

Abilene Christian University

Digital Commons @ ACU

Stone-Campbell Books

Stone-Campbell Resources

1920

A Study in Methodist Discipline

C. R. Nichol

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), [Comparative Methodologies and Theories Commons](#), [History of Christianity Commons](#), [History of Religions of Western Origin Commons](#), [Practical Theology Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nichol, C. R., "A Study in Methodist Discipline" (1920). *Stone-Campbell Books*. 102.
https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books/102

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Stone-Campbell Resources at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Stone-Campbell Books by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU.

A Study in Methodist Discipline

By C. R. NICHOL

**In vain do they worship me, teaching for
doctrines the commandments
of men—Jesus.**

**"We are justified by FAITH
ONLY."**

Methodist Discipline, Art. 9.

**"By works a man is justified and
NOT by FAITH ONLY."**

Bible, Jas. 2:24.

**PUBLISHED BY
MRS. C. R. NICHOL
CLIFTON, TEXAS**

25 CENTS PER COPY

Books! Books!! Books!!!

Send me order for any book you may want.
I will be glad to secure it for you.

OLD BOOKS

I am prepared to furnish any book that is out of print that can be secured. ..Write me your wants.

BIBLES

I will be glad to furnish you with any kind of a Bible you may desire.

MRS. C. R. NICHOL, Clifton, Texas.

BALLARD-NICHOL DEBATE

on

INFANT BAPTISM

Of the debate, J. W. Chism says: You have certainly defeated Ballard on every position he advanced in the discussion. Your work is complete in every detail, and the Truth stands out in its beauty.

W. P. Richardson says: You showed yourself master of the subject, and met Ballard with ease on every argument he made. Those who read the discussion cannot but appreciate the Truth.

Joe S. Warlick says: Mr. Ballard uses about all the arguments than any man ever used in debating Infant Baptism, and he presents them in this book. Brother Nichol was prompt and pointed in his replies, and abundantly showed the fallacy of the arguments. All should read the book.

You should read the discussion and hand it to your Methodist friend as a missionary.

25 cents per copy.—Order from

MRS. C. R. NICHOL, Clifton, Texas.

ORIGIN OF THE METHODIST CHURCH

Mr. John Wesley was born June 17, 1703, in Epworth, Lincolnshire, England. He was a member of the Church of England: "In September, 1725, he was ordained a deacon and the following year elected fellow of Lincoln College. He took his degree in February, 1727, and 1728 was ordained a priest or presbyter in the Church of England."—History of Methodist Episcopal Church, by Nathan Bangs, Vol. 1, page 39.

His father also was a minister, and desired his assistance as curate in his parish. "He complied with his father's wishes, and left Oxford for this purpose in August, 1727; and only for priest's orders and Master's degree did he visit Oxford during the next two years."—McTyeire's History of Methodism, Page 55.

NAME METHODIST

"In 1729 he attended the meeting of a small society which had been formed at Oxford, in which were included his brother, Charles, and Mr. Morgan, for the purpose of assisting each other in their studies and consulting how they might employ their time to the best advantage. The same year he became a tutor in the college, received pupils, and presided as moderator in the disputations six times a week.

"It was about this time, the society above named having attracted some attention from the regularity of their lives, and their efforts to do good to others, that some of the wits at Oxford applied to the members the name of Methodists, a name by which John Wesley and his followers have ever since been distinguished." Bangs, Vol. 1, p. 39, 40.

WESLEY, THE FOUNDER

"The history of Methodism cannot be given without a biography of John Wesley. To him belongs the distinction of Founder. Great men by a natural law come forward in groups; but to insure the success and unity of a movement, there must be a solitary pre-eminence. While Charles Wesley, George Whitefield, John Fletcher and Thomas Coke were mighty auxil-

iaries, it is around John Wesley that the religious movement of the eighteenth century, called Methodism, centers." (McT p. 14.)

Mr. McTyeire, one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, claims Mr. Wesley as the founder of Methodism, and that it centers around him. Christ is not the founder of Methodism, neither is it claimed that it "centers" around him.

THE FIRST METHODIST

"The first Methodist were the two Wesleys, with Robert Kirkham and William Morgan." (McT. p. 57.)

Seventeen hundreds years after the death of Christ, seventeen hundred years after the establishment of the church of Christ, sventeen hundred years after men became Christians by following Christ, the first Methodist appeared in the world. The apostles were Christians. Thousands were Christians in the first century; but the first Methodist were the two Wesleys, Kirkham and Morgan. The apostles were not Methodist, and since they were saved, it must follow that it is not necessary to be a Methodist to be saved. Methodist are wholly unknown in the word of God. What claim can they make to being the church of which Christ is head; (Col. 1:18), how can they claim to be the church purchased with the blood of Christ? (Acts 20:28.) The word of God, the seed of the kingdom, (Lk. 8:11), produced Christians in the days of the apostles—it did not produce a single Methodist. Since the word of God did not produce Methodist, it follows that something other than the word of God is necessary to the production of Methodism.

RISE OF METHODISM—1729

In the Methodist Discipline of 1832 I find the following:

"To the Members of the Methodist Episcopal Church:

"Dearly Beloved Brethren, We think it expedient to give you a brief account of the rise of Methodism, both in Europe and America. 'In 1729, two young men, in England, reading the Bible, saw they could not be saved without holiness: followed after it, and incited others so to do.'"

Is 1729 the date of the rise of Methodism? We shall see.

"Wesley, indeed, speaks of four other epochs, each of which

may be regarded as a new development . The first of these was the rise of student Methodism, when, in 1729, four serious students began to meet together at Oxford. The second epoch was in April, 1736, when twenty or thirty persons began to meet in Wesley's house at Savannah. The third was May 1, 1738, when, by the advice of Peter Bohler, Wesley and other serious persons began to meet in Fetter-lane. Again: 'In the latter end of the year 1739 eight or ten persons came to me in London, and desired that I would spend some time with them in prayer, and advise them how to flee from the wrath to come; this was the rise of the United Society.' " (McT. p. 177.) Methodism had its rise in 1729, with a few students.

"The little society of Methodist, as they were called, began now to extend its operations. When Mr. Wesley joined them, they committed its management to him, and he has himself stated its original members: In November, 1729, four young gentlemen of Oxford, Mr. John Wesley, fellow of Lincoln College; Mr. Charles Wesley, student of Christ Church; Mr. Morgan, commoner of Christ Church; and Mr. Kirkham, of Merton College, began to spend some evenings in a week together, in reading chiefly the Greek Testament."—Watson's Life of Wesley. p. 19-20.

"The first Methodists were the two Wesleys, with Robert Kirkham and William Morgan." (McT. p. 57.)

There can be no question that Methodism arose in 1729. Keep this date in mind. This was not the church of Christ, for it had been in the world for seventeen hundred years when Methodism had its origin.

Mr. Wesley left Oxford in 1727 and returned in 1729. (McT. p. 55-57.) "On his return to Oxford he naturally took the lead of the little band of Methodist. They rallied round him at once, feeling his fitness to direct them. He was their master-spirit, and soon compacted the organization and planned new methods of living and working." (McT. 57.) Methodism has its origin in 1729 with a few students, and as a society. Mr. Wesley did not intend that it should result in a church. Mr. Wesley at the dates above mentioned was not converted.

WESLEY SAILS TO AMERICA .

Methodism had its rise in England, as a society in the Church

of England. It is a daughter of that Church, and a granddaughter of the Roman Catholic Church.

Mr. Wesley left England in 1735, and arrived in America in 1736. (McT. 74.) He came as a missionary—to convert the unsaved, though he was himself an unconverted man.

FIRST METHODIST SOCIETY IN AMERICA—THE SECOND IN THE WORLD

“March 7 he commenced his ministry at Savannah.” (McT. 88.) “In a few weeks after Wesley had commenced his ministry he had established daily morning and evening public prayers. It was also agreed: ‘1. To advise the more serious to form themselves into a sort of little society, and to meet once or twice a week, in order to reprove, instruct and exhort one another. 2. To select out of these a smaller number for a more intimate union with each other, which might be forwarded partly by conversing singly with each and partly by inviting all together to the pastor’s house every Sunday in the afternoon.’ This he afterwards reckoned as the first Methodist society in America, and the second in the world.” (McT. 88-89.) This was in 1736.

The second Methodist society formed was in America in 1736. The first one was formed in England in 1729. This was not the church of Christ, but a society in the Church of England, founded by an unconverted man—John Wesley.

Mr. Wesley’s work was not all that he desired it should be in America. In fact, he made worse than a failure, for he became involved in trouble, and returned to England. “Wesley’s excessive pastoral fidelity and his ritualistic severity made enemies, and they found occasion to avenge themselves in an affair connected with one of his parishoners, Miss H———. It seems he thought of proposing marriage to her, but Delamotte warned him, and the Moravians advised him ‘to proceed no farther in the matter.’ Wesley answered: ‘The will of the Lord be done.’ The lady’s uncle, Causton, of bad record, and then in brief authority, sometime afterwards hatched up indictments—ten bills, some civil and some ecclesiastical—against him. Wesley was prepared to answer, and moved for an immediate hearing; but the court evaded his request. From September 1, when the indictment was first presented, to the end of November, when

Wesley made known his intention to return to England, he seems to have attended not fewer than seven different sittings of the court, asking to be tried on the matters over which it had jurisdiction, but denying its right to take cognizance of the ecclesiastical offenses alleged. Thus harassed and obstructed—power being in the hands of his enemies, and he unable and they unwilling to reach an issue—he gave notice of leaving, and left.” (McT. p. 95. Foot note.) Some accounts of the trouble of Mr. Wesley makes it an ugly affair. He made a failure in his work in America, is admitted. He remained in America about one year, then returned to England.

WESLEY NOT CONVERTED

“On his arrival in London (Feb. 3, 1738), and without delay, John Wesley visited Oglethorpe, and waited upon the Georgian trustees; gave to them a written account why he had left the colony, and returned to them the instrument whereby they had appointed him minister of Savannah. While on his way to England, upon the bosom of the great deep, his ‘mind was full of thought,’ and in the fullness of his heart he made the following entry in his private journal: ‘I went to America to convert the Indians; but, O, who shall convert me? who, what is he that will deliver me from this evil heart of unbelief? I have a fair summer religion. I can talk well—nay, and believe myself, while no danger is near; but let death look me in the face, and my spirit is troubled.’” (McT. p. 106.)

“A few days afterwards, standing again on English soil, he makes in his journal this record of the inward struggles, this estimate of his spiritual condition: ‘It is now two years and almost four months since I left my native country, in order to teach the Georgia Indians the nature of Christianity; but what have I learned myself in the meantime? Why (what I least of all suspected), that I, who went to America to convert others, was never myself converted to God.’ ‘I am not mad,’ though I thus speak, but ‘I speak the words of truth and soberness; if haply some of those who still dream may awake and see that as I am, so are they. * * * * This, then, have I learned in the ends of the earth—that I ‘am fallen short of the glory of God;’ and my whole heart is ‘altogether corrupt and abom-

inable,' and, consequently, my whole life (seeing it cannot be that an 'evil tree' should 'bring forth good fruit'), that 'alienated' as I am from the life of God, I am 'a child of wrath,' an heir of hell.'" (McT. 107.)

Mr. Wesley came to America to convert the Indians, and while here organized a society which he called the "first Methodist society in America, and the second in the world," (McT. p. 89.) The Methodist church was founded by Mr. John Wesley in 1729; at that time he was an unconverted man. After his return to England he claims to have been converted.

SUBSCRIBE TO THE DISCIPLINE

(Quotations Are From the 1910 Discipline)

"Will you be subject to the Discipline of the Church, attend upon its ordinances, and support its institutions? Ans. I will endeavor so to do, by the help of God" (Par. 666)

Not one word is said about being governed by the word of God, nor about supporting the institutions of Christ. Though every member of the Methodist Church has pledged himself, "by the help of God," to "be subject to the discipline of the Church, attend upon its ordinances, and support its institution," few of them own a copy of the Discipline and fewer of them know what it contains. How can a person afford to pledge himself to live by laws of which he is ignorant?

When one states he is a member of a church, we associate him with the doctrine of that church. When a man tells me he is a member of the Mormon church, I believe he accepts Joe Smith as a prophet, and the Book of Mormon as an inspired record. If he does not, he has deceived me; though it may have been unintentional on his part. If you are a Methodist, I am forced to believe you accept the doctrine of that church. If you do not, you deceive me, and possibly you are deceiving those you associate with each day in your religious life—for they entertain the view that you believe the doctrine of the church of which you are a member.

Concede to others that which you claim for yourself—conscientiousness. You would not give your time, influence and

means to the support of an institution if you did not believe the doctrine and practice of such an organization. For this reason, and because Methodist subscribe to the Discipline, I am forced to the view that they believe the doctrine of the Methodist church.

