

Abilene Christian University

Digital Commons @ ACU

Stone-Campbell Books

Stone-Campbell Resources

1950

Zeke and the Methodists

J. W. Jackson

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



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), and the [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jackson, J. W., "Zeke and the Methodists" (1950). *Stone-Campbell Books*. 418.
https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books/418

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.

Zeke and the Methodists

BY J. W. JACKSON



A Sequel to the Religious Ups and
Downs of the Jackson
Family

Price, Per Copy 5c; Per Dozen 50c

**PUBLISHED BY
FIRM FOUNDATION PUBLISHING HOUSE
AUSTIN, TEXAS**

INTRODUCTORY.

This little book is a review of the "Theological Grub-Ax," a tract written by J. H. NICHOLS, of the Methodist church, and relied upon by Pedobaptists as a strong argument in favor of infant baptism. I have given, in the following pages, the exact words of the Grub-Ax, or reference to it, in order that its arguments may be fully tested.

No apology is offered for the form of the review. Mr. NICHOLS' Grub-Ax is written in dialogue form and purports to be a conversation held by himself with a "Campbellite," whom he succeeds in converting. In lieu of MR. NICHOLS' "man of straw," I introduce ZEKE JACKSON, of whose many trials and hardships in learning the truth, we have an account in the RELIGIOUS UPS AND DOWNS OF THE JACKSON FAMILY.

ZEKE, then, is but the representative of a Christian, who with great earnestness and fidelity clings to the word of God and repudiates all the traditions and commandments of men.

The writer is truly thankful to all those who have commended this work, and rejoices to know that some have been led into the gospel light by its teachings, and he sends forth this new edition with the sincere hope that it may lead many others into the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus.

Some few changes are made in this edition, especially in the concluding chapter, which contains in small compass the Bible testimony by which any one can determine whether or not he is "in the One Body."

Reader, give it an impartial examination, compare diligently what you have read with the Scriptures and having learned the way of truth, walk therein and you will find peace and joy here and hereafter.

J. W. JACKSON.

ZEKE AND THE METHODISTS

CHAPTER I.

After the Jackson family had been happily united together in Christ by their obedience to the gospel, they searched the Scriptures daily that they might be thoroughly furnished to all good works. Zeke was an apt scholar and made such rapid progress in the knowledge of the gospel that his father urged him to go and preach. Zeke, however, doubted his ability to appear before an audience in such a responsible position, and told his parents, that for the present he would do all he could in teaching the truth in a quiet way by the fireside, or as opportunity presented privately, and that, perhaps, afterwards he would have the courage to go out into the world as a proclaimer of the gospel.

Not long after the determination recorded above, a Methodist preacher came into the neighborhood and held a meeting at the old schoolhouse. Zeke attended the meeting and often felt his righteous soul stirred with indignation at the perversions of Scripture made by the preacher. He held his peace, however; not because he thought himself incapable of showing the fallacy of the preacher's system, but because he was in love with a Methodist lady. Miss Fannie Jones was a well educated woman, of amiable disposition, and withal a zealous Methodist. She did not permit prejudice to rule her, and took great pleasure in Zeke's company. They would converse freely with each other about religion, taking especial pains to avoid all points of controversy. Sometime after the meeting above referred to, Zeke made an offer of marriage to Miss Fannie, which was accepted, and the time appointed some three months from that date. On his return home Zeke told his father of his contemplated marriage, fully expecting that he would be rejoiced to learn of his prospects of soon becoming a settled man. Uncle Hezekiah, however, did not receive the announcement with any degree of pleasure. He said:

"Zeke, my son, have you been studying the word of God so long and so earnestly, to so little purpose? Do you not know that it is sinful for a Christian to marry one who is 'out of Christ?'"

Z.—"I had never seen any positive injunction forbidding such

marriages, and in this Christian land where all believe in God and Jesus, I do not see that any harm can come of such marriages."

Uncle H.—"My son, we must never stop to inquire as to the *harm* in doing an action, but rather is there *good* in it. Is it according to the will of God? Paul says that Christian widows might marry again, but only *in* the Lord.—1 Cor. 7:39, and in 2 Cor. 6:14-16, he says: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" In matrimony, concord, fellowship, communion, are absolutely necessary to happiness, and these can not be obtained by Christians intermarrying with the world. Besides these Scriptures, the apostle Paul claims that he himself had the *right* to marry a sister or one in Christ. He says: "Have I not power to lead about a sister, a wife?"—1 Cor. 9:5. This to my mind is proof positive that the right to marry should be exercised only in the kingdom. Besides these Scriptures we have the types. The Jews were God's people and the principles governing their relation toward the heathen have their anti-type in the principles governing our relation to the world. They were forbidden to marry or give in marriage to the Gentiles.—Deut. 7:3. We find that in their history they disobeyed this law and great wrath came upon them because they did so. You can read Josh. 23:12, and Ezra 10:2, and Neh. 13th. Taking these typical lessons with the plain instructions of Paul, I can not see how a Christian can marry out of the Lord, without sin. So, my dear son, I advise you to crucify your affection rather than transgress the will of God."

Zeke.—"But father, there are a great many Christian men whose wives are unbelievers, or belong to some one of the denominations, and also women whose husbands are unbelievers or sectarians—what are they to do?"

Uncle H.—"The apostle settles this matter: 'If any brother hath a wife that believeth not and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And the woman which hath a husband that believeth not and if he be pleased to dwell with her let her not leave him.' My son, you must not permit earthly ties or prospects to lead you away from God. It is right and honorable to marry, but in order to happiness, there must be fellowship, communion, harmony. In all marriages of Christians with

sectarians, peace and harmony are purchased by the sacrifice of *right*. They agree to be silent about religion for fear of wounding each other's feelings. The very subjects that should be the constant theme of fireside conversation are banished, and thus they are deprived of the consolation and comfort of God's word. No, my son, do not marry this young lady unless you can persuade her to be a Christian."

Zeke.—"I thank you, father, for your kind advice. I determined when I began the Christian life to obey the will of the Lord as revealed to us in the New Testament, and no matter what it may cost me of self-denial I shall adhere to that resolution, and I shall seek an early opportunity of conversing with Miss Fannie on this subject."

Some days after this conversation, Zeke called upon Miss Fannie. He had been very much troubled in mind as to what plan to pursue in order to teach her the truth, but had come to no determination about it. On entering the house he found the Methodist preacher, Mr. Nichols, present. Zeke was truly glad of this, and determined to lead the gentleman into a discussion that would bring forward the chief doctrines held by the Methodists and examine them closely and carefully in the light of God's word. He hoped by this procedure to show Miss Fannie the simplicity and harmony of the gospel plan of salvation, and demonstrate to her the power of truth when brought in contact with error.

CHAPTER II.

COMING TO JESUS.

Full of his determination, and prompted by zeal for the truth, and the hope of gaining a wife, Zeke turned to Mr. Nichols and said:

"Did you not write a tract called the *Theological Grub Ax*?"

N.—"Yes, sir, I did, and my people consider it one of the best things ever written upon the subject of infant baptism, and infant church membership. It also exposes the fallacy of the dangerous heresy of Campbellism. I shall be glad to furnish you with one."

Zeke.—"Thank you, sir, I have one, and have read it carefully, and can not agree with you at all. I am what you call a

Campbellite, and if I am holding to a dangerous heresy, I shall be thankful to you to show me the truth."

Fannie.—"Well, that is right, and Brother Nichols, I want you to begin right away. I want to hear all your conversation, for I am sure that I will learn something myself."

N.—"Then, when shall we begin our examination of these subjects?"

Zeke.—"I suggest that we begin them tonight. I would like very much for my father and mother to be present. They believe as I do, and if they are in error I desire that they should be set right."

Fannie.—"I shall like that arrangement so much. We can all assemble here at eight o'clock this evening and spend an hour very profitably, I hope."

Mr. Nichols and Zeke both expressed their approval, and Zeke soon left for his home.

Promptly at eight o'clock that evening Uncle Hezekiah, Aunt Hannah and Zeke arrived at Mr. Jones' and found Mr. Nichols and the Jones family already assembled in the parlor awaiting them. As soon as all parties were comfortably seated, Zeke began the discussion by calling attention to what Mr. N. had said in his "*Grub-Ax*" about infant baptism.

N.—"Do you deny that infants have a right to membership in the church, and that they should be baptized?"

Zeke.—"Yes, I deny it."

N.—"Well, have all whom Jesus invites to him the right to come?" (G. A., p. 5.)

Zeke.—"Yes, they have."

N.—"Jesus says: 'Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God.'—Mark 10:14. Luke says they were infants. Luke 18:15. Now, we will try this Scripture by your own theory: 1. You say all whom Jesus invited have a right to come; 2, no one can come without water baptism. Conclusion: Infants have been invited to Christ, therefore they have a right to baptism, according to your own theory." (G. A., p. 6.)

Zeke.—"Your reasoning is not correct; you *assume* that the word *come* means baptism. Jesus invites all who are 'weary and heavy laden to come to him.'—Matt. 11:28, 29. But he says that no one can come except the Father draws him, John 6:44, and he explains this drawing in the 45th verse as *teaching*, and

adds that all who 'hear and learn' of the Father should be permitted to *come* to Jesus, not *brought* to him against their will and without their knowledge, as you have it. Besides this, in the Scriptures referred to, there is not a word about *baptism*; and it is strange that the apostles should have forbidden the bringing of the children to Jesus, if, as you say, 'children always had the right to membership in the church.' (G. A., p. 4.) They were brought to Jesus that 'He should put his hands upon them and pray,' Matt. 19:14; or as Mark 10:13-16, and Luke 18:15, 16, both say, 'touch them.' And if *putting his hands* on them, or *touching* them, means baptism, you would be right; but would get yourself into a serious difficulty. For we are told that the Pharisees sought to *lay hands* on Jesus. (Matt. 21:46). Did they want to baptize him?"

