through Christ, "according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself."



“The eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord” (Eph. 3: 11), contained Christ as Savior of the race of mankind, and the Gospel system of salvation which was to be published to the race by Christ.

In Eph. 1: 7-12, Paul says: “In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace; wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence; having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth; even in him: in whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will; that we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ.” Here we learn that all God did in providing means for the education and salvation of the race of man, was in exact harmony with, or, “according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.” Here we find, not only Christ in the “eternal purpose” of God, but the entire system of human redemption, to be published, or made known, to both Jews and Gentiles, for the obedience of faith. “Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according

to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began; but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." 2 Tim. 1 : 9, 10.

From these Scriptures we learn,—

1. That God, "before the world began," "purposed in himself," "according to his good pleasure," to "abolish death."
2. That Jesus Christ should disclose, or bring to light, on his arrival to this world, "life and immortality," "through the gospel."
3. He purposed also to reconcile both Jews and Gentiles "in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby."

These grand blessings and privileges were first "given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." It was in Christ Jesus our Lord that the Heavenly Father "abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence," and "before the world began" this "hidden wisdom" was ordained of God unto our glory, but kept a secret, for "none of the princes of this world knew" it. There was a time previous to which it was truthfully said, "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." Thus, Jesus Christ and the plan of salvation were given unto us in the purpose of God before the world began. The

whole plan of saving the world, the conditions of remission of sins, the promise of this world and the world to come, all came to the world just as they were originally purposed in Jesus Christ.

## CHRIST IN PROMISE.

All that the purpose of God contained concerning Jesus Christ and the gospel to be given to the world by him is now given to man in promise. This is the first promise of a Savior to perishing humanity. We find all in the promise that we found in the eternal purpose of God. This promise God first made to Abraham, as recorded in Genesis: "And Jehovah said to Abraham, Go from thy land, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, to the land that I will show thee. And I will make thee a great nation; and I will bless thee, and will make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing. And I will bless them that bless thee, and him that curses thee will I curse. And in thee shall all the families of the earth be blest." Gen. 12: 1-3, (Conant's translation).

About 4,000 years ago, Abraham, a Chaldean shepherd, was called out from Ur of Chaldees, at which time Jehovah made the promise to him, "In thee shall all families of the earth be blest."

The call of Abraham marks the beginning of Jewish history, and the prominence given to Abraham in the Bible, as a representative man, most

wonderfully indicates the purpose of God in the creation and organization of the Jewish nation. Abraham, according to the above Scripture, was to be a representative man in two important particulars, namely: *First*. He was to be the *fleshly* father of the Jewish nation. *Secondly*. He was to be the *religious* father of all God's faithful children.

The organization, therefore, of the Jewish nation, with Abraham at its head, was designed by God as a *repository* for the preservation of God's covenants and promises, and as a *medium* through which the blessings of the promise God made to Abraham might be offered to all the families of the earth. This is abundantly manifest from Paul's comment, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree, that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ." Gal. 3: 13-16. And again at verse 18 of same chapter, Paul says: "For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise, but God gave it to Abraham by promise."

As we advance to the meaning of the promise

we have a better understanding of God's eternal purpose in Christ.

The *foolish* idea attached to the promise of God to Abraham by Universalists, namely, that this is a promise of *unconditional universal salvation in Christ*, making all mankind the spiritual descendants of Abraham and recipients of the blessings contained in the promise, is most wonderfully *exploded* by Paul in the following: "Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." Gal. 3: 7-9. "He that believeth not shall be damned."—*Jesus*.

The promise of God to Abraham contains Christ, the gospel, the church of the first born, and the promise of salvation from sin and eternal salvation to all who comply with the conditions laid down by Jesus Christ in the gospel.

At this juncture in the discussion, we desire to give some attention to a common mistake among speakers and writers respecting the *first* promise of Christ to the world as Savior. It is claimed by a majority of our authors that Gen. 3: 15 contains the *first* promise of Christ to mankind. But this is not true. Gen. 3: 15 cannot contain the *first* promise of Christ, for the following reasons:

1. This language was addressed *directly* and *personally* to *the Devil* in the form of a serpent. And, to say the least, God would hardly employ that kind of a *medium* through which to make all the future ages of the world happy in the glorious anticipation of the coming Savior, unless it would be on the "old score" of the time of *superstition*, "that the hair of the dog is good for his bite." Preachers should know better.

2. This theory flatly contradicts Paul's calculation of the time that elapsed between the giving of the law from Mount Sinai and the promise of God, "In thee shall all nations be blessed," which Paul says, "was four hundred and thirty years." This theory misses the true time about 2000 years.

3. The New Testament writers do not recognize Gen. 3:15 as containing a promise of Christ to the world, as Savior.

4. The New Testament says, "To Abraham and his seed were the promises made." (Gal. 3:16).

5. Abraham, and not the Devil, is the father of the faithful. (Gal. 3:7-8).

6. The gospel (in promise) was first preached to Abraham, and not the Devil. "God gave it to Abraham by promise," we know, but we never heard or read of his giving it to anybody else before Abraham's day.

7. Gen. 3:15 is *not* the language of a promise, but of a *threat*; a *declaration of war* between the

Devil, our great enemy, and mankind, the perpetuity of which is plainly seen by the fact that the enmity put between the serpent and the woman was to follow down the line of their posterity through all the future ages of the world. The very necessity for the existence of hell itself is explained by this awful declaration of war which has been waged against the people of God in all the dispensations of religion since the world began.

By this declaration of war the good are separated from the bad by a great gulf, bridged over by regeneration, over which men and women may pass in time, during the reign of Christ as King; but this mighty *gulf* plows its way through time into eternity, deepening and widening as men wax worse, till finely it crosses the fatal line and enters the eternal world, when it becomes an *impassable gulf*.

Perhaps, in all that God ever said to man, devils or angels, this is the most comprehensive declaration known to us.

That this language implies that Jesus Christ will lead in the great battle against sin and Satan, as the Captain of our salvation, is very evident, but it is by no means the first promise of Christ.

It is surprising that learned men, truly great men, teachers of the people, should locate the *first* promise of Christ in Gen. 3: 15.

When we carefully examine the parties to the transaction narrated in this passage, we find, in the very nature of the case, no necessity for any such promise; and hence, the absence of that kind of language. Now, according to the commonly accepted interpretation of this text, Jehovah God of Genesis is the *promiser* and the Devil is the *promised*, and the *thing* promised was the *biggest job* of "*bruising*" ever known to mortal man on earth or angels in heaven. In the very nature of the case, believing, as we do, that God is a God of order, we would expect *first* a declaration of war, *then* the *promise* of the Captain of our salvation. There is a grand order in the revelations of God to man that cannot be ignored with impunity.

#### CHRIST IN PROPHECY.

Jesus the Christ, whether viewed in God's eternal purpose, or his promise to Abraham, or in the prophetic light of the Jewish age of the world, is the sunlight of every dispensation of religion established since the world began; first reflected by the *stars* of the Patriarchal age, then by the *moon* of the Jewish age, and finally he becomes the risen Sun of the moral universe, "the light of the world," dispelling all the clouds of the shadowy past.

The prophets were inspired to look down through the vista of the future, and to predict the



coming Christ, thus interpreting the *purpose* and *promise* of God to the natural offspring of Abraham. The prophecy concerning Christ will be found to contain all that God had purposed and promised.

Of the "use of prophecy" Dr. Smith says :

"Predictive prophecy is at once a part and an evidence of revelation ; at the time that it is delivered, and until its fulfilment, a part ; after it has been fulfilled, an evidence. St. Peter (2 Pet. 1: 19) describes it as 'a light shining in a dark place,' or 'a taper glimmering where there is nothing to reflect its rays,' that is, throwing some light, but only a feeble light compared with what is shed from the Gospel history. But after fulfilment, St. Peter says, 'the word of prophecy' becomes 'more sure' than it was before ; that is, it is no longer merely a feeble light to guide, but it is a firm ground of confidence, and, combined with the apostolic testimony, serves as a trustworthy evidence of the faith." The Jews expected Christ to come because they had been so taught by the prophets. The light of prophecy had been glimmering in the old world throughout the prophetic age, when it is represented as a star, guiding the magi of the East to the birthplace of the Savior. It would be more difficult to determine how these magi learned the significance of this star, provided we call it a miraculous meteor, than it would to believe that this star stands for the light of proph-

ecy, or in other words, their knowledge of the time and place of the birth of the King of the Jews, derived from the prophets. If we grant that the star was a miracle, then, the necessity for a second miracle arises, to explain the significance of the first. We have more faith in prophecy than to believe that this star was a miraculous meteor. Because the star that guided the magi "came and stood over where the child was," thus preventing them from entering the wrong house, is no evidence of the star being a miraculous meteor; for the knowledge of the event of the birth of Jesus derived from the predictions of the prophets, which were fulfilled at the *time* and *place* of the birth of Jesus, would be represented in a figure as resting over the place where the young child was. To be sure, the predictions concerning the birth of Christ were fulfilled in that event. The prophecy ended there.

When Herod "demanded" of the priesthood and scribes "where Christ should be born," their reply to him was, "In Bethlehem of Judea, for thus it is written by the prophets, And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a governor, that shall rule my people Israel." Matt. 2: 4-6.

1. Balaam, in Num. 24: 15-19, represents Christ as a Star coming out of Jacob, and a King who shall smite and destroy.

2. Moses represents Christ as a Prophet like

unto himself; the author of a new government and a leader of the people. Deut. 18: 15.

3. Isaiah represents Jesus Christ as teaching the world a *new* religion, and judging among the nations, and organizing the government of God on earth. Isa. 2: 1-5.

4. The "Counselor" among the nations of the earth. Isa. 9: 5-7.

5. "The Everlasting Father," that is, the Father of the future age—the Christian age.

6. "*The Prince of Peace.*" "And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host, praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." Luke 2: 13, 14.

Just as the prophet predicted, so was it announced at the birth of Christ. He came to give to the obedient "the peace of God that passeth all understanding." His reign was to be a reign of peace to all who accept him.

"Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days." Peter had just quoted a prophetic statement from Moses (Deut. 18: 15) in testimony of the Messiahship of Christ, then he adds that all the prophets of the Old Testament times, in regular order, beginning with Samuel, had voiced the same sentiment respecting the times, or days, of Christ. Then he tells them that they "are the children of the

prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our father Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed." Acts 3: 22-25.

Thus we find that "the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." (2 Peter 1: 21). And they uniformly predicted of the coming Christ and his rule on the earth. Hence, we find Christ not only in the *purpose* and promise of God, but we find that "the testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy." Christ acknowledges this to be true when he begins at "Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." Luke 24: 27.

#### CHRIST IN FACT.

Christ first in the purpose of God, then in the promise God made to Abraham, then in the prophecies of Old Testament times, and lastly, *Christ in fact*; a grand and glorious *reality*, the real Son of God among men. He was "in the beginning with God," and "all things were made by him," but the Word became *Christ in fact* when it "was made flesh, and dwelt among us," when "we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father," "full of grace and truth;" by whom the Father "hath in these last

days spoken unto us," "who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." Behold, the Christ is here *in fact*, as the great teacher of men, the representative of God, the Savior of men, the object of our faith.

The Christ of purpose, the Christ of promise, the Christ of prophecy, is now the Christ of history. He is the grandest and most sublime fact in history, as well as the soul of the Bible. It is a *fact now* that he was born in Bethlehem of Judea. He has come to us as the *real* Son of God, and tells us the object of his mission to this world. "For the Son of man is come to seek and save that which was lost." Like the eunuch of our text, we are called upon to "believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." This brings us to the examination of the text which stands at the beginning of this discourse.

According to the eighth chapter of Acts, "the angel of the Lord spake unto Philip, saying, Arise, and go toward the south, unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert, and he arose and went; and, behold, a man of Ethiopia, a eunuch of great authority under Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, who had the

charge of all her treasure, and had come to Jerusalem for to worship, was returning, and sitting in his chariot read Esaias the prophet. Then the Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot."

If the reader will examine carefully the parties to this transaction, he will learn the grand work of the Holy Spirit in the regeneration of sinners. Here, now, we have a sinner seeking to understand the word of God, and also a regular preacher of the gospel of Christ. The Holy Spirit does not operate directly upon the sinner, but operates upon the preacher, by saying to him, "Go near, and join thyself to this chariot." For in this age of the church, the ministers of God were directed by the Holy Spirit, through words, just as we should now be guided by the Holy Spirit through the Word of God. The Spirit's work, you see, in the salvation of the eunuch, was to bring the preacher of the gospel of Christ and the unconverted man together. That is his work to-day. This single case will serve to illustrate the whole scope of the Spirit's work in the salvation of man through Christ. Philip, as he was directed by the Spirit, ran to the chariot, and when he found the eunuch reading from the prophecy of Esaias, asked him if he understood what he was reading. The eunuch answered, "How can I, except some man should guide me?"

Then he invited Philip up to sit with him. The Scripture he was reading was this :

“He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his mouth. In his humiliation his judgment was taken away: and who shall declare his generation? for his life is taken from the earth.” (Acts 8 : 26–33).

Now the eunuch desires to know, “Of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself or of some other man?” Here we have *Christ in prophecy*, but this man of authority did not know it, hence, the necessity of the ministry. “Then Philip opened his mouth and began at the same Scripture, and preached unto him Jesus.” That is, preached unto the eunuch *Jesus Christ in fact*, showing that this prophecy was fulfilled in Jesus Christ. Whether this man had ever heard of Jesus before or not is a question, but one thing is certain, this is the first time he had ever heard Jesus spoken of by one of his friends. The word preached unto him by Philip opened up his understanding and pierced him to the heart to such a degree that when they “came unto a certain water” he demands baptism at the hands of Philip. “See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?” Are the modern sects prepared for this question? No; there is not a man among them who dares to give a scriptural answer to this

question. Suppose we put them to the test. "What doth hinder me to be baptized?"

*Methodist Preacher:* "Why, sir, you were sprinkled when an infant."

*Eunuch:* "No, Mr. Preacher, I never heard of such a thing as sprinkling for baptism in all my life."

Then the M. E. preacher replies: "Very well, I can't baptize you till your six months' probation expires, any way."

*Baptist Preacher:* "Well, sir, until you can relate a Baptist experience of sins forgiven this will hinder you from being baptized."

*Eunuch:* "Dear sir, I never heard of but one man by that name, and his experience, according to his history, was such that I don't care to try it. I am not to *lose my head* in order to become a Christian, if men do in order to become Baptists, so you will excuse me."

*Presbyterian Preacher:* "Immersion, sir, is not the practice of our church; besides the water to-day is too cold."

*Universalist Preacher:* "Neither present nor future salvation is conditioned on being baptized, and if you have been vaccinated, it is just as good; we will take you just as you are."

Here the authority of Jesus Christ is set aside and human inventions take its place.

But what was Philip's answer? "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." The



eunuch replies in the language of our text, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Upon this profession of his faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God, Philip baptized him into Christ, "in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace" (Eph. 1 : 7), and therefore baptized him for the remission of his sins. (Acts 2 : 38).

There is one thing, perhaps, the reader up to this time has not thought of, and that is, Philip in preaching unto the eunuch Jesus must have spoken of the importance of Christian baptism, or the eunuch could not have demanded it at his hands. This is evident. No man can preach Jesus without preaching baptism as a condition of forgiveness of sins, along with the other conditions, such as *faith, repentance* and *confession*.

Now, since Christ has come in fact, he has laid down the terms upon which he proposes to "seek and to save that which was lost." Paul says that the "purpose and grace" of God, "which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began," "is now made manifest by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel."

So, you see, the purpose, promise and prophecy of Jesus Christ are now all embodied in the gospel of Christ. The gospel is the medium through which God brings to light his plans and purposes

in the salvation of the race. To reject the gospel is to reject all. Expel the influence of Christ from the world, and society is a miserable wreck. Expel Christ from history, and nothing remains but desolation. This would drive the race of mankind into eternal night, and forever blast and destroy the hopes of all ages.

He is the hope of the world. He is the divine author of the Christian system. He is the only perfect man known to the history of the world. He is our model. Jesus Christ, "who spake as never man spake," and lived as never man lived, is represented to us by both his friends and enemies as the author of that system of Christian ethics found in the New Testament; that system of moral principles which alone can furnish the correct rules of moral living. Our means of knowing all about his moral character are found in that system of which he is the author. Indeed, his personal and moral excellence must agree with that system of ethics, and by that system his perfect character is proved. One of the strong proofs of the real character of Christ is found in the fact stated by Soame Jenyn, in his "Internal Evidence," that Christ is the only "founder of religion, in the history of mankind, which is *totally unconnected with all human policy and government, and therefore totally uncondusive to any worldly purpose whatever.*" "All others, Mahomet, Numa, and even Moses himself, blended

their religious institutions with their civil, and by them obtained dominion over their respective people; but Christ neither aimed at, nor would accept of, any such power. He rejected every object which all other men pursue, and made choice of all those which others fly from and are afraid of; he refused power, riches, honor and pleasures, and courted poverty, ignominy, tortures and death."