ORIGIN OF THE DISCIPLINE

"TO THE MEMBERS

OF THE

METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH

"We esteem it our duty and privilege most earnestly to recommend to you as members of our Church, our **Form of Discipline**, which has been founded on the experience of a long series of years."—Discipline, page (iii.)

No claim for the Discipline higher than "the experience of a long series of years." Such frankness is refreshing. Methodist call it "our" form of Discipline, and theirs it most certainly is.

Those who love God are willing to be governed by his will as expressed in the Bible, and subscribe to nothing in their religious life save what he has commanded. In doctrine and discipline all should be content to accept just what the Lord has revealed. Has the Lord failed to give a sufficient rule for those who would honor him in life and service? Listen: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. 3:16, 17.) The word of God furnishes the "man of God" unto all good works. Is there anything in the line of good works for the Discipline to furnish? Again: "Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord, according as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness." (2 Pet. 1:2, 3.) Since the Lord has revealed to us "all things" that pertain to life and godliness, where is the necessity for the Methodist Discipline? Does the Discipline

claim to pertain to life and Godliness? Possibly the Discipline was designed for the life of Methodist, on the ground that the Lord made a revelation to govern Christians!

Hear the Discipline again: "Far from wishing you to be ignorant of any of our doctrines, or any part of our Discipline, we desire you to read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest the whole. You ought, next to the Word of God, to procure the articles and canons of the church to which you belong." (p. iii.) This is an admission that the doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Church are not found in the word of God. I have reference, of course, to the things peculiar to the Methodist.

Will you please notice that in the foregoing excerpt from the Discipline, it speaks of "our doctrines," "our discipline," and "the articles and canons of the church to which you belong." You are to receive these as "next to the word of God." This is a clear admission that the "doctrines" and "canons" of the Methodist are not the word of God,—but they claim it is "next to it."

What is meant by "canon?" "Canon: A law or rule in general; a law or rule regarding doctrine or discipline enacted by a council and confirmed; rules or laws relating to faith, morals, and discipline that regulate church government, as laid down by popes and councils." As the "canon" is a rule of church government, then the law of the Methodist Church is not the word of God, but "laws, rules and discipline" enacted by "councils" of the "church to which you belong," and is to be received "next to the word of God." This is a virtual admission that the Methodist Church is not controlled by the word of God; but by the laws that are to be received, not as equal to, but "next to the word of God." One cannot be a Methodist by complying with the word of God; but by subscribing to rules that they say are "next to the word of God," one becomes a Methodist.

If the Discipline contains more than the word of God, it contains too much. If it contains less than the Bible, it does not embody enough.

In the Bible is revealed the doctrine of Christ, and he who goes beyond the same is condemned. In the Bible is the sum total of the teachings of Christ. He who teaches more, is condemned, for "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God." (2 Jno. 9.) (R. V.) The Discipline contains a great many things not in the teaching of Christ. I leave you to draw the conclusion.

THE DOCTRINES
AND
DISCIPLINE
OF THE
METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH
1910

The foregoing is the "title page" of the Discipline.

You will notice that it is the "Doctrines" (plural) of the Methodist Church. In the scriptures we read of the "apostle's doctrine" (Acts 2:42), "sound doctrine" (Tit. 2:1), "doctrine of God our Savior" (Tit. 2:10), "doctrine of Christ" (2 Jno. 9.) It is *doctrine* (singular), not *doctrines*. In the Bible we also read of *doctrines*, in the plural. Reference is made to "doctrines of men" (Col. 2:22), and "doctrines of devils" (1 Tim. 4:1), and in the Methodist Discipline, we read of the "Doctrines of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South." Methodists and Methodist preachers have to do with "doctrines," while the apostles had to do with the "doctrine" of Christ. Not only so, but the apostles had to do with the "church of God" (1 Cor. 1:2), while the Discipline has to do with the "Methodist Episcopal Church, South," an institution unknown in the word of God, and to the world till seventeen hundred years after the birth of Christ.

The Discipline was designed for Methodist, while the scriptures speak of Christians. "Christian" is the name God promised his people—it is the name they should wear in this dispensation. "And thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name." (Isa. 62:2.) "And the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch." (Acts 11:26.) "Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." (Acts 26:28.) "But if any man suffer as a Christian let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God in this name." (1 Pet. 4:16.) (R. V.)

You must be a Christian to be saved; but it is not necessary to be a Methodist to be saved. Why be a Methodist? Give one reason that you think God would accept for one being a Methodist.

"Fear God and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man." (Eccl. 12:13.) When one becomes a member of

the Methodist church, are they "keeping" God's commandments—do they become a member in obedience to God's commandment? If yes, then will not all who obey his commandments become members of that church? If God commanded one to become a member of the Methodist church, where is the commandment recorded? It is not in the Bible! If God has not commanded one to become a member of the Methodist church, is one doing his duty when he unites with that church, seeing one's whole duty is to keep God's commandments?

"ARTICLES OF RELIGION"

RECONCILIATION

"Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his father to us." (Par. 2.)

Think of that statement: "To reconcile his Father to us." Man had gone astray, sinned against God, rebelled against his government. This was the condition of man. The Discipline says Christ died "to reconcile his Father to us." Think of God being reconciled to man, and man a sinner! God cannot be reconciled to man while he is in his sinful, mutinous life; besides God has done no wrong that he needs to be "reconciled," neither can he be "reconciled" to men in their sins. Rebellious man is the one to be reconciled.

What is the meaning of this word, "reconcile?" "Reconcile: To conciliate anew, to call back into union and friendship the affection which have been alienated; to restore to friendship or favor after estrangement."—Webster. Can you entertain the idea that Christ died to "reconcile his Father to us?" Man had sinned—separated himself from God by his sins. Is it possible for you to think of God being reconciled, called "back into union and friendship" while man is in sin?

"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. 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. 5:18-20.)

The Discipline says Christ died to "reconcile his Father to us." The Bible says we are to be "reconciled to God." Behold the disagreement!

Again: "And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." (Eph. 2:16.)

Why is it that people who declare they desire to honor the Lord, people who insist they believe the Bible, will fly in the face of God and deny the plain statements of his word, or subscribe to a doctrine that flatly contradicts the Bible? The Discipline says Christ died to "reconcile his Father unto us," while the Bible says: "be ye reconciled to God."

METHODIST DISCIPLINE

Christ "suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his Father to us." (Par. 2.)

BIBLE

"We pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." (2 Cor. 5:20.)

Which of these statements do you believe? Which of them will you give your means, time and influence to teach to the men about you?

OF FREE WILL

"The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and works to faith, and calling upon God; wherefore we have to power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will." (Par. 8.) If this be true, man cannot do a good work "without the grace of God preventing." Then, if man is not saved, God is to blame. Man cannot do a "good work" until God gives him this grace, if the above is true. Then he must have this grace before he believes, or believing is not a good work. "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." (Jno. 6:29.) The Discipline declares that man cannot believe, "do this good work," till God

gives him "grace of God by Christ." God refuses to give all men this grace that they might believe and be saved, and then he is sent to hell for not believing.

All who receive this grace do believe, and are saved. If this is not true, then the grace fails to accomplish its purpose. But the majority do not believe and will be damned, because God withholds this grace. This doctrine makes God a tyrant, and utterly destroys the free moral agency of man.

FAITH ONLY

Read carefully the following statement from the Discipline.

"We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings; wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort." (Art. 9.)

"Justified by faith only." Not only does the Discipline declare that we are saved by "faith only," but Methodist preachers, true to their pledge, preach that the very moment one believes, he is saved.

The expression "faith only" does occur in the Bible. Just one time do we find it, but one time is enough—God does not have to say a thing twice to make it true—or for it to be true. The one time it is found in the Bible though is a plain, positive, unequivocal contradiction of the Discipline. God says we are not justified by "faith only." Read it for yourself, "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." (Jas. 2:24.)

Look at the two statements:

"We are justified by faith only."—Discipline, Art. 9.

"By works a man is justified and not by faith only." Jas. 2:24.

One may be a mental acrobat, able to perform all kinds of mental feats, but it is impossible for you to believe the statement in the Discipline, and at the same time believe the one in the word of God. Are you a member of the Methodist church? Will you try to reconcile the statement in the Discipline with the one in the word of God? Remember Methodist have subscribed to the Discipline and at the same time declare they believe in the Bible. How can they believe both of them, when there is such a clear contradiction between them? Do you say you did

not know there was such a clear contradiction of the Bible in the Discipline? Possible that is true, but now you know it. The members of the Methodist Church cannot change the Discipline; they do not have one thing to do with making any changes in it; but they subscribed to it at the time they became members of the Methodist Church, and pledged themselves to support its institutions. Can one afford to give his time and influence, as well as his means, to the support of an institution which preaches a doctrine that flatly contradicts the word of God? Can you afford to give your means and pray for God to assist men who preach that we are justified by "faith only," when God says we are not justified by "faith only?" Your zeal is worthy of a better cause.

Those who believe that man is justified by "faith only" may persuade themselves that they believe the Bible, but they are mistaken. Men cannot believe two contradictory statements.

If one is justified by "faith only" there is nothing else necessary to justification on man's part. "Faith only" does not admit of anything in addition to faith.

SALVATION WITHOUT THE POWER OF GOD

Not only does the doctrine of justification by "faith only" contradict the Bible, as cited above, but it teaches salvation without the power of God. Paul says: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." (Rom. 1:16.) The gospel is the power of God. The "power" of God for what? The power of God unto salvation. Is it the power of God to save disbelievers? No, there is no power to save disbelievers. The gospel is the power of God to save believers. The man must first be a believer, and the gospel is the power of God to save such a man. How are men made believers? The miracles, wonders and signs were to make believers, (Jno. 20:30,31), and the gospel is the power of God to save the believer. Inasmuch as the gospel is the power of God to save the believer, if a man is saved by "faith only"—as the Discipline teaches—then man is saved without the power of God; for the gospel is the power of God to save the believer. Do you believe it takes the power of God to save the believer? If you do, then you do not believe the Discipline, and cannot without stultifying your conscience, uphold those who teach such.

SAVED BEFORE BECOMING SONS OF GOD

"He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." (Jno. 1:11, 12.) In this passage "power" is again mentioned. "Power" is given to some one. To whom? What for? There are people who believe, and others who do not believe. This passage says "power" is given to the believer—**power** to become a son of God, is given to the believer. It does not say that one is a son the moment he believes; but says the believer is given power to become the son of God. If man is saved the moment he believes, as the Discipline declares, he is saved without the power of God, for to the believer is given power to become the son of God.

SAVED WITHOUT THE NEW BIRTH

If man is saved the moment he believes, he is not only saved without the power of God, but is saved without being a son of God! You were not a "son" the moment you believed; but the "believer" is given power to become the son of God. It follows, if the Discipline is right, when it declares that all that is necessary to your salvation is that you believe; you are saved without being a son of God. But if you are saved without being a son of God, then you are saved without being born of God, for in being born of God you become a son of God.

SAVED BEFORE COMING TO GOD

Salvation by "faith only," as taught in the Discipline, is contending for salvation before coming to God. Proof:

"He that cometh to God must believe that He is." (Heb. 11:6.) An unbeliever cannot "come" to God. Who can come? None but believers—"he that cometh to God must believe that He is." One must believe before he can come. If a man is saved the moment he believes, as the Discipline teaches, then it follows by all the laws of logic, and the Bible, that man is saved before he comes to God. Is it answered that a man is saved by faith in Christ; that he believes that God is, and then has faith in Christ, and that it is at the moment he exercises "faith in

Christ" that he is saved? That will not do, for Christ says: "No man cometh unto the Father, but by me." (Jno. 14:6.) Since man cannot "come" to God, but by Christ; it follows that if man is saved the moment he believes or exercises faith in Christ, he is saved before he "comes" to God.

SAVED BY IMPERFECT FAITH

If one is saved the moment he believes, as the Discipline teaches, then he is saved by an "imperfect faith." Proof: "Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect." (Jas. 2:22.) Faith must exist before it can work; but till it works it is imperfect, and if salvation is by faith before it works, it is salvation by an "imperfect faith." But if man is saved by "faith only," it is salvation by faith without works, and would be salvation by an imperfect faith.

SAVED BY DEAD FAITH

If man is saved by "faith only," he is saved by a "dead faith." Proof: "But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works it dead." Again: "Faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone." (Jas. 2:17.) If man is saved the moment he believes, if he is saved by "faith only," as the Discipline declares, then he is saved by faith without works, and James says faith without works is dead. It follows then that salvation by "faith only" would be salvation by a dead faith. Again: "As the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." (Jas. 2:26.) The body when the spirit has left it is dead; it is worthless so far as blessing man or mankind is counted. Just so it is with faith without works—"so faith without works is dead also." The dead faith—faith without works—can no more bless man, than can the dead body. The Discipline contends for salvation by "dead faith," and by that alone.