N.—"Of course not; I understand the meaning of those Scriptures as well as you do, but I say the children do have a right to membership in the church and ought to be baptized."

Zeke.—"Well, tell us why you baptize them."

N.—"Because God has a visible kingdom into which we enter by a visible ordinance, baptism; and an invisible kingdom into which we enter by a 'Spiritual baptism administered to the spiritual man.' All persons should be admitted into the visible kingdom in infancy, because it gives them better opportunities than they would have out of the kingdom." (G. A., p. 14.)

Zeke.—"Do children get into the invisible kingdom?"

N.—"No, they do not get into *that* kingdom, for we only get into the invisible kingdom by Holy Ghost baptism, and faith is the condition on which it is received." (G. A., p. 15.)

Zeke.—"Is the church and the kingdom of God the same institution?"

N.—"Yes, sir, it is."

Zeke.—"Please explain to us, then, how infants can be *in* the church and *out* of the church at the same time. You say that infants are put into the church by water baptism, and are put into the visible kingdom by baptism; and that the invisible kingdom is the church (G. A., p. 15), and children can't get into it. So you have the church equal to two kingdoms, or a part greater than the whole."

N.—"I see that you are determined not to receive the truth. Do you deny there being two kingdoms, a visible and an invisible one?"

Zeke.—“I do. Paul says: ‘The kingdom of God is righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.’—Rom. 14:17. There is nothing about *two* kingdoms. Again Jesus said to Peter when he confessed him to be the Christ, the Son of the living God: ‘Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.’ Here the church and the kingdom are the same. Hence all your theory and assumption about two kingdoms and *two* kinds of ordinances to enter them is unscriptural.”

N.—“Well, sir, you will certainly not deny that Paul calls the church the family, (Eph. 3:14, 15), and as infants are members of the family they have a right to baptism.” (G. A., p. 7.)

Zeke.—“Yes sir, I will deny what *you* say. Paul says that the church is only *a part* of the family, the other part of God’s family are in heaven. A great many people will be in heaven who never belonged to the church of Christ on earth. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the prophets, and all the children who die in infancy will be in that heavenly family.—Luke 13:28, 29.

N.—“You admit, then, that children are good enough to go to heaven: yes, even *better* than you are, and yet you deny them the right to church membership.” (G. A., p. 6.)

Zeke.—“The words *good* and *better* are not applicable to children in the sense in which you use them. Infants have no knowledge of good or evil, hence are not responsible. Jesus came into the world to call sinners to repentance.—Matt. 9:13. Infants are not sinners, and are not included in the call. When they can *hear* and *learn* the word of God, and willingly come to Christ, we do not *prevent* them, but *suffer* them to come.”

N.—“Well, sir, I have some arguments that you can not shy around like you have these, and tomorrow night I will show you that I am right about these matters.”

Zeke.—“I do not ‘shy around’ your Scriptures or arguments, my dear sir, but I want everything to harmonize. I think all those present can say that I have met your positions so far, fairly, and shown them to be fallacious. Do you not think so, Miss Fannie?”

Miss Fannie.—“I have followed your conversation very closely, and I am forced to admit that Brother Nichols has failed to show us how the church can be *two* kingdoms, a visible and an invisible

one. Nor can I see that an infant enjoys any better opportunities by being in the visible kingdom. You say that the invisible kingdom is the church, but the infant is not in it and can not get in it, but it is in the visible kingdom, and put there by baptism. So it seems that your *two* kingdom theory brings about confusion. I hope, Brother Nichols, you will bring your strongest arguments tomorrow night and clear away these confusions."

N.—"I hope, Miss Fannie, *you* are not going to turn Campbellite. Don't you know that they believe in water salvation?"

Fannie.—"You are unkind, Brother Nichols, in using such language. All I desire is to know what is right, and I am sure that you must be mistaken about our friends believing in 'water salvation.'"

N.—"Well, we shall see; as I must now go, we will adjourn until tomorrow night."

After the meeting adjourned, Zeke lingered for a few moments conversation with Fannie. He was delighted at the progress made toward the consummation of his hopes, as he found her very much interested in the investigation, and withal determined to be guided by the word of God. After a short and pleasant conversation, the Jacksons bid them adieu and returned to their home.

CHAPTER III.

IDENTITY OF COVENANTS.

The following night all the parties interested were punctual in their assembling at Mr. Jones'. Mr. Nichols, somewhat nettled that a common country boy should have gained the advantage of him the previous night, determined to bring forward his strongest arguments and defeat Zeke, and put him to shame. So without delay he began.

N.—"Now, sir, I am going to show you that the church of God now in the world is the same church to which Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and all the prophets belonged, and infants have a right to membership in it. (G. A., p. 4.) Note the following points of identity: (1.) They have the same Savior, the promise to Abraham was thy seed, which is Christ.—Gal. 3:16, 17.

(2.) The covenant made with Abraham was confirmed before of God in Christ. (3.) The law was a school-master to bring the Jews to Christ, that they might be justified by faith.—Gal. 3:24. (4.) They drank of that Rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ.—1 Cor. 10:4. They had the same condition of justification; the same gospel, and the same condition of pardon, and there is no intimation that God would ever make a new church. (G. A., p. 17.) Besides these points, you must admit that infants were in the church in the days of Abraham, and all through the Jewish age, and, of course, there being no *new* church, they have a right to be in the church now."

Zeke.—"The points of identity, as you call them, are made out by scrapping the Scriptures and by a perversion of their meaning. Paul calls the *promise* made to Abraham, *gospel* or *good news*. This was preached to Abraham, and not to the world or nations. A promise is a species of prophecy, and points to something in the future. In this case it was preached to Abraham, that in the future God would bless all the families of the earth through his seed, which seed was Christ.—Gen. 12:3; Gal. 3:16. The *promise* was made to Abraham, but the *blessing* was yet far in the future. Paul calls this promise the covenant concerning Christ (Gal. 3:15, 16), and says that God confirmed it by an oath. Turning to the 22nd chapter of Genesis you will find when God confirmed it; but though confirmed, we do not find the *blessing* to all nations until we come to the commission given by the Savior to his apostles (Matt. 28:19), 'Go teach the nations,' and (Mark 16:15), 'Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.' The gospel that must be preached to the world *now* includes the facts of Christ's death, and burial, and resurrection (1 Cor. 15:1-4), and certain commands to be obeyed (2 Thes. 1:8). This gospel of Christ is then different from the gospel preached to Abraham. The conditions of pardon are not the same, for nowhere can you find in anything preached to Abraham or the Jews before the ascension of Jesus that man should believe with his heart that God hath raised up Jesus from the dead, and confess with the mouth the Lord Jesus, as Paul teaches (Rom. 10:9). Nor were they ever taught or commanded to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, as the apostles commanded their believers in their day (Acts 10:48 and 19:5)."

N.—“That is very easy, sir, to explain. The Methodist church teaches that the church was first established in the family of Abraham, and circumcision was instituted as the ceremony of initiation into it, and baptism has come in the place of circumcision. The covenant God made with Abraham included infants, and was unlimited. (G. A., pp. 21, 22.) It is, therefore, still in force, and infants are now brought into it by baptism, instead of circumcision.”

Zeke.—“If it is the same covenant, circumcision would still be in force. How can you say, then, that baptism came in the place of circumcision?”

N.—“All those ordinances and rites were types; they are done away, and we now have those ordinances given by Christ.”

Zeke.—“Paul says that circumcision is a type of ‘the circumcision of the heart in the Spirit, and not in the letter’ (Rom. 1:29), so that you are mistaken about it being a type of baptism. Besides this, a *natural birth* brought children into the family of Abraham, and grown persons or aliens were brought into it by *money* they were *bought* with Abraham’s money. What were these things typical of? Does *natural birth* bring children into the church? You seem to argue that it does. (G. A., p. 7.) And if it does, what does baptism do for them?”

N.—“I don’t propose to answer all your questions. I want you to stick to the question of identity of covenants, and not go rambling about asking me hard questions.”

Zeke.—“I ask only such questions as are legitimately connected with the subject. Any theory that fails to harmonize all that is said about it in the word of God must necessarily be wrong. And if your position is correct, you should be willing not only to answer questions, but to show the harmony and unity of the doctrine with the word of God. Now, God made *three* covenants with Abraham; which one was it that included infants, and established the church in his family?”

N.—“You are mistaken, sir, about the three covenants; they were all parts of one covenant. You will find the one of which I speak in Genesis 17:10 to 16 verses.”

Zeke.—“I will prove to you that there were *three* covenants made with Abraham. In Gen. 12:3, the promise, ‘In thee shall all families be blessed,’ is called by Paul a *covenant* (Gal. 3:15). This was in the 75th year of Abraham, and 430 years before the law was given at Mount Sinai. Some years after this we read:

'In that same day the Lord made a covenant with Abraham, saying unto thy seed (posterity) have I given this land,' etc., (Gen. 15:18). Again, in Gen. 17:10-14, the covenant of circumcision was given when Abraham was 99 years old. Here are three covenants, given at three different times, under different circumstances, and for different purposes. The first one (Gen. 12:3) was the covenant concerning Christ, and was confirmed by the oath of God (Gen. 22:15-18). The second and third had *no Christ* in them, and the first had *no infants* in it. The two latter secured to the Jews the land of Canaan, and the special care and protection of God. David speaks of this covenant (Ps 105:8). So that the *unlimited* covenant of which you speak was the one that referred to the land of Canaan. These two covenants formed the basis of the covenant made with the Jews at Mount Sinai, while the first covenant was afterward consummated or fulfilled in the gospel of Christ given to the nations. Your covenant was twenty-four years *too late*, and when you lose it, you can't get the infants in the church."

N.—"Hold on, hold on, you get along too fast, and want to do all the talking. If God made a covenant including children *then*, can't he do it now? And if children were in the church then by virtue of that covenant, they would be so now."