It appears that his only object in establishing the Christian system was to elevate humanity at any sacrifice whatever. That system of moral principles which comes to us through the ignominious death of Christ has stood the thunderbolts of the infidel world for more than eighteen hundred years, and to-day that system furnishes abundant evidence of his pure, heavenly character, and establishes the Scriptures beyond the reach of the combined powers of infidelity. Ambition has been the motive power which has actuated all the founders of false religions, and excellence, superiority, and eagerness for fame, the only objects. These speak of their character. But can anything of the sort be said of Christ? No. As says Mr. Jenyn, "I defy history to show one who ever made his own sufferings and death a necessary part of his original plan, and essential to his mission. This Christ actually did; he foresaw, foretold, declared their necessity, and voluntarily endured them." O, what wonderful proofs of his heavenly character and mission.

among men! Do infidels stop to consider this argument in favor of the Christian's faith? No; it is entirely overlooked by them. They spend their time in looking up, in a technical manner, what they fancy is a contradiction in revealed religion. And out of this they construct their hobby-horse, and ride through society doing their disastrous work.

“But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God.” Let us bow at his feet and learn the lessons of life. He is the great Teacher. Then we shall be enabled to say, in the language of the text, “I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.”

# THE MINISTRY OF RECONCILIATION;

## OR GOD'S METHOD OF SAVING SINNERS.

“Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.”—2 Cor. 5 : 20.

We have chosen the above passage purely as a starting point in the discussion of one of the most important subjects in the world of thought—*God's Method of Saving Sinners*. The investigation of this subject is of universal interest and importance; it includes the race of mankind; our happiness for time and eternity is made to depend upon it. The destiny of our race is suspended upon the *means* of salvation appointed by God himself. It is our purpose in this discourse to look for God's *plan* of saving sinners, to examine it in its parts, and to recommend it as a harmonious whole to the serious and prayerful consideration of all who may chance to read these pages.

The world is rapidly growing weary of human creeds and confessions of faith formulated without regard for the teachings of Christ and the apostles of the New Testament. Let us therefore ascertain, by a careful examination of the Word of God, what God's method of saving sinners is.

We are all more or less acquainted with the doctrines of the creeds of Christendom, and we know them to be worthless, because they are out of harmony with the *will* of God. All creeds, confessions of faith and articles of religion agree that man is alienated from God by wicked works; that man is in a state of enmity, and, being thus separated from God, that he must be reconciled to God or die an enemy of the cross of Christ, and perish. Now, the Scriptures plainly declare that God has undertaken the reconciliation of man to himself, employing just such means as he saw fit, in his infinite wisdom, to accomplish that end. And it is the purpose of the present discourse to ascertain, in the light of the Word of God, just what God's *plan* of reconciling man is. And in order to reach satisfactory conclusions in this investigation we will observe the following order in the discussion :

*I. Show how God proposes to reconcile the world to himself.*

*II. The part Christ performs in the reconciliation of man.*

*III. The legitimate work of Christ's ambassadors in the salvation of man.*

*IV. The qualifications of Christ's ambassadors.*

*V. The terms of reconciliation.*

In pursuance of this order we are to examine—

I. How God proposes to reconcile the world to himself. The settlement of this proposition, as seen on the very face of it, is purely a question of *revelation*. What has God said on the subject? What do the Scriptures teach on the subject? How has God promised to reconcile the world to himself? These are vital questions that now specially concern us.

Now, to be *reconciled* to God can mean no less than to be saved by God, brought into agreement with God, into a state of reconciliation—pardoned and justified. This reconciliation is not *mutual*, as has been supposed, but the word implies God's *purpose* and *plan* to reconcile the enemies of the cross of Christ to himself. This word indicates a *change* to be effected, but let it be remembered that man, not God, is the subject of that *change*. It contemplates a *change* of *heart*, *character* and *state*, on the part of man. All of which is evidently included in the *message of reconciliation*. Thus the *at-one-ment*, or reconciliation, of the world is effected.

We read in the Discipline of the Methodist Church that “the Godhead and manhood were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, *to reconcile his Father to us*, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also

for the actual sins of men." Perhaps this is one of the most *absurd, unreasonable, and unscriptural statements to be found in the English language on the subject*. The M. E. Church having been found so far wrong on this *vital* doctrine of the New Testament, it is not surprising to see her wrong in almost all of her teaching on the subject of salvation. It is *not God*, but man, who needs reconciliation. Besides, the statement above, quoted from the M. E. Discipline, is a palpable *contradiction* of the plain statement of the Word of God on the subject. But to the question in hand.

As to how God proposes to reconcile sinners, we cite the following Scriptures: "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." 2 Cor. 5: 17-19. From this Scripture we learn, (1) that, notwithstanding the message of reconciliation had been placed in the hands of Christ's chosen ambassadors, who themselves had been reconciled to God, that "*all things* are of God." That he is the *author* of the *plan*, and that "all things



that pertain unto life and godliness" are under the directions of his *divine* power. And (2) that God proposes to reconcile sinners to himself, *in Christ*. There is, therefore, no promise or offer of salvation out of Christ. In Christ God offers to meet the world and to reconcile sinners to himself. Paul declares that God had given to us the ministry of reconciliation, "To wit," *namely*, "that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." God saves, but he saves through Christ, who is the Mediator, through whom God has purposed to accomplish the reconciliation of a perishing world. In Christ sinners may be reconciled, for God has recorded his name *there*. He made a deposit of "all spiritual blessings in the heavenly place," in Christ, "in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." (1) According to the passage already cited, God reconciles the world to himself *in Christ*. (2) According to Eph. 1: 3, God placed all spiritual blessings *in Christ*. (3) According to Eph. 1: 7, "redemption" and "forgiveness of sins" are offered to sinners *in Christ*. (4) According to 2 Tim. 1: 1, and 1 Jno. 5: 11, eternal life is offered to the world *in Christ only*. (5) "For all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us." (2 Cor. 1: 20). We are made *new creatures* in Christ, not out of Christ. The reconciled are rep-

resented as the *new creation*. Paul emphatically declares that this new creation is effected in Christ. God is the Creator, and the saved are the creatures or creation. "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ," etc. (Eph. 1: 10). "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature." Now, the fact that God only offers to reconcile sinners *in Christ* can not be ignored. Those who make the *direct* appeal to God for "converting power" *ignore* the *mission* of Jesus Christ to this world, the *Mediatorship* of Christ and God's *plan* of reconciliation. Let the reader remember that "in Christ dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." To Christ God committed the work of saving the world. By reference to the seventeenth chapter of John, you will see Christ's acknowledgment of that fact: "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world."

*II. The part Christ performs in the reconciliation of man.*

Christ Jesus the Lord is the *first great* minister in the reconciliation of a lost world to God. He was made the *Alpha* and *Omega* of the *plan* of redemption, "who is the beginning, the first born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and having made peace through the blood of the cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by

him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven. And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled." Col. 1: 18-21.

The word *apostle* means *one who is sent*, and in this sense it is applied to our Lord. Paul to the Hebrews says: "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus, who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house." Heb. 3: 1-2. "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." Paul, in contrasting the priesthood of Christ with the Levitical priesthood, says: "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the Mediator of a better covenant, [testament] which was established upon better promises." "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." Jno. 3: 16. Christ was sent to the world to *develop* and carry out God's *plan of reconciliation*; to ratify that plan by the willing sacrifice of himself, and then to fix the *terms* of reconciliation and to have them published to the world. In the process of development, Christ

1. Demonstrated the *truth* and *divinity* of the

*plan of salvation*, by the interposition of *miracles*, by which his claims to be the *Messiah* were established. 2. He formulated the law of pardon, fixing the *terms* of salvation from sin, and organized the "ministry of reconciliation," and committed to that ministry the *message of reconciliation*, *qualifying* them to publish it and confirm it to the alienated sons of Adam's race. 3. When this was done God *exalted* him to the *throne* of the universe, and he "sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high," when the climax of God's approval came thundering down from the throne of the universe: "*Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom.*" As he is we behold him, (1) as the ruler over all creatures; all divine authority is exercised in his name; (2) as the *head* of the church; (3) the great object of human and angelic *adoration*; (4) "heir of all things," "the brightness" of his Father's glory "and the express image of his person."

"Let every kindred, every tribe,  
On this terrestrial ball,  
To Him all majesty ascribe,  
And crown Him Lord of all."

### *III. The legitimate work of Christ's ambassadors in the salvation of man.*

Under this head we have special use for the text. "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ,

as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." Bloomfield renders the above passage thus: "In the exercise then, of this office of reconciliation, we, the apostles of Christ, are ambassadors on the part of Christ." "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ." Tyndal renders, "Now then are we messengers in the room of Christ." In order to a better understanding of the work of the apostles of Jesus Christ in the reconciliation of man to God, and to know the *force* of apostolic authority, we shall define the term *ambassador*: "A minister of the highest rank, employed by one prince or state, at the court of another, to manage the public concerns of his own prince or state, and representing the power and dignity of his sovereign."—*Webster*. In connection with Webster's definition of this word, we propose to show that the New Testament use of the word is *precisely* the same: "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the New testament; not of the letter (the law), but of the spirit (administration of the gospel); for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."—*Paul*. Again the same author says: "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake. For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light

of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us."—*Paul*.

Now, from the definition of the term *ambassador*, and its New Testament use, which are in perfect accord, we learn—

1. That the ambassadors, or apostles, of the Lord Jesus Christ were ministers of the *highest* rank.

2. That they were employed by the rightful sovereign of the universe to manage the public concerns of the exalted Prince.

3. That they were, by the reception of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, made *representatives* of the "*power and dignity*" of Jesus Christ in the reconciliation of the world to God.

4. "The word of reconciliation" "committed" unto them, was the New Testament, of which God made them "*able ministers*."

Now, if this be God's method of saving sinners, the apostles cut quite a figure in the plan of salvation; they perform a very important part indeed, and the place they occupy in God's method of salvation as an indispensable factor can not be ignored except at the expense of eternal *truth*. At this juncture in the discussion, we desire briefly to notice some of the *tremendous evils* resulting from the *rejection* of this view of the subject by the *sects* of our land:

1. They *ignore apostolic authority* by appealing *directly* to God for what they term "converting power."

2. It was the *prolific* mother which gave birth to the *mourners' bench system* of *revivalism*, which takes the place of *faith* in Christ and cheerful *obedience* to the gospel.

3. It is the *source* from which flows the stream of sectarian *names, creeds, confessions of faith,* and the doctrines and commandments of men, whose tendency is to infidelity.

4. It is the rejection of *apostolic authority* which fosters *sprinkling for baptism*, and rejects *baptism for remission of alien sins*, which is as plainly taught in the New Testament as the *divinity* of Christ. These are only a *few* of the *many* evils growing out of this *sin* of *religious infidelity*. Yes, we mean just what we say. When R. G. Ingersoll rejects the Bible we call him an *infidel*, and he does not object. But religious fanatics who reject full one-half of all Christ published to the world through the inspired apostles, object if we are modest enough to call them *semi-infidels*. The *charge* is *just*. Persons are not bound to reject the *whole Bible* to be justly called infidels. Of course, multiplied thousands are ignorant, but not so with the leaders of sectarian thought. The work of the apostles in the salvation of the world must be accepted; this is the way God has appointed to *reach* the world with the

*means* of salvation. Let us prove this proposition by Scriptures not yet cited in this discussion.

We call attention to the grand commission given by Christ to the apostles just before he left this world—the proclamation of the terms of reconciliation:

“And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,” etc. Matt. 28: 18, 19. And again: “And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.” Mark 16: 15, 16. Can we not plainly see that Christ committed the whole *plan* of salvation to the apostles. Now, to reject the apostles is to reject Christ, for Paul plainly declares in the text, “We pray you in Christ’s stead, be ye reconciled to God.” Now from the commission we learn—

1. That the *faith* that works by love, without which it is impossible to *please* God, “comes by hearing the word of God” proclaimed by the ambassadors of Christ. So you see, the faith of the world is made to depend upon the apostles after all.

2. That our *knowledge* of Jesus Christ as Savior depends upon the apostles of Christ. “Go



ye therefore, and *teach* all nations." "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, except they be sent? As it is written, how beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings." Rom. 10: 14, 15. There is no earthly *escape* from the logical conclusion. The gospel was committed to the apostles; hence, Jesus says: "*I have given them thy word.*" And again, "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world." "Neither pray I for these (apostles) alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word." How clearly these precious words of Christ show the part performed by his inspired apostles in the reconciliation of sinners to God.

Finally, when Paul was made an apostle, or ambassador of Christ, Christ tells him that his work is "to open their eyes and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." "He that heareth you heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me; and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me."—*Jesus*. May God help us to

accept Christ through the teaching of his *own* chosen apostles.

*IV. The qualifications of Christ's ambassadors.*

Under this head but little need be said, for all who admit that the apostles were *chosen* by Jesus Christ will also agree with us that they were *qualified* by him to perform the duties of their office in the salvation of the race. The apostolic office must be recognized as one of very great dignity and responsibility; and the fact that God never exalts a man to office without *first* qualifying him to perform its functions, makes the discussion easy.

The reader will remember that Paul says: "But our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the New Testament," etc. And again, "For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

This passage is proof of the *inspiration* of the apostles of Jesus Christ. God "*commanded the light.*" He enlightened their minds by *revealing* unto them the gospel system of salvation through the Holy Spirit. God, at the creation of the physical universe, commanded, "*Let there be light, and there was light.*" So, in the opening of the new creation he "commanded the light to shine out of darkness," and it was so. Thus the apostles were "made able ministers of the New Testa-

ment;" thus they were qualified "*to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.*"

God illuminated them for the work of proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation to a perishing world. "But you shall receive power, when the Holy Spirit comes upon you, and you shall be witnesses for me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and to the uttermost part of the earth." *Acts 1:2, as rendered by Professor J. W. McGarvey.*

The apostles were qualified for the work of the ministry when they were "endued with power from on high;" when they received the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, as recorded in the second of Acts. And as the *called, qualified and sent* of God, they represent "all power in heaven and in earth." The qualifications of the ambassadors of Christ may be summed up thus:

1. *They were qualified to bear testimony to the fact that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.*

To qualify the apostles to testify concerning Christ, it was necessary for them to both *see and hear* him, after his resurrection from the dead; therefore, "he showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." Acts 1:3. For this same purpose he showed himself unto Saul. "But rise, and stand upon thy feet; for I have

appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness, both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee." Acts 26 : 16.

2. *They were qualified to reveal the plan of salvation to the world of mankind.*

It will not do to say that the *system* of salvation rests on *human* testimony for proof of its validity, but upon *Divine testimony*. Jesus precluded the *apostolic commission* with these words: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth;" then he adds, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations." etc. That is, "go" for this reason.

3. *They were qualified to enact such laws as God saw fit, in his infinite wisdom, to govern the Disciples of Christ.*

The *second part* of the commission, as given by Matthew, applies here, "Teaching them," that is; the baptized, "to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," that is, commanded you to teach, "and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

4. *They were qualified to establish in the Church of Christ all the ordinances of God's appointment.*

See 1 Cor. 11:23. The keys of the kingdom of heaven were given to the apostles by Christ himself, that whatsoever they bound on earth should be ratified in heaven. Whatever the apostles did was by Divine authority. Now, intelli-

gent reader, if the latter-day system of mourners' bench revivalism was communicated to the apostles by Jesus Christ, and delivered to the Church by the apostles, it is of divine authority, and you ought to receive it as such ; but on the other hand, if by looking through the New Testament you cannot find this doctrine, not even a single mention of it, either by Christ or the apostles, you ought to reject it as an UNAUTHORIZED HUMAN INVENTION. If "sprinkling," "pouring," "six months' probation," and the "mourners' bench," are any part of God's METHOD OF SALVATION, it is our duty to receive them ; but if you should look the whole plan of salvation through, and could not find these doctrines once mentioned in all the word of God—then what? Then it becomes your duty to reject them as *basely false*. To make a short matter of this, let me say, the word of God does not once mention any of these practices. They are wholly human, and unauthorized by the word of God, and therefore evil. These doctrines form no part of the system of salvation given to the world by Christ and his apostles. Why should a man of ordinary intelligence hold to and believe in these doctrines, when he knows they are not once mentioned in all the Bible? As well might we contend for the practice of polygamy, so far as the gospel is concerned ; for one is as unscriptural as the other.

V. *The terms of reconciliation.*

By the *terms of reconciliation* we mean the *conditions of pardon* fixed by the Lord Jesus Christ, and proclaimed to the world by the inspired apostles. Salvation from sin is conditional, and it was the right of Christ to say just what should be the conditions upon which he would pardon the sinner. That our Lord has the right to stipulate the terms or conditions of remission of sins is as unquestionably certain as the fact that he is the Savior of mankind. To *doubt* his right to do so is to *doubt* the *truth* of the New Testament and *question* the *veracity* of both Christ and his apostles. He possesses "all power in heaven and in earth" and claimed the right to lay down the conditions of reconciliation for the race. Now who that believes the Scriptures to be a revelation from God will deny Jesus Christ the right to say just what sinners must do in order to pardon?

Under this head it shall be our aim to point out the terms of reconciliation in the order in which they were delivered unto us by the apostles of Christ, whose duty it was to represent Christ in the proclamation of the gospel of our salvation. What are the *terms* set forth by the Savior? This is a *vital* question and one upon which the salvation of the world depends. Let us, therefore, be very careful, lest we misrepresent the Lord of our salvation and be found guilty of "handling the word of God deceitfully." Christ is the *author* of

the *terms* of pardon as well as the *law* of pardon, and we are bound to submit to the terms ordered by him, or be found guilty of *rejecting* the means of salvation appointed by him. There is no escape from this conclusion. The gospel of Christ *does*, or *does not* contain the plan of salvation. Which shall we say?