SAVED WITHOUT CONFESSING

The doctrine of justification by "faith only" declares one is saved without confessing Christ. "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." (Jno. 12:42, 43.) These cowardly rulers believed, this is plainly stated, but they would not confess Him! Will God save a man who loves the praises of men more than the praises of God? Such was the condition of the rulers here mentioned. They believed, and if the Discipline is correct, when it declares one is justified by "faith only," they were certainly justified. But the rulers, though they believed, would not confess Christ. Are men justified without "confessing" Christ—are they justified by "faith only?" "Faith only" does not include confessing Christ. Are men justified who will not confess Christ? That is the question. Men must believe before they can confess Christ. "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (Rom. 10:10.) If man is justified by "faith only," as the Discipline teaches, since these rulers believed, and refused to "confess" Christ, and confession is made unto salvation, then they were justified without "confessing unto salvation." Again: "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in Heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in Heaven." (Matt. 10. 32, 33.) These rulers refused to "confess" Christ before men, and Christ declares he will refuse to "confess" them before His Father in heaven; but the Discipline declares they were justified—for they had faith, just faith, nothing but faith, and the Discipline says men are justified by "faith only." More: Their refusal to confess Christ was a tacit denial of Christ, and Christ says those who deny Him, He will "deny before His Father which is in heaven." The Discipline says they were "justified," Christ says He will "deny them before His Father which is in heaven." Do you believe such characters as these cowardly rulers were "justified?" No? Then do not support a doctrine, or subscribe to a theory which declares they were.

FAITH ONLY WILL NOT AVAIL

Though the Discipline declares man is "justified by faith only," God declares that "faith only" will not "avail."

"For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything,

nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love." (Gal. 5:6.)

1. Circumcision does not avail. 2. Uncircumcision does not avail. 3. What does avail? 4. Faith, which works by love, avails. 5. But faith must exist before it can work. 6. Faith must work before it avails. If man is saved by "faith only," as the Discipline declares, then faith does avail before it works; but Paul says faith must work before it avails. It follows then that faith must exist before it can work, and must work before it can avail. Since faith must exist before it can work, and must work before it can avail, it cannot be true that man is "justified by faith only," for "faith only" is faith without works; and faith without works will not avail. But if "faith only," which is faith without works, brings "justification," then "faith without works" does avail; but God says it does not avail. There is not recorded in all the word of God a single instance where God blessed a man on the condition of that man's faith before his faith expressed itself in some act.

FAITH ONLY DOES NOT PROFIT

"What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? Can faith save him?" (Jas. 2:14.) The Discipline says faith could and would save him. Hear God's answers immediately following the inquiry: "If a brother or sister be naked and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful for the body; what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone." (Jas. 2:15-17.) This should settle the matter with every candid reader. "Faith only" can profit a man no more than saying to the hungry, "Depart in peace, be filled," when not a mouthful is given to eat; or saying to the naked, "Be warmed," when not one thing in the way of clothing is provided.

SAVED AND NOT PARDONED

Men must believe before they turn unto the Lord. "And the hand of the Lord was with them; and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord." (Acts 11:21.) After they believed,

they "turned unto the Lord." If the Methodist are right when they declare that man is saved the moment he believes, then it follows that man is saved before he "turns unto the Lord." But if men are saved before they "turn unto the Lord," they are saved before they are pardoned!

"Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and He will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for He will abundantly pardon." (Isa. 55:7.) Men must turn unto the Lord before He pardons them; but they believe before they turn. It follows then, that if men are saved the moment they believe, as the Discipline teaches, they are saved before they "turn unto the Lord." But the Lord says He pardons only those who turn unto Him, and they turn unto Him after they believe. It stands thus: 1. Believe. 2. Turn unto the Lord. 3. Pardon. If the Discipline is right, when it declares that man is saved the moment he believes, he is saved before the Lord pardons him. How can such be true? A saved man who is not pardoned? Such a contradiction of terms; but this is the doctrine of the Methodist. You are not willing to give your time and influence to such a doctrine, are you? If "no," then become a member of the church of Christ, accept the Bible, the Bible only, as your rule of faith and practice—teach only the things found therein.

ABOUT THE METHODIST CHURCH

"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered according to Christ's ordinances, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." Par. 13.

INCONSISTENCY

There could not possibly be a Methodist church before there were Methodists. "The first Methodists were the two Wesleys, with Robert Kirkham and William Morgan." (McT. 57.) In debating with the Methodist preachers they invariably take the position that the church of God began with the covenant God made with Abraham, Gen. 12th chapter, 1921 years before

Christ. Seventeen hundred years after the death of Christ we find the first Methodist. If it be true that the church of Christ began with Abraham, in the 12th chapter of Genesis, the Methodist Church is 3600 years too young to be the church of God. But if the church of Christ began with Christ and His apostles, still the Methodist Church would be seventeen hundred years too young to be the church of Christ.

The very fact that the Methodist Church came into existence seventeen hundred years after the beginning of the church of Christ, is positive proof that it is not the church of Christ. It is an institution separate and distinct from the church of Christ. This is further shown from the fact that the church of Christ had no laws, rules and regulations except those given by inspiration, and recorded in the New Testament. The Methodist Church is governed solely by laws devised by fallible men.

The church of Christ is a spiritual institution, and human laws cannot control spirituality. If they could, man can control God and God's institutions by such laws as man may ordain. As the church is God's institution, with Christ as head (Col. 1:18), for man to enact "laws" and "rules of religion" in God's institution, is to presume: First, That God has not enacted laws to govern His church; or, second, that man has discovered that God's law is not sufficient, and that man, by his wisdom, can, and has supplied the deficiency. Think of the absurdity of a divine institution, with Christ as its head, being controlled by laws of man, or a set of men! Such a course dethrones Christ and enthrones man. If the Methodist Church is the church of Christ, or any part of it, by enacting laws, rules and regulations to govern their church they have dethroned Christ and enthroned the Methodist bishop.

But the Methodist Church claims to be the church of Christ, paragraph 666. "We rejoice to recognize you as members of the Church of Christ." How are these "members of the Church of Christ" to be governed? Question: Will you be subject to the discipline of the church, attend upon its ordinances (ordinances as set forth in the Discipline, of course), and support its institutions?" To this question the following answer is made: "I will endeavor so to do, by the help of God." Par. 666. After the questions have been propounded, and the answers made, they engage in prayer, in which they ask God to "help them to perform the promise and vow which they have made." Par. 666. Think of it. They pray for God to help them perform

the vow they have made to uphold laws made by the bishops of the Methodist Church to govern His (God's) institution. I presume a man may call such "presumption," but I am inclined to think a more appropriate name would be "audacity."

BAPTISM

"Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized; but it is also a sign of regeneration, or the new birth. The baptism of young children is to be retained in the church." Par. 17.

"Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christians are distinguished from others not baptized." Indeed! To whom is it a sign? The person who has been regenerated certainly knows it, God knows it, the preacher has been convinced of the fact, or he would not baptize them. "Baptism" is a "sign." To whom? But more: "Baptism" is a "mark of difference, whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized." I have never been able to "distinguish" between those who have and those who have not been "baptized" by the "sign" "baptism." Have you yet been able to "distinguish" between Christians, and others who have not been "baptized" by this "mark," "sign?" Who, by any authority higher than that of man, ever declared that "baptism" was a sign? Neither God, nor an inspired man, breathed such a statement.

Again, in the same paragraph: "The baptism of young children is to be retained in the church." Par. 17. By this statement, Methodists include "infants." Those who read the Bible know that there is no record in all the word of God of the baptism of an infant. It is a useless and senseless practice. Christ did not command the baptism of either infants or adults; but He did command the baptism of believers. But paedo-Baptists, in their effort to justify this statement in the Discipline have argued: "The infant is like the man in the kingdom; hence reckoned as a believer." If this be true, more is true; for the man in the kingdom of heaven, is not only a "believer," but he is a baptized believer. If he is not, he is not in the kingdom, nor in Christ, for we are baptized into

Christ. (Gal. 3:27.) If the infant is like the man in the kingdom, it is safe, and being safe, does not need baptism.

Read again: "Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized; but it is also a sign of regeneration, or the new birth."

As "baptism" is a "sign of the new birth," and infants "are born into this world in Christ the Redeemer," (Par. 664), and infants are to be baptized, and baptism is a "sign of regeneration or the new birth, is it not a fact that, as the infant got the "sign of regeneration," "baptism," that the infant got the "new birth" after he was "born in Christ the Redeemer?" Then the sign—baptism—takes place in Christ, and follows the new birth; and the new birth takes place in Christ. Why? Because the Discipline says all born into the world are born "in Christ the Redeemer, heirs of life eternal." Then all, absolutely all, infidel, atheist, heathen—everybody is in Christ. Why? Because they were born, and the Discipline says all "are born into this world in Christ the Redeemer, heirs of life eternal." Then it follows that every one is "in Christ," before being born into the world. As those "born in Christ the Redeemer" are "heirs of life eternal and subjects of the saving grace of the Holy Spirit," (Par. 664), then all are saved before natural birth. Why? Because the Discipline says all are born "in Christ," and those born "in Christ" are "heirs of life eternal," and none but children of God are heirs of eternal life. It follows then that the only good accomplished by the "new birth" would be to restore the fellow that had fallen from grace!

"If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold all things are become new." (2 Cor. 5:17.) As the Discipline teaches that all who are "born into this world" are "in Christ the Redeemer," it certainly follows that before natural birth all became new creatures, old things passed away, i.e., when one comes into Christ old things pass away. What are the "old things" that "pass away?" Look, "in whom (Christ) we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins." (Eph. 1:7.) As all are born "in Christ," and those in Christ are "new creatures, * * * old things pass away;" and as the "old things" are our sins that are forgiven, who will say the Methodist Church does not teach that we come into pardon before natural birth.

After they become "heirs of life eternal," by being born "in Christ," they are "subjects of the saving grace of the Holy Spirit." Par. 664. Then if a single one fails to reach the glory world, it will be because there is not enough "saving grace" of the Holy Spirit.

When we are born (natural birth) we are "in Christ," the Discipline declares; being regenerated, pardoned, then they put the sign—baptism—on all they can.

The Discipline says we are "born in Christ." If you were born in Christ, it must follow that you were "in" Christ before you were born, but if you were "in Christ" before you were born, then you were saved from sin before you were born. But if saved from sin before you were born, then you were a sinner before your birth.

CHANGE OR ABOLISH RITES AND CEREMONIES

"Every particular church may ordain, change, or abolish rites and ceremonies, so that all things may be done to edification." Par. 22.

The church of Christ is the body of Christ. Only Christ has the right to make, ordain, ceremonies for His body, the church. Think of men, uninspired men, presuming to "ordain, change, or abolish rites and ceremonies." This would place the right of legislating in the hands of men. The apostles of Christ did not presume to do such things. What do you think of men in this age doing such? The above quotation is given as pertains to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, an institution wholly unknown in all the work of God; and not known in the world till seventeen hundred years after the death of Christ. It is a human institution, and I presume those who compose it should have the right to make any changes as they may elect.

If you would learn about the church of Christ, the church of which Christ is head, go to the Bible. There you will find all that he has given to direct her in her work, and He has given all that is necessary.

Imagine the presumption of a body of men trying to "ordain, change or abolish rites and ceremonies" for the church of God?

Appealing to the Bible: "If any man speak, let him speak

as the oracles of God." (1 Pet. 4:11.) Think of a church in one town "changing or abolishing" rites and ceremonies, and their brethren in another town refusing to make such changes, and they are to "speak as the oracles of God." Are people speaking as the "oracles of God" when they propose to change or abolish rights and ceremonies? "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me." (2 Tim. 1:13.) How can people "hold fast the form of sound words" and make changes in "rites and ceremonies," when there is not one word in all the book of God which authorizes such changes? "And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." (2 Tim. 2:2.) Is it possible that men can be "faithful" and change rites and ceremonies which were delivered by inspiration? But rites and ceremonies were never delivered to the Methodist Church by inspiration. "Therefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or by epistle." (2 Thess. 2:15.) How can one hold fast the things taught by the apostles, and make the changes provided for in the Discipline? "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing." (1 Tim. 6:3,4.) At no time or place has God ever allowed man to change rites and ceremonies. It is a sin of presumption and rebellion against God. I have reference, of course, to the church of Christ. I have no idea that God has ever taken cognizance of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South—it is an institution which does not exist by His authority.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. 3:16,17.) Just how men can profess to believe the word of God and at the same time, in the face of the above statement propose to change rites and ceremonies, is passing strange. That is a prerogative that belongs to God only. It contradicts inspiration, apostolic precept and example. The directions about changing rites and ceremonies are given in the Methodist Discipline, for the Methodist Church—not the church of God. The Methodist Church is a human institution, founded by men, some seventeen hundred years after the establishment of the church of Christ, and in-

asmuch as it is a human institution those who constitute it should have the right to make such changes and alterations as they wish.