Zeke.—"You assume the very points to be proven. There is not a word in the Bible about a church in Abraham's family; and if there was a church, it had no Christ in it, and no gospel of Christ, as I have shown you. It will not do for us to speculate about what God *can* or *can not* do, but what he has done. 'HOW READEST THOU?' (Luke 10:26). The covenant of circumcision is the only one including infants, and it was a fleshly institution, not a spiritual promise connected with it. So reasons Paul, in the 4th chapter of Galatians. There he tells us that the children of the bond-woman should not be heirs with the children of the free-woman. The bond-woman represented the old covenant made at Sinai with the Jews, and this old covenant was but the consummation of the two covenants made with Abraham (Gen. 15:18, and Gen. 17:10-14). Moses tells the children of Israel that God had chosen them in order to fulfill his oath to their fathers concerning the land (Deut. 7:8-11; Ex. 32:13). The Jews could not inherit any of the blessings promised through Christ by virtue of these covenants. The first covenant made with Abraham (Gen. 12:3) is called the New

Covenant, because none of the provisions of that covenant were ever given or unfolded to man until Jesus, the promised seed, came into the world. The covenant or gospel given by him excludes infants by the very terms used in it."

N.—"I can not see how that is."

Zeke.—"In the New Covenant quoted by Paul (Heb. 8:8-12) God promised to put his laws into their minds and write them in their hearts; there should be no teaching of each other the terms of this covenant, for all should know them, from the least to the greatest, and their sins should be forgiven them. Now, sir, infants have no sins; they can not learn God's law, so can not have it in their minds or hearts, and they can not know the Lord. This proves conclusively that they are not included in it, and that all who come into the covenant relation with God must *know* him."

N.—"But, sir, the Bible says that Abraham's seed shall be heirs. Abraham is called the father of the faithful, and all Christians are Abraham's seed. We must have the *same faith* that Abraham had (Rom. 4:13). Peter and Paul both teach that the blessings of the covenant came upon them through Abraham (Acts 3:25). And they never say a word about a *new* church. Of course, then, it was the same covenant and the same church, and infants had a right to be in it."

Zeke.—"I admit that Christians are Abraham's seed, and they are such by virtue of walking in *the steps* of that faith Abraham had before he was circumcised (Rom. 4:11). Now, if the covenant you claim (Gen. 17:10-14) dated the establishment of the church in the family of Abraham, the model faith for us to walk by happened twenty-four years before the church was established. It happens also that this model faith was directly connected with the covenant of promise made concerning Christ (see Gen. 12:1-3; Heb. 11:8). His faith was *active*; it did something, obeyed God. To walk in the same *faith*, one must not only have *faith*, but must obey God. This again excludes infants, for, according to your own argument (G. A., pp. 14, 15) they can not have faith. Besides this, Paul tells us plainly who are Abraham's seed (Gal. 3:27-29). He says that all who are Christ's are Abraham's seed, and all are Christ's who have put on Christ, and 'as many as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ,' so those who are baptized into Christ are Abraham's seed."

N.—“Yes, but that is Holy Ghost baptism, and can only be had by faith” (G. A., p. 15).

Zeke.—“If that were true, it would leave infants out. For you say that they can not have Holy Ghost baptism, and only those who are thus baptized are Abraham’s seed. It is very plain to me, sir, that you do not wish to have the truth upon this subject. The baptism of water, by your own admission, brings an individual into the church (G. A., p. 24). All your people so teach and practice. Your discipline says that the child is brought into the church of Christ by baptism (Dis., p. 225). Then the baptism Paul speaks of is one that springs from faith and brings the person into Christ, and, again, your own argument shuts the infant out. I suppose, however, that you have other Scriptures you rely upon for this practice?”

N.—“Yes, sir, plenty of them, and I will just give you a few after we conclude this argument on the covenants. Paul says that the old Sinaitic covenant was done away; that is the ordinances given to them as a pledge that Christ would come and redeem the world, were fulfilled and taken out of the way (G. A., p. 20), and the new covenant was made with the twelve tribes, and no new church at all (G. A., pp. 10, 19). It was not an *additional* covenant, but the very same covenant, and made with the same people. God never made a separate covenant with the Gentiles (G. A., p. 22). They must comply with the terms of the covenant made with the Jews, in order to their salvation, and as they had infants in their covenant and church, so must the Gentiles bring their infants into the church.”

Zeke.—“When we finish our argument on the covenants I will notice what you say about a *new* church. Your mixing of the covenants makes as much confusion as your *two* kingdom theory.

“Doesn’t the prophet, in speaking of Christ, say, ‘I, the Lord, have called thee in righteousness and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee and give thee for a covenant to the people, for a light to the Gentiles?’ (Isa. 43:6 and 39:8). Of course, Jews and Gentiles must all comply with the same terms, in order to enter into the covenant with God. The covenant concerning Christ includes a *blessing* for all the families of the earth, and this includes Gentiles. The covenant of circumcision which you claim, included only *one* family, the Jews. The blessing designed for all families was *spiritual*; that given to the Jews was *temporal* and *fleshly*. The gospel of Christ, or New Covenant, is the ful-

fillment of the promise to Abraham made 430 years before the law. The law of Moses, or the Old Covenant, is the fulfillment of the two promises or covenants made with Abraham, Gen. 15 and 17. Now, sir, contrast these two and see if they are the same. Please notice the Old Covenant was given at Mount Sinai; the New at Jerusalem. Moses was mediator of the Old and Jesus the mediator of the New. Aaron and his sons, high priests; Christ was our High Priest. The sacrifices under the Old were animals; under the New, our sacrifice is the blood of Christ. The principle of membership under the Old was flesh, a natural birth, or bought with Jewish money; the principle of membership under the New is spiritual, ye must be born again. Under the Old the promises were temporal; under the New, spiritual. The provisions of the Old embraced the Jews only; the provisions of the New embrace all in every nation who will obey God. Now, sir, with all these absolute changes, how can you persist in saying that the two covenants are identical?"

N.—"I think it is about time that we should adjourn. I can see very clearly that you are trying to *edge* your way to Pentecost. I understand your doctrine, sir, and I am going to show these good people the fallacy of your position tomorrow night, that is, if you don't occupy all the time."

Zeke.—"I will give you all the time you desire, and hope you will come fully prepared to clear up the inconsistencies into which your theory has driven you."

N.—"Then, tomorrow night we will take up the subject of the kingdom of God, and I will show you your error."

CHAPTER IV.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

N.—"I intend, tonight, to show you that the kingdom of God or Jewish church is the same as the Christian (G. A., p. 8). You will notice that the wise men say that Jesus was born King, Matt. 2:2. Jesus himself acknowledged that he was a King born to that end, and Pilate wrote a title and put it on the cross, 'Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews.' (John 18: 37 and 19:19). Now, sir, as he was *born* a King, he evidently

lived and ruled as King on the throne of David, according to the prophecy, Isa. 9:7. That prophecy says, there shall be *no end* to his government, and that he should reign over the house of Jacob and Israel forever. On Pentecost Peter said: 'Therefore being a prophet and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him (David) that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne.'—Acts 2:30. So you see that it was stated that Christ should sit on the throne of David. Now if the Jewish church, or kingdom, was done away, and a new kingdom or church established, why didn't Peter say so? It is evident, then, that it was the *same* kingdom or church, and being the same, infants had a right in it." (G. A., pp. 8, 9.)

Zeke.—"I think that all that you have said has really but little bearing upon the subject. You have never yet shown the Scripture that said there was a church in the family of Abraham, and that infants were in it. You *assume* that there was; then you *assume* that circumcision brought infants into that church; then you *assume* that baptism now takes the place of circumcision, and on these *three* assumptions you build the theory of infant baptism. But I will now attend to your theory of the kingdom. Your interpretation of these Scriptures is wrong. The facts in the case will disprove your conclusions. Who occupied the throne of David during the life time of Jesus on this earth? You know that at the time of Jesus' birth Judea was a dependency of the Roman government, and Herod the Great was King. You know further, that, though there were some changes in the administration of the government, yet the land remained under the dominion of Rome during the life-time of Jesus, and even Pilate, who delivered Jesus to be crucified, was a Roman governor. Jesus then did not occupy the throne of David, nor did he exercise any rule or authority as a king during his life on earth. True, he was 'born a King,' that is, he was of the royal line and legal heir to the throne. That he did not occupy the throne is proven by John 6:15; 'When Jesus therefore perceived that they (the people) would come and take him by force to MAKE HIM A KING, he departed again into a mountain himself alone.' Is it not strange that the people should want to *make* him a King, and he 'already on the throne of David?' Again, I say that Jesus never exercised the prerogative of king or ruler while on

earth. 'And one said unto him, Master, speak to my brother that he divide the inheritance with me. And he (Jesus) said unto him, Man, who made me judge or divider over you?' (Luke 12:13, 14). The people who knew the prophecies were looking for a king who should deliver them from Roman bondage; they expected an earthly government, and when Jesus was crucified they lost all hope. 'We trusted that it had been he who should have redeemed Israel' (Luke 24:21). The apostles did not know that the kingdom was in existence, and Jesus a King, if your theory is true, for at the last meeting prior to his ascension they asked, 'Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?' (Acts 1:6.) The prophecies you quote (Isa. 9:6, 7), and many others said that the kingdom or government should be established or restored, and these apostles were still looking for it. They made the same mistake, in one sense, that you do; they thought that the kingdom was to be a temporal, worldly affair, and Jesus said, 'My kingdom is not of this world.' There is one other point in your argument that deserves present notice. You cite Peter's language on pentecost, that 'God would raise up Christ to sit on his (David's) throne' (Acts 2:30). This one statement refutes your whole theory. Having told them of the *death* of Jesus (23), he quotes David's prophecy of the resurrection (25-28); tells them David is still dead, so that the prophecy did not refer to him, but to the 'fruit of his loins;' and 'he being a prophet and knowing that God had sworn with an oath that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would *raise up* Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before, spake of *the resurrection of Christ.*' So you see when David said, '*raise up,*' he referred to the *resurrection*, and not to the *birth* of Jesus.