If you say it does, we shall move on with this investigation pleasantly, and we shall agree throughout the entire discussion. Indeed, we apprehend no difficulty whatever, except from that class of religionists who are *tied* to human *creeds* and speculative theology, and who virtually deny that the New Testament contains the *whole* of the *plan* of salvation. This is a grave charge, to be sure, but nevertheless it is true. Persons who contend for the *abstract* operation of the Holy Spirit, and "converting power directly from heaven," thereby *ignoring* the teachings of Christ and the apostles, in the very nature of things cannot believe that the gospel contains the *whole plan* of redemption. But we start out with this understanding, that the New Testament, of which Paul says God made us "able ministers," contains the whole *plan* of salvation from sin and *final* salvation in "the world to come."

The word of God, the gospel of the Son of God, either *does* or *does not* contain the *law* of pardon and the stipulated *conditions* upon which

pardon is offered to sinners. If it does, then we, as a people, are *right*; if it does *not*, then *all* the world is at sea. We now invite the critical attention of the reader to the *terms* of pardon or reconciliation, and the order in which they stand in the "Word of Reconciliation."

1. *To hear.* This involves the necessity of preaching the "word of reconciliation," the gospel of our salvation, to the world. Because "the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." Hence, the language of the commission, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations," etc. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." "So then faith *cometh* by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Rom. 10: 17.

2. *Faith.* Remember that Paul says, "faith comes by hearing the word of God." "Without faith," Paul says, "it is impossible to please" God. Christ says: "He that believeth not shall be damned." Now, is this not enough to satisfy any sane person that faith in Jesus Christ is an *essential condition* of pardon?

3. *Repentance.* Repentance follows after faith, and, in fact, is produced by faith—grows out of faith. Paul tells us that God "commanded all men every where to repent."

4. *Confession of Jesus Christ with the mouth, before men.* This, like faith and repentance, is a



command of God. It is an *act* of obedience in order to salvation.

5. *Immersion into the name of the Father, the Son, and Holy Spirit.* Matt. 28: 19. Christ says emphatically, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mark. 16: 16. Christ either meant what he said or something else. Which is it? There is no *dodging* the force of this language. The apostle on Pentecost says baptism is for remission of sins. Did he tell the truth? As we expect to have considerable to say on the design of baptism in another discourse prepared for this work, we will not discuss the subject at length here.

6. *Pardon.* Here we desire to speak of pardon for the sake of the *order* in the law of pardon.

7. *The gift of the Holy Spirit,* which is received, mind you, "because we are sons," not to make us sons, as taught by some. (Gal. 4: 6; Acts 2: 38). This is God's order of things. All, therefore, who *believe* the gospel, *repent, confess* the Savior and obey the Lord in *baptism*, are *reconciled*, or pardoned and justified, and have been made one with Christ.

Finally, dear reader, we entreat you to accept the terms of reconciliation to God, as they are stipulated by the Christ, sealed by his precious blood and proclaimed to the world by his divinely inspired ambassabors; that you may, "ac-

ording to his abundant mercy," be begotten to a living hope "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time."

Do you realize the uncertainty of life and the certainty of death? Act at once, *act now*. O, what a slender thread is life :

"There is a tide in the affairs of men  
Which taken at its flood leads on to fortune;  
Omitted, all the voyage of their life  
Is bound in shallows and in miseries."

## THE PROCESS OF REGENERATION.

*“ And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.”—Matt. 19 : 28.*

These are the words of Jesus in his reply to Peter's question: “Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee: what shall we have therefore?” This was introduced by the case of the man who had refused to dispose of his property and follow Christ, because he more highly esteemed his earthly possessions than the treasures of eternal life offered by Christ on the conditions that he should go sell what he had and give it to the poor, and come and follow Christ. Now, the very thing he refused to do—to follow Christ—Peter and other disciples had done, and now Peter desires to know what the reward is to be. Hence, the reply of Christ was not, as many have interpreted it, namely, that he speaks of the disciples as having followed him through the regeneration, for there is no connection between “in the regeneration,” and the preceeding clause, “ye who have followed me,” but the connection is clearly marked by that period during which the apostles were to sit on the thrones, the beginning of which is pointedly fixed by the words, “When the Son of

man shall sit on the throne of his glory." Jesus had not passed through the regeneration, nor had he even begun the regeneration, only in so far as he had been preparing the materials; hence there was no sense in which the apostles could have followed him in the regeneration.

This passage plainly marks out a period of regeneration, cotemporaneous with the period of the mediatorial reign of Jesus Christ; hence, the process of regeneration could not begin till Christ was crowned King of kings and Lord of lords. This period and process of regeneration commenced with the day of Pentecost after the ascension of Christ to heaven, and will continue "till he hath put all enemies under his feet," "then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power." (1 Cor. 15: 24, 25).

Prof. J. W. McGarvey, in his commentary, says: "Regeneration means, either the process of regenerating, or the result attained by that process, according to the context in which it is found. Here (Matt. 19: 28) it evidently means the former, for it designates a period during which the apostles would sit on the thrones," etc. Evidently Christ alluded to the process of regenerating sinners, which he knew would begin with the beginning of his *reign*, when the gospel system of salvation should be opened to a perishing world by his

chosen apostles, who were to be authorized and qualified to occupy the throne of judgment among men on earth, respecting matters of faith in the Christ and obedience to his divine law, by which sinners were to be regenerated, or born again. And it must be remembered that the *whole process of regeneration* is meant, which has been in progress ever since the day of Pentecost. We therefore use the term "regeneration" as denoting the *whole* process of turning to God, and not merely as denoting the result of that process, or the state into which we are brought by the process. And while the term is here employed to indicate the whole process of turning to God, it is proper to say that it is the *name* of that process, which does not consist of a *single* act or thing, but a process which consists of every moral change essential to the full salvation of sinners. It is the purpose of this discourse to examine the process of regeneration in its parts, that we may ascertain what are the essential elements of that great process by which we are made new creatures in Christ. If regeneration is the name of that great spiritual change which brings sinners from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God, this investigation should be pursued with prayerful hearts and very great care.

What is the current meaning of the term ?

Regeneration is a theological expression in com-

mon use among all the religious sects throughout the civilized world, and its current meaning is that spiritual change which passes on all in becoming Christians. Now, to ascertain more fully the meaning of this term, Bro. Campbell says: "Moses calls the creation, or whole process of formation of the heavens and the earth, 'The generation of the heavens and the earth?' The account of the formation of Adam and Eve, and also the account of the creation of Adam and Eve, are, by the same writer, called 'the book or record of the generations of Adam.' This is the literal import of the word; consequently, *regeneration* literally indicates the whole process of renovating, or new-creating man." It is the process of the *new* creation we are to investigate. But you find the same agencies and instrumentalities employed in the new creation that were present in the physical creation; the only difference being found in the fact that in the generation or creation of the material universe God operated through agents and instruments on *matter*, but in *re-generation*, or the *new creation* of man, God operates on *mind*. In the physical creation we have, first, the Holy Spirit as the agent. The creative power that brought the material universe into being was put forth through the agency of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit of God brooded over the face of the waters, and thus order was brought out of chaos. Secondly, the Word of God was the instrument. God said:

“Let there be light; and there was light.” The same thing is true of the “new creation.” The Holy Spirit is God’s agent, and the gospel of Jesus Christ, the word of his power, is his instrument in the re-generation of man.

This prepares us for a fair and impartial discussion of re-generation as a *process* of turning to God, the *modus operandi* established by God himself in the new creation, the process which embodies every essential element of a perfect system of human redemption.

Now, with these introductory remarks before us, we are prepared to enter at once upon the discussion of the process of regeneration, in its essential parts.

Regeneration consists of three moral changes, viz:

- I. *A change of affections, or change of heart.*
- II. *A change of character.*
- III. *A change of state, or relation.*

This order is not only suggested by the Scriptures, but by a careful examination it will be found in exact harmony with the constitution of man.

These changes are essential to regeneration. No man can be said to be regenerated, or born again, until these changes have been effected in him. How, then, are these changes brought about? What does the law of the Lord provide to this end?

I. *The change of man's affections, or heart, is produced by faith in Jesus Christ.*

Faith is the *belief of testimony*. The *object* of faith is Jesus Christ. The *testimony* of faith is the gospel of the Son of God. It follows, therefore, that Christ is the *creed* of his church. Faith is the *act* of man. Faith is a condition of remission of sins, and therefore essential to regeneration. "Faith comes by hearing the word of God," and can come in no other way; the word of God, therefore, is essential to faith. Faith is not the *direct* gift of God, as our religious neighbors suppose, for faith is an *act* of our own, but the testimony of faith is the gift of God. The word of God is the *seed* of *new* life in Christ, and faith is the *first* fruit of that *seed*. It is for this reason that faith occupies the first place in the order of this discussion. "Without faith," Paul says, "it is impossible to please" God, "for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Heb. 11: 6. "But he that believeth not shall be damned."—*Jesus*.

There is, therefore, a very important place in the *process* of regeneration occupied by faith. There is no regeneration without faith. It is the *first* step in that *process*. In fact, the sinner's right or privilege to become a son of God depends on his faith in Christ; yea, more, the gospel of Christ only becomes the power of God



for salvation to those who believe. (Jno. 1 : 12 ; Rom. 1 : 16.) These passages make the matter plain as to the *place* faith occupies in the *process* of regeneration. As to what faith does in the regeneration of the sinner, Paul, in Rom. 5 : 1, 2, says, "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ ; by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." It is plain to be seen what faith does for our regeneration. We are regenerated and justified by faith precisely in the sense of this passage, namely, it is the means of "access into grace."

Certainly every one admits that our salvation from sin is by grace, but it must not be forgotten that faith in Jesus Christ is the *only access* "into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." "For," says Paul, "by grace are ye saved through faith ; and that (grace) not of yourselves ; it is the gift of God." Eph. 2 : 8.

Now, to farther prove that faith, in the economy of God, changes our hearts, or affections, the reader's careful attention is invited to Acts 15 : 7-9 : "And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and

believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as *he did* unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith."

There are two important points in this passage to which special attention is called, viz: (1) That faith in Christ comes to the sinner through "the word of the gospel" preached to his understanding; (2) That the gospel thus heard and believed produces the change of the heart or affections. No man who believes the New Testament to contain the law and conditions of pardon will dispute this position. Thus the gospel system begins the regeneration of the sinner. When he is made to believe the story of the cross by having heard it related by the inspired apostles, then his good will, his love for God and zealous attachment for the Christ, begin to be formed in the heart. Here is just where moral regeneration begins. "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Rom. 10: 10. Here the apostle argues, (1) that faith begins with the heart, and (2) that men must believe *before* they can confess their faith in Christ; (3) that *faith is in order to* salvation. There is no religious act that can be performed by man prior to his faith in Christ; and it was for this reason that Paul said, "Without faith it is impossible to

please him," and also, "For whatsoever is not of faith is sin." This places the teaching of the Baptist Church in a bad light, but we are not responsible for the false teaching of Baptists. Baptists teach that repentance, in the order of pardon, comes *before* faith; that sinners must *repent* before they *can believe*. This fallacy is also held by the Methodist Church. This position was taken by Rev. G. W. Hughey, D. D., in a discussion with the author. These teachers of the doctrines and commandments of men, have *no* regard whatever for the *order* of things established by Christ and his apostles.

Now since we have shown what faith does in the regeneration of sinners, it is in order to show what it does not do in the salvation of sinners. And this we shall do by exposing the absurd doctrine of

#### JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ONLY.

The following proposition will show just the sense in which the M. E. Church uses the term *justification* in its Discipline:

"Wherefore that we are justified (in the sense of pardon) by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort." G. W. Hughey, affirmant.

We discussed this proposition with the doctor, at New Douglas, Illinois, and his defeat was so prominent to his own brethren that some of them

remarked, "Hughey would be all right if that word only were not in the proposition." We discussed the same proposition with Dr. Webster, a Presiding Elder of Ohio. Now, the fallacy of justification by faith *only* is seen without a discussion; it is false on the very face of it; in the nature of things it is bound to be false.

Justification by faith *only* means, (1) justification without repentance; (2) without grace; (3) without blood; (4) without obedience to the commands of God; (5) without the Holy Spirit; (6) without the resurrection of Christ; (7) without the "name of the Lord."

The passages of Scripture in which the words *only* and *alone* occur in connection with faith do most emphatically *contradict* the faith alone theory of justification. "Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone." James 2:17. Again: "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." James 2:24. Now let us compare the teaching of Dr. Hughey and his *little book* with the Apostle James and his *big book*. This is the proper way to settle this difficulty.

*First.* "Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort."—*Hughey and the little book.*

*Second.* "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only."—*Apostle James and the big book.*

Take your choice, reader. Which will you take? the uninspired Methodist preacher, or the inspired Apostle James? "Then Peter opened his mouth," just as Dr. Hughey's went shut, and said, "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Acts 10: 34, 35. By reference to the 12th chapter of John and verses 42 and 43, you will find a text against the faith alone theory, in these words: "Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue: for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." Why were these rulers not saved? They believed on Christ. Simply because it takes *more* than faith to save, and that they refused to do. That's all. While the Word *nowhere* says we are saved or "justified by faith only," it does say plainly that we are not saved by faith only. And this forever sets the matter at rest. The doctrine of "justification by faith only" is therefore false and unscriptural. From this conclusion there is no logical escape. The faith that changes the sinner's affections "works by love," and therefore never refuses to obey the commands of God. Notwithstanding faith is a condition of salvation from sin, it is the first step in regeneration.

“ Faith must obey our Father’s will,  
As well as trust His grace ;  
A pard’ning God requires us still  
To walk in all His ways.

“ How vain are fancy’s airy flights  
If faith be cold and dead !  
None but a living pow’r unites  
To Christ, the living Head.”

*II. The change of character is produced by repentance.*

This brings us to the second item and the second change in the process of regeneration. Faith produces repentance, which is an important item in regeneration, and one that deserves a careful and candid investigation at this juncture of the discussion. It is now to be observed that while faith is an essential condition of salvation from sin, that faith is not *all* of the process of regeneration, but an essential part of the whole plan, and that the nature of faith is such that repentance necessarily follows as next in order. We remark here that repentance is just as essential to the salvation of man as faith in Christ. The office of faith is one thing and that of repentance is another. Repentance does for man in the process of regeneration what faith does not do, hence the necessity of this condition. While repentance is in order to the same end, or, in other words, has the same design, it produces different effects on man. It effects in man a

change essential to his salvation, which no other condition of salvation can produce. The *necessity* of repentance is based in this fact. The word of God produces *faith*, and faith effects the change of man's *affections*, and this leads to *repentance*.

Repentance is used in different forms in the Scriptures; it is sometimes used with reference to God, and sometimes with reference to man. The terms *repentance* and *repent*, as used in the New Testament Scriptures to denote the command of God to sinners, and exclusively applied to man, is translated from the Greek *metanoio*, and is essential to remission of sins. The difficulty in understanding this word arises from the fact that it is translated from different Greek terms by the same English word. For example, (1) *metanoio*, in Acts 2:38 and Acts 3:19, expresses the command of God to alien sinners; (2) *metamelomai* denotes sorrow or regret. The difference in meaning, in consequence of the different Greek words being translated by but one English word, is very prominent in 2 Cor. 7:8-10, thus: "For though I made you sorry with my epistle, I do not regret (*metamelomai*) it, though I did regret; for I see that epistle made you sorry, though but for a season. Now I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye were made sorry unto repentance (*metanoian*—reformation) for ye were made sorry after a godly sort, that ye might

suffer loss by us in nothing. For godly sorrow worketh repentance (*metanoian*—reformation) unto salvation, a repentance which bringeth no regret” (*metameleton*).

From this passage we learn that repentance means vastly more than sorrow for sin; and secondly, that “godly sorrow” leads to repentance, which is in order to salvation from sin. Godly sorrow is not repentance, according to the New Testament teaching, but a condition or state of the mind, produced in man by faith in Jesus Christ, which leads to repentance.

For example, take the Jews on Pentecost, who are represented as being “pricked in their heart,” which led them to ask the apostles what they must do to be saved. Peter commands them to repent, knowing that they, being pierced in the heart, had that “godly sorrow” which leads to repentance. Repentance, then, must mean that change of mind which leads to reformation. Thus it is that repentance produces that moral change in man’s character essential to regeneration. The change of mind produced in the Jews on the day of Pentecost, which resulted in turning them from darkness to light, and led them to abstain from sin, constituted their repentance.

The account of Paul’s visit to Athens, given in the 17th chapter of Acts, furnishes the reader with sufficient proof as to the universal importance and necessity of repentance. Here Paul



says: "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." "All men everywhere" does not mean all men in this and every other world, as taught by modern universalists. This is a fallacy, an absurdity, for the gospel of Christ teaches nothing of the kind, but to the contrary, Paul says, "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world." Titus 2: 11, 12. Remember, sinner, that you must repent "in the present world," or perish.

Peter, in the second chapter of Acts, commands the Jews to repent in order to remission of sins. Thus, according to the commission by Luke, "repentance and remission of sins" was preached in the name of Jesus Christ. Paul says, God "commandeth all men everywhere to repent: because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that Man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." Acts 17: 30, 31. "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." Acts 3: 19. Here we learn not only the purpose of repentance, but the absolute necessity of it as well.

From these passages it will be seen that the sinner's salvation from his past sins, and the *hope* of eternal life in the world to come, depend upon *repentance*; he must *repent*; it is the command of Almighty God to "all men everywhere" to repent. His character must be changed in this way. God is not a respecter of persons, but of character. "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Acts. 10: 34, 35.