It is not enough for men to worship God. Men may worship the God of the Bible, and at the same time be sinners. When Paul was on a missionary journey he passed an altar, built by the heathens, which bore the inscription: "**To the Unknown God.**" In discoursing to the Athenians he mentioned having seen the altar and the inscription on the same, and said: "Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you." (Acts 17:23.) Paul tells them that they were worshiping the very God he preached. Were they accepted, even though they worshiped the same God Paul preacher? No. They were worshiping in ignorance, and Paul says to them: "The times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." (Acts 17:30.) It is not enough to worship God. You must worship Him as He has directed. It is not enough to be honest when it comes to worshiping God. He demands that we do the very things He has commanded, and do them in the very way He has revealed—to worship in spirit and in truth; to worship as He has directed in His word, the truth. (Jno. 4:24.)

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Religious oppresion became so great in the old world that people hailed with delight the opportunity to come to America, the country that is regarded as the home of the free. Such indeed it is, save where people voluntarily place themselves in bondage. I have reference to people who become members of a religious institution in which they have not one word to say relative to the government and regulations made by men for the church in her work and worship.

Those who are well read in the history of the Methodist Church are not forgetful that the members have no liberty. Indeed, during the life of Mr. Wesley, the founder of the Methodist Church, they looked to him as the one to direct them. In 1784 they adopted a minute, in which they declared: "During the lifetime of Rev. John Wesley, we acknowledge ourselves his sons in the gospel, ready, in matters of church government, to obey his commands." Bang's, Vol. 1, p. 277. What more could the

Catholics say relative to the obedience to the Pope in matters of church government?

In the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the bishops are the "bosses." The bishops boss the presiding elders, the presiding elders boss the preachers, and the preachers boss the members. The members have not one word to say, authoritatively, in the matters of the church and her services—unless the boss simply indulges them. The members cannot say when they will have a protracted meeting, who will assist them in the meeting as preacher, who will be their pastor, when they can build a house in which to worship God, or who will be their Sunday school superintendent. The services of the church are in the hands of the preacher, and possibly he is not the preacher the congregation desired, but the one the "bosses" sent them. They can hear the preaching, pray and—Pay!

BISHOP THE BOSS

The bishops shall have authority, when they judge it necessary, to change the place appointed for the meeting of the General Conference." Par. 39.

The bishops have the authority to change the place that may have been appointed for the meeting of the General Conference. They have much more power, as you will learn from the study of this subject. There was no such institution as a "General Conference" known in the days of the apostles—they never attended such an unscriptural thing, nor is there any ground for its existence.

GENERAL CONFERENCE

"The General Conference shall have full power to make rules and regulations for our church, under the following limitations and restrictions, viz: The General Conference shall not revoke, alter or change our articles of religion, or establish any new standards or rules of doctrine contrary to our present existing and established standards of doctrine." Par. 42.

1. The General Conference shall have full power "to make rules and regulations for our church." 2. "The General Conference shall not revoke, alter or change our articles of religion."

The merest tyro can see that the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has "rules and regulations for our church" that are no part of the "Articles of Religion." Why? Because, one can be changed, the other cannot.

"You ought, next to the word of God, to procure the articles and canon of the church to which you belong." Discipline, p. iii.

The Methodist Church has "Articles of Religion," "next to the word of God" that cannot be changed. These "Articles" differ from the word of God, yet are more binding than the word of God. But they can change some "rules and regulations." Then, these "rules and regulations" are not the word of God. If they are, then the "General Conference" assumes the right to change the word of God. If these "rules and regulations" are not the word of God, then it follows that the Methodist Church is not governed by the word of God.

BISHOP BOSS

"Who shall appoint the times of holding the Annual Conferences? Answer: The Bishop; but they shall allow every Annual Conference to sit a week at least." Par. 49.

The General Conference meets once each four years, in the month of April or May. Par. 36. The Annual Conference meets each year. The bishops appoint the time for holding the Annual Conference, but they must "allow" the conference at least one week to attend to its business.

"Who shall preside in the Annual Conferences? Answer. The Bishops." Par. 51.

Of course, the bishop—he must be there, when it is possible. Why? He is the big boss in Methodism; he must see that matters go just as they have enacted rules to govern such gatherings. In the absence of a bishop, what will they do? "In the absence of a Bishop, the conference shall elect the president by ballot, without debate, from among the traveling elders. The president thus elected shall discharge all the duties of a Bishop except ordination." Par. 51.

The preachers and presiding elders present cannot "ordain." That is a prerogative of the bishop; he is the authoritative man. True, he is only a man, an uninspired man, but he has the power in Methodism to do the ordaining.

SOME DUTIES OF THE BISHOP

"What are the duties of a Bishop? Answer. To preside in the General, Annual and District Conferences." Par. 101.

That's it, he is to be right on the ground all the time, when there is to be an assembly of preachers; for they might undertake to do something which would undermine the system.

Listen to answer No. 2 to the same question, i. e., "What are the duties of a Bishop?" "To fix the appointments of the preachers in the Annual Conferences; **provided**, that he shall announce to the open cabinet before the minute question answering the appointments of the preachers is officially announced, * * * and, **provided further**, that he shall not allow any preacher to remain in the same circuit or station more than four years successively, except the connectional officers, the supernumerary and superannuated preachers, missionaries among Indians," and such like work. Par. 102.

Thus the bishop "bosses" the preacher. He says where the preacher shall go, and how long he shall remain at one place, provided it is not more than four years at the same place. It is not a question of how well a preacher may be suited for the work in a certain place; it matters not how well pleased the people may be with the preacher, the Bishop says he must go, and go he must! True the move may be an expensive one, and the field assigned him may be Gourd Neck Creek, or 'Possum Trot, where his children cannot have the school advantages they have been enjoying and really need, for it is likely they have been in a school where they have advanced to the eighth grade, but should the Bishop assign the preacher a work where there is but three months school each year, and this school not graded, the preacher must go. He is not a free man—i. e., he is not free to go where he might choose, and where the people might call him. His only freedom consists in his ability to quit the Methodist ecclesiasticism. So long as he remains with them he must go where and when the bishop says. It is possible that the thought—with the desire—that he may some day become a presiding elder, or perchance a bishop, holds him in this slavery? Can't you see why the preachers are so willing to look up to, and make much over the bishops. To "stand in" with them may result in the bishop giving them a "good" place for the next year. If you are a Methodist preacher, and have incurred the

displeasure of the bishop—well, he is but a human being, and it might influence him in assigning you the work for the next year. Fine system, that of Methodism—fine to make the preachers obey their “bosses,” the bishops. True, this is a system that was not known in the days of the apostles; but you should remember that Methodism, with its whole machinery, is of modern invention.

BISHOP BOSSES THE PRESIDING ELDERS

“What are the duties of a Bishop?” Answer 3. “To choose the presiding elders, fix their stations, and change them when he judges it necessary: **provided**, that he shall not allow any elder to preside in the same district more than four years successively.” Par. 103.

Not only does the bishop say where the preacher shall go, and how long he shall remain at a place, but he has the power over the presiding elders also, and determines how long he shall preside in any place, provided it is not more than four years. Not only so, but he is to change the presiding elders when “he judges it necessary.” You can see why the elder will make an effort to please the bishop. The bishop has the power to change him from one place to another, when he judges it necessary.

Men, men of America, men of freedom, what do you think of this system of slavery—this, system which takes from men, preachers, who should be allowed to work where they are capable of doing the most good, or where they are wanted, their freedom?

BISHOP MAY RECEIVE, CHANGE OR SUSPEND PREACHERS

“What are the duties of a Bishop?” Answer 4. “To change, receive and suspend preachers in the intervals of the conferences, as necessity may require, and as the Discipline directs.” Par. 104.

Who is it that has power to “change, receive and suspend preachers?” The bishop, of course, the bishop; for he is the

big "boss." What has the church to do with the matter? Not one thing. The church may not wish the preacher changed, but that does not matter—the bishop has the power to change him—"as the Discipline directs." It is not intimaetd that he is to do it as the Bible directs. There is no such power delegated to a "bishop" by the word of God. You should remember, though, we are studying about the Methodist Church, an institution not one time mentioned in all the word of God.

BISHOP A JUDGE

"What are the duties of a Bishop?" Answer 6. "To decide all questions of law coming before him in the regular business of an Annual or District Conference. * * * Annual or District conferences shall have the right to appeal from such decision to the College of Bishops, whose decision in all such cases shall be final." Par. 106.

The bishop is a judge, but should there be a desire on the part of the conference, they may appeal to the College of Bishops, and their decision ends the matter—they are the highest court known in the Methodist Church.

BISHOPS FORM DISTRICTS

"What are the duties of a Bishop?" Answer 8. "To see that the Districts be formed according to his judgment: **provided**, that no District shall contain more than thirty appointments." Par. 108.

Not as the people in any section may decide about the matter; not as they may elect, shall they become a part of the Methodist machinery, but as the bishop may decide—according to the judgment of the bishop shall the districts be formed. Verily, the bishop is a great "boss" in Methodism.

PRESIDING ELDERS AND BOSSES

No one who reads the Bible will for a moment entertain the idea that there were in the days of the apostles presiding

elders as there are now in the Methodist Church, or that there is Scripture for such presumptive officers in the church of God. You will not forget that we are making a study of the Methodist Discipline, the authoritative book for the Methodist Church, which is a human institution, founded seventeen hundred years after the death of Christ, by Mr. John Wesley, who was not converted at the time he began the work.

In Methodism, bishops have their realm, where they boss, but you would hardly expect to find the presiding elders contented to be "bossed" and not in turn be able to show some authority as bosses themselves. That the elders are bosses you will learn from the following:

"What are the duties of a Presiding Elder?" Answer 1. "To travel through his appointed District in order to preach and to oversee the spiritual and temporal affairs of the Church." Par. 112.

The presiding elder is an overseer—he is to look after the "spiritual and temporal affairs of the Church." Though one may be a member of a local congregation of Methodists, and entertain the idea that the congregation is able to look after its "temporal" affairs, it must be remembered that this is one of the duties of the presiding elder—it is so provided in the Discipline, and Methodists agree to be governed by the Discipline when they become a member of the Methodist Church. You will remember this. When the presiding elder begins to inquire into such matters with authority he is acting in the capacity of overseer, and does not transcend his rights in the Methodist Church. Though the bishop bosses him, he is boss himself in some matters, and over some people.

OVER PREACHERS

"What are the duties of a Presiding Elder?" Answer 2. "In the absence of the Bishop, to take charge of all the traveling and local preachers and exhorters in the District." Par. 113.

Yes, that's it—the Presiding Elders is "it" when the Bishop is not around! He is boss over the preachers in the district, in the absence of the bishop. It may seem to you that the local congregation should have the matter of the preacher in charge, but such is not the case in Methodism. The presiding elder is to look after your preachers—when the bishop is not present.

SUSPEND PREACHERS

“What are the duties of a Presiding Elder?” Answer 3.
“To change, receive and suspend preachers during the intervals of the Conferences, and in the absence of the Bishop, as the Discipline directs.” Par. 114.

This is, as you see, a “one man” rule. The presiding elder has the power to suspend a preacher—provided the bishop is not present. It is quite easy to understand why a preacher makes an effort to please the Presiding Elder. The Elder has power over him. If the presiding elder is pleased with a preacher, then he may be changed to a better circuit. How much do Methodist preachers like of being men pleasers? More, the presiding elder has the power to “receive” preachers. What has the local congregation to do with this matter. Not one thing!

PRESIDING ELDER A JUDGE

“What are the duties of a Presiding Elder?” Answer 4.
“To decide all questions of law which may come up in the regular business of the Quarterly or District Conference, when submitted to him in writing, subject to an appeal to the President of the next Annual Conference.” Par. 116.

The presiding elder is a judge. True appeal may be taken from his decision, but he can tie the matter up till the next Annual Conference. While such methods are wholly unknown in the Bible, this is the policy of the Methodist Church.

SEE THAT DISCIPLINE BE ENFORCED

“What are the duties of a Presiding Elder?” Answer 5.
“To take care that every part of the Discipline be enforced in his District.” Par. 117.

Not one word about seeing that the word of God be observed in his district, but to see that the Discipline be “enforced”—to be sure the Discipline “has been founded on the experience of a long series of years,” and has been subscribed to by the Methodist—see that it is enforced.

TO REPORT THE PREACHERS

"What are the duties of a Presiding Elder?" Answer 6.
"To inquire carefully, at each Quarterly Conference, whether the rules respecting the instruction of children and the supplying of our books and periodicals have been faithfully observed; whether the preacher in charge administers the sacraments, holds Church Conferences, enforces moral discipline and attends to the collections assessed to his charge; and to report to the Annual Conference the names of all delinquent traveling preachers within his District." Par. 117.