"Peter then goes on: 'This Jesus hath God raised up whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God EXALTED and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit he hath shed forth this which you see and hear.' The order then in which the items are given shows your error. They are thus, death, burial resurrection and exaltation at the right hand of the Father. In addition to this thought, God never bestowed the promised blessing until Jesus was raised up. Peter, speaking to the Jews, said: 'Unto you *first*, God having *raised up* his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you in turning away every one of you from his iniquities' (Acts

3:26.) Now, sir, I have shown that your theory of a continued kingdom is not true, and that Jesus did not receive his kingdom, on the earth, so away goes your infant membership again."

N.—"Well, sir, I have some more proof to confirm the position I have taken; for the Jewish church was continued under the name of the *twelve tribes*. (G. A. p. 11). Paul, speaking twenty-six years after pentecost, says: 'Unto which promise our twelve tribes instantly serving God day and night hope to come. For which hope's sake, King Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews' (Acts 26:17). Now, if there was a new church, Paul did not belong to it, or he would have had the hope of the new church, and not of the twelve tribes. James also addressed his epistle 'to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad' (Jas. 1:1). And no apostle ever addressed a letter to a new church. Besides this, Jesus said to his apostles: 'And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father appointed unto me: that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel' (Luke 22:29, 30; G. A., p. 10). Now, sir, Jesus places his table in the twelve tribes; the twelve tribes sprang from the house of Jacob, and Jesus reigned over the house of Jacob (Luke 1:33). Now, sir, how are you going to get a new church? (G. A., p. 10.) This idea of the twelve tribes we see carried out in John's vision of the heavenly Jerusalem. He says, 'It had twelve gates, and at the gates, twelve angels and names written thereon which are the names of the twelve tribes of Israel' (Rev. 21:12). And in the city we read: 'On either side of the river was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits and yielded her fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations' (Rev. 22:2). There, you see, is fruit representing each of the twelve tribes, but none to represent the new church' (G. A., p. 12).

"Now, sir, if there was a new church established at pentecost, as you teach, Christ did not rule it, for he ruled the house of Jacob, or twelve tribes; the apostles had no care over it, for they were appointed judges of the twelve tribes; the Lord did not give it any table, for he put his table in the twelve tribes; God did not appoint any apostle to write an epistle to it; its name is not written on any one of the gates of the New Jerusalem, but the names of the twelve tribes are written there; there is nothing in heaven to represent it; there is no

mention of it in the Bible. I hope that you will pay particular attention to these points."

Zeke.—"An argument that proves too much is as worthless as one that proves too little. Your assumption that 'the twelve tribes' spoken of in the above Scriptures refer to the *natural* descendants of Jacob, and your argument based upon the assumption exclude forever all Gentiles from the church. You say that 'the house of Jacob' and 'the twelve tribes' refer to the same people, the Jewish church, and that it is continued through all time, even into heaven, and not a mention made of a *new church*. Then, sir, the *Gentile world is lost*. You can not show any provisions made for the Gentiles in 'the Jewish church,' as you call it, and if there was no *New Covenant*, no *new church*, they are still 'without God and without hope in this world.' So that in your attempt to get infants into the church, you have figured the Gentiles out, babies and all. What will you do about it?"

N.—"But I said that this Jewish church or twelve tribes was continued as the church of Christ or kingdom of God, and Gentiles must obey the same conditions as the Jews."

Zeke.—"You did not show us any authority for this *continuance*. Jesus tells us not to put a new patch on an old garment, nor new wine in old bottles; you are trying to do both. But I will examine your Scriptures. It is true that the twelve tribes of Israel were descended from the twelve sons of Jacob. But during the reign of Rehoboam, son of Solomon, there was a division of the kingdom, and ten tribes separated from him, and under Jeroboam formed the kingdom of Israel. Two tribes, Benjamin and Judah, remained true to the house of David. The ten tribes, because of their sinful life, were completely destroyed, or scattered, about 700 years before Christ, by the king of Assyria, and their land filled with a mongrel race. Hence, at the time of Jesus, there were only *two* tribes, besides the Levites. These are the facts in the case. Hence, the expression, 'the house of Jacob,' 'the twelve tribes,' 'the house of Judah,' *literally* understood, refer to those two tribes and the Levites who lived at the time Jesus spoke.

"But I will show you that *more* is meant by the phrase than simply the *natural* descendants of Jacob. Paul was a Jew, and the apostle of the Gentiles; he wrote to a church composed of Gentiles, the church at Corinth; they had the Lord's table;

they were no part of the *literal* twelve tribes; they had the hope of the resurrection and immortality, and having these things by the authority of Jesus, they constituted a part of Israel, or 'the twelve tribes' spoken of. Paul calls attention to 'Israel after the flesh' (1 Cor. 10:18); that is the *natural* descendants of Jacob, and as you have already admitted, he speaks of some, who are Abraham's seed, not by *natural* descent, but by faith and obedience to Christ, so Paul says: 'For they are not all Israel which are of Israel. Neither because they are the seed of Abraham (natural posterity) are they all children; but in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, they which are the children of the flesh (the literal twelve tribes), these are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted for the seed' (Rom. 9:6-8). These children of God are the true Israel of God (Gal. 4:28). These are blessed with faithful Abraham; and as only those who are 'of faith' are blessed with him (Gal 3:7-9), the children of promise are children of faith. These children of faith were from among the Gentiles, and constituted the Israel of God, or 'the twelve tribes' spoken of.

"Again, as the apostles were appointed rulers, by your own admission, I will show you something you failed to see. Jesus says to them: 'Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, you shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel' (Matt. 19:28). If they were to sit upon thrones, they were to have authority and power. So we hear Jesus saying to Peter: 'I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven' (Matt. 16:18). This was afterwards repeated to the twelve, and in John 2:23, the Savior says: 'Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained.' Now, they were to receive this power at a certain time. During the life of Jesus on earth, they did not have it. When was it to be given? WHEN the Son of man is seated on the throne of his glory.

"I have shown you that Jesus was *exalted* after his resurrection; but in addition, call your attention to Paul's language to the Philippians (2:5-11), where he speaks of the humiliation

of Jesus, 'That he made himself of no reputation and took upon him the form of a servant and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient to death, even the death of the CROSS; WHEREFORE God hath highly exalted him and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.' Now, when was he *exalted*; when made Lord and Christ, or Ruler of all? Not before his death, for he came as a servant (Matt. 20: 28, and Rom. 15:8); but it was Jesus who died that was crowned with glory and honor (Heb. 2:9), and Peter makes the first announcement of this fact ever made on earth: 'Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus whom you crucified both Lord and Christ' (Acts 2:36). The regeneration, or new creation, or dispensation, began, then, with the exaltation of Jesus. Then, the apostles are to receive *power* to act in his name. The date of reception of this power is so fixed that you can not fail to see it. Jesus said to them, 'Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high' (Luke 24:49). 'But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you' (Acts 1:8). Jesus had promised to give them power; they couldn't receive the power, though, before the Holy Spirit came, and the Holy Spirit was not sent until Jesus ascended. He said, 'It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you (John 16:7). Peter said that Jesus, being exalted to the right hand of the Father, and 'having received of the Father, the promise of the Holy Spirit, hath shed forth this which you see and hear' (Acts 2:33), alluding to the baptism of the Holy Spirit received on Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4). Here, then, in Jerusalem the regeneration began; they proclaimed for the first time on earth the Lordship of Jesus; and Peter gave the first command ever given on earth in the name of Jesus for the remission of sins."

N.—"Hold on, sir, you are getting on too fast, though I saw all the time you were trying to get to pentecost. Why is it that you people all want to go there?"

Zeke.—"Because here we find the *beginning* of the teaching of remission of sins in the name of Jesus Christ, just as Jesus

had said (Luke 24:46, 47). In order to know his commands we must go to the apostles whom he appointed to administer the laws of his government. This takes us, then, to the first *place* and *time* when commands were given by the authority of Jesus, and where people obeyed them and entered the kingdom. Were not the apostles called foundation stones in the church?"

N.—“Yes, I believe they were.”

Zeke.—“Which do you build first, the doors of a house or the foundation?”

N.—“Of course, the foundation is first laid, and then the house is built.”

Zeke.—“Well, when Peter confessed Jesus, saying, ‘Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God,’ Jesus replied: ‘Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hades shall not prevail against it’ (Matt. 16:16-18). He didn’t say that he *had* built it in the days of Abraham, nor that he would build *an addition* to the old Jewish church. It was to be his church, and was still future. Paul says: ‘Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid which is Jesus Christ’ (1 Cor. 3:11). This foundation was to be laid in Zion (Isa. 28:16). To lay a foundation according to Paul is to preach the gospel (Rom. 15:20). So we see again that the foundation was laid in Zion on pentecost by the apostles preaching the gospel. This agrees with the figure you alluded to of the city of the New Jerusalem. Strange that you did not see the foundation stones. ‘And the wall of the city hath twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb’ (Rev. 21:14). The symbolical representation of the glorified church, then, agrees with the facts. For if there was a church, as you claim, during the life of Jesus on earth, JUDAS was one of the foundations; if the church existed before the time of Jesus, it has no foundations, no apostles in it, and if between his death and ascension, it had but *eleven*. Then we go to Jerusalem after the complement was completed, and find twelve apostles, or foundations, at the beginning of the church, with Jesus the corner stone (Eph. 2:19-22). Here you have a *new* church from foundation to cap-stone, and Paul so calls it in Eph. 2:15. He tells us that Christ had broken down the petition wall (the law of Moses) between Jews and Gentiles and had taken it away, in order ‘to make in himself of twain

one new man so making peace. Adam Clarke, one of your commentators, says of this: 'To make one church out of both people which should be considered the body, of which Jesus Christ is the head. Thus he makes one new church, and thus he makes and establishes peace.'