The process of regeneration has, therefore, its faith in Christ, and also its repentance of sins. The first to purify the affections, or heart, and the second to purify the life, or character, of the alien sinner. But these are not all the conditions. God demands more than faith and repentance of the sinner, in order to his pardon and justification.

We have now passed over two of the essential steps toward God, which fully prepare the sinner for admission into the one body—the church of the first born, where God has promised to meet him in the forgiveness of all his sins. Let the penitent go on, for still he hears the voice of Christ bidding him to come.

"Sweet is the friendly voice  
Which speaks of life and peace;  
Which bids the penitent rejoice,  
And gives a sweet release."

*III. The change of state, or relation, is produced by baptism.*

Baptism is the last act in the process of regeneration, because by it that process is consummated. It follows, therefore, that when a sinner is brought to believe from the heart that Jesus is the Christ, and repents and is baptized, he is regenerated, or born again. Under this head the "washing of regeneration" is to be examined. We have already examined the faith and repentance of regeneration, but it must not be forgotten that there is also a "washing of regeneration" to be considered in this connection. But before we proceed with our arguments in support of the proposition that the change of the penitent believer's state is effected by baptism, we desire to give some attention to the oft-repeated charge of baptismal regeneration.

The sects have charged it upon us thousands of times, that we are guilty of teaching baptismal regeneration. Now, one of two things is true, the sects are either ignorant, as dumb as Dagon before the Ark of God, or they are willfully dishonest, in making this charge upon us. The most charitable view that can be taken is that it is purely ignorance, sectarian blindness.

1. They seem to know no difference between "baptism for remission of sins" and "baptismal regeneration." In fact, with the sects, these two expressions mean precisely the same thing.

2. They seem to know no difference between baptism and regeneration. At least they will not give us the advantage of that knowledge if they possess it. If they have learned that baptism is one thing and regeneration is another, they have not yet given publicity to it. Baptism, according to the concurrent testimony of all Bible critics and scholars, the confessions of faith, to say nothing of the plain statement of the apostle Paul, is the washing of regeneration, and not regeneration itself. We are not saved by regeneration, no more than we are saved by salvation, but we are said to be "saved by the washing of regeneration."

3. *Baptismal regeneration defined.* Baptismal regeneration, fairly and honestly stated, is that an unconscious infant, receiving baptism, is by that rite regenerated, or born again, and thus becomes a child of God and an heir of heaven. That is, by baptism alone, for all other gospel conditions of salvation are left out of view. This is baptismal regeneration.

This is, (1) baptism without the consent of the baptized and against his will; (2) baptism without faith in Jesus Christ; (3) it is baptism without repentance; (4) this is baptism in which the subject does not even know that such a being as Christ the Lord exists, much less to know that he ever commanded persons to "be baptized." If regenerated at all, the infant is regenerated by baptism alone—baptism to the utter exclusion of

everything else. This is baptismal regeneration.

Now, you are ready to ask, Who is guilty? We answer, Methodists, Presbyterians, Roman Catholics, and, in fact, all the baby-sprinkling churches on earth. Here we put the shoe on the other foot. We as a people never believed in baptismal regeneration. But our religious neighbors do. That's the difference, you see. Like Haman, who attempted to destroy all the Jews of the Persian empire, and was hanged on the gallows he erected for Mordecai, we are pleased to leave our neighbors across the way hanging on the gallows created by their own logic. We have taken pains in this definition to define baptismal regeneration just as our religious enemies use the terms when charging it upon us as a people, and in doing so we have defined and described a fallacy of which they themselves are guilty before God and men. Again, we say, this places the shoe on the other foot, where it properly belongs. Let our sectarian friends hereafter be just a little cautious to avoid this false charge.

4. *Baptism for remission of sins defined.* "Baptism for remission of sins," defined in the light of New Testament teaching, and also as held by the Disciples of Christ, is the "obedience of faith," the act of faith, faith actualized, faith made perfect, an act of obedience to a command of Christ, produced by faith, which brings the penitent into Christ, into remission of sins, the con-

dition by which the penitent believer is placed where God has promised to bestow pardon upon him. It must be an act of faith in order to be New Testament baptism. Hence, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."—*Jesus*. Baptism is for remission of past sins in the sense of in order to forgiveness; just as faith and repentance are essential to forgiveness of sins, as we shall now proceed to prove. It is unquestionably certain that the sinner's state, or relation, must be changed in order to pardon and justification. He must attain to a relation which places him in proper position before God, in order to pardon. This change of relation is essential to pardon. Pardon is only promised to sinners in Christ; hence, what we mean by a change of state, is induction into Christ, "in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." Eph. 1:7. We are introduced into Christ by baptism, therefore baptism is essential to that change of relation which brings us into the redemption that is in Christ.

We now proceed to arrange and bring forward the arguments in support of the proposition that Christian baptism produces the change of state, or relation, of the penitent believer, and is, therefore, in order to the remission of past sins.

1. The first argument under this head is based upon the fact that salvation is offered to the world

in Christ only. This is important to the case in hand, and so much so that, if made out, we shall have no trouble whatever in settling the important place baptism occupies in the plan of salvation. In order to man's salvation, God has proposed to meet him in Christ, and there to reconcile man to himself, through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, once for all. To establish this position beyond the reach of controversy, we will now cite the plain passages which, bearing directly upon the question under consideration, will shorten this discussion.

2 Cor. 5 : 17-19 : "Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature : old things are passed away ; behold, all things are become new. And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation ; to-wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them ; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation."

Here Paul positively affirms "that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself;" so, you see, as we above stated, God proposes to meet the sinner "in Christ," and nowhere else. This is God's arrangement. This passage is sufficient, but we will cite others. This new creation is effected in Christ, and not out of Christ. Paul, in Eph. 2 : 10, says : "For we are his work-

manship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." This is the new state into which baptism brings us. Now, mind you, whatever act God has appointed for the purpose of bringing us into Christ—the one body, the church—is the act which changes our state. Don't lose sight of this important thought, as we prosecute the argument.

Eph. 1:3: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ." If our heavenly Father has made a deposit of all spiritual blessings "in Christ," it is quite evident that remission of sins—salvation from sin—is included. Whatever act, therefore, which brings us into Christ, brings us into "all spiritual blessings in the heavenly place."

Verse 7: "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." There is no need for an argument in favor of "remission in Christ," for here Paul plainly asserts it. It cannot be disputed. It is an established fact. The blood of Christ itself is represented as being deposited in Christ. It is by the blood of Christ we are saved, and that act which brings us into the body of Christ changes our state, and may be called the appropriating cause of our salvation, while the blood itself is the meritorious or procuring cause.

Again, Paul says: "There is therefore now no



condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." (Romans 8 : 1). What does this declaration imply to the careful reader? That all out of Christ are under condemnation. That is, persons capable of hearing, believing, and obeying the law of heaven. The "promises" of God are all "in Christ," the word of God plainly declares, and in order to reach them the sinner must take the steps necessary to that end.

Now, that salvation cannot be attained out of Christ, is, we think, abundantly manifest from the Scriptures already cited. From this conclusion there is no possible escape; we are logically forced to acknowledge that the position herein taken, respecting salvation being offered to the world "in Christ" only, is not only tenable, but absolutely true, because plainly stated by the inspired apostle of our Lord.

Paul, in Col. 1 : 13, 14, says : "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son, in whom [that is, in Christ] we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." This is salvation in Christ, dear reader, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," "for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

*II. Our second argument is drawn from the plain teaching of Christ and the apostles with regard to the manner in which penitent believers "put on Christ."*

This is certainly an important argument, and should be carefully and honestly considered. It is the more important since we have found that there is no salvation out of Christ. The reader's attention is at once called to the proof of this proposition: 1 Cor. 12:13: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." Here it is declared that the Corinthians were all baptized into one body; hence it is plain that the purpose of baptism is to translate us into the new state, or relation, into the one body—the church. This is a plain statement of the place baptism occupies in the process of regeneration. If persons could pray into Christ, or repent into Christ, or believe into Christ, it would have been so stated in the word of God. Reader, remember that Paul says that "redemption through his blood," is in Christ. (Eph. 1:7.) 1. Forgiveness of sins is in Christ. 2. Baptism introduces the penitent into Christ. 3. Therefore baptism is essential to forgiveness of sins. Some have tried to evade the obvious meaning of this passage by contending that Paul had the baptism of the Holy

Spirit in his mind when he said, "For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body." But this cannot be the meaning of the passage, for the following reasons, viz: (1) The Greek preposition *en* is employed to express *agency*, or *authority*; hence, by the authority of the one Spirit you were all baptized into the one body. (2) This would make the Holy Spirit both the element and administrator of the baptism of the Corinthians. This, you see, is absurd. (3) The work of the Holy Spirit in the regeneration of man is never called the baptism of the Spirit. (4) Besides, the baptism by the authority of the Holy Spirit, and being "made to drink into one spirit," are plainly distinguished one from the other, so that it must mean the baptism of the commission.

Gal. 3:27: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." This simply amounts to positive proof. To dispute our proposition—that in baptism the penitent believer puts on Christ—would flatly contradict this passage. There is no logical escape from this conclusion. Being "baptized into Christ," or "baptized into one body," is the same as being baptized into Christ's church, or kingdom.

John 3:5: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Here the penitent's admission into the kingdom, or church of Christ, is made to depend upon his being born of water and the Spirit.

The birth of water is baptism? The only birth of water known to the religion of Jesus Christ is baptism. The M. E. Discipline, Westminster and Cumberland Presbyterian confessions of faith, say this alludes to baptism. In connection with this we give Dr. Timothy Dwight, another Presbyterian author, on John 3:5: "To be born again is precisely the same thing as to be born of water and of the Spirit; and to be born of water is to be baptized; and he who understands the nature and authority of this institution, and refuses to be baptized, will never enter the visible or invisible kingdom of God."

George Whitfield: "Born of water and of the Spirit: Does not this verse urge the absolute necessity of baptism? Yes, when it may be had."—*Works, Vol. 4, p. 355.*

John Wesley, the father and founder of Methodism, on "Born of Water," says: "By water, then, as a means, the water of baptism, we are regenerated, or born again: whence it is also called by the apostle 'the washing of regeneration.'—*Doctrinal Tracts, published by order of the Methodist General Conference, pp. 248, 249.*

III. Our third argument is based upon the fact that *Christian baptism is for, or in order to, remission of past sins.*

This is but a plain, simple statement of an argument in favor of the position that baptism

changes the state of the penitent, or, in other words, introduces him into Christ, or the church of the first born. Now, the thoughtful reader can see without an effort how it is that baptism is for the remission of past sins, when he calls to mind the fact that we have shown by a preponderance of testimony that remission of sins is always effected "in Christ"; and that the purpose of Christian baptism is, as affirmed by the Scriptures, to bring us "into Christ."

Baptism is an appropriating or conditional cause of salvation or remission of sins. By baptism we appropriate to ourselves the promise of forgiveness, for which faith and repentance have fully prepared us as antecedents of baptism. Is this not too plain to be misunderstood? We think so. But to the law and the testimony.

Acts 2:38: "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

This text brings us into the great field of controversy, over which the advocates of sectism have fought, unsuccessfully, for years, in opposition to the doctrine stated above by the inspired Peter—that baptism is for remission of sins. This passage so directly associates baptism with the "remission of sins" as to preclude all idea of successful opposition. It is not a question of argument, it is simply a question of fact or authority. If

the Acts of the Apostles is a faithful record, then "baptism for the remission of sins" is made out, and if baptism does not hold this prominent place in the Christian system, this record is false. From this conclusion there is no getting away. To affirm the proposition that baptism is "for," or in order to, "remission of sins," is to affirm that the inspired apostle Peter told the truth, and to deny that proposition is to deny the truth of his statement! This statement by Peter is either true or false. Which way, Mr. Preacher, will you have it? You are at liberty, of course, to take either side of this question you choose. The one side places you along by the side of Peter, the other side—the negation—places you with the great army of opposers in battle array against the inspiration of God's word. Does any man dispute that repentance is for remission of sins? No. Very well, then, this passage makes "remission of sins" depend upon baptism precisely in the same sense that it does upon repentance. If, therefore, Peter commanded those Jews to "be baptized" "on account of remission," or "because of," as our opponents say, it follows that they were commanded to repent for the very same purpose!

Dr. Albert Barnes, a Presbyterian author of great note, says: "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ (*eis*) unto, or in order to, or with reference to, the remission of sins. That is, the repentance and baptism both have reference

to the remission of sins. This is the complete process appointed by God in connection with remission of sins.”—*Answer to J. B. Briney’s letter, August, 1870.* This is the utterance of an honest scholar. Presbyterians, what think you of the Doctor’s interpretation of Acts 2:38? You observe that the Doctor says, “repentance and baptism both have reference to the remission of sins.” What, therefore, repentance in this connection is for, baptism is for the same thing.

Dr. Hackett, a popular Baptist author, in his commentary on Acts, translates *eis aphasisin amarition*, “in order to the forgiveness of sins.”

Wesley says: “Baptism administered to real penitents is both a means and seal of pardon. Nor did God, ordinarily, in the primitive church, bestow this (pardon) on any unless through this means.”—*Wesley’s Notes.*

Certainly it is not claimed by us that baptism is essential to the remission of sins, unless the candidate be a penitent believer, and this is just what Mr. Wesley says. John Wesley was either wrong in his teaching on the design of baptism or the Methodists are now wrong, for they differ as widely from Wesley as they do from us.

Next we call the reader’s attention to Orchard’s History, which is a very prominent Baptist work, and is indorsed by Rev. J. R. Graves as the only work of the kind worthy of the name. Dr Orchard says: “The extraordinary circumstances

on the day of Pentecost occasioned many Jews congregating where the apostles and disciples met, at which time Peter opened to the Jews the gospel system of salvation. Three thousand felt the force of the truth, and confessed themselves convinced of the dignity and authority of Christ as the Messiah: and as a proof of their sincerity, and the submissive state of their minds to his commands, they arose, were baptized, and washed away their sins; and the same day were added unto the church. This church of Jerusalem was composed of those only who 'gladly received the word and were baptized.'—*Vol. 1, p. 6.*

How does this harmonize with Baptist teaching now? Modern Baptists are not only out of harmony with Christ and the apostles on the purpose of Christian baptism, but they are in direct opposition to the above from Dr. Orchard. Christ and his inspired apostles teach that baptism is for remission of past sins. The Baptist Church teaches that baptism is not for the remission of sins, but because of remission of sins. This amounts to a flat contradiction of the teaching of the New Testament.

The next witness we call upon the stand to testify as to the meaning of Acts 2:38 shall be Bishop Merrill, of the M. E. Church, who says: "Two brethren, whose judgment we respect, have called our attention to Acts 2:38, and suggested that some exegetical remarks upon it would be



acceptable to a great number of our readers. Desiring, as far as possible, to meet the demands laid upon us by our brethren, and believing nothing is lost by a dispassionate consideration of any portion of Scriptures, however much it may have been abused, we cheerfully comply with the request, and give our own view of this passage. It reads thus: 'Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.' The relation which baptism sustains to remission of sins is the point which calls for investigation. Upon this subject it is known that men widely differ, so that we can not express our own convictions without seeming to controvert the notions of others. But we must not refrain on this account. Those who differ from us are not so seriously troubled with modesty as to be unwilling to let it be known that they do not agree with us. \* \* \* This language must mean something; and, regardless of what others think, it becomes us to understand it, and have a place for it both in our doctrine and practice. It was the language of Peter, addressed to those who heard the gospel on the day of Pentecost, and were pricked in their hearts, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, 'Men and brethren, what shall we do?' The answer was given under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and was perfectly adapted to the case, and we hesitate not

to say that it is precisely the answer that ought now to be given to all who are in the same spiritual condition and make the same inquiry. What, then, was their condition? They were Jews. This fact will not be called in question. But we make no point on it, for the conditions of the gospel are precisely the same to Jews and Gentiles. They were penitents; of this there can be no doubt. They were pricked in their hearts. They had discovered that Jesus of Nazareth was indeed the Messiah; that he had risen from the dead, and that they were guilty of sin before God. Under this astounding conviction they inquired, 'What shall we do?' \* \* \* 'Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ,' pointed out the whole of the duty then pressing upon them. The design was that they might 'receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.' All they were exhorted to do looked to this end. Anything they might do would be valueless if this was not gained. But they were sinners, and they never could receive this 'gift of the Holy Spirit' until their sins were blotted out. No one ever received the gift of the Spirit while unpardoned. This was an impossibility. Hence the first duty of these penitents was to seek pardon. They must come to Christ, trust in him, receive him; for repentance and remission of sins was preached in his name. And all they did in coming to Christ was for remission. If they repented, that was 'for remission;' if they confessed

their sins, that was 'for remission,' and if they were baptized, that too was 'for remission.' But this covenant act was mentioned, as it implied and included the whole matter of renouncing sin and embracing Christ for salvation. It was, under these circumstances, a help to Christ. It was an outward means of pardon, as it was an outward means of coming to Christ that they might be justified by faith. Faith is the appropriating act, hence faith is imputed for righteousness. Therefore, whatever promotes faith and helps the sinner to Christ may be done by the penitent seeker 'for remission of sins.' We agree with Mr. Wesley on this point. He said that 'baptism administered to real penitents is both a means and seal of pardon.' It is more difficult to explain the sense in which it is a 'seal' than that in which it is a 'means,' but in the sense in which Mr. Wesley used these terms it is both. We therefore hold that when unbaptized persons become really penitent, and are willing to do all the gospel requires, they should 'be baptized for the remission of sins.' We see no reason for delaying baptism until their probation in the church expires; nor is there any scriptural grounds for withholding the ordinance from them until they profess pardon. The evidence or test of pardon is the gift of the Holy Spirit. None obtain this before pardon."