In short, he is a sort of a spy on the preacher. He is to ascertain if the Discipline has been enforced; to see if the collections have been attended to, and if the preacher has not attended to such matters, he is to "report" him to the Annual Conference. Let not the Methodist become angry with the preacher should he be insistent about these matters—indeed, you should bear with him, even though he should make repeated efforts to see that the collections assessed be raised. It may be an irksome task for him, but should he fail to raise the money assessed he will be "reported" to the "Annual Conference." A few failures to raise the money assessed against his charge, and he will gain the reputation of being a poor hand to get money, and this is reported to the Annual Conference, and it is not likely he will be given the promotion—better appointments—he would like. The Bishop's salary must be raised, and the Annual Conference is to see that it is (Par. 339, 340), and the presiding elder's salary must be raised as well as the preacher's, and should the preacher make a failure in raising the amount assessed against the work he has in charge, his ability as a money "raiser" is not counted as much. Do not blame the preacher; he was assigned to the work at your place, the assessment was made, and it is his business to see that it is raised—if he does not he will be reported to the Annual Conference. Bad, too bad, but it is the system of Methodism.

PRESIDING ELDER, A LACKEY BOY

"What are the duties of a Presiding Elder?" Answer 7.
"To attend the Bishops when present in his District, and to

give them, when absent, all necessary information, by letter, of the state of his District." Par. 118.

In short, he is a kind of lackey boy for the bishop. He must attend him when the bishop is in his district, and when necessary report to him by letter such matters as the bishop should be apprised.

THE PREACHER A BOSS

Though the preacher knows that the bishop and presiding elder are bosses over him, at the same time he knows that he is a boss, too, and in his field he is the boss—when the bishop and presiding elder are not present.

"Question. What are the duties of a preacher who has the charge of a circuit, station or missions. Answer 1. To preach the gospel; to celebrate the rite of matrimony, provided it does not conflict with civil laws; in the absence of an elder or Bishop, to administer baptism; and in the absence of the presiding elder or bishop, to control the appointment of all services to be held in the churches in his charge." Par. 123.

MEMBERS HAVE NO CONTROL OF CHURCH HOUSE

"The preacher in charge is not required to secure the consent of the trustees of church property before appointing a service in the same." Par. 548.

The people build the house, make all the sacrifices to raise the money, the bishop sends them a preacher, a man they may never have heard of, or it may be a preacher they know well, one that they do not wish for the work; he is sent to them, and no sooner does he arrive than the control of the house falls into his hands—provided the presiding elder is not present. Should every member of a Methodist Church in a town invite me to preach in the house, the preacher in charge can close the house over their united protest. What liberty does one have in the Methodist Church? None! So long as one remains there he is a slave. As American citizens they have the power to sever their connection with the human institution, but so long as they remain in it, others dictate what the members are to do.

EXPEL MEMBERS

"What are the duties of a preacher who has the charge of a circuit, station, or mission? Answer 2. To receive, try and expel members according to the provision of the Discipline." Par. 124.

It is not the right of the members to "receive, try and expel members." This is the work of the preacher. The preachers is not a member of the local congregation—he is not a member of the church of which he is "pastor." Though he labors with them, lives in the town, has the power to "receive, try and expel members," his membership is not in the congregation. The proof will be given later.

PREACHER APPOINTS LEADERS

"What are the duties of a preacher who has the charge of a circuit, station, or mission? Answer 3. To appoint all the leaders annually, and change them when he sees it necessary." Par. 125.

Though the people build the house, constitute the congregation, and furnish the money necessary to carry on the work, they are not allowed to say who shall be leaders in the local work? Strange as it may seem, such is the case in the regime of Methodism. The preacher, who is not a member of the congregation, appoints the leaders, and more, he changes them when he deems it necessary! The preacher is the boss, the people are bossed.

SEE THAT GENERAL RULES BE READ

"What are the duties of a preacher who has the charge of a circuit, station, or mission? Answer 4. To see that all the ordinances and regulations of the Church be duly observed, and see that the General Rules be read at least once a year in every congregation." Par. 126.

Would reading of the word of God be sufficient. Certainly not, for the "General Rules" are rules never known by the inspired men of God—they are rules unknown to the Bible. They are rules enacted by fallible men and subscribed to by Methodist.

SEES THAT A FAST BE HELD

"What are the duties of a preacher who has the charge of a circuit, station, or mission? Answer 5. To see that a fast be held in every congregation within his charge on the Friday preceding every quarterly meeting." Par. 127.

The preacher has subscribed to the Discipline, and pledged himself to see that it is enforced in the work of his charge, so far as he can. You who are members of the Methodist Church answer how faithfully the preacher has enforced this rule? Has God provided that a "fast" be held on Friday before the "quarterly meeting?" No, God knows nothing of that "quarterly meeting," nor of this "fast" imposed by men—the bosses of Methodism.

REPORT TO THE PRESIDING ELDER

"What are the duties of a preacher who has the charge of a circuit, station, or mission? Answer 9. To give an account of his charge every quarter to his Presiding Elder." Par. 131.

The preacher has to account to the boss over him how matters are going in his charge. Do not get out of humor with him—he is not a free man. Though you may not like the way he bosses in your midst, remember that he was sent there as such, and is being called on to make reports—and reports he must make.

PREACHER A SLAVE

"Who shall be admitted into the conference in full connection? Answer 1. No one except a preacher who has been employed at least two years in the regular itinerant work (which is to commence from his being admitted on trial at the Annual Conference), and who is approved by the Annual Conference." Par. 148.

"Answer 2. Before any preacher is admitted into full connection, he shall pass an approved examination upon the Course of Study prescribed by the Bishops for candidates for the ministry; and in no case shall a vote be taken to admit any one

until he is recommended by the Examining Committee." Par. 149.

See the power of the bishops—they prescribe the course of study. After a man has completed and has stood a creditable examination, and is recommended by the Examining Committee, he is voted on. Think of this procedure, will you, remembering that the Methodists declare God calls men to preach the gospel—often calling them in an audible voice, so they declare! Even if one insists he has thus been called of God, he cannot be a preacher in the Methodist Conference till he has been duly examined by them.

Having passed the examination, the applicant is asked:

"Are you willing to conform to the Discipline?" Par. 151.

The preacher obligates himself to conform to the Discipline, not the Bible. He took the yoke of the Discipline when he became a member of the Methodist Church, but he must take it again when he becomes a preacher.

"OUR RULES"

That you may be certain that he obligates himself to obey those who have the office over him—that he is not free, read:

"Do not mend our rules, but keep them." Par. 151. Reference is made to the uninspired rules of Methodism—rules that God knows nothing of. Methodist preachers obligate themselves to keep them.

EMPLOY YOUR TIME AS WE DIRECT

"Act in all things not according to your own will, but as a son in the gospel. It is therefore your duty to employ your time in the manner which we direct." Par. 151.

You are not to have your will in the matter. "Act in all things not according to your own will." Your own will is not to be consulted—you are not your own; you have submitted yourself to the slavery of Methodism, an institution made by

men, who are very humanly human. As a member of this aggregation you are not to act "according to your own will," for the "bosses" over you do the "will" work—you do the obeying. The members of the Methodist Church should remember that the preachers have thus obligated themselves. But more: "It is therefore your duty to employ your time as we direct." True, the preacher is right in the congregation, and may better know just what the local conditions demand, but he has obligated himself to "employ his time as we (the bosses) direct." His failure or refusal to so do will result in trouble for him with those over him in authority.

WORK AS WE ADVISE

"Above all, if you labor with us in the Lord's vineyard, it is needful you should do that part of the work which we advise, at those times and places we judge most for his glory." Par. 151.

Do not presume to say what you should do, or where you will labor, preacher. You have placed yourself under those who are to advise what, when and where you are to labor. It matters not what your judgment may be in the matter; if you are allowed "full connection" you must be willing to cry: Not my will, but thine be done, O ye bishops! Speak, we hear; command, we obey. We as completely subject ourselves to you as the Catholics do to the Pope.

PREACHERS MUST OBEY

"What shall be done when a preacher refuses to attend to the work assigned him? Answer. He shall be liable to suspension or deposition from the ministry, unless he have consent of the Bishop who made the appointment, or is in charge of the work; and the final determination in all such cases shall be with the Annual Conference." Par. 291.

You will notice it is the work assigned him, not the work he may have selected and obligated himself to do. Who does

the "assigning?" The bishop. But should the preacher refuse to do the work assigned him, what will be the result? He "shall be liable to suspension or deposition from the ministry." With the preacher is it "not to question why, 'tis but to do or"—suspension or deposition from the ministry! Can you understand why the preacher is so persistent with the work assigned him—he must do it; he dare not refuse.

PREACHER'S MEMBERSHIP

I made the statement in this tract that the Methodist preacher who is in charge of a circuit is not a member of the local congregation where he labors. Indeed, he does not hold membership in any Methodist Church.

"The membership of a traveling preacher is in the Annual Conference, and not in the pastoral charge to which he is appointed." Par. 516.

Though the Methodist Church has a man sent them as "pastor," the bishop sends him—true, he may be a man that they have never heard of, or he may be a man they know and do not wish to labor with them; that makes no difference; the bishop sees proper to send him. He dare not refuse to go, for he has obligated himself to labor where they direct. So soon as he arrives in town he has control of the house the members sacrificed to build, and has charge of all services to be conducted in the house; he appoints the leaders in the work, and changes them when he sees proper; but he is not a member of the church, his membership is in the Annual Conference. True it is that the church can not receive members into the congregation—Methodist Church—that is the right of the preacher in charge of the work—the pastor—though he himself is not a member of the church. He is boss over the work, and the members quietly submit, or the preacher has the power to expel them from the church. This is Methodism!

TO WHOM IS THE PREACHER AMENABLE?

"To whom is a traveling preacher amenable for his conduct? Answer. To the Annual Conference, which shall have power to try, and to acquit, to suspend or to expel him." Par. 276.

Is it not strange that a body of people will submit to such? A man is sent to them, though he may be a man that they did not desire, he must labor with them. But should he not do the work they desire done, should his conduct not be what they are certain it should be, is he amenable to them? Not in the least—he is amenable to the Annual Conference. Why should he not be? His membership is in that body. The preacher is sent to the work, the people take him, pay him, and allow others to determine whether he is what he should be. They must pay a man whom they can neither employ nor discharge. This is Methodism!

SUPERNUMERARY PREACHERS ARE SLAVES

“What is a supernumerary preacher? Answer 1. A supernumerary preacher is one who is so disabled by affliction as to be unable to preach constantly, but who is willing to do any work in the ministry which the Bishop may direct, and he may be able to perform.” Par. 164.

Should he refuse to do the work the bishop directs, what will be the result? Read:

“A supernumerary preacher who refuses to attend the work assigned him, unless in case of sickness or other unavoidable cause or causes, shall not be allowed to exercise the functions of his office, nor even to preach among us.” Par. 166.

Methodism proposes to boss all they can, from birth to the grave—they propose to take the unconscious babe and “baptize” it, and do not let up on the old, afflicted preacher. This is Methodism!

LOCAL PREACHERS

“What directions are given concerning the licensing of persons to preach. Answer 1. The District Conferences shall have authority to license proper persons to preach, and to renew their licenses annually, when, in its judgment, their gifts, grace and usefulness will warrant it. Par. 170.

“Answer 2. No person shall be licensed to preach without

the recommendation of the Quarterly Conference of the charge to which he belongs. Nor shall any one be licensed to preach without first passing, before a committee of three, to be appointed by the Presiding Elder." Par. 171.

Though a man declare he has been called to preach—he says he knows the Lord called him to preach, if he is a Methodist—the Methodists declare he shall not preach, with their approval till he has a recommendation from the Quarterly Conference, and has passed a creditable examination before a committee appointed by the presiding elder. This is Methodism!

CALLED TO PREACH

A man thinks he is called by the Holy Spirit to preach, and presents himself to the Methodists, making known his desire to preach. What do they do with him?

"How shall we try those who profess to be moved by the Holy Ghost to preach?" Par 98.

The man says he knows the Holy Spirit has called him to preach. The Methodists sit in judgment on the work of the Spirit and ask the man the following questions:

"Let the following questions be asked, namely: 1. Do they know God as a pardoning God? Have they the love of God abiding in them? Do they desire nothing but God? And are they holy in all manner of conversation? 2. Have they gifts (as well as grace) for the work? Have they (in some tolerable degree) a clear, sound understanding, a right judgment in the things of God, a just conception of salvation by faith? Do they speak justly, readily, clearly? 3. Have they fruit? Are they truly convinced of sin and converted to God by their preaching? As long as these three marks concur in any one we believe he is called to preach." Par. 98.

That is Methodism. God's call to preach is not worth anything to a Methodist till it has been censored by proper authorities! This censorship business would not look so bad if they did not believe in a direct call from Jehovah. God calls, but these boards of censors will block God's efforts to put a man to preaching if they decide God has not made a wise choice!

When the Methodist sit in trial on a man "called of God" to preach, and his views are not in accord with the doctrines of the Methodist Church, do they believe he is "called of God" to preach? Would they ordain him to preach? A man comes to them declaring that he is "called of God" to preach, but insists that sprinkling and pouring water on the man is not baptism, and that a child of God "cannot fall from grace," would they ordain him? No. It follows, then, that they regard only those who preach Methodist doctrine as "called of God" to preach, or they refuse to ordain a man that God called to preach." It is said each one is "called" to preach the doctrine of the church of which he is a member? Does God ever call a man to preach anything but the word of God—the gospel? No. Is the preaching done by the Methodist in harmony with the preaching done by the Baptist? No. Then if the Methodist are "called of God" to preach the gospel, and preach it, the Baptists are not, or the gospel does not harmonize with itself. Do not hold God responsible for the theories which are contradictory.