"I hope now, sir, that you can clearly see that pentecost dated the beginning of a new administration of the government of God on earth, and that the very *nature* of this government excludes from it all persons incapable of hearing, understanding and obeying its laws. Infants and idiots are not responsible, and are saved without either faith or obedience."

N.—"I haven't got much more to say to you, sir. You run about so that it has got my head mixed up, and besides, I don't think you ought to monopolize the talk as you do."

Zeke.—"I am really glad that you have found out that your head is 'mixed up.' I thought so when you brought forward that absurd idea of a visible and invisible kingdom. I hope now that you will abandon such a *misty* theory; and then the mixture that you have made of the covenants is also clear evidence of the confused state of mind in which you find yourself. With your consent, we will now adjourn, and I hope that after a good night's rest, and a careful examination of the Scriptures, you may get your ideas fully straightened."

CHAPTER V.

KINGDOM OF GOD AND CHURCH OF CHRIST.

N.—"Well, sir, I have some more Scripture for you tonight. You said last night that the language of Jesus, 'Upon this rock I will build my church,' could not refer to the church in Abraham's family. I shall show that your claim that the kingdom, or church, set up on pentecost is not true, but that it did exist in Abraham's family, and long before pentecost."

Zeke.—"Please remember that you have said that the kingdom of God and the church of God are the same, and that Jesus was *born* a king. Now, sir, if the church existed before his birth, who was king of it?"

N.—"Why Jesus was always king of his church; the church in Abraham's family had the same Savior that we have (G. A., p. 17)."

Now, sir, the prophecy of Dan. 2:44, with regard to setting up a Kingdom, and the promise of Jesus to build his church are the same as the prophecy of Amos 9:11. 'In that day I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen and close up the breach thereof; and I will raise up his ruins and I will build it as in the days of old.' Now if we can find what this prophecy refers to, we can understand the above passage. Let us read Acts 15:15, 16, 'And to this agree the words of the prophets as it is written;' and James then quotes the prophecy. The apostles were considering the matter of circumcision *and also the reception of the Gentiles into the church*, and they declared that God put no difference between the Jews and the Gentiles, and that bringing in the Gentiles was building again the tabernacle of David, and setting it up. Now, the passages you rely upon do not refer to the establishment of a *new* church, but to the 'building again of the tabernacle of David.' Now, sir, this forever settles your *new* church theory; and shows that I am right" (G. A., p. 16).

Zeke.—"If this, sir, is your *last* stronghold, and I believe it is, I will show our friends here that it is strong only in the *perversion* of the Scriptures and *addition* to the word of God. And any doctrine that depends upon *assumptions*, *perversions* and *additions* to the word of God is sinful, and ought to be abandoned. Please turn and read the 15th chapter of Acts. Certain Judaizing teachers had gone down to Antioch and wanted to have those Gentiles *already in the church* circumcised according to the law of Moses. Paul and Barnabas would not permit it, and there was considerable discussion of the matter. The church at Antioch then sent Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem to consult the apostles and brethren there. When they arrived in Jerusalem the apostles and elders of the church received them. They told their mission and 'the apostles and elders came together to consider the matter.' What matter? Whether the Gentiles *in the church* should be circumcised or not? They did not have any discussion whatever as to the *reception of the Gentiles*; for Peter told how he had preached the gospel to the Gentiles and now they had believed and obeyed it 'a good while ago,' and James also adds: 'Simeon hath declared how God *at the first* did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name: and to this agree the words of the prophets as it is written: 'After this I will return and build again the

tabernacle of David which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up. That the residue of men might seek after the Lord and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things.' By reading it all you get the true idea. The fallen fortunes of the kingdom of David are raised up in Christ, who is the Son of David, according to the flesh. Jesus was crowned; his kingdom inaugurated that the residue of men—the remnant, according to the election of grace (Rom. 11:5)—and all the Gentiles upon whom his name was called, might seek him. So that this prophecy was quoted by James only to show that it accorded with Peter's declaration that God had visited the Gentiles 'a good while ago,' and taken out of them a people for his name. And now that the Jews were seeking to impose upon them the requirements of the law of Moses, these apostles come together and decide that it shall not be done. In the 23rd verse it says they wrote letters unto the '*brethren of the Gentiles* in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia.' In the letter that follows they disclaim having given any command that they should be circumcised and keep the law. So, sir, all your scrapping and patching together avails nothing when exposed to the light of truth.

"I have shown you clearly that Jesus was 'made Lord and Christ' after his ascension, and that the kingdom spoken of by Daniel did begin at Pentecost. You have failed to show any kingdom of heaven prior to the birth of Christ, and if there was a church you have failed to show any king as *head* of it."

N.—"Well, sir, Stephen, speaking of Jesus, said: 'This is he that was in the church in the wilderness' (Acts 7:38). David said, 'In the midst of the congregation will I praise thee' (Ps. 22:22). The congregation spoken of by David is called the church by Paul. 'In the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee' (Heb. 2:12.) Jesus said, 'Tell it to the church' (Matt. 18:17; G. A., pp. 17, 18). Now, sir, you see that there was a church even in the wilderness. And I'll show you that infants were baptized into it. When the Jews left Egypt, it is said that there were 'about six hundred thousand on foot that were men, *besides children*;' also in 1 Cor. 10:2, 'that they were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.' Now, sir, this shows that there was a church in the wilderness and Jesus was in it. Though I reckon that you will say that all this was

only in type; but, if so, we must have children 'in the anti-type' (G. A., p. 30).

Zeke.—"I am glad that you have introduced the types; but before I notice this one, I want to call attention to your perversion of Acts 7:38. Stephen did not say a word about Jesus until he had nearly finished his speech. It was Moses who was in the church in the wilderness and with the angel who spake to him in Mt. Sinai, and whom the fathers would not obey (Acts 7:29-40). As to the other Scriptures cited, they do not show the existence of a church of Christ. The congregation of Israel is often mentioned in the Old Testament, meaning thereby the Jews; and this Jewish kingdom was at that time the kingdom of God. Your quotation from David is simply a prophecy, and Paul shows its fulfillment in Jesus after the church is established. Did you not say that infants were admitted into the church anciently by circumcision?"

N.—"Yes, sir, I did, and that baptism has now taken the place of circumcision."

Zeke.—"Then, sir, *there were no infants admitted into the church during the travels through the wilderness; for circumcision was not practiced during their forty-years' journey. Josh. 5:2-6. There were, then, no infants in the church in the wilderness.* True, you have, by scrapping two Scriptures, made it appear that the children were baptized into the church in the wilderness. So that you have both *baptism and circumcision* to get the infants into the church. I have shown you that none got in by *circumcision*, and now I'll show that none were *baptized*, and as both of your modes of initiation fail, you will have to invent some other plan. I will now read 1 Cor. 10:1-2: 'Moreover, brethren, I would not that you should be ignorant how that *all our fathers* were under the cloud and all *passed* through the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.' Paul says that the *fathers* were baptized unto Moses and not the children. It was those who passed through the sea that were baptized, and not those who were *carried* through. Now turn to Heb. 11:29, and you will see that it was 'by faith they (our fathers) passed through the Red sea as by dry land, which the Egyptians assaying to do were drowned.' Now you say that infants can't have faith, and as only those who had faith *passed* through the sea and were baptized unto Moses, the children were not baptized. Pass-

ing through the water *without* faith was not baptism *then*, nor is it baptism *now*. What kind of a mode of initiation will you resort to now?"

N.—"Well, sir, I shall have nothing more to do with you. I can see that you are after making proselytes of Brother Jones and his family to your Campbellite doctrine."

Mr. Jones.—"Stop, Brother Nichols, don't get angry, I am sure Mr. Jackson has met all of your arguments fairly, and if you leave now it will be a virtual surrender on your part and an acknowledgment of defeat."

N.—"No, sir, *never*, I'll *never* give it up. I have too much at stake. I've written several books to substantiate this doctrine, and I am not going to surrender. I can see though, that you are in a fair way to be caught in his Campbellite net."

Fannie.—"Brother Nichols, I think that you are unjust in speaking in that way. If we are in danger of going into a heresy. It is your duty to remain with us. Doesn't Paul say that the minister should hold fast the faithful word as he hath been taught that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers? Now if Mr. Jackson is wrong, you should stay and convince him and us of it, so that we may be placed right."

Mr. Jones.—"Yes, that would be right, and if you do not do this, we shall conclude that you are not able to do so; that you are lacking in the *sound doctrine*."

N.—"I do not care what you think; I shall quit this business and go where I will be better appreciated."

Zeke.—"I regret, sir, that you should so unceremoniously quit this discussion before we finish examining all that is in your book. True, we have examined all your main proofs and shown their fallacy. You charged me just now with a desire to make *proselytes* of Mr. Jones and his family. I know that you hope by using this language to arouse their prejudice against me, and thus put a stop to our further examination of the word of truth. But I am sure that you will fail in this. All *sensible* people have ceased to be frightened by ghosts; and your efforts to frighten them by raising a hue and cry of 'Campbellism,' 'Campbellite net,' 'water salvation,' etc., will prove a failure. A sound judgment and an earnest desire to please God will lead our friends here, and all other honest hearted peo-

ple, to try every doctrine by the word of God, and I doubt not that when convinced by the truth, they will obey it."

Mr. Nichols would stay no longer, but abruptly bidding them good night, left the house. After his departure, Mr. Jones suggested that they continue their examination for a short time, and asked Zeke to explain the argument made by Mr. Nichols about 'the olive tree' (G. A., p. 22).