So much for Bishop Merrill's "exegetical remarks." This is indeed a lengthy quotation from

the Bishop, but we desire our Methodist friends to know how an honest scholar in their ranks interprets Acts 2 : 38. The Bishop denies that there is "any scriptural grounds for withholding the ordinance from" penitents "until they profess pardon." Nor does he find any "reason for delaying baptism until their probation in the church expires." But he says, "When unbaptized persons become really penitent, and are willing to do all the gospel requires, they should be baptized 'for the remission of sins.'" It follows from Bishop Merrill's interpretation of this disputed text that penitents must "be baptized for remission of sins," in order "to do all the gospel requires." Certainly the gospel requires the baptism of penitents in order to remission of sins. The passage in dispute teaches that repentance and baptism are both essential to forgiveness of sins. Whatever else may be required for the remission of sins, this passage teaches that both repentance and baptism are essential to that end. For it is now agreed by the leading scholars of the world that *eis* is connected with the two preceding verbs,—“repent” and “be baptized”—to denote the purpose or object in the action of these verbs. Hence, “repent” and “be baptized” for the purpose of remission of sins, or in order to remission of sins. All of our opponents agree that repentance is essential to remission of past sins, but are slow to believe that baptism is for that

purpose, but in the text now being considered they are both coupled for precisely the same purpose, viz., remission of sins. *Eis*, therefore, indicates the object of both the repentance and the baptism of the penitent Jews on the day of Pentecost.

IV. Our fourth argument is based upon the commission as recorded in Mark 16:16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved : but he that believeth not shall be damned."—*Jesus*.

Whatever else is essential to our salvation from sin, Jesus declares that the salvation of the sinner depends upon faith and baptism. Some brother among us gives the following rule for the conditions: "When salvation is promised to a person on certain named conditions, though it may depend on more conditions than those named, it can never depend on less." This rule is both reasonable and just, and no honest man will reject it. Now, the above passage names *faith* and *baptism* as conditions upon which Jesus offers salvation from sin. We have just seen that repentance and baptism, in Acts 2:38, are coupled together for the same purpose. This rule applies to both of these passages. While salvation, or forgiveness of sins, can depend on no less than faith in Christ and Christian baptism, it does in fact depend upon other conditions, for Acts 2:38 names repentance as a condition. When Jesus says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," he means just what he says. Here salvation is used in the

sense of salvation from sin, remission of sins, or forgiveness of sins. So you see, the sinner's salvation from sins is made to depend on baptism in the same sense it depends on faith. They are therefore both necessary to salvation from past sins. This is a plain and pointed proof, and from the conclusion there is no escape. These are the words of Jesus Christ. It was his right to fix the terms of forgiveness and it is our duty to submit to them.

Let us compare this statement of Jesus with the teaching of the Baptists on the design of baptism.

*First.* Baptists tell us that baptism is not in order to remission of past sins, but that persons are saved from their sins before baptism, and therefore without baptism; that baptism was not commanded to be obeyed by any except those who are previously saved. The Baptists therefore render the language of Jesus thus: "He that believeth and is saved shall be baptized." But Jesus has it this way: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." How do they compare? This is a fair test of Baptist teaching on the design of baptism. Our Baptist friends are badly off the track right here. This, however, is true of all the sects. They are all in the same boat on this subject.

V. Our fifth argument is drawn from the following statement from the Apostle Peter: "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 Christ." 1 Pet. 3:21.

We are not disposed to spend much time on this passage, but will allow such men as Wesley and Watson to settle the meaning of the text.

Peter declares that "baptism saves us." Now, this is either true or false. If the New Testament is the word of God, the statement is true. And how dare our religious neighbors to deny this statement and at the same time claim the word of God as their only means of salvation? This is a mystery. Wesley says on this passage: "That is, through the water of baptism we are saved from the sin which overwhelms the world as a flood."—*Wesley's Notes*.

Dr. Clark says on this passage: "He who is faithful to his baptismal covenant, taking God through Christ, by the eternal Spirit, for his portion, is saved here from his sins," etc.

Commenting on 1 Pet. 3:21, Watson says: "It is thus that we see how St. Peter preserves the correspondence between the act of Noah in preparing the ark as an act of faith by which he was justified, and the act of submitting to Christian baptism, which is obviously an act of faith, in order to remission of sins or the obtaining a good conscience before God."—*Institutes*,

*Vol. 3, pp. 624, 625.* Watson is good Methodist authority. Will Methodists accept him? Reader, you see that the ablest men ever known to belong to the Methodist Church make just as much of baptism as we do. "Baptism doth now save us if we live answerable thereto," etc.—*Wesley*.

*VI. Baptism the washing of regeneration.*  
Tit. 3:5: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost."

Since we have already clearly defined baptismal regeneration, and also have clearly shown who are the guilty parties; that is, those in the religious world absolutely guilty of teaching baptismal regeneration, we proceed at once to the investigation of this text. Baptism is certainly meant by the washing, or bath, of this text. This is the concurrent testimony of the scholars of the whole religious world. The washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit, and also regeneration itself, are clearly and forcibly distinguished the one from the other. Neither the washing of this passage nor the renewing of the Holy Spirit is regeneration. The passage teaches plainly that God saves us through this washing, which belongs to regeneration, the genitive case, expressed by the English *of*, denoting possession. So, it must be borne in mind that regeneration is one thing, and the wash-



ing is another, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit still another. But it is declared that regeneration has a washing attached to it, and a renewing of the Holy Spirit, by which sinners are said to be saved. Now, regenerated means the same thing as the new birth, or "born of water and of the Spirit." Jno. 3:5. Let us compare these two statements. The "washing" in Titus 3:5, corresponds to the "water" of John 3:5, and the "renewing of the Holy Spirit," corresponds to "Spirit" in the last named text.

Then regeneration has a *washing*, and what shall we call it? Call it what you will, it is essential to the process of regeneration and in order to the salvation of man. It is the baptism of the commission. This is the only washing of New Testament Christianity.

John Wesley says it is "the laver of regeneration." Clark says: "Undoubtedly the apostle here means baptism." Dr. Wall says: "The washing of regeneration (Tit. 3:5) is the washing of baptism." The scholarship of the world says it means baptism. Well, suppose we grant it, then what? Nothing, only baptism is essential to salvation from sin; that's all. Baptism is the consummating act of faith in the process of regeneration. The *last* act; the act by which we are inducted into Christ. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Gal. 3:27.

“And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.” Acts 22:16. Wesley, in commenting on this passage, says: “Baptism administered to real penitents is both a means and seal of pardon. Nor did God ordinarily in the primitive Church bestow this on any unless through this means.”

John Calvin says: “Therefore, those who have imagined that baptism is nothing more than a mark or sign by which we profess our religion before men, as soldiers wear the insignia of their sovereign as a mark of their profession, have not considered that which was the principal thing in baptism; which is, that we ought to receive it with this promise, ‘He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.’ The man who believes in Christ, and repents of his sins and is baptized, is regenerated, or born again, of water and the Spirit. He is saved within the meaning of the promise of this passage. May God in his goodness bless all who thus bow to the authority of the Christ. Amen.

## THREE BAPTISMS.

*"I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire."—Matt. 3:11.*

Perhaps this will be considered a strange text and a very strange discourse to be found published in a book of sermons, but nevertheless the subject is one of vital interest and deserves our most serious consideration. The discussion of this peculiar text is a necessity growing out of the use our religious neighbors make of the passage. This passage is employed to support a number of modern fallacies. The reckless manner in which it is interpreted obscures the work of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of man, and hides from view the place Christian baptism occupies in the law of pardon.

Some have taken advantage of the seeming obscurity of this passage to bolster false theories of the Spirit's work and of baptism. For these reasons alone the discussion becomes one of great interest to all thoughtful readers. This passage is employed to support the unscriptural dogma of the immediate, direct and supernatural operation of the Holy Spirit on the hearts of men and women in conversion and regeneration. Men

claim to have been baptized in the Holy Ghost and fire, and cite this passage in proof. But to the unprejudiced mind this passage teaches nothing of the kind; nor does any other passage in the word of God teach that persons are baptized in the Holy Spirit and in fire. This is the only verse in the whole Bible that contains *three* baptisms. Now, in order that we may reach correct conclusions, in the investigation of these baptisms, we propose to examine each one of the three baptisms separately, and also to examine each in its parts. This we believe is the proper method for this discussion, and the only method by which to determine the real meaning of the passage. The following are the three baptisms of the text:

1. Baptism of John.
2. Baptism of the Holy Spirit.
3. Baptism of fire.

These are evidently three separate and distinct baptisms. The language of the text demands this, and especially when we examine it in the light of the context. Let us now examine the essential elements of these baptisms, taking them in the same order they are found in the text.

*I. Baptism of John.* This was a baptism *in water*. This was a baptism of command, and could be obeyed or disobeyed; and those who rejected it are charged with "rejecting the counsel of God against themselves." This baptism in its parts stands thus: (1) John the Baptist was the *ad-*

*minister*; (2) Water was the element in which it was performed; (3) Believing Jews were the subjects; (4) To prepare the Jews to receive Christ was the object, or design, of this baptism.

*II. Baptism of the Holy Spirit.* This was a baptism *in spirit*. This was a baptism of promise, and could be *received*, but it could not be obeyed, because promises can *not* be obeyed. In this particular this baptism differs from the Baptism of John. This baptism in its parts stands thus: (1) Jesus Christ was the administrator; (2) The Holy Spirit was the element in which this baptism was performed; (3) The apostles were the subjects of this baptism; (4) To qualify the apostles to publish the unsearchable riches of Jesus Christ to all the world for the obedience of faith, was the object of this baptism.

*III. Baptism of fire.* This is a baptism *in fire*. This baptism, unlike either of the others, is neither a promise nor a command, but a *threat*. And when we examine this baptism in its parts, as we have the other two, we find, (1) Christ is the administrator; (2) *Fire* is the element in which this baptism is to be performed; (3) The wicked Jews who rejected Christ—the “chaff”—the unfruitful “tree”—are the subjects of the baptism of fire. (4) The punishment of the ungodly, the design, or object.

John the Immerser is the administrator of the first baptism in this text, and Christ is the admin-

istrator of the other two. The first of these three baptisms—John's baptism—belongs the other side of the cross. The second—the baptism of the Holy Spirit—belongs to the first Pentecost after the ascension of Christ. The third and last baptism of these three—baptism of fire—belongs to the “appointed day, in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man (Christ the Administrator) whom he hath ordained.” The first is a command, the second is a promise, the third is a threat. The subjects of the first were those who received Christ; the subjects of the second were those who published Christ and his claims on humanity to the world; the subjects of the third, were those who rejected Christ because they hated him without a cause.

The baptism of John ceased with the death of Christ, because the object for which it had been established had then been accomplished. The baptism of the Holy Spirit, spoken of in the text, belonged exclusively to the apostolic age of the church, or in other words, to the age of miracles, and ceased for the very same reason—namely, because the purpose of it had been accomplished. It is believed by some that every one's salvation depends upon his being baptized in the Holy Spirit. This is a miserable religious blunder. In the first place, the work of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of sinners is not once in all the Bible called the baptism of the Spirit. Let the reader remember

this. Secondly, the baptism of the Holy Spirit was only promised to the apostles; and thirdly, Jesus emphatically said the world could not receive the Holy Spirit in this form. (See John 14: 16, 17.) The only cases of Holy Spirit baptism on record are found in Acts. On the day of Pentecost is the first, and at the house of Cornelius the second case. There are no others. And in both of these cases we find the same effects, that is, both of these baptisms were attended by miracles. The baptism of the Holy Spirit, in the very nature of things, is connected with miraculous demonstrations, and no man can divorce them. The ignorance of the modern clergy is never so fully manifested as it is in their praying to God for a "baptism in the Holy Ghost and fire." Now, the import of such a petition is simply this: "O God, immerse us in the Holy Ghost, and then burn us up with unquenchable fire!"

Beginning at the verse preceding our text, John says: "And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire." From this verse we learn that John was addressing a mixed multitude of people, and that he compares them to an orchard of trees; some were fruit-bearing trees and others unfruitful trees. Now, this is a grand and instructive metaphor, which determines the character of John's hearers, and also that judgment—

the axe—should rest upon individuals regardless of their nationality, that the unfruitful trees should be cut down by the axe of judgment and cast into the fire. Now, omitting the text, the next verse fully explains the whole matter. “Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.”

From this passage we learn the same lesson, namely, that John's audience was a mixed multitude. By reference to the ancient method of separating chaff from the wheat, John clearly enforces the thought of this lesson upon our minds. “But he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.” The wheat represents the good, the chaff represents the bad, the same persons who are spoken of as subjects of the baptism in fire. Prof. J. W. McGarvey says in his commentary on Matthew: “It is clearly the wicked who are to be baptized in fire, and the fulfillment of the prediction will be realized when they are cast into the lake of fire.” (Rev. 22 : 15.)

The connection between the baptism in the Holy Spirit and the baptism in fire has been supposed by some to teach that the fire in the passage represents the purifying influence of the Holy Spirit, and that the whole thing was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost. But this is not in harmony with either the language of the text itself or



the context. Besides, there was no fire on the occasion of the apostles' baptism in the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, but "cloven tongues like as of fire."

A thorough examination of the context will convince any fair minded reader that fire is here employed as a *symbol* of punishment, as it is in many other passages. The language of the text very plainly describes the character of John's hearers. *Trees* stand for persons; the fruitful tree represents the good, the unfruitful the bad. The wheat and chaff are employed for the enforcement of the same thought. Those represented by the "chaff," to be "burned up with unquenchable fire," or, immersed in fire, were the enemies of Jesus Christ, a "generation of vipers."

A word on the subjects of Holy Spirit baptism. Who were the subjects of the baptism in the Holy Spirit? This is indeed a very important question to settle now. A right understanding of the plan of salvation as preached by the apostles to both Jews and Gentiles largely depends upon the settlement of this question. We can not conceive how a man can understand the plan of salvation who does not know the object of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. And it is certain that a correct knowledge of the object depends largely upon our knowledge of the subjects.

Now, in our effort to determine who are the subjects of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, we cite a

passage from Prof. McGarvey's commentary on Acts, which, perhaps, is the most comprehensive statement of Scripture teaching on the subject to be found in books. He says :

“It is important to determine who are the parties declared by Luke to be ‘all with one accord in one place;’ for upon this depends the question whether the whole hundred and twenty disciples, or only the twelve apostles, were filled with the Holy Spirit. The words are almost uniformly referred, by commentators, to the hundred and twenty. Any one who will read the first four verses of this chapter (Acts. 2nd ch.), noticing the connection of the pronoun ‘they,’ which occurs in each of them, will see, at a glance, that it has, throughout, the same antecedent, and therefore, all the parties said in the first verse to be together in one place, are said in the fourth to be filled with the Holy Spirit, and to speak in other tongues. The question, then, Who were filled with the Holy Spirit? depends upon the reference of the pronoun ‘they’ in the statement, ‘They were all together in one place.’ Those who suppose that the whole hundred and twenty are referred to, have to go back to the fifteenth verse of the preceding chapter to find the antecedent. But, if we obliterate the unfortunate separation between the first and second chapters, and take the last verse of the former into its connection with the latter, we will find the true and obvious

antecedent much nearer at hand. It would read thus: 'The lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered together with the eleven apostles. And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. It is indisputable that the antecedent to *they* is the term *apostles*; and it is merely the division of the text into chapters, severing the close grammatical connection of the words, which has hid this most obvious fact from commentators and readers. The apostles alone therefore, are said to have been filled with the Holy Spirit. This conclusion is not only evident from the context, but it is required by the very terms of the promise concerning the Holy Spirit."

The grammatical construction forbids not only the foolish use the sects make of this passage, making the whole world subjects of Holy Spirit baptism, but it also excludes all of the hundred and twenty on the day of Pentecost, save the twelve apostles. That the text contains three separate and distinct baptisms, is settled, we think, to the entire satisfaction of our readers. Now, Paul tells us that there is but *one* baptism that remains. This is the baptism of the commission, the one baptism of Paul, by which Peter says, we are saved. Now, in conclusion let us analyze the baptism of the commission as we have the three baptisms of our text. It was instituted by

Jesus Christ and was given to the world by the inspired apostles.

1. The preacher of the gospel of Christ is the administrator.

2. Water is the element.

3. Penitent believers, and not babies, are the subjects.

4. The remission of past sins is the design.  
(See Acts 2 : 38 : Mark 16 : 16.)

## BAPTISTS ON THE DESIGN OF BAPTISM

The writer has been asked a great many times, "What is the difference between Baptists and Disciples on the design of baptism?" While there is an important difference, it does not appear to be understood by the people at large. And this fact alone is a sufficient apology for this discussion. There is a difference that is real, not imaginary, and the purpose of this discussion is not to magnify that difference, but to fairly and honestly state the difference, and to determine by the word of God, which, if either, is right in their teaching on the design of baptism. The design of Christian baptism is an important subject, and should be candidly and logically discussed in the light of the Holy Scriptures in order that we may have right conceptions of the gospel system of salvation.