No one is in harmony with the doctrine of the Methodist Church except Methodist. It follows then: If the Methodist preach the word of God, no one is in harmony with the word of God but the Methodist. If the Discipline is in harmony with the word of God, then no one is in harmony with the word of God who is not in harmony with the Discipline. If the Discipline is in harmony with the word of God, since it contains the doctrines of the Methodist Church, then no one is in harmony with the word of God who is not in harmony with the Discipline of the Methodist Church.

The truth is, the Methodist preacher is called to preach the doctrine of the Methodist Church as set forth in the Discipline. and in so doing he preaches that which is believed and accepted by Methodist only. Methodist preachers are called and ordained to preach Methodism—that's all.

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE MEMBERS

LIBERTY SURRENDERED

The Methodist are fine people, and their zeal is worthy of a better cause than they have espoused. As members of the Methodist Church they have surrendered their liberties.

CAN'T BUILD A CHURCH HOUSE

"It shall be the duty of the Quarterly Conference of every circuit and station, where it is contemplated to build a house or houses of worship, to secure the ground or lot on which such house or houses are to be built, according to our deed of settlement, which deed must be legally executed; and also said Quarterly Conference shall appoint a judicious committee of at least three members of our Church, who shall form an estimate of the amount necessary to build; and three-fourths of the money, according to such estimate, shall be secured before any such building shall be commenced: Provided, however, that no house of worship shall be built unless the authority of the Quarterly Conference shall first have been obtained." Par. 447.

Is it not remarkably strange that a congregation, all of them Methodist, are not allowed to build a house in which to worship God till they secure authority from the quarterly conference? They may be amply able to build the house, and the house may be needed, but that does not matter, they must first secure the authority from the quarterly conference. The conference secures the lot or ground on which the building is to be erected, sees that at least three-fourths of the money necessary to erect the building is secured. When such has been complied with, then the Methodist may proceed with the building. Such is Methodism, and such is power exercised by the Methodist machinery over free born Americans, i. e., the Americans who are Methodist.

Is the quarterly conference whose permission must be secured before they build composed of the congregation wishing the house?

"Who shall compose a Quarterly Conference? Answer. All the traveling and local preachers, including superannuated preachers residing within the circuit or station * * * with the exhorters, stewards, trustees who are members of the Church, and class leaders of the respective circuits, stations and missions, together with the superintendents of Sunday schools who are members of the Church, the secretaries of Church Conferences and the presidents of Senior Epworth Leagues, if eligible, and none others." Par. 80.

The "lay members" do not compose the quarterly conference—it is composed only of "officials." To this aggregation Methodist must apply for permission to build a house in which to worship God. Good Methodist will submit to what they say about the matter, for they so obligated themselves when they became members of the Methodist Church.

DON'T OWN THE HOUSE

Though Methodist secure the permission of the quarterly conference to build the house; make all the sacrifice, supply all the money, when it is completed, the house is not theirs. They do not have any control of it.

"Let every Annual Conference take account of all the church buildings, parsonages and other church property within its bounds, and see that same be legally secured to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, according to the provisions of the Discipline." Par. 60.

"The trustees, with the consent of the preacher in charge and the Quarterly Conference, or if a District parsonage, then the Presiding Elder and the District Conference, shall have the power to sell any church or parsonage property which has gone out of use, or which should be removed to another place, the proceeds of which shall be invested in other church property under the directions of the Quarterly or District Conference." Par. 456.

The Revolutionary fathers fought for liberty, but those who become members of the Methodist Church willingly submit themselves to slavery—to the bosses of Methodism.

CAN'T SELECT THE STEWARDS

"How are the stewards to be appointed? Answer. The preacher in charge shall have the right of nomination, subject to the confirmation or rejection of the Quarterly Conference." Par. 193.

• STEWARD ACCOUNTABLE

"To whom are the stewards accountable for the faithful performance of their duties? Answer. To the Quarterly Conference, which shall have the power to remove them from office." Par. 197.

The duties of the stewards is directly connected with the local congregation, yet the congregation has nothing to do with selecting them, nor are they accountable to the congregation.

CAN'T ELECT SUNDAY SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT

"The Quarterly Conference of each circuit and station shall be a board of managers, having the supervision of all the Sunday schools within its bounds. It shall elect at the fourth Quarterly Conference of each year, on nomination of the preacher in charge, a superintendent for each Sunday school under its care." Par. 246.

Does it seem strange to you that in this country where we boast of religious liberty, there should be a body of people, a people who boast of being Protestants; who have willingly submitted to rules which do not even allow them the right to select a Sunday school superintendent? Such is the condition of those in the Methodist Church.

CAN'T RECEIVE MEMBERS

"What are the duties of a preacher who has the charge of a circuit, station, or mission? Answer 2. To receive, try and

expel members, according to the provisions of the Discipline." Par. 124.

The preacher is to receive the members according to the provisions of the Discipline—not according to the Bible.

SOME THINGS THE CHURCH CAN'T DO

The Methodist Church in your town cannot choose the preacher they will have labor with them; they cannot say how long the preacher now preaching with them may remain; they cannot select their Sunday school superintendent, stewards, bishops or presiding elders; nor build a church house till they have the consent of conference. It seems the bosses in Methodism think about the only thing the members can do is, hear the preacher, pay and pay.

In receiving one into the membership of the Methodist Church, he is asked:

"Will you be subject to the Discipline of the church, attend upon its ordinances and support its institutions? Answer. I will endeavor so to do by the help of God." Par. 666.

RECEPTION OF MEMBERS

Methodists believe and teach that a person is saved before he becomes a member of the church. He had to obey the gospel before he could be saved, for God takes "vengeance on all them that know not God, and obey not the gospel" (2 Thess. 1:8.) If one is a Christian and not a member of the Methodist Church, it follows that believing the Methodist doctrine is not necessary to being a Christian, living a Christian, dying a Christian and going to heaven. But a man must believe the word of God and obey it to become a Christian, live a Christian and go to heaven. What does a person have to subscribe to to become a member of the Methodist Church, or how does one become a Methodist? "See that they be duly recognized as members of the Church, agreeable to the provisions of the Discipline." Par. 217. "Do

you solemnly, in the presence of God and this congregation, ratify and confirm the promise and vow of repentance, faith and obedience contained in the baptismal covenant? Answer. I do, God being my helper. Will you be subject to the discipline of the Church, attend upon its ordinances and support its institutions? Answer. I will endeavor so to do, by the help of God. The minister shall then say to the candidate: We rejoice to recognize you as members of the Church of Christ." Par 666. Members of what? "Members of the Church of Christ." Think of it! A man becoming a member of the church of Christ by complying with the Methodist Discipline!

Is there more than one way revealed in the Bible for a man to become a member of the church of Christ? If there is, then God's word does not harmonize with itself. But God's law does harmonize with itself; then there can be but one way to become a member of the church of Christ. If compliance with the regulations of the Methodist Discipline is God's way, then one cannot become a member of the church of Christ without taking the "oath of allegiance" as prescribed in the Methodist Discipline.

The law by which a man gets into the Methodist Church will not put a man into any other institution in the world. Compliance with the law of God will put a man in the church of Christ. But no man gets into the Methodist Church by compliance with the word of God. If they do, then all who comply with the word of God will be in the Methodist Church. If not, then the same cause produces different effects. If this does not follow, then the same law obeyed will put people into antagonistic institutions.

The rules and regulations of the Discipline have connection with the Methodist Church only. But God's laws, rules and regulations are for the church of God. It follows, then, that the Methodist Church is a separate and distinct institution from the church of God. As the Methodist Church is an institution unknown to the Bible, they had to formulate rules by which one becomes a member, and laws to regulate their lives. Such is the Discipline. Such is Methodism!

Again: If complying with the Discipline is necessary to make one a member of the church of Christ, since the Discipline and the rules contained therein did not exist until seventeen hundred years after the death of Christ, it follows that no one became a member of the church of Christ for seventeen hundred

years after Christ died. The truth is, complying with the Discipline, regarding the reception of members, will make you a member of the Methodist Church—that is all! It is not the church of Christ, nor any part of it.

LORD'S SUPPER

In most things the Methodists are a liberal people. I am persuaded the "lay members" would be in all things if they had their way. They are so bound by their creed, and have become so accustomed to their practices that I doubt if they really think of the unscriptural things in which they engage. You frequently hear a Methodist boast of the liberties they have in the Methodist Church. At times you will hear a Methodist make a remark about the "close communion" of the Baptist, and declare that Methodists do not believe in "close communion." The facts are the Methodists are the "closest of" the "close communion," or possibly I should say, there is the "closest" "close communion" practiced in the Methodist Church.

Methodist preachers are "officials" of the Methodist Church. Their membership is not in the Methodist Church, but in the conference, and the conference is not the church; if it was, then all Methodists would be members of the conference. The preachers are a class of "overseers" for the congregation of which they are not members.

If you have attended the services of the Methodists when they partook of the "Lord's Supper" you have seen the practice.

CLOSE COMMUNION

The Discipline, in giving directions for the administration of the Lord's Supper, says:

"The elder shall read one or more of these sentences, during the reading of which the stewards shall take up the collection for the poor." Par. 663. The following scriptures are quoted: Matt. 5:16; 6:19, 20; 7:12, 21; Luke 19:8; 2 Cor. 9:6, 7; Gal. 6:10; 1 Tim. 6:6, 7, 17-19; Heb. 6:10, 13:16; 1 Jno. 3:17; Prov. 19:17; Ps. 41:1.

After this comes the invitation, prayers and "prayer of consecration." After the "prayer of consecration" the Discipline directs:

"Then shall the minister first receive the communion in both kinds himself, and then proceed to deliver the same to the other ministers in like manner, if any be present. Then shall he say the Lord's Prayer, the people still kneeling and repeating after him every petition: Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come; thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven; give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us; and lead up not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever and ever. Amen.

"Then a hymn may be sung, and the communicants shall be invited to the table. The minister shall deliver both kinds to the people into their hands." Par. 663.

The ministers first partake, after which comes the "Lord's Prayer," then a song may be sung; then the people—the lay members—are invited to the table to partake. The ministers partake at the first table, then the prayer and song, then the members partake. The Methodist preachers are so "close" that they do not partake with the members of the Methodist Church.

You have often heard of "class distinction," and when you attend the services of the Methodist, when they partake of the "Lord's Supper," you will most certainly see it. The preachers do not eat at the same table with the members—after the ministers partake, then the members are allowed to come to the table. This is Methodism.

In the days of slavery in this country, the "overseer" did not eat at the table with the slaves; the "overseers" ate at the "first" table, and the slaves were allowed to eat what was left. In the Methodist Church the preachers are "overseers" of the congregation—his membership is not with them. His membership is in the conference, not in the church—and he does not eat with them; he eats at the "first" table, and the members, after he has eaten, are invited to the table. This is Methodism!

INFANT BAPTISM

Human creeds should never be subscribed to in matters of religion. This is evident from the fact that they are frequently revised. There have been many changes in the Methodist Discipline.

In the Discipline, 1894 edition, I find the following:

"THE MINISTRATION OF BAPTISM TO INFANTS"

"The minister, coming to the font, which is to be filled with pure water, shall use the following, or some other suitable exhortation. Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Saviour Christ, saith, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." Par. 439.

Now please notice carefully how it reads in the 1910 edition of the Discipline:

"THE MINISTRATION OF BAPTISM TO INFANTS"

"The minister, coming to the font, which is to be filled with pure water, shall use the following or some other suitable exhortation: Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men, though fallen in Adam, are born into this world in Christ the Redeemer, heirs of life eternal and subjects of the saving grace of the Holy Spirit; and that our Savior Christ saith, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God." Par. 664.

In 1894 the Discipline said: "All men are conceived and BORN IN SIN."

In 1910 the Discipline says: "All men, though fallen in Adam, are BORN into this world IN CHRIST THE REDEEMER."

Behold the disagreement: "BORN IN SIN"—1894. "BORN into this world IN CHRIST"—1910.

Those who believe the statement made in the Discipline in 1894, that "all men are conceived and born in sin," cannot believe the statement made in the Discipline in 1910, viz: "All men, though fallen in Adam, are born into this world in Christ."

90

The Discipline, edition of 1832, reads: "Dearly beloved, for as much as all men are conceived and born in sin," p. 102. I presume all the Discipline read that way till 1910.

Who made the change? Did the members of the Methodist Church? Have they the right to make changes in the Discipline? Certainly not! The bosses in the general conference made the change—true, their membership is not in the Methodist Church, as officials, but they made the change—and the members of the Methodist Church have to accept it.