Zeke.—"I will read it: 'Speaking of the Gentiles coming into the Jewish church, he (Paul) said: And thou (Gentiles) being a wild olive tree wert grafted in among them (Jews) and with them (Jews) partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree' (Jewish church). (Rom. 11:17). 'For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature (kingdom of darkness), and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree, how much more shall these (Jews) which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree (church)?' (Rom. 11:24). Paul wrote this about twenty-seven years after Pentecost, and it was a fine time for him to have told the Gentiles that God had made a new church for them, if such had been the fact; but he tells them they were 'grafted into the good olive tree,' or 'Jewish church.'

This seems to be a strong point with him. We will examine it: If the 'good olive tree was the Jewish church' it was composed of Jews, the natural branches. Now Paul says, they (the Jews) were broken off, cast away, and that through their fall salvation had come upon the Gentiles. Mr. N.'s theory can not be true then, because he has the Jewish church cast away and the Gentiles grafted into a cast away church.

By reading the whole context we learn that Paul is talking of the *rejection* of the Jews, the *natural* descendants of Abraham; and the *reception* of the Gentiles. The figure of the olive tree is introduced to explain the principles involved in this rejection and reception. We must not press a figure beyond the point to be illustrated. Some of the *natural* branches stood, that is, were not broken off; the Gentiles were grafted in among them. Those stood by faith, and these were grafted in by faith. Hence if the good olive tree represents a church, the figure shows that only those Jews *who stood by faith* were in it, and only those Gentiles *who had faith* were grafted in, so that in either case infants are excluded. I have already explained to you that the natural descendants of Abraham are

not counted as the children of God. 'Neither because they are the seed (natural branches) of Abraham are they all children; but in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, they which are the children of the flesh (natural branches, or Jews) these are not the children of God; but the children of promise (children of faith) are counted for the seed.'—Rom. 9: 7, 8. Some of the Jews, 'a remnant according to the election of grace;' (Rom. 11:5) believed in Christ and *stood by faith*; and the rest, that is, those who did not believe, were broken off or cast away, Rom. 11:20. Those who stood and those who were grafted in, constitute the true Israel of God or Abraham's seed. There is nothing in all this to support infant baptism."

Fannie.—"What about the households mentioned? Brother Nichols says that he comes as near knowing that there were children in them as you do that there were not." (G. A., p. 29.)

Zeke.—"He is mistaken again in that. Turning to Acts 16:15, we find that Lydia and her household were baptized; in the 40th verse we learn who they were. Paul and Silas entered into the house of Lydia 'and when they had seen *the brethren* they comforted them and departed.' So no infants there. The household of the Jailor were all able to believe and rejoice, for we read, 'He (the jailer) set meat before them and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house.' No infants here. The household of Stephanas mentioned by Paul (1 Cor. 1:16) were among those who 'hearing believed and were baptized,' Acts 18:8. Paul says of them, 1 Cor. 16:15, they were the 'first fruits of Achaia and had addicted themselves to the ministry.' No infants here either."

Mr. Jones.—"Well, there is but one other point in this little book to notice. It says that the commission, 'Go teach the nations' authorizes infant baptism, because infants form a very large class of the nations (G. A., p. 30). And on same page he contends that Jesus having told Peter to feed the sheep and also the lambs, means that we should baptize the infants."

Zeke.—"The commission of the Savior was to 'go and teach the nations;' 'go preach the gospel;' and the class to be baptized were those who were taught or who believed. Jesus said, John 6:44, 45, 'They shall all be taught of God. Every one therefore that hath *heard* and hath *learned* of the Father cometh to me.' If we are to baptize infants simply because they form a very large class of the nations, for the very same

reason we ought to baptize all lunatics. As to the exhortation of Peter to feed the sheep and the lambs, I know of no dictionary in the world, except perhaps the *Grub-Ax*, that would give *baptize* as one of the meanings of *feed*. It is very evident that as Christians are sometimes spoken of as *sheep*, that *lambs* would refer to young Christians, and to feed them is to instruct them."

Having examined all the arguments relied upon by Mr. Nichols for the support of his theory of infant baptism, the Jones family declared that they would no longer adhere to a doctrine so contrary to the plain teachings of the Scriptures, and expressed themselves as anxious to continue their meetings in order that they might examine into the action and design of baptism. To this the Jacksons agreed and the following night was appointed to examine the subject of the "one baptism."

CHAPTER VI.

THE ONE BAPTISM.

The following night when the two families had assembled, Zeke said that he had prepared a summary of the points thus far elicited and would submit them:

1. That Jesus came to call sinners to repentance, Matt. 9:13; infants are not sinners, therefore are not included in the call.

2. That in order to *come* to Jesus, all must be *taught* of God; and every one that *hears* and *learns*, cometh to Jesus. Jno. 6:44, 45; therefore when children can *hear* and *learn*, permit them to come.

3. That the covenant of circumcision made with Abraham (Gen. 17:10-14), the only one that includes infants had reference to Abraham's natural descendants, and secured to them the land of Canaan as a possession. That this covenant was made *twenty-four* years after the covenant concerning Christ, and that it was afterwards developed into the Mosaic Institution given at Mount Sina, and finally fulfilled and abrogated at the death of Christ. Eph. 2:14-16; Col. 2:14; Hebrews, chapters 3, 9 and 10.

4. That the promise to Abraham (Gen. 12:3) is called the covenant concerning Christ (Gal. 3:15, 16); that this covenant

was developed into the gospel of Christ and the *blessing* promised in it was first preached and offered to all nations at Pentecost.

5. That Jesus was made both Lord and Christ after his resurrection, and ascension, and that His first act as King was to send the Holy Spirit to His Apostles that they might have power to begin and carry on His government among men.

6. That these Apostles as rulers in spiritual Israel, began to preach by the authority of Jesus in Jerusalem on Pentecost, as recorded in Luke.—Luke 24:44-47; Acts 2.

7. That from the terms of the New Covenant (Heb. 8:10-12) infants are not included in it. They have no *sins* to be forgiven, nor can they *know* the Lord.

8. That there is no foundation in fact or in Scripture for the theory of the "identity of the church," or the "identity of the covenants." The many differences between the Mosaic institution and the church of Christ show that they are not identical.

9. That the New Testament teaches that there is a new body or church, Eph. 2:15; that Jesus Christ is the head of it, Col. 1:18; that He was not made Head until His resurrection and ascension, Eph. 1:19-22; and that no authority can be found for infant membership in this new church, in the commission given to the Apostles, or in their preaching or practice under that commission.

10. That the doctrine of infant baptism is based upon assumptions and inferences; such as, assuming that there was a church in Abraham's family, and that circumcision was the rite of initiation into it, and assuming that baptism now takes the place of circumcision; and inferring that the words "come," "feed," "touch," and "lay hands on," mean baptism. Is it not rather a *presumption* of man, speaking where God has been silent? See Jer. 7:30, 31.

11. That in coming to Jesus the mind must be enlightened, the affections enlisted, the will changed and the conscience made good in obedience.

All agreed that the points thus set forth were scriptural, and Mr. Jones then said:

"I realize the truth and force of all that you have said. My family and myself have hitherto rested easy under the conviction that we had obeyed God, having been sprinkled in our in-

fancy. But I now see that that act can not be called *obedience*, as there was no faith, no will, no conscience in it, and we do now desire to obey the Lord from the heart (Rom. 6:17). But there are *two* baptisms spoken of in the New Testament. Holy Spirit baptism, and water baptism, must we have *both*, or only one? And if only one, which one?"

Zeke.—"It can not be both; for Paul, in writing to the Ephesians, about A. D. 64, or 31 years after the beginning of the gospel dispensation, says that there is 'one Lord, one faith, ONE BAPTISM.'—Eph. 4:5. If there was but one at that time, there is but one *now*."

Mr. Jones.—"Well, that is conclusive as to the number of baptisms; can we ascertain positively which one remains?"

Zeke.—"We can do so by noting the differences between these baptisms. Holy Spirit baptism was a promise.—Acts 1:4, 5 and 2:33. God gave it through Jesus, John 14:16; Acts 2:33; the subjects of it were filled with it, Acts 2:4; it was accompanied by miraculous signs, and conferred the power to speak with tongues, Acts 2:4 and 10:45. Water baptism was a command given by Jesus, Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:16; believers were commanded to be baptized, Acts 2:38 and 10:48; it was for the remission of sins, 2:38 and 22:16; obedience to it brought the subject into a new relation to Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, Matt. 28:19. Now, in Paul's letter to the Ephesians he says that 'Christ loved the church and gave himself for it that he might sanctify it, and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word' (Eph. 5:24-26). The only *washing of water* enjoined by the word is in the command 'be baptized for the remission of sins;' it is therefore conclusive that the 'one baptism' that *now* remains is water baptism."

Mr. Jones.—"I see very clearly the distinction between these two baptisms; but there are a great many who claim to receive the Holy Spirit baptism now, and many others think that they must be baptized with the Holy Spirit before they can be converted, just as Cornelius and his household were."

Zeke.—"There are but two instances of Holy Spirit baptism recorded in the Bible; that of the Apostles in Acts, second chapter, and of Cornelius and household in tenth chapter. Both of these were just alike; for Peter says that the 'Holy Spirit fell on them as on us at the beginning.' Now, whenever you *see* 'tongues like as of fire,' sitting upon any one's head and hear

him 'speak with tongues,' you may conclude that it is the Holy Spirit baptism. There were many other gifts of the Holy Spirit, that were conferred 'by the laying on of hands of the Apostles,' Acts 8:18. All these miraculous gifts having served their purpose have ceased. We do not need miracles now in order to confirm the mission of the Apostles. Peter explains why Cornelius and his household were baptized with the Holy Spirit. 'And God who knoweth the heart bare them witness, giving them the Holy Spirit even as He did unto us,' Acts 15:8. The baptism was a *testimony* from God concerning the Gentiles. But testimony must be given to some one, and for some purpose. This baptism was a testimony to the six Jewish brethren who accompanied Peter (Acts 11:12), and through them to the whole church at Jerusalem (Acts 11:1-18), that the Gentiles should be admitted to the privileges of the gospel. Peter also explains the conversion of these Gentiles; he says that God made choice of him that the Gentiles by his mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe, Acts 15:7. Again, he says that he was to tell them words whereby they shall be saved (Acts 11:14); and that the soul is purified in obeying the truth, and that we are born again of incorruptible seed, by the word of God (1 Peter 1:22, 23). Now, if we get our faith by hearing the word and are saved by the words; our souls purified in obeying the truth; and are born again of the word of God, it is not necessary to have the Holy Spirit baptism in order to be converted."