By the *design* of baptism we mean the object, end, or purpose, for which persons are called upon to be baptized. What are we required to be baptized for? What is its design? Why should persons be baptized? These are the questions that now concern us. We shall endeavor to fairly state Baptist teaching on this subject. It would not be possible for us to correctly state the views

Baptists hold on the design of immersion, but for the fact that these views have been stated by Baptists themselves. It is very common, in the field of controversy, for an opponent to try to break down a cause or position by overstatement, to make it look ridiculous, and thus to prejudice the minds of the people against it. But since the Baptists have stated their own views of the design of baptism, there need be no mistake in this matter.

We have met a few able representative men in Baptist ranks in public discussion, and know therefore, just what they teach on this subject. Truly, Baptists do not differ from the common sects of this country on the design of baptism. The only advantage they have over the sects in general, on the whole question of baptismal controversy, is in the *action* of baptism. While Baptists are strongly apostolic on the action of baptism, earnestly contending for the one immersion of the apostolic age of the church, their teaching on the design of baptism is unquestionably erroneous. It is a question whether Baptists are any nearer right on the subject of baptism in general than Methodists or Presbyterians. Immersion, to be sure, is essential to Bible baptism, but Bible baptism means much more than immersion. Those who accept immersion as apostolic baptism, so far as the action is concerned, and then reject the New Testa-

ment design of baptism, are but little ahead of sprinklers, after all. You may approach a Baptist minister on the subject of the design of baptism, and ask him plainly what he baptizes people for, what the purpose of baptism is, and you will find him disposed to evade the question, by telling you what baptism is not for. They can all tell you what baptism is not for, and none of them can answer the question, What is the design of baptism? It is argued by some that the real difference between us and the Baptists, on this subject, is simply a *chronological* one. This is a grand mistake.

There is another matter of difference between Disciples and Baptists that might be called simply a chronological difference; that is the setting up of the kingdom, or Church of Christ, during the life time of John the Baptist. There is also a slight chronological difference between us and the Methodist Church that is measured by all the time that elapsed between the covenant God made with Abraham and the day of Pentecost. To say the difference between us and Baptists on the design of baptism is simply a chronological one, is a glaring misrepresentation of the known facts. Let us be honest. We know better than that. It makes no kind of difference when Baptists baptize, they utterly refuse to baptize "for the remission of sins." The utter rejection of the design of baptism is a vast deal more than a mere question

of chronology. Loyalty to the law of Christ demands that the design of an institution, when plainly stated by inspired men, must be recognized as well as its mode. A man might contend that he had fully accepted Christ as the divine Son of God, but refuse to accept the design of his mission to earth—to seek and to save that which was lost—with just as much propriety. Jewish infidelity is largely the outgrowth of a little chronological difference.

We will now notice briefly some of the mistakes of Baptist teaching on the design of baptism.

I. Baptists deny that baptism has any connection whatever with forgiveness or remission of sins. This is the teaching of all the Baptists. Now, we ask, does not this denial involve the denial of the plainest and most emphatic declarations of Jesus Christ and his apostles on this subject? Yes; nothing is more certain. Now we shall proceed to prove the fallacy of this position by the word of God itself. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," etc. (Mark 16:16.) Here baptism is a condition of salvation from sin, and is therefore connected with the sinner's remission of sins. Baptist theology disputes this passage. On this text, Prof. J. W. McGarvey says: "In the statement, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,' the salvation promised must include at least the for-



giveness of sins, whatever it may be supposed to include in addition to this. It really includes no more than this, and is equivalent to the promise of pardon to all who believe and are baptized."

The reader can see without an effort that Jesus places baptism in such a connection with remission of sins, or salvation from sins, that remission is made to depend upon baptism precisely in the same sense that it is to depend upon faith. This connection is made by Jesus, and cannot be broken without destroying the connection between *faith* and *salvation*. Will our Baptist friends examine this argument? But what is the Baptist use of this passage? How do they dispose of it? Simply by denying it. We will give the reader an illustration of Baptist teaching and practice as respects this passage, by giving the passage in close connection with Baptist teaching on the subject, thus :

1. "*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.*"—*Jesus*.

2. "*He that believeth and is saved shall be baptized.*"—*Baptists*.

This is a correct representation of Baptist teaching, for they earnestly contend that persons must be saved before they can be subjects of baptism. Here they are proven guilty of transposing the commission given by Mark; that is, changing the order of the terms of remission of sins, by

putting baptism in the place occupied by "saved," and bringing back the word "saved" to take the place of "baptized." Thus, they transpose the authority of Jesus Christ out of the New Testament, as to the place Christian baptism occupies in the plan of salvation. This is indeed a grave charge, but is nevertheless true.

II. Baptists deny that baptism belongs to the law of pardon. They claim that it is an item of worship in the church, to be observed by those who are recognized in the Scriptures as saved and justified—Christians. They place baptism with prayer, praise and the Lord's supper. Here our Baptist friends are badly off the track. Baptists teach that sinners are pardoned *before* they are baptized, and hence that baptism has nothing to do with remission of sins. But Christ and his apostles teach that sinners are not pardoned until *after* baptism. That is the difference. On this proposition we challenge controversy. Baptist teaching on the design of baptism is contradictory.

Now, we ask, if baptism, as Baptists teach, is an item of church worship, and as an institution, belongs on the inside of the church of God, why do they not baptize persons *repeatedly*? Can any man lay his hand on a single item or practice in the church, that is not commanded to be done repeatedly? Not one. This makes it evident that baptism is *not* an item of

worship *in* the church. Besides, if baptism is an item of church worship, as Baptists teach, then it follows that aliens, unpardoned persons, compose the church of God, for baptism is commanded for remission of sins. Baptism belongs to the law of induction into the church of Christ, and as persons enter into the church but *once*, they are baptized but *once*. Baptists, you see, make Peter command the saints on Pentecost to repent and be baptized for the remission of sins. (Acts 2: 38.) These saints are not only without salvation, but they are also without the Holy Spirit as well. Baptists, according to their theory of baptism, baptize Christians, but Christ and the apostles teach us to baptize penitent believers, in order that they may be inducted into Christ, and thus become Christians. No man can read the commission by Matthew carefully without seeing the fallacy of Baptist teaching. "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." This is said with reference to the alien, and when he believes and is baptized, then the other part of the commission applies to him, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," etc. (Matt. 28: 19, 20.) But baptism is found in that part of the commission which relates to the unsaved.

III. Baptists will not accept any into their fellowship without baptism. Again we say, Bap-

tist teaching is contradictory. 1. They tell us that sinners are saved *before* they are baptized, and therefore saved without baptism. 2. But they will not fellowship them until *after* they are baptized. They are not allowed to commune with any such. How is this to be explained? On the ground that Baptists are harder to please than Christ? If Christ accepts a man as saved and justified before he is baptized, why may not the Baptists? Must a man do more to become a Baptist than a Christian?

This is an acknowledgment that a man may become a Christian without becoming a Baptist. Christianity, therefore, is one thing and Baptistism is another. The Baptist Church, according to this acknowledgment, is not essential to any one's salvation. If the sinner is pardoned and justified by faith, and without baptism, and therefore accepted of God, why do Baptists make so much of baptism? If baptism, as they teach, is not essential to the sinner's forgiveness, why do Baptists spend so much of their time in criticising the denominations that sprinkle? The manner in which Methodists and Presbyterians treat the subject of baptism is less objectionable to-day than the Baptist idea.

With Methodists and Presbyterians a drop of water is as good as an ocean; but with the Baptists *much water* is essential to baptism, and when they are done with it, baptism is essential to *noth-*

*ing!* According to the Baptist theory of baptism the only thing baptism can do for a man is to make a Baptist of him. Baptism cuts no figure in the salvation of the sinner except what it does in and through the Baptist Church. That is, no man can be a Baptist without baptism, and none can be saved outside the Baptist Church; baptism, therefore, is only essential through the Baptist Church. Of course, many of our Baptist friends do not believe this foolish idea, but all Rayites do, and some others.

IV. *Baptists deny that baptism is for remission of sins.* It is now a question with a great many honest persons as to how much is involved in this Baptistic negation. This is evidently a serious matter. We boldly affirm that this negation flatly contradicts the teaching of Christ and his apostles on the design of baptism. This is a very grave affirmation, but the question is, can it be sustained? We will prove this affirmation by the word of God, or acknowledge our weakness.

If the Scriptures prove any thing, they prove that the Baptists are not only mistaken on the design of baptism, but that their teaching flatly contradicts the gospel of Jesus Christ. We will now proceed to bring forward the proof, so that the reader may see for himself the fallacy of Baptist teaching on this all-important subject. First, we invite the reader's attention directly to the language of Christ, in Mark 16:16: "He that be-

lieveth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." This is a plain statement as to the place baptism occupies in the law of pardon, and it is equally as plain as to what baptism has to do in the sinner's salvation from his past sins. Now, one of two things must be true, either Christ did not mean what he here declares, or the Baptists are wrong in their teaching. Which is it? There is no escape from this conclusion. Let the Baptists examine this passage carefully.

Next, we call attention to Peter's sermon on the occasion of the opening of the gospel system of salvation to the Jews, on the day of Pentecost, in Acts 2:38. When the preaching of the apostles pierced them "in their heart," the Jews exclaimed, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Here, now, we have the design of baptism plainly stated by an inspired apostle, who says he preached the gospel with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven. Will this not settle the question? With this passage before us, we are bold to affirm that Christ and Peter both flatly contradict the Baptist idea of the design of baptism. Peter declares that baptism is "for the remission of sins," but the Baptists declare it is

*not* for the remission of sins. Which shall we accept? The reader has his choice.

Paul, in narrating his conversion, says that God's chosen preacher commanded, "And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Acts 22:16. Peter also says, "Baptism doth also now save us."

Now, reader, what are we to do with these plain and pointed statements? They are either true or false. If these Scriptures are to settle the matter as to the design of baptism, then we are bound before God and man to reject the Baptist idea. Certainly, we are driven to the Scriptures which speak of baptism, in order to ascertain just what its design is. We have cited a few of them and have found that the design of baptism is, "for the remission of sins."

This, however, is not the only blunder in Baptist teaching, but it is certainly a very grave mistake; nor is the Baptist Church the only church guilty of this miserable blunder on the design of baptism. In conclusion, the reader's attention is called to a brief summary of the points of difference between Baptists and Christians:

1. Baptists teach that the Holy Spirit operates on the hearts of sinners in their conversion, directly and independently of the word of God.

Christians teach that the Holy Spirit puts forth his power to save sinners *through* the word of God. They deny the Baptist idea of *abstract operation*.

2. Baptists teach that repentance comes *before* faith; that sinner's can not believe *before* repentance. Christians teach that faith in the Lord Jesus Christ is the first step towards remission of sins. (Heb. 11 : 6; Mark 16 : 16.)

3. Baptists teach that immersion is an item of worship *in* the church, to be observed only by Christians. Christians teach that immersion belongs to the law of induction into Christ (Gal. 3 : 27-29), and is, therefore, a condition of pardon. (Jno. 3 : 5; Acts 2 : 38; Mark 16 : 16). And for this reason, they claim that immersion is not to be repeated, claiming that if immersion is an item of worship *in* the church, like prayer and the Lord's supper, we would have to immerse repeatedly, as all items of church worship are commanded to be done repeatedly.

4. Baptists say that immersion is *not* "for remission of sins," but "*because of* remission of sins." Christians, or Disciples, say immersion is "for the remission of sins." (Acts 2 : 38.) Christians claim that Baptist teaching on this subject contradicts the teaching of Christ and the apostles.

5. Christians read, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16 : 16.) Bap-



tists read, "He that believeth and is saved shall be baptized." Don't fail to read the Scriptures cited above.

6. Christians will not accept persons into fellowship with them without immersion, because immersion is essential to admission into the body or church of Christ. Baptists will not fellowship persons without immersion, yet they claim Christ accepts persons without immersion. It is at this point that Disciples hold that according to Baptist teaching, Baptists are harder to please than Christ. This is an inconsistency in Baptist theology that no man on earth can reconcile. If Baptists believe that persons are pardoned and justified before baptism, how dare they reject unbaptized persons? These are some of the points of difference between Baptists and Disciples. The reader can see just what must be done before a union can be effected between these two large bodies of people.

7. Another point of difference is, the Baptists support a human creed. Disciples stand on the word of God alone.

8. "Baptist Church" is a sectarian name, unauthorized by the word of God. Christians, or Disciples, reject all human creeds and names.

We have aimed to fairly and honestly discuss the differences between the Baptists and our own people, and if we are criticised we are prepared to prove each and every position taken in this

discussion from standard works by Baptist authors.

## THE ETERNITY OF PUNISHMENT.

“*And these shall go away into eternal punishment; but the righteous into eternal life.*”—*Matt. 25 : 46.*

We have chosen this language of Jesus as a text for a discourse on the subject of the final destiny of the wicked. It is the purpose of this discourse to discuss the duration of the punishment of the wicked after death. In the settlement of this question we shall strictly adhere to the Scriptures of divine truth. Do the Scriptures teach that the wicked shall suffer eternal punishment? It is not a question of *future* punishment, for even Universalists themselves agree that the Scriptures teach future punishment, but they deny the eternity of that punishment. Hence, it is purely a question of the *eternity* of future punishment.

However, before we enter upon the discussion of the eternity of punishment, we desire to call the attention of the reader to the history of Universalism in this country. Our object in this is to give the reader a better understanding of the opposition with which we must contend in this investigation.

Universalism is of modern invention; as a system of religion it dates no earlier than 1770, when Murry came to this country. Universalism, virtually, is the invention of Mr. Murry. Notwith-

standing Ballou, in his "Ancient History of Universalism," speaks of Origen, Clement of Alexandria, and others of early times, as being Universalists; but the statement is false; these men did not believe in universal salvation. John Murry is styled the "father of Universalism," and it is evident that the child is not older than its father. And if we were to undertake to trace modern Universalism to its origin, it will be found to be a thing of very recent date, indeed. Universalism has recently changed base. The doctrines of John Murry and H. Ballou are not believed by modern Universalists; they have not a single advocate in all this country. And we are not ignorant as to the cause of this wonderful change. Dr. Fishback, once a very prominent preacher among the Universalists, says, "Alexander Hall killed *fogy* Universalism thirty years ago." Hall's work entitled "Universalism Against Itself" was what created the necessity for a radical change.

Universalism, as revamped by Balfour, denied, (1) the existence of hell; (2) the existence of the devil; (3) the immortality of the soul; (4) the resurrection of the body; (5) the second coming of Christ. All idea of future punishment was regarded as a "relic of heathenism," and "God a merciless tyrant," provided the doctrine of future punishment be true. But how is it now? Now they believe, yea, they declare that the Scriptures teach both future punishment and the existence of

a devil! Well, they have made one step towards what they are pleased to style orthodox hell.

We are certain that if Universalists now will try their hand on "Universalism Against Itself," since Dr. Hall has revised it, they will get there with both feet. The way the matter now stands, Universalism is wonderfully spread out; it stands with one foot on the threshold of an orthodox *hell*, while the other rests in the gateway to Catholic *purgatory*.

The characteristic features of Universalism, since the arrival of John Murry in this country—in fact, from the time of its birth—have been vacillation and doubt. It is purely a system of negation. It affirms but little, but denies everything; it has no faith, but it is full of doubt and unbelief. It is a gloomy theory of doubts, and all it can possibly do for sinners is to furnish a palliation for their sins in the form of a *placebo*.

Universalists have made one fatal mistake in their logic for which the people now are well prepared; that is, they argue that the truth of universal salvation depends upon their success in disproving the eternity of punishment. This by no means follows. If we were to grant now at the start that the word of God is as silent on eternal punishment as a grave-yard, this would not prove the truth of universal salvation. It does not necessarily follow that because the Bible does not teach eternal punishment Universalism must be

true. But the Bible does most emphatically teach eternal punishment, in language that none need misunderstand.

Now, the reader's attention is called back to the subject in hand: "And these shall go away into eternal punishment; but the righteous into eternal life."—*Jesus*.

The chapter from which we have chosen our text, beginning at the 31st verse and running down to the end of the chapter, contains a graphic description of the final judgment of the world, from which we learn—

1. That the judgment is to take place at the second, or final coming of Christ. This connects the judgment and punishment of the wicked with the second coming of Christ. That the final coming of Christ is meant (verse 31) is proved by the following points, which distinguish the final coming of Christ from his first: (1) He will "come in his glory;" (2) That "all the holy angels" he will bring "with him;" (3) That he will then "sit on the throne of his glory."

2. It shows that Jesus Christ is to be the Judge of quick and dead at that time.

3. It shows that all nations shall be gathered before Christ, to be judged according to the deeds done in the body.

4. It shows that the judgment "will bring a just sentence upon both parties, by giving justly to those who have done well an everlasting fru-

ition ; but allotting to the lovers of wicked works eternal punishment.”

Here Jesus assigns the reason for this awful separation at the final judgment. The bad are represented as utterly ignoring Christ by ignoring the conditions of their acceptance with Christ. The good are those who had accepted Christ by accepting the conditions upon which he offers eternal life. Hence, the final decision: “And these shall go away into eternal punishment ; but the righteous into eternal life.” The very fact that eternal salvation is conditional, renders this whole matter plain and simple to the reader. Paul says: “Though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered ; and having been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation ; named of God a high priest after the order of Melchizedek.” Heb. 5 : 8, 9.