The members of the Methodist Church did believe till 1910 that "all men were conceived and born in Sin," but they now believe that all men are "born into this world in Christ." This is now the expression of Methodist faith on that point.

In rejecting the statement of the old Discipline they have given up the original ground of infant baptism. Now they have no "original sin"—they did have until 1910, per the Discipline. Wonder how they lost it—provided they ever had any? (And they did not.)

If they are "born in Christ" as the Discipline now declares, then they are "new creatures," for Paul said: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature" (2 Cor. 5:17). If they are born thus, they are in the same condition as the Christian, (in Christ), and there is no ground for their baptism.

Methodist, think a moment; suppose you became a Methodist in 1894. You then believed that "all men were conceived and born in sin"—of course you did, for such was the statement of the Discipline. The Discipline reads differently now. To which edition of the Discipline do you now subscribe? If to the latest edition, when and how were you converted in your views about the condition of men at birth?

Let us examine this article on "Infant Baptism" a little more.

"Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men, though fallen in Adam, are born into this world in Christ the Redeemer, heirs of life eternal and subjects of the saving grace of the Holy Spirit; and that our Savior Christ saith, Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God." Par. 664.

Please read the foregoing quotation again. It says the babe is born into this world "in Christ the Redeemer." If this be true the child was "in Christ" before it was "born into this world."

There is another curious feature about this matter, viz: That though the child is born "in Christ the Redeemer," Christ says, "Suffer them to come unto me." They are already in Him; according to the Discipline yet must "come unto Him." Such is the foolish position held by the Methodists.

The Discipline declares that every one is "in Christ" before they are born into this world, but that they are not in "God's holy church." "I beseech you to call upon God the Father through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of His bounteous goodness He will grant to this child, now to be baptized, the continual replenishment of his grace, that he may ever remain in the fellowship of God's holy church, by faith that is in Jesus Christ." Par. 664.

"In causing this child to be brought by baptism into the church of Christ." Par. 664.

They teach that one is brought by baptism, baptism in water, into the church. Who will say there is nothing in baptism? Not a Methodist, surely.

Jesus says: "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." (Jno. 3:3.) So far as I know all have contended that the natural birth is the first birth, and that when Jesus said one must be "born again" he had reference to the birth of water and the spirit—the new birth; and that this second birth, the new birth, brings one into the kingdom of God. The Discipline presents another view. If all men are "in Christ" before their natural birth, as the Discipline declares, and the birth which puts one "in Christ" is the birth Jesus spoke of when he said one must be "born again," it follows that the Methodist have one "born again" before he is born the first time; they make the second birth come before the first birth. But if it is the birth of "water and of the spirit" which puts one "in Christ," and the Discipline is correct in saying that all are born into this world "in Christ," it follows that all men were born of water and of the Spirit before they were born into this world. If this be true, what did Jesus mean when he told Nicodemus he must be "born again?" He could not have made reference to the birth of the Spirit, according to the Methodist, for they declare that the birth of the Spirit puts one "in Christ", and that all men were "in Christ" before they were born into this world. Christ could not have made

reference to the natural birth in saying to Nicodemus that he must be "born again." For the natural birth was a past event in the life of Nicodemus.

To me it is evident that the Methodist have reference to baptism in water, and that they believe Jesus had reference to this when he spoke of one being "born again." Hear the Discipline: "Our Savior Christ saith, except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God; I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous mercy He will grant to these persons, now to be baptized with water, that which by nature they cannot have; that they may be baptized with the Holy Ghost, received into Christ's church, and be made lively members of the same." Par. 665.

Surely they teach by this that baptism is the birth one must have, or they cannot enter into the kingdom of God. In trying to escape the doctrine of inherited depravity, which they formerly taught, they have sadly muddled their theology of the new birth.

"Name this child." Par. 664.

"In causing this child to be brought by baptism into the Church of Christ." Par. 664.—Foot note.

It is declared that the parents caused the "child to be brought by baptism into the Church of Christ." Certainly they did not cause Holy Spirit baptism to bring the child into the church—clearly it is baptism with water, for the above is in the article on the baptism of the child with water.

The child is before natural birth "in Christ the Redeemer," the Discipline says, and if it is in Christ is it a "new creature"—in the "way, the truth and the life;" yet such a child has to have baptism in water—the "again" birth—before it can get into the church, or go to heaven. This is Methodism. Great is the Methodist Discipline!

WHY BAPTIZE INFANTS?

In all the word of God there is not an apostolic example, precept nor command for the baptism of infants. The practice was unknown in the days of the apostles.

Infant baptism was founded on the doctrine that infants were guilty of "original sin," and that this sin was washed away by baptism.

WESLEY ON INFANT BAPTISM

Mr. Wesley, the founder of the Methodist Church, says: "By baptism we, who were "by nature, children of wrath," are made the children of God. And this regeneration which our church in so many places ascribes to baptism is more than barely being admitted into the church, though commonly connected therewith; being "grafted into the body of Christ's Church, we are made the children of God by adoption and grace." This is grounded on the plain words of our Lord, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Jno. 3:5. 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."—Wesley's Works, Miscellaneous, Vol. 2, p. 15.

"By baptism, we who were 'by nature children of wrath,' are made the children of God." And again: "By water then, as a means, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again." This is the original doctrine of the Methodists, but like all human doctrines it is undergoing a change.

In the same article Mr. Wesley raises the question of infant baptism. He says: "But the grand question is, Who are the proper subjects of baptism—grown persons only, or infants also? In order to answer this fully, I shall, first, lay down the grounds of infant baptism, taken from scripture, reason and primitive, universal practice; and, secondly, answer the objections against it.

"As to the grounds of it: If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism; seeing, in the ordinary way, they cannot be saved, unless this be washed away by baptism. It has been already proved, that this original stain cleaves to every child of man; and that thereby they are children of wrath, and liable to eternal damnation. It is true, the Second Adam has found a remedy for the disease which came upon all by the offense of the first. But the benefits of this is to be received through the means which he hath appointed; through baptism in particular, which is the ordinary means he hath appointed for that purpose; and to which God hath tied us, though he may not have tied himself. Indeed, where it cannot be had, the case is different; but extraordinary cases do not make void the standing rule. This therefore is our first ground. Infants need to be washed from original

sin; therefore they are proper subjects of baptism."—Wesley's Works, Miscellaneous, Vol. 2, p. 16.

I have no desire to make a comment on the foregoing. It is the doctrine taught by Mr. Wesley, the founder of the Methodist Church. But hear him again:

"It is certain our church supposes that all who are baptized in their infancy are at the same time born again; and it is allowed that the whole office for the baptism of infants proceeds upon this supposition."—Wesley's Sermons, Vol. 1, p. 405.

Mr. Wesley freely expresses himself as to the ground of infant baptism, and for many years the Methodists made an effort to defend his view, but they have been forced to abandon the position. They have met defeat when making an effort to defend the position in discussion, and their members have shown their dissatisfaction. They now make the effort to defend their practice of infant baptism from a different standpoint. Without consulting the members they have changed the Discipline.

In their attempt to defend their practice it is quite common to hear them now contend: Since Christ says of children, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven," then children are like those in the kingdom of heaven, and are therefore proper subjects of baptism. Such reasoning is fallacious, for those in the kingdom of heaven are not proper subjects of baptism. Paul says: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." (Gal. 3:27.) This shows that baptism alone cannot put one into Christ; but that one must be moved to this baptism by FAITH which works by love. If the infant is like the man in Christ, then he is in the condition of the believer who has been baptized, and is therefore not a subject of baptism.

Infant baptism is not only unknown to the scriptures, but many of those who practice it are so candid that they admit it to be a post-apostolic institution. The mistake that infants were guilty of "original sin," was the ground for infant baptism. Mr. Wesley, the founder of the Methodist Church, believed this doctrine, and expressed himself freely, teaching that baptism was necessary to the salvation of infants—in the ordinary way. Methodists do not believe this now. It would be amusing to hear one make an effort to give a real reason why they baptize infants. There is not in the word of God a command for, nor in the work of the apostles an example of the baptism of an infant.

HISTORY OF INFANT BAPTISM

What gave rise to infant baptism? That it is not authorized by the word of God is freely admitted by many that practice it. On what ground is it placed—why do they contend for it?

Mr. Wesley, the father of Methodism, says: "If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism; seeing, in the ordinary way, they cannot be saved, unless this be washed away in baptism."—Wesley's Works, Miscellaneous, Vol. 2, p. 16.

"Gregory Nazianzen felt this, and qualified the doctrine accordingly. In that famous oration where he recommended the baptism of little ones at three years of age, and urged the necessity of it to babes in case of danger of death he took care to expressly declare what, in his opinion infants would suffer by dying unbaptized. Three positions give his precise meaning. Adults who wilfully neglect to be baptized will be condemned. Infants dying unbaptized will neither be glorified nor punished: not punished, for it was not their fault; not glorified, for they were not sealed, or initiated. When this doctrine came into the hands of the barbarous Africans, they made no scruples to affirm both in their writings, and their canons, that infants dying unbaptized in the name of the Trinity, were inevitably punished with the torment of everlasting fire. (3). This doctrine was the parent of the baptism of Abortives: and this doctrine in all its stages was called an apostolic tradition."—Robinson's History of Baptism. (Page 306, 307.)

"The sprinkling of children is an article of Pagan mythology."—Ibid. 137.

"The baptism of babes first appeared in the most ignorant and impure part of the Catholic world."—Ibid, 177.

"The persons that were to be baptized, after they had repeated the Creed, confessed and renounced their sins, and particularly the devil and his pompos allurements, were immersed under water."—Mosheim, page 48. (There could not be an infant in this number.)

"Among all the persons that are recorded as baptized by the apostles, there is no express mention of an infant."—Wall's History of Infant Baptism. Preface, page 29.

Speaking of the baptism of John, he says: "There is no express mention of any children baptized by him."—Ibid, page 27.

"There is no trace of infant baptism in the New Testament."
—Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia. Article, Baptism.

"We have every reason for holding infant baptism to be no apostolic institution, and that it was something foreign to that first stage of Christian development."—Neander's *Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, Vol. 2, page 336.

"As baptism was closely united with a conscious entrance on Christian communion, faith and baptism were always connected with one another; and thus it is in the highest degree probable that baptism was performed only instances where both could meet together, and that the practice of infant baptism was unknown at that period." —(1st Century Ibid, Vol. 1, page 162.

"The initiatory rule of baptism was usually performed by immersing the whole body in the baptismal font, and in the earlier periods of Christianity was admitted to all who acknowledge the truth of the gospel, and promised to conform to its laws."—Gregory, page 34. No infants.

THE FIRST HISTORY OF INFANT BAPTISM

"During the first three centuries Christian congregations all over the east subsisted in separate independent bodies, unsupported by the government, and consequently without any secular power over one another. All this time they were baptized churches, and though all the fathers of the four first ages down to Jerome were of Greece, Syria and Africa, and though they gave great numbers of histories of the baptism of adults, yet there is not one record of the baptism of a child till the year of three hundred and seventy."—Robinson's *Ecclesiastical Researches*, page 55.

Speaking of the church at Rome, Robinson says:

"Not one natural infant of any description appears in this church during the first three centuries, and immersion was the only method of baptizing."—Ibid, page 130.

"The principal alteration was made by Augustine in Africa, and Innocent the First at Rome, who administrated baptism to new-born infants. Augustine procured a provincial canon to enjoin this kind of baptism in a part of Africa in the autumn of the year four hundred and sixteen, some say eighteen. In the

spring of the next year Innocent wrote a letter to Augustine to signify his approbation of what was done (8). The same Innocent very consistently introduced infant-communion. This grew out of infant baptism, as that did out of original sin; and if there be such a thing as original sin in the sense of these innovators; and if water can wash it away; it was certainly a great amendment, and one that Jesus with all his wisdom and compassion did not think to approve."—*Ibid*, 151.

Among some of those who practice "infant baptism" there is to be found a deal of frankness. The following from Dr. A. T. Bledsoe, who was editor of the *Southern Review*, a Methodist journal, is to the point. He says:

"With all searching, we have been unable to find in the New Testament a single express declaration, or word, in favor of infant baptism."—*Southern Review*, vol. 14, p. 334.

He gives the following quotation from Dr. Jacob, of the Church of England. "However reasonably we may be convinced that we find in the Christian Scriptures the fundamental idea from which infant baptism was afterwards developed, and by which it may now be justified, it ought to be distinctly acknowledged that it is not an apostolic ordinance."—*Southern Review*, vol. 14, pp. 334,5.

On page 335 Dr. Bledsoe says: "Neander concedes the point that infant baptism is not an apostolic ordinance. We might, if necessary, adduce the admission of many other profoundly learned Paedo-baptists, that the doctrine is not found in the New Testament, either in express terms, or by implication from any portion of its language."

On page 336 he remarks: "Before the time of Tertulian (A. D. 200) the practice of infant baptism is nowhere distinctly mentioned by any writer of the church."