Mr. Jones.—"Well, sir, I am thoroughly satisfied upon that point. I wish now to examine the Scriptural *action* of baptism."

Zeke.—"You are aware that the word *baptize* is a Greek word transferred into our language, and as we are not Greek scholars, we shall have to depend upon what is said in the New Testament about it."

Mr. Jones.—"That will be more satisfactory to us, and I doubt not that we shall succeed better in that way than if we were to go to the Greek."

Zeke.—"Then we will turn to the New Testament and notice carefully all the circumstances connected with baptism that are necessary in order to obey the command. We will begin with the baptism of John, because the *action* was just the same as Christian baptism, and the apostles having been baptized by

John understood the meaning of the word. In order not to be tedious I submit the following items as necessary requirements in order to have the Scriptural action of baptism:

1. Water (Matt. 3:16).
2. Much water (John 3:23).
3. Going to the water (Mark 1:5 and Acts 8:36).
4. Going into the water, both preacher and the one to be baptized (Acts 8:38).
5. Both coming up out of the water (Acts 8:38).
6. Bodies washed with water (Heb.10:22; 1 Peter 3:21).
7. Buried in baptism (Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:12).
8. Raised up in baptism (Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:12).
9. Baptism a figure of a birth (John 3:5).

Now, sir, as there are three different actions claimed for baptism, viz: sprinkling, pouring and immersion, please see which one will meet all these requirements."

Fannie.—"Why, any one can see at a glance that sprinkling and pouring will meet only *one* of them, and that is *water*, and that *immersion will meet every one of them*. But I have been led to believe that Paul spoke of Holy Spirit baptism, when he says we are buried and raised in baptism. How about that?"

Zeke.—"It is not true, because the Romans to whom Paul wrote had been baptized, but they had never received any Spiritual gifts. Paul says, 'I long to see you that I may impart unto you some Spiritual gift to the end ye may be established' (Rom. 1:11). Now, if they had been baptized with the Holy Spirit, they would have had Spiritual gifts. Their baptism, then, was in obedience to 'the form of doctrine delivered them' (Rom. 6:17)."

Mr. Jones.—"I have been told that 'born of water' does not refer to baptism at all."

Zeke.—"There is not a scholar in America, who has any regard for his reputation, that will interpret it any other way than to mean baptism. By consulting the Methodist Discipline, pages 221 and 227, you will see that those who wrote it understood 'born of water' to mean baptism. Paul says that Jesus is 'the first born from the dead' (Col. 1:18). He died, was buried, hidden from sight in the tomb, and raised up, or born, from the dead; so we come by faith and repentance, and having confessed with the mouth the Lord Jesus, are buried, hidden from sight in

the water, and raised up, or born, from the water, to walk in a new life."

Mr. Jones.—"Well, sir, I must admit that all these Scriptures are conclusive as to the action of baptism. I wish now to learn something about the design of baptism."

Zeke.—"We believe and teach that baptism is for (in order to) the remission of sins. I invite your attention to what the word of God teaches on this point:

"1. Jesus said to his apostles: 'Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. He that believeth not shall be damned' (Mark 16:15, 16). Salvation is here promised to a certain class—'he that believeth and is baptized.' Jesus does not say, 'He that believeth and is saved shall be baptized;' but he placed baptism before salvation. All admit that faith is necessary to salvation, and precedes it; and nothing but a blind partisanship will prevent any one from seeing that baptism is here so joined to faith as to make it necessary to whatever faith is, and as both precede salvation, they are both for or in order to salvation.

"2. The commission as recorded in Luke 24:46, 47 tells us that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in the name of Jesus among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. The apostles taught that there was salvation or remission in no other name given under heaven among men (Acts 4:10-12 and 10:43). By the 'name of Jesus' is meant by the authority of Jesus. I have already shown you that he received this authority after his resurrection and ascension, and that the apostles began to act, under their commission, on pentecost in the city of Jerusalem. Peter then preached 'repentance and remission of sins' for the first time on earth, in the name of Jesus. But how did Peter preach the remission of sins? He first presented the facts and the testimony proving Jesus to be Lord and Christ; then he told those who believed 'to repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins' (Acts 2:38). Language certainly could not be plainer than this, and it is in perfect harmony with the commission already noticed."

Mr. Jones.—"It is taught by a great many that *for* here means 'because of;' that we are baptized because we are saved, and not in order to be saved."

Zeke.—"I am very familiar with that idea; but if true, it

would make nonsense of Peter's command. Two things are commanded by the authority of Christ, and are so connected together that all the ingenuity of the doctrine-makers has never been able to separate them. Let us notice other commands. 'Repent and pray God if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee (Acts 8:28). Two things are here commanded for forgiveness. Now, did Simon repent in order to forgiveness and pray to God because of forgiveness? One more example. Jesus said: 'Watch ye and pray lest ye enter into temptation' (Mark 14:38). Were they to watch in order not to enter temptation and then pray because of not entering it?

"3. One of the chief promises of the New Covenant was that God would put his laws into the mind and write them upon the heart (Heb. 8:10). Jesus also said, 'They shall all be taught of God. Every one that heareth and learneth of the Father cometh to me' (John 6:44, 45). In fulfillment of this promise God *now* speaks by his Son (Heb. 1:2). The Son speaks by his apostles. He commanded them to 'go *teach* the nations.' These apostles taught that salvation was only to the obedient (Heb. 5:9), and that obedience must be from the heart (Rom. 6:17). We see from all this that the law or rule of action is first written in the heart; that it is taught or preached. Man *hears* and *learns* and thus *knows* the Lord (Heb. 8:11). This agrees with that Jesus said of those who received seed into good ground: 'He that heareth the word and understandeth it beareth fruit' (Matt. 13:23; Lk. 8:15). So we see that in order to remission of sins, we must obey a law; in order to obey that law we must understand it, and in order that we may understand it, it is put into our minds and written in our hearts by the agents appointed for that purpose—the apostles speaking by the Holy Spirit. Turning once more to pentecost, we see just how 'the law of the spirit of life (Rom. 8:2) that sets us free from sins was written in the hearts of the inquiring multitude. Peter first convinced them of sin, and proved to them the resurrection of Jesus and that God had made him both Lord and Christ (Acts 2:36). Those that believed this were 'pricked in their hearts,' and cried out, 'What shall we do?' They could not be saved without obedience, and they could not obey without *knowing* what to do. Peter told them 'to repent and be baptized for the remission of sins,' and they that *understood* the word obeyed."

Mr. Jones.—"Sir, I thank you for thus directing us to the

plain teaching of God's word. I now see the simplicity of the gospel plan, and shall obey the gospel at the very first opportunity I may have."

Mrs. Jones and Fannie, having also expressed their determination to follow the example of Mr. Jones, Zeke said:

"I rejoice to hear of your noble intentions, and am glad to say that you may have an early opportunity of obeying the Lord, for I received a letter today announcing that Brother Raccoon Bill Jones would preach at the school house tomorrow night."

All parties were glad to hear of the proposed meeting, and bidding each other good-night, adjourned, to meet again the following night at the school house.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ONE BODY.

The following night quite a large audience assembled at the school house. The Jacksons and Jones were there, all eager to greet the preacher, and to hear him proclaim the glad tidings of salvation. The preacher read the 4th chapter of Ephesians, and announced as his subject the "ONE BODY." He said:

"The apostle states emphatically that there is *one* body. Many attempts have been made by the religious bodies of this age, either to evade the force of this statement or so interpret it as to connect themselves with that 'one body.' It is not my purpose to examine their claims. If we can ascertain clearly from the divine record what are the characteristics of that 'one body,' we can then determine our own relationship to it.

"The word *one*, in the apostle's statement, is used numerically, meaning a single thing. It does not here refer to that oneness that must exist in the body. By the word 'body' we understand 'the church' (Eph. 1:19-23). Hence there is one *church*. By an examination of the figure here presented we will see that the word 'body' implies unity, concord, harmony, compactness (Eph. 4:15, 16). The following elements enter into this body: 1. Head. 2. Members. 3. Blood. 4. Spirit. All of these must be 'fitly joined together.' A body without a head is a corpse, so that a religious body that does not hold to the 'Head,' is a religious corpse (Col. 2:18-23). The members must be united, compact-

ed together by joints and bands (Eph. 4:15, 16). This forever sets aside the popular idea that people may be *one in Christ*, and at the same time be members of various religious bodies that believe and teach antagonistic doctrines (see also 1 Cor. 12:12-27). So also a body without blood would be lifeless, 'for the life is in the blood' (Lev. 17:11). But there may be bodies, having head, members and blood, and yet without Spirit. 'A body without the Spirit is dead' (Jas. 2:26). No intelligence in it, no activity, and, of course, no responsibility. With all of these elements fitly joined together, according to the will of God, we will have a body or church of Christ. What do the Scriptures teach concerning these elements?

"1. Jesus, the Christ, the Son of God, is the Head of the body' (Col. 1:18).

"2. Christians to whom Paul wrote were the members of the body (Eph. 5:30; Rom. 12:4, 5; 1 Cor. 12:27).