The reader will observe that in the King’s Translation of our text, the two terms, *everlasting* and *eternal*, are both from the same Greek word, and therefore mean the same thing. But in the Revised Version the Greek word, *aionion*, from which we have both *everlasting* and *eternal*, is translated by the one English term, “*eternal*.” Now, we have “*eternal punishment*” in the first clause of this sentence, and “*eternal life*” in the second, both uttered by the lips of Christ in the same sentence, in the same breath. The

rule is, that a term when repeated in the same sentence, must have the same meaning. Whatever, therefore, the term "eternal" means when applied to the duration of punishment, it must mean the same thing when applied to life. If it means unlimited life on the part of the righteous, it means unlimited punishment on the part of the wicked. There is no escape from this conclusion. This passage for this reason proves the eternity of punishment. So far as our text is concerned, it is absolutely declared that the punishment of the wicked after death is *unlimited* or *eternal*.

We are willing that the whole argument shall turn upon this passage and the uniform use made of the term eternal—*aionion*—in the Christian Scriptures. By what authority do Universalists claim that the term eternal is unlimited when applied to the righteous, but limited when applied to punishment? Just none under the heavens! This is not argument, but miserable pettifoggery; the most that can be said for it is that it is purely *philological nonsense!* To further prove the eternity of punishment, we call the reader's critical attention to the use made of this term by Christ and the apostles in the New Testament.

1. The word eternal is applied to God. "Now to him that is able to stablish you according to my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery which



hath been kept in silence through times eternal, but now is manifested, and by the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the eternal God, is made known unto all the nations unto obedience of faith," etc. Rom. 16: 25, 26. Here the endlessness of God's duration is measured by the same word that is employed to measure the duration of future punishment. *Eternal* means unlimited duration, therefore.

2. It is applied to the Holy Spirit. "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" Heb. 9:14.

3. It is applied to the happiness of the saved after death. (Matt. 25:46.)

4. It is applied to the punishment of the wicked after death. (Matt. 25:46.)

Thus you see that the eternity of God, of the Holy Spirit, of the happiness of the righteous, and the punishment of the wicked, is measured by the same term. The eternity of these persons and things is determined by the same term. Thus we learn the New Testament *use* of the term. You have the same right to doubt the eternity of God, or the happiness of the righteous, that you have to question the eternity of future punishment.

Again we insist that the Universalists are miserably unfair when they argue that eternal means eternal when applied to the future salvation of the

righteous, but it means something else when applied to punishment! Have they ever presented the world with the rule for such an interpretation? Have they ever offered a reason for such an interpretation? No; they have done neither. Simply because there can be no reason found for their unwarranted use of the Scriptures.

Our next argument is based upon Matt. 10 : 28 : “And be not afraid of them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul : but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.” From this passage we learn—

1. That as the soul cannot be “killed” with the body, the soul survives the death of the body ; and both soul and body being “destroyed in hell,” shows that hell—*gehenna*—denotes future punishment, which is inflicted upon the wicked at the judgment, and after the re-union of soul and body at the great resurrection day.

2. That notwithstanding the danger to which these disciples would expose themselves in going abroad to proclaim the gospel of the kingdom, the opposition could only “kill the body,” but they were to fear to displease God by refusing to perform this duty which would subject them to the danger of suffering the destruction of both soul and body in hell.

3. The word *hell*, in this passage, is not *hades*, the intermediate, but *gehenna*, the place of future punishment.

Our next argument is drawn from Luke 13:23-27: "And one said unto him, Lord, are they few that be saved? And he said unto them, Strive to enter in by the narrow door: for many, I say unto you, shall seek to enter in, and shall not be able. When once the master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, open to us; and he shall answer and say to you, I know you not whence ye are; then shall ye begin to say, We did eat and drink in thy presence, and thou didst teach in our streets; and he shall say, I tell you, I know not whence ye are; depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity."

1. The "kingdom of God," whose "door" is to be "shut" against "all workers of iniquity," while they "stand without," is the eternal kingdom of glory, the future home of the saved. This is manifest from the 28th verse, for Christ says the kingdom he is talking about is the one to which "Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and all the prophets," belong. Of course it could not mean the church or kingdom of Christ on earth, for the persons mentioned were all dead a great many years before that kingdom was established. It could not mean the kingdom of Christ on this earth now, because all who "seek to enter" into that kingdom do enter; the door of the kingdom of Christ on earth is never shut against any who "seek to enter."

2. The wicked are represented as not being

able to enter, and the reason assigned is that they have been "workers of iniquity." If the wicked are shut out of heaven by the "master of the house," and shall seek to enter and shall not be able, will this not be their condition through all eternity? Certainly it must be true, unless our Universalist friends can show a promise of redemption applied to the inhabitants or *gehenna*.

Universalists will have no little trouble to establish a missionary post in hell, for the people can have no confidence in their ability to perform such a wonderful work, since, according to their teaching in *this world*, the salvation of the wicked does not depend upon preaching in the least. So, you see, they will, in the very nature of things, be compelled to change base again, if they do that, for preaching now cuts no figure whatever in the salvation of sinners in the present world. This is a plain case made out against the dogma of universal salvation, and one that is a death blow to it. Let the reader examine this argument with great care, with the word of God in his hand, and we will be satisfied with the result.

The next argument is drawn from Phil. 3:18, 19, which runs thus: "For many walk, of whom I told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ: whose end is perdition, whose god is the belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things."

1. Paul is here discussing human conduct and its influence on man's final destiny. He speaks of certain disorderly persons whose hearts and minds are absorbed with "earthly things," who are altogether led and controlled by the *god* of passion and appetite. These he calls "*enemies of the cross of Christ.*"

2. Lest he should not be understood as teaching that the conduct of these "enemies of the cross of Christ" would determine their *final* destiny, Paul says: "*Whose end is perdition.*" Now, if the *end* of the "enemies of the cross of Christ" is *perdition*, then the question of the final destiny of the wicked of our race is settled, once for all. This is the *end* of the wicked, an *end* beyond which there is no other *end*. How, then, can the *end* of the "enemies of Christ" be *perdition* and salvation both? Universal salvation, therefore, is impossible, while the eternal punishment of the "enemies of the cross of Christ" is certain. This is either true or Paul is not authority.

Then, reader, the work of life is important; out of that course we pursue in this world come the issues of life and death. Our hopes for the world to come are built upon what we do in this world. Our aspirations for the future must depend upon the realities of this present world. God has so ordained it, and there is no escape from it. The law of God, by which we are to be governed in this world, declares that "we should live soberly

and righteously and godly in this present world." Tit. 2: 12, 13. We learn from these Scriptures two important thoughts, namely: *first*, that eternal salvation is *conditional*; and, *second*, that the conditions *must* be performed in "*this present world*." We claim these *two points* already proved beyond the reach of controversy. Let those who pretend to believe in the final holiness and happiness of all mankind, regardless of conditions or character, grapple with these arguments if they will! We have no kind of fear as to the results.

Our next argument is based upon the Scriptures which declare that the sin against the Holy Spirit is neither pardoned in this world nor in the world to come. Matt. 12: 31, 32: "Therefore I say unto you, every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven. And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come." (See also, Mark 3:28-30.) Christ declares that this sin "shall not be forgiven," "neither in this world, nor in that which is to come." This needs no discussion. If Christ is authority in the matter of the final destiny of our race, then the question is settled. But Christ is not authority with Universalists, it seems. This passage completely drives Universalists from their last and most favorite

fort, namely, hell-redemption. For Christ plainly declares that this class of sinners "*shall not be forgiven,*" "neither in this world nor in that which is to come." If persons, therefore, enter the eternal world unforgiven and remain eternally unforgiven, as this passage teaches, the only way Universalists can save them is to save them *in their sins*. Universalists argue that *aion* in this passage should be translated *age*, and that Christ meant, "Neither in this age nor in that age which is to come." Very well, we accept that rendering as faithfully representing the original. *Aion* may be correctly translated by either *age* or *world*. Then it would read after this manner: "But whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this *age nor in the eternal age to come.*" But they say, "this age and that which is to come," means the Jewish age and the Christian age to come. Very well, that view of the passage will not help them out, for if they send men thus guilty into eternity unforgiven, then again we say, it devolves upon them to establish a missionary post in hell. Their view, you see, forbids that these sinners can be saved in this world—the Christian age—hence, Universalists send the sinners of this passage to hell with no hope of redemption!

But "this world and that which is to come," does *not* mean the Jewish and Christian ages; but if it did, it defeats Universalism just the same. In

the 20th chapter of Luke, we have the same expression, which will show the reader the daring effrontery of Universalists in trying to put a forced construction on this language. In Christ's answer to the Sadducees he says: "The sons of this world marry, and are given in marriage: but they that are accounted worthy to attain to that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: for neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection."

Here this world (*aion*) means the present age, and the world (*aion*) to come represents the eternal age. This is proven by the following points in the passage, namely, (1) The people of this age, or world, marry and are given in marriage, but in the "world," or age meant by the world to come, they neither marry nor are given in marriage. (2) "This world" and "the world to come" are divided, or separated, by the general resurrection. (3) Those accounted worthy to obtain the world to come are "equal unto the angels." (4) "Neither can they die any more." Could these things be said of the Christian age? No. In this world we marry and are given in marriage, nor are we sons of the resurrection yet. It would give us a little trouble also, to prove that we don't die here, nor are we equal unto the angels in this country. These things were said of the resurrec-



tion state. Hence, those who die guilty of the sin against the Holy Spirit not only enter the eternal age unforgiven, but they are to continue *eternally unforgiven*. All the sophistry of Universalism, from the time of Murry to the present, can not dispose of this passage.

In Paul's second letter to the Thessalonians, first chapter, he says: "So that we ourselves glory in you in the churches of God for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and in the afflictions which ye endure; which is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God; to the end that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer: if so be that it is a righteous thing with God to recompense affliction to them that afflict you, and to you that are afflicted rest with us, at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of his power in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus: who shall suffer punishment, *even* eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be marvelled at in all them that believed (because our testimony unto you was believed) in that day."

There are three important points in this passage to which the reader's attention is invited: (1) That those who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus, shall be punished; (2) That punishment

consists of *eternal* destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might; (3) That this eternal banishment is to take place "when he shall come to be glorified in his saints," or in other words, at the *second* coming of Christ to judge the world in righteousness—the day of judgment.

This passage, you see, like our text, is a positive proof of the eternity of punishment. The conclusion cannot be ignored. There is no possible escape from it. "Knowing, therefore, the terror of the Lord, we persuade men" to "follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord." Then said Jesus: "I go away, and ye shall seek me, and die in your sin: whither I go, ye cannot come." Jno. 8:21.

We have now plainly proven the *conditionality* of eternal life, and the *eternity* of future punishment. Let the reader examine these arguments and Scriptures carefully, with a view to understanding what the word of eternal truth teaches respecting the final destiny of the wicked, and he will see the nakedness of modern Universalism and the miserable blunders that theory makes in its use of the holy Scriptures. He will find that Universalism is bogus all the way through; a baseless fabric, without foundation in either the word of God or sanctified common sense. John T. Walsh says of Universalism: "It is no better than Atheism. It is no better than Deism. It is no

better than Infidelity. It is no better than Paganism."

The following reasons for the above, from the same author, make the matter perfectly plain:

"1. Universalism ignores faith in the existence of God in this life, as necessary to future holiness and happiness; and is, therefore, a system of infidelity.

"2. It ignores faith in Christ in this life, as necessary to future holiness and happiness; and is therefore, a system of infidelity.

"3. It ignores faith in the Scriptures in this life, as necessary to future holiness and happiness; and is, therefore, a system of infidelity.

"4. It ignores regeneration in this life, as necessary to future holiness and happiness; and is, therefore, a system of infidelity.

"5. It ignores a change of heart in this life, as necessary to future holiness and happiness; and is, therefore, a system of infidelity.

"6. It ignores repentance in this life, as necessary to future holiness and happiness; and is, therefore, a system of infidelity.

"7. It ignores confession and prayer in this life, as necessary to future holiness and happiness; and is, therefore, a system of infidelity.

"8. It ignores obedience to the gospel in this life, as necessary to future holiness and happiness; and is, therefore, a system of infidelity.

"9. It ignores a holy life in this world, as nec-

essary to future holiness and happiness; and is, therefore, a system of infidelity.

“10. It ignores all the conditions of the gospel in this life, as necessary to future holiness and happiness; and is, therefore, a system of infidelity. Thus, one by one, does it render null and void the obligations of men to believe, repent, and obey the gospel. Thus, one by one, does it extinguish the lights of heaven, and leave man to grope his way in darkness so intense that it may be felt!”

May God help the reader to carefully and prayerfully consider this great matter.

Dear reader, we are told that “we must all be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ; that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad.” Let us be awakened to the responsibilities and obligations of this life. If we are not awakened in this world to our duties, the time is coming when we, with all the “dwellers in the dust,” will be called from our slumbering to render a just account for our conduct in this world.

“The trumpet sounds—Awake!  
Ye dead, to judgment come!  
The pillars of creation shake,  
While hell receives her doom.”

## THE SABBATH.

The Sabbath was an institution of the law of Moses. It is first mentioned in Ex. 16 : 23-28, as a day to be observed by the children of Israel, and afterwards it was re-enacted in the fourth commandment. Deut. 5 : 12.

It is proposed in this short discussion to establish the following propositions :

1. The Sabbath is of the law, and not of the gospel.

2. The Sabbath was given by Moses, and not by Christ.

3. The Sabbath was given to the Jews, and to no other nation.

4. The law, of which the Sabbath was an institution, was "done away" at the coming of Christ.

The first, second and third propositions of this list, even Sabbatarians themselves admit to be true. So there remains but one of the whole list of propositions to be proved.

*I. The Sabbath is of the law, and not of the gospel.* The truth of this first proposition is admitted on all hands. Nobody disputes it. That the Sabbath, as an institution to be observed, belongs to, and is a part of, the Jewish law, no sane man will deny. The only way a Sabbata-

rian could prove the Sabbath binding on those who live under the New Testament dispensation, would be to either establish the fact that we are *now under the law*, or, in the second place, show that the Sabbath, as an institution, was re-enacted in the New Testament by Christ and the inspired apostles. Neither of which can be done. There is not a shadow of evidence in favor of either being true, but to the contrary, the Scriptures expressly declare that neither is true. So far, then, the question is settled.

*II. The Sabbath was given by Moses, and not by Christ.* Will any one dispute the truth of this statement? No; the most superficial thinker will admit it. The Sabbath is an institution of the law, and John says: "For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." And we are not under law but under grace. No law or command of Moses can be binding on the people of the New Covenant unless re-enacted by Christ. Does any Sabbatarian pretend that the New Covenant contains the command to "keep the Sabbath?" No such law can be found in the New Testament.

Where, then, is the authority? Does not the New Testament teach us "all things whatsoever" we are "to observe?" Yes. Very well, then, does it enjoin upon us to observe the Jewish Sabbath as "a shadow of things to come," declaring plainly that the substance of this shadow, or, in

other words, the thing typified by the Sabbath, finds its antitype in the body of Christ? These are facts from which there is no escape. So far, so good. But let us continue the investigation.

*III. The Sabbath was given to the Jews, and to no other nation.* None but Jews were ever commanded to keep the Sabbath, and none but Jews were ever punished for violating it. The Sabbath was an institution of that law to which all other peoples were "strangers" and "aliens."

The Sabbath was, as has been stated, an institution of the Jewish law, and of course was designed for the Jews only. This is admitted by all, and therefore needs no discussion here. Since Sabbatarians all admit that the Sabbath is an institution of the law of Moses, and also that it was given by Moses to the Jewish nationality only, they are logically forced to show the same law—command to observe the Sabbath—re-enacted by Christ in the gospel of our salvation, or their claim is lost without remedy. This they can never do.

*IV. The law of which the Sabbath was an institution, was "done away" at the coming of Christ.* Since the whole argument turns upon the proof of this statement, we shall give some attention to the Scriptures to be employed as proof of this proposition.

Heb. 7:12: "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the

law." It must be remembered that the Old Covenant, or the law of Moses, was given to the Jewish nation under the Levitical or Jewish priesthood, "after the order of Aaron." (Heb. 7: 11.) Here we learn that the law was to stand or fall with the priesthood. The Levitical priesthood was made the basis upon which the entire Mosaic Economy rested; therefore, any change in the priesthood, "of necessity," must effect that law which rests upon it.

It was with reference to the priesthood that the law was given as a sort of civil code, to aid in the preservation of the Jewish nationality till the Promised Seed should come, who was to be our great High Priest, and whose priesthood was to be perfect. The law, therefore, resting in the priesthood, must be changed when that which necessitated it, that is, the priesthood was changed. So, you see, the law of which the Sabbath was an institution, was "done away," or abrogated. This is positive proof, and settles the question.

Heb. 8: 6, 7: "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the Mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises." And again, "For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second." It will not be denied that the Sabbath belonged to the "first covenant" and the "Lord's day" to



the "second" covenant, "established upon better promises." The first came by Moses, the second by Jesus Christ. The man who contends for the Jewish Sabbath must either be ignorant of the place the New Testament occupies in the revelations of God to man, or wilful in his rejection of the authority of Christ.

In Gal. 3:18, 19, Paul says: "For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise. Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added (to the promise) because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator." In the same chapter Paul gives us the purpose of the law, on this wise: "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith (that is, the system of faith) is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." This was said of the Jews to whom the law was given. So far as the Gentiles are concerned, they were never under the law. Hence, the Sabbath never was binding on the Gentiles. When Christ came and established the New Covenant on "better promises," he divorced the Jewish nation from the law of Moses with all of its institutions. "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye

should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God." (See Rom. 7:1-4.)