On page 339 he says: "However strange it may seem, the fact is that the first father, or either, by whom the practice is noticed, condemns it as having no foundation either in reason or revelation."

On page 169, vol. 15, he says: "We should, if possible, be glad to find this custom mentioned by all the early writers of the church—by Hermas, by Justin Martyr, by Irenaeus, and all the rest. But after the most careful and conscientious investigation, we have been able to find no such corroboration of the views we hold, nor do we need it."

The practice of infant baptism is unknown to the New Testament. Since faith comes by hearing the word of God (Rom. 10:17), one cannot accept the word of God as the foundation of his faith and believe that it is right to baptize infants, for in all the Bible there is not one word which will lead any one to such a belief. Those who claim they believe it is right to baptize infants have for the foundation of such belief what some man has said.

SPRINKLING, POURING, IMMERSION

The Methodist are "close" on the communion question, but liberal in what they call baptism. The Discipline directs:

"Then shall the minister take each person to be baptized by the right hand; and placing him conveniently by the font, according to his discretion, shall ask the name; and then shall sprinkle or pour water upon him (or, if he shall desire it, shall immerse him in water), saying: N., I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." (Par. 665.)

How can three acts so dissimilar as "sprinkling water on a person," "pouring water on a person" and "immersing the person in water" be called the same thing? Is it possible that any one can really think that when water has been "sprinkled on a person" and another person has been "immersed in water" that the same act has been performed?—that each act is baptism? It will not do to say that the results of the different acts is the same—baptism; for in debating with the Methodist, they affirm with me that all three acts are "baptism"—or that either of them is baptism.

In the Bible there is no record of God ever commanding water, water only, water unmixed with any other substances to be sprinkled or poured on any man for anything. Water mixed with ashes, water mixed with blood, water mixed with oil was sprinkled, but water only, water alone was never sprinkled or poured on any one for anything, by the authority of God.

In reading the Bible you never get the idea that anything short of immersing the person in water was called baptism. Indeed that is just what Christ commanded to be done.

"And were baptized of him in Jordan." (Mt. 3:6.)

"And there went out to him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river Jordan." (Mk. 1:5.)

Some one may say: It is stated that John baptized "with water." True, such is the statement in the King James translation; but the American Standard version says, "in water." The word "baptize" tells what was done, while the word "water" names the element used.

"And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan. And straightway coming up out of the water." (Mk. 1:9, 10.) Christ was baptized "in Jordan," and after his baptism, he came "up out of the water."

"And John also was baptizing in Aenon near to Salim, because there was much water there." (Jno. 3:23.)

"And as they went on their way they came unto a certain water; and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? * * * * * And he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water." (Acts 8:36-39.)

"Buried with him in baptism." (Rom. 6:4.)

"Buried with him in baptism." Col. 2:12.)

From the passages that mention baptism in the Bible, we learn those baptized went to the water, went down into the water, were buried and came out of the water. Did you?

HISTORY OF SPRINKLING

Sprinkling or pouring water on a person for baptism was wholly unknown in the apostolic age.

Baptism is a noun: nouns are the name of things.

Baptize is a verb: verbs express action.

Adverbs express the manner or mode of doing things.

The noun, baptism, is the name of the act expressed by the verb, baptize.

As "baptize" is a verb of action, if it carries with it the idea of "sprinkle, pour and immerse," we have one word con-

veying three different ideas at the same time. If it is right to "sprinkle" water on a person and call it "baptism," or to "pour" water on a person and call it "baptism," or to "immerse" the person "in water" and call it "baptism," we have three different acts called by the same name—and all of them right.

An example: A Methodist preacher has three persons that demand baptism at his hand. He "sprinkles" water on one, and calls it "baptism." He "pours" water on another and calls that "baptism." The third he "immerses in water" and calls that "baptism." Will you please look this matter over with your knowledge of English grammar in mind. The first one had water "sprinkled" on him, and the preacher called it "baptism." Remember that "baptism" is a noun, and a noun is the name of things. The next one had water "poured" on him, and the preacher called that "baptism." The third one is "immersed in water" and the preacher calls that "baptism." The three acts differ. How is it possible for the noun "baptism," to be the name of three different acts? If "immersing the person in water" is "baptism," "sprinkling" water on the person is not, and cannot be "baptism." Why? Because, if "immersing" the person in water is "baptism," that which differs from "immersion" cannot be "baptism," and since "sprinkling" water on the person differs from "immersing the person in water," it follows that "sprinkling water on the person" cannot be "baptism." Do you ask why again? For the simple reason that when the preacher "immersed" the party in water and called it "baptism," the word "baptism" was the name of the act performed. When he sprinkled water on another person he performed a different act, an act wholly different from the act "immersion," which he called "baptism," then it must follow conclusively that the word "baptism" cannot be the name of the second act.

Look at the matter again: If when a preacher "sprinkles" water on a person and calls it baptism, he is obeying the command of Christ to "baptize," I submit that when he "immerses"

a person in water and calls that "baptism" he has performed an act wholly different from the first act. As the acts differ; if the act "immersing the person in water" is right, then "sprinkling" water on the person, an act different from "immersing the person in water" is not right. Do you ask why? If "immersing the person in water" is right, since "sprinkling water on the person" differs from "immersing the person in water," then "sprinkling water on the person" cannot be right. Because that which differs from that which is right, cannot be right; and you say that "immersing the person in water" is right. It follows then that "sprinkling" water on the person cannot be right, for "immersing the person in water" is right.

To view the matter again: If when a preacher "immerses a person in water," he tells the truth when he says he "baptized" the person; does he still tell the truth when he "sprinkles" water on the person, an act wholly different from the act "immerse," and calls it baptism?"

Just a few words from history regarding the matter of sprinkling and pouring water on persons and calling it baptism.

✓ "The administration of baptism by sprinkling was first invented in Africa in the third century, in favor of clinics or bed-ridden people: but even African Catholics, the least enlightened and most depraved of all Catholics, derided it, and called it no baptism."—Robinson's History of Baptism, page 402. ✓

FIRST DEPARTURE FROM IMMERSION

In A. D. 251 Novation thought he was going to die. He had not been baptized. Wall, Vol. 2, page 433. "Novation, it seems as he was not baptized in the ordinary way, but in his bed; (which was one objection against his being made a bishop)."

How was Novation baptized? Eusebius Ecclesiastical History says of him: He "was baptized by aspersion in the bed on which he lay." (Page 266.) This is the first case on record of

pouring water on a person, or sprinkling water on a person and calling it baptism. Wall in speaking of this case with some others mentioned later, says: "These are the most ancient instances of that sort of baptism that are now extant in records." Vol. 1, page 390. The first case of anything but "immersion" called baptism, is that of Novation, in A. D. 251.

SPRINKLING LEGALIZED

"The Council of Ravenna (1311) was the first to allow a choice between sprinkling and immersion."—Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, page 201.

Sprinkling was "legalized by the Catholics—it was not authorized by Christ.

"The first law for sprinkling was obtained in the following manner: Pope Stephen II, being driven from Rome by Adolphus, King of the Lombards, in 753, fled to Pavia, who a short time before, had usurped the crown of France.

"While he remained there the Monks of Cressy, in Britany, consulted him whether, in case of necessity baptism poured on the head of an infant would be lawful.

"Stephen replied that it would, yet pouring and sprinkling was not allowed except in cases of necessity.

"It was not till the year 1311 that the legislature, in council held at Ravenna, declared immersion or sprinkling to be indifferent.

"In Scotland, however, sprinkling was not practiced, in ordinary cases, till after the Reformation—about the middle of the Sixteenth Century.

"From Scotland it made its way to England, in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized in the Established Church."—Article Baptism, in Edinburgh Encyclopedia.

"Not one natural infant of any description appears in this church during the first three centuries, and immersion was the

only method of baptizing. Prof. Boehmer with his usual accuracy made a just distinction in regard to the place of baptism. The place of administering baptism, says he, was not the church, but a river, in which people were dipped in the presence of witnesses."—Robinson's *Eccl. Researches*, page 130.

"The usual form of submersion at baptism, practiced by the Jews, was transferred to the Gentile Christians."—Neander in *Planting and Training of Christian Church*, page 161.

"The sacrament of baptism was administered in this century," (the first century) "without the public assemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by an immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font."—Mosheim, page 28.

He says, in the second century, "The persons that were to be baptized, after they had repeated the Creed, confessed and renounced their sins, and particularly the devil and his pompos allurements, were immersed under water, and received into Christ's Kingdom."—Mosheim, page 49.

"The sacraments of the primitive Church were two—those of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The ceremony of immersion (the oldest form of baptism) was performed in the name of the three persons of the Trinity."—Waddington's *Church History*, page 46.

"But enough. "It is," says Augusti (*Denkw. VII.*, p. 216) "a thing made out," viz. the ancient practice of immersion. So indeed, all the writers who have thoroughly investigated the subject conclude. I know of no one usage of ancient times which seems to be more clearly made out. I cannot see how it is possible for any candid man who examines the subject to deny this." Stuart on Baptism, page 149.

Speaking of the word "baptize," Robinson says: "The word is confessedly Greek, that native Greeks must understand their own language better than foreigners, and that they have always understood the word baptism to signify dipping; and therefore from their first embracing Christianity to this day they have al-

ways baptized, and do yet baptize, by immersion. This is an authority for the meaning of the word baptize infinitely preferable to that of European lexicographers; so that a man, who is obliged to trust human testimony, and who baptized by immersion, because the Greeks do, understands the word exactly as the Greeks themselves understand it; and in this case they are exceptional guides."—Robinson's Hist. of Baptism, pp. 16, 17.

Wesley's Notes on Ro. 6:4: "We are buried with him—alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion."

BAPTIZO

Baptize is from the Greek word "baptizo" which is defined by Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon, as follows:

"Baptizo: I. 1. prop. to dip repeatedly, to immerse, submerge. 2. To cleanse by dipping or submerging, to wash, to make clean with water; in the mid. and the 1 aor. pass. to wash one's self, bathe. 3. Metaph. to overwhelm, to be overwhelmed with calamities, of those who must bear them. II. In the N. T. it is used particularly of the rite of sacred ablution, first instituted by John the Baptist, afterwards by Christ's command received by Christians and adjusted to the contents and nature of their religion (see Baptisma, 3), viz, an immersion in water."

"Baptisma, tos, to, (baptizo), a word peculiar to the N. T. and eccl. writ., immersion, submersion; 1. used trop. of calamities and afflictions with which one is quite overwhelmed. 2. of John's baptism, that purification rite by which men on confessing their sins were bound to a spiritual reformation, obtained the pardon of their past sins and became qualified for the benefits of the Messiah's kingdom soon to be set up. 3. of Christian baptism; this according to the view of the apostles, is a rite of sacred immersion, commanded by Christ."

I could quote the definition of the word as given by a number of Greek lexicons which I have in my library, but Thayer's is called the best by all the Universities, and there is no need for others.

A 65 Cent Edition

Nichol-Bradley Debate. Just From the Press, a 65-cent Edition of the Nichol-Bradley Debate—Bound in paper.

The Nichol-Bradley Debate is the most complete exposure of Materialism I have seen. You cannot afford to be without the book.—Foy E. Wallace.

I have never read a debate that surpasses the Nichol-Bradley Debate. It is worth its weight in gold to those who want the Truth.—J. W. Chism.

The Nichol-Bradley Debate is the death blow to Materialism. Get a copy of the Debate and be prepared to meet this dark, damnable heresy of materialism.—John W. Denton.

You would have mistreated the cause of Truth if you had not put this debate in print.—W. P. Richardson.

The Nichol-Bradley Debate is very fine—a complete refutation of Materialism. Chas. R. Nichol is the strongest man in the South on Materialism.—Joe S. Warlick.

Paper Binding.....\$.65

NICHOL'S BOOKLET

55,000 off the press.

It is the best little book I have ever seen gotten up by man. For young or old, it will prove a jewel.—J. W. Denton, Evangelist.

You have done the church good service in many ways, but my judgment is this is the most valuable work thus far. All Bible students should have a copy. Ten thousand copies should be ordered in the next ten days.—G. H. P. Showalter, Editor Firm Foundation.

It is more than the author claims for it. It is full of meat from cover to cover, and handy is not a word that expresses the readiness with which it may be used. Every one should have a copy.—Joe S. Warlick, Editor Gospel Guide.

I pronounce it the best thing I have ever seen of its kind—and there is nothing I know of like it. A fifteen year old school boy can take it and whip any sectarian preacher in the country. It is great. The price is a mere trifle compared with the value of the Booklet.—Foy E. Wallace, Evangelist.

It furnishes you with shot and shell for the enemy when they attack you. It is characteristic of its author—pointed, logically arranged, powerful and penetrating. It is worth its weight in gold, and then some. Brother, you should have a copy; each member of your family need a copy.—Thos. E. Milholland, Evangelist.

50 cents per copy. MRS. C. R. NICHOL, Clifton, Texas.