Finally, as positive proof that the law of which the Sabbath was an institution, was "done away" in Christ, we cite 2 Cor. 3:4-15. Will the reader please examine this Scripture. "And not as Moses, which put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." Christ was the end of the law, or in other words, Christ was the object for which the law was given. But the Jews, like the Sabbatarians of the present time, could not see the purpose of the law.

"Old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new," and all the Jews who accepted the Christ, were "changed into the same image from glory to glory;" they passed from the glory of the Mosaic Economy to the glory of the Christian Economy, which "excelleth" and "remaineth."

#### DESIGN OF THE JEWISH SABBATH.

The most interesting study in the world of thought is the *design* of things, and more especially is this true of the institutions of the Bible. In fact, the design of things lies at the very foundation of a correct Bible knowledge, and the enjoyment of the blessings of Revelation as well. It is

quite certain that the institution of the Sabbath, as a day to be observed by the Jews, does not ante-date the deliverance of the Jews from Egypt. The Sabbath of the creation was distinguished above other days (Gen. 2 : 3), but not as a day to be observed by man, but "because on it he rested from all his work, which God created in making it." In connection with the six creative periods we have the Sabbath-period, beginning immediately at the close of the sixth period of creation. And this Sabbath has lasted ever since, and will continue till God begins the creation of the "new heaven and the new earth."

Twenty-five centuries elapsed from the beginning of Genesis to the time of Moses, when the Sabbath of the Jewish law was instituted for the observance of the Jewish people. No mention is made of the institution till we come to the camp of Israel after they had crossed the sea under the leadership of Moses. We are, therefore, to look after the design of the Jewish Sabbath, the Sabbath of the law, given to the Jews by Moses, and not the Sabbath of creation.

*I. It was commemorative.*

It is unquestionably certain that the Sabbath was instituted to preserve the memory of Israel's salvation from Egyptian slavery. In keeping the Sabbath, the Jews honored the memory of that grand event in the history of their past. The Sabbath was designed to call to remembrance the

event of their deliverance from bondage. It was designed to preserve the remembrance of that awful event, just as the Lord's Supper is intended to preserve our memory of his death in order to our salvation from bondage to sin. Now that we have clearly stated the proposition, suppose we refer you to positive proof of the same.

“And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath.” Deut. 5: 15. “Therefore,” that is, for this reason, “the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath.” Is this plain enough? This positive declaration sets the matter at rest. God has assigned his own reason for the command. This establishes the proposition that the Sabbath was given to the Jews, and to no other nation. But this is not all of the design of the Sabbath.

2. *It was typical.*

The Sabbath of the law was a type. This question should be settled first. See Col. 2:14-17; “Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.” This is easy to believe when taken in connection with the fact as stated by Paul, that the law was but a “shadow,” or faint outline, of

the good things of the kingdom of Christ yet to come.

The Sabbath was typical, "emblematical, figurative; representing something future." What did it typify? What did the Sabbath represent? The Sabbath was a type of rest to the souls of men, in Christ. Rest from physical labor is understood in the type, but the antitype contemplates rest from the burdens of sin.

Take the language of our Lord, in Matt. 11:28, 29, and you will find the grand lesson of the typical signification of the Jewish Sabbath: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls."

Now, with the commemorative and typical significations of the Jewish Sabbath before us, let the reader imagine Moses standing at the head of the marching hosts of Israel, with his arms stretched out from his body, with his left pointing back to the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage, and his right hand pointing down through the future to the coming of Christ and rest to the soul in him; and you have a faint idea of the design of the Sabbath of the law. The Sabbath thus stands between the two great events—the one celebrated by the Sabbath and the other typified by it. The

Sabbath begins with the one and ends with the other.

The Sabbatarian idea that the Catholics changed the Jewish Sabbath and gave the world the Lord's day in its stead, is fabulous and false. The Sabbath was an institution of the Mosaic law and passed away with that law, of which it was a part. "The Lord's day," "the first day," like the "New Covenant," is a *new day*. It is a burning shame and disgrace that the sectarian world persists in calling the "Lord's day" the Sabbath. The word Sabbath never was applied by any divine authority to any day except the seventh. Let us be careful what we say. Call Bible things by Bible names and all will be right.

1. The Sabbath is one of the Ten Commandments. Ex. 20 : 8 ; Deut. 5 : 12.

2. It is the seventh day. Ex. 20 : 10 ; Deut. 5 : 14.

3. The Ten Commandments are called a law. (Ex. 24 : 12). This is the law that came by Moses (Jno. 1 : 17), which Paul says "was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we (Jews) might be justified by faith." "But after that faith (the system of faith) is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." (Gal. 3 : 24, 25.) This law, therefore, has been displaced by the gospel of Christ. (2 Cor. 3 : 7-15.)

4. The Ten Commandments are called a covenant. Ex. 34 : 27, 28 ; Deut. 4 : 13.

5. This covenant was between God and the children of Israel. Respecting this covenant Paul says, "For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second." Heb. 8:7. Paul says: "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises." Heb. 8:6.

6. The Sabbath is a part of this covenant. And if the covenant is done away, the Sabbath is also done away.

7. The Sabbath is a memorial of the deliverance of the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage (Deut. 5:15). If the Sabbath was a memorial, it is not a moral precept.

8. The Sabbath was made for man (Mark 2:27). So were the sacrifices of the law of Moses, and also circumcision. But this does not prove that these are still binding on mankind.

9. The law, the Ten Commandments, or the Old Covenant, given by Moses to Israel, which included the Sabbath, was written on two tables of stone (Ex. 31:18. Deut. 4:13).

10. But that which was written on the tables of stone is called the "ministration of death," and "to be done away." (2 Cor. 3:3-11).

11. The Sabbath, therefore, is "*done away*,"

with the law of which it was a part, and is not binding on us.

Let the above Scriptures and propositions be carefully and honestly examined, and we will be satisfied with the result.

May the Lord bless every soul that reads the word of eternal truth with a view to understanding it, is our sincere prayer.



## TRUE LOYALTY.

*“ And they reviled him, and said, Thou art his disciple; but we are disciples of Moses. We know that God hath spoken unto Moses: but as for this man, we know not whence he is.”—Jno. 9:28, 29.*

This chapter records one of the grandest and most eminently instructive lessons in all revelation. It becomes intensely interesting to the Bible student, as he sees portrayed in this chapter the goodness of God and the mission of his Son to this world, on the one hand, and on the other hand a vivid picture of human weakness, so developed as to exhibit to our view its characteristic ugliness. This chapter should be read with very great care and studied prayerfully. This is a record of one of our Lord's miracles, which stands to this hour, and will to the end of the world, as the golden key that unlocks and opens to our view the object of Christ's mission to earth.

At the command of the Lord the blind man washed in the pool of Siloam, and “came seeing.” He did just what the Lord required, and as a result was restored to sight. His physical condition exactly represented the moral condition of the world at that time. And one of the objects of this miracle was to convince the people then that Jesus had come into the world to dispel moral blindness. “As long as I am in

the world, I am the light of the world." This divine interposition was evidently designed to demonstrate his power to accomplish that end. The world at large was morally as blind as the subject of this miracle was physically blind. And notwithstanding the power of Jesus, he commands that the blind man "go, wash in the pool of Siloam," thus indicating clearly that man's salvation from moral darkness—spiritual blindness—would turn upon his compliance with the law, or command, of the Christ. All of this seems to be evident from the answer Jesus gives to the question, "Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?" The disciples, it will be observed, had the correct idea of sin and its effects, hence they desire to be informed as to the cause of this blindness. The question with them was, whether the cause was in the child or his parents. "Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him." Now, as to whether this answer alludes to God's purpose subserved by the miracle, in the establishment of the claims of Christ, or whether it really was designed to explain the *cause* of the man's blindness, is a problem hard to solve. One thing is certain, if the answer was intended to impart the information sought for by the disciples, then we are forced to the conclusion that the answer of Jesus explains the *cause* of the

man's blindness, as well as the *purpose* of his being restored to sight. That God purposed his blindness that his own works might be made manifest, is just as reasonable as the peculiar manner in which Moses was brought up that he might be fitted for the work of redeeming Israel from Egypt. If this blindness, as Jesus says, was not the result of any one's sin, it must be the result of God's purpose. For the New Testament Scriptures recognize *all* physical frailties, and death itself, as in some way resulting from sin. While his blindness was not the result of his own or his parents' sins, it does not necessarily follow, of course, that sin could not be the cause, for it could have been inherited from earlier generations. But we infer from Christ's answer that the blindness was not the result of sin at all.

The jealous Pharisees reviled the man whose eyes had been opened for his faith in the Lord, saying, "We are disciples of Moses. We know that God hath spoken unto Moses: but as for this man, we know not whence he is." This is evidently a case of pretended loyalty, outright hypocrisy, for had Moses been present they would have been the very first to stone him, and the loudest in their cries against him. Notwithstanding Moses had been dead for many hundred years, yet they boasted of their devotion to him. They boasted of their loyalty to Moses while they were disloyal to Christ. Their faith, if they had

any, looked backward; their allegiance to God was purely a thing of the past. They pretended to love Moses while they hated Christ. They clung with an unyielding tenacity to the *dead* Moses, but bitterly rejected the *living* Christ. This back-looking loyalty has marked all the ages of the past, and the people who now live are badly touched with the same weakness.

We all delight to honor Abraham Lincoln now; we revere his name. But while he lived many criticised him severely. And, in fact, he died at the bloody hands of a cruel assassin. The same thing, in part, is true of George Washington. After the hard fought battles are over, how natural it is for some people to file into line and enrol their names as battle-scared heroes. This is true in every department of life. There is plenty of this *back-action* devotion now in the world. This Mosaic loyalty is still common. Moses is dead, and the people have a *new* man and a new issue before them, and it is loyalty to the present Law-giver and faith *now*, that the world wants. Jesus, in this case, suffers just what every true gospel preacher suffers now. The church now is full of modern Pharisees. See them as they boast of their loyalty to the preacher who preceded you. What a grand man he was! Their faith and love and confidence all are in the past. They sigh for the return of the good old days, but never think of improving the living *present*, that

some poor living preacher may be made happy. It is the living, present, struggling issues, the battles that are *now* to be fought, we need to stand by. The Christ who lived eighteen hundred years ago is the present Christ. He reigns *now*. Let us be loyal to him. Faith in Jesus Christ, to be effective, must be faith *now*, it must lay hold on the present. How we love and revere the fathers, yet how shamefully we neglect the sons? Never mind the past, but let us file into line for the war that sin is *now* waging. The present tests our loyalty, and not the past. We glory in the truth that triumphed in the apostolic age, then allow what some Christians style a "*calf*"—an organ in the church—to run us wild into perdition. We hold in sacred memory the heroic fight of Martin Luther against the Pope, yet we are disloyal to Christ. Some men will undertake to excuse their disloyalty to the present by avowing loyalty to the past. This is a great mistake.

If we are not loyal to the Christ *now*, if we are unfaithful to the *present* duty, if we ignore the present struggle against sin, all our faith in Moses will avail us nothing.

It is an easy matter for persons now to talk flippantly about the Campbells, Johnson, Stone and other grand reformers; about the "Bible and the Bible alone;" to boast of their loyalty to the "ancient order of things," then turn around on

their loyal heel and inaugurate a war on the use of the organ in the churches, and pursue it till the cause of Jesus Christ is made to bleed at every pore and sectarianism is established upon its ruins. Are there any marks of loyalty in this course of conduct? It is the kind of loyalty found in our text; it simply amounts to disloyalty in the end. This is simply an attempt to excuse disloyalty to Christ *now* by avowing loyalty to great and good men in the past. Our faith should be in the present, and we should always be ready to show our faith by our works. There is nothing wrong in looking back with grateful hearts, so long as we do not neglect the present; but when a man neglects the duties of the present to boast of his loyalty to the past, he is guilty of the same weakness that the jealous Pharisees of our text were. We should be generous as well as just. The present is the test of our loyalty. Paul lays down the principle by which we should be willing to be governed in this matter: "Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. Let us therefore, as many as be perfect be thus minded: and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless, whereto we have al-

ready attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing." Phil. 3:13-16.

Now, we invite the reader's attention to the fact that the same argument made by the Pharisees against the faith of the people in the Healer of the blind man, is now made in the political arena, and is designed to accomplish the same thing, namely, to destroy the confidence of the common people in the ability of this nation to make and enforce laws that will destroy the rum power in this country. So, you see, we have political Phariseeism as well as religious Phariseeism.

The Pharisees *then* refused to believe that Christ had healed the blind man, because the healing took place on the Sabbath day. They declared that, "This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath day." With them it was purely a question of time. The Pharisees now, like the Pharisees then, have no special objections to urge against the prohibition of the whiskey traffic, except that of *time*. They tell us "the people are not ready for such a law," and for that reason "prohibition," they say, "will not prohibit."

The Pharisees argued then that public sentiment was not sufficiently educated for the establishment of Christianity. Pharisees now argue that public sentiment is not ready for prohibitory laws. The Pharisees then boasted of their loyalty to the great leader and the issues of the past, ignoring the present with its living issues and

its living Christ. The Pharisees now in the lead in the political struggle for office and spoils boast of their devotion and loyalty to the leaders and issues of the past, utterly ignoring the present, living issues of the country. They are now, as they were then, earnest advocates of party policy, but the bitterest enemies of living principles. They then apologized for their disloyalty to present, living principles, by declaring themselves in favor of dead issues of the past. The Pharisees then were wonderfully in love with the dead Moses, but they hated the living Christ. The Pharisees now are wonderfully in love with Washington and Lincoln, but they hate the loud cry of broken-hearted mothers and wives for the destruction of the rum power.

The Pharisees of old feared that Christ and Christianity might materially interfere with their "personal liberty," hence they were opposed. The thief who murdered the sheriff and broke jail, did it in defense of his own "personal liberty." The Democratic and Republican parties are parties of policy only. Their loyalty, love and faith, are spent on men and things of the past. They are careful about policy, but have a burning hatred for principle. They attend in mourning the memorial day set apart in respect to the fallen heroes of the late war, but they turn a deaf ear to the cries of their widows and orphans for protection against the outrages of the rum power.



They boast of loyalty to our government and its flag, and cast their votes in favor of common drunkenness. They vote whiskey saloons on the innocent and helpless women and children of this country, against their will and earnest prayers, and when the poor heart-broken woman and her ragged children fall on their knees and beg and cry for the removal of these hell-holes, the cowardly and Pharisaical reply is: "Ladies, we would inform you that we were not elected on that issue, and besides, we are opposed to any measure that will, in the very nature of things, infringe on the personal rights and liberty of our constituents!" Is this true loyalty? No; it is disloyalty, to all intents and purposes. May God save us from both religious and political Phariseeism. Let us reform. "The money made by immoral means is worse than counterfeit. It damns the man and will damn the people that love it."—*Beecher on distilleries, in 1846.*

#### THE OBJECT OF PROHIBITION.

1. It is designed to oppose a traffic that robs women and children of food and clothing, and health and home, wrecks manhood, corrupts society, debauches morals, sends our boys as criminals to the prisons of this country, crushes the hearts of fathers and mothers and brings them in sorrow to the grave.

2. Another object of prohibition is to save this country \$900,000,000 of money a year.

3. To save the American people from the awful disgrace of legalized drunkenness.

4. To reconcile capital and labor and to reward honest labor.

5. To protect the family, which is the fundamental organization of good government and Christian civilization.

6. To destroy the evil effects and demoralizing influence of the rum power upon civil government.

7. To remove from our midst one of the greatest obstructions in the way of the world's conversion to the religion of Jesus Christ.

Brethren, we exclude from our fellowship all persons who become common drunkards; yea, more, we tell them that they will be excluded from heaven. Now, can we be consistent Christians when we vote for license, high or low, thus to *legalize the liquor traffic*, that our families and the church may be filled with drunkards, and at the same time we refuse to fellowship these legally manufactured drunkards? "Come, let us reason together." No drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of heaven. Be careful how you vote. Vote as you pray. Make a record that you shall not be ashamed of when you come to judgment. No man shall be expelled from the Church of Jesus Christ on the account of being made drunk on the

liquid hell sold to him *by my vote. Never, no never.*

“What place doth Satan like the best?  
Where does he sit, and smile, and rest,  
And plant the greatest social pest?  
At the saloon.

“Where does Old Nick erect his throne  
Of kegs and bottles, blood and bone,  
And rule in power all his own?  
At the saloon.


“What makes the drunkards howl and hoot,  
And curse and swear, and fight and shoot,  
And play the demon and the brute?  
The saloon.


“Where do we find the meanest hole,  
Where men in foul pollution roll,  
And kill the body and the soul?  
At the saloon.


“Where do we find the liquid fire,  
Where hope and joy and life expire,  
Where bloody, hellish deeds transpire?  
At the saloon.

“Stand firm, ye friends of truth and right;  
Take God’s armor, march and fight;  
The victory gain, through moral might,  
O’er the saloon.”

Let us be loyal to Christ, true to our convictions and earnestly devoted to the best interests of a perishing world.









Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.  
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide  
Treatment Date: April 2006

**PreservationTechnologies**

A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION  
111 Thomson Park Drive  
Cranberry Township, PA 16066  
(724) 779-2111



BX  
7231

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 016 110 125 4

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 017 685 003 6