"3. The blood of Christ is the life of the body (Matt. 26:28; 1 John 1:7).

"4. The Holy Spirit dwells in the body (1 Cor. 3:16; Eph. 2:19, 20).

As God hath set the members in the body as it pleases him (1 Cor. 12:18), and as he is the author of all life, all of these parts must be fitly joined together by the will of God.

"Everything that has an existence on earth had a *time* and *place* of beginning. It is important to ascertain this beginning, in order that we may fully identify the body, and also ascertain clearly how members are now set in the body by the will of God. Let us examine each item closely and see, if we can, when all of them were *first* brought together, or 'fitly joined together.'

"1. *When* was Jesus made Head? Paul says it was done by the mighty power of God when he raised Jesus from the dead and set him at his right hand and put all things under his feet, and 'gave him to be the Head over all things to the church, which is the body' (Eph. 1:19-23). This is conclusive that Jesus was made Head, that is, Ruler, Law-giver, King, after his resurrection and ascension. But as the body is on earth, and must 'hold to' Jesus as Head, in order that it may be truly 'the church of Christ,' we must find the first place where Jesus is declared to be the Head. While he was on earth he told his disciples to tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ (Matt. 16:20). This

restriction was not removed until the apostles received the Holy Spirit on pentecost and 'spake as he gave them utterance' (Acts 2:4). On that occasion Peter standing in the presence of those who had taken part in the rejection and crucifixion of Jesus, boldly charged upon them the sinfulness of their deed, and then declared that 'this Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath shed forth this which you see and hear. * * * Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye crucified both Lord and Christ' (Acts 2:32, 33, 36). Here, then, in Jerusalem, on the first pentecost after the resurrection of Jesus, is the first *public* announcement, proclamation, or preaching, that Jesus is 'made both Lord and Christ.' From this time forward the mouths of all preachers were unlocked and the great burden of their message was 'that this Jesus whom I preach unto you is the Christ.' Now, as it is impossible to please God *without faith* (Heb. 11:6), and faith comes by hearing the word of God (Rom. 10:17), and the word of God declares that the fundamental truth to be believed in order to our salvation is that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God (John 20:30, 31), and *that* word was never proclaimed on earth until spoken by Peter, as above shown, it follows conclusively that that day marked the beginning of a new order of things, of which Jesus is declared to be Head, and in which men are saved by 'the obedience of faith,' just as those who 'gladly received' Peter's words obeyed and were added to the Lord.

"2. The members. Jesus had prepared the apostles for entrance into the new dispensation. In John 15:3 we read: 'Ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you.' Again he told them, 'Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you and ordained you that you should go and bring forth fruit,' etc. After his resurrection he spoke to them of *the things* pertaining to the kingdom of God, and commanded them not to depart from Jerusalem until they were endued with power from on high (Luke 24:49). Hence they remained in Jerusalem and constituted the foundation stones of the church, Christ Jesus being the chief corner stone (Eph. 2:19). Here, then, were 'members,' properly prepared, brought together into one place by the will of God, and ready to *act* as soon as power was given to them from the Head.

"3. The blood. 'Without the *shedding* of blood there is no remission' (Heb. 9:14), and as the blood of Jesus cleanseth us from all sin (1 John 1:7), we can confidently say that salvation or remission of sins in the name of Christ was never offered or preached to man until the sacrifice had been made. Jesus said, prior to his death, 'This is my blood of the New Covenant which is shed for many for the remission of sins' (Matt. 26:28). he *shed* this blood when he suffered on earth as the Lamb of God (Heb. 13:12). But both type and anti-type show us that something more than *shedding* of blood was necessary, hence we see Jesus made a High Priest by the oath of God (Heb. 7:28), entering into heaven, the true holy place, there to appear in the presence of God for us (Heb. 9:14-24). After the sacrifice was made for sins; after he had, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, he sat down at the right hand of God (Heb. 10:12). Being thus exalted, the time was fulfilled for 'remission of sins' to be proclaimed 'in his name' as commanded (Luke 24:46, 47). So that in Jerusalem, through the proclamation made by Peter, the *blessing* of remission of sins, procured by the shedding of Jesus' blood, was first offered to sinful men, as recorded in Acts 2:38.

"4. The Spirit. In Acts 1:4 we read: 'And being assembled together with them he commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father which you have heard of me.' What promise was this? By reference to John 14:15-17, we learn that it was the Comforter, or Holy Spirit; whom Jesus would send to the apostles when he went away (John 16:7-13). While Jesus was with the apostles, we read: 'For the Spirit was not yet given because Jesus was not yet glorified' (John 7:39). As long as Jesus remained *on earth* the Spirit was not given, but when he returned to the Father the Spirit came to the apostles as recorded (Acts 2:1-4). This *coming* of the Holy Spirit is proof that Jesus was 'glorified' when he ascended to the Father, just as proven before. But, more than this, the Spirit was to bring the words of Jesus to the memory of the apostles (John 14:26), guide them into all truth, show them things to come, give them power, etc. (John 16:7-13; Acts 1:8).

"After the reception of the Holy Spirit by the apostles, a large multitude of people gathered together and Peter preached to them. In explanation of this wonderful event (the appearance

of cloven tongues like fire and the apostles speaking in different languages) he told them that God promised, by one of his prophets, Joel, to pour out his Spirit upon all flesh, and that Jesus, whom they knew, who had done among them many wonderful works, whom they had crucified, had been raised from the dead and 'being exalted to the right hand of God and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath shed forth this which you see and hear' (Acts 2:16-33).

"Here, then, we see brought together in one place all the parts that constitute the one body. According to the will of God, Jerusalem was to be the beginning place (Luke 24:27). The record shows (1) that the apostles, the foundation stones of the church, tarried in Jerusalem by the command of Jesus. (2). That the Holy Spirit came upon them and gave them power. (3). That Jesus was first declared to be 'both Lord and Christ.' (4). Salvation first proclaimed 'in his name.' And all these things on the first pentecost, after the ascension of Jesus. Hence, we confidently locate the beginning of the church at this place. If there was a church in existence prior to this time, Jesus was not Head of it; it had no Holy Spirit in it, and had only the blood of animals, which could not take away sin.

"Having located the beginning at Jerusalem, we follow the apostles and see how they preached the gospel; we learn what they commanded the people to do in the name of Jesus; and believing them to be the accredited messengers of God, and their teachings to be the authoritative commands of the Holy Spirit, we preach as they did and obey what they taught. And as the word of God is 'the seed of the kingdom,' and is life-giving, and God has said that his word shall accomplish that whereto he has sent it (Isa. 55), and that it lives forever (1 Peter 1:22, 23), we believe that when we accept Jesus as Head by a faith that obeys, we enter into the One Body and enjoy the promises given to the obedient.

"But this brings us to consider more particularly *how* to become a member of the One Body.

"Paul preached two years in Ephesus and says that he declared to them the whole counsel of God (Acts 20:27). What Paul preached to them was the gospel of their salvation (Eph. 1:13). As they were *in* the one body, it is evident that they had come into it by obedience to the gospel. For he says to these Ephesians that 'the mystery which had been hid for ages was *now*

made known to the apostles and prophets by the Spirit. That the Gentiles should be fellow heirs and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel (Eph. 3:3-6). All the promises of God are 'in Christ' (2 Cor. 1:20). Salvation or remission of sins is one of these promises (Eph. 1:7). Now, according to the above statement, we must be 'in Christ' in order to partake of his promise. To be 'in Christ' is equivalent to being 'in the one body,' and the apostle says that we partake of God's promise *in Christ* or *in the body* 'by the gospel.' It is, therefore, evident that some provision is made in that gospel by which we are brought *into Christ* or *into the One Body*. We find just such teaching (Rom. 6:3; 1 Cor. 12:13; Gal. 3:26-29). Here it is said we are 'baptized into Christ,' 'baptized into one body.' From these Scriptures it is *certain*:

"1. That salvation, one of the promises, is 'in Christ,' or 'in the one body,' 'in the church.'

"2. That to be a partaker of this promise one must be 'in Christ.'

"3. That we partake of the promise 'by the gospel.'

"4. That we are 'baptized into Christ,' 'baptized into one body.'

"Therefore, baptism is a part of the gospel, and as it was commanded in the name of the Lord Jesus (Acts 2:38; Acts 10:48), it must be obeyed in order for us to partake of the promise.

The apostle says that '*as many as have been baptized into Jesus Christ have put on Christ.*' How many more 'put on Christ?' Tradition says 'a great many.' Paul simply says, *as many as have been baptized into Jesus Christ have put on Christ.*

"How many are thus baptized into Christ?"

"It is certain that we can not baptize an unbeliever, whether young or old, into Christ, for 'without faith it is impossible to please him, for he that cometh to God must believe that he is and is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him' (Heb. 11:6). You must believe, then, with all the heart in Jesus the Christ, the Son of God (Acts 8:36, 37). It is also certain that an impenitent heart only treasures up to itself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God' (Rom. 2:5). Repentance is then necessary. Please note that 'the goodness of God leadeth to repentance' (Rom. 2:4). God's infinite love and mercy, manifested in the gift of his Son to die for us,

apprehended by faith, produces godly sorrow and this works in us that change of will called repentance (2 Cor. 7:10).

"Then the believing penitent, according to Paul's gospel, confesses with the mouth the Lord Jesus (Rom. 10:8-10), and is, by the authority of Jesus, 'baptized into Christ.'

"Please note, in conclusion, that these conditions, faith, repentance, confession and baptism, do not change God, neither do they bring salvation to man, but they change the man and bring him into Christ, or into the one body, where he receives the promise, the remission of his sins.

"Having 'obeyed from the heart' this teaching, we have the WORD OF THE LORD, the highest authority we can have, that our sins are forgiven. Do you believe him? Will you trust in him? If so, obey his will, so clearly expressed to you, that you may rejoice in the hope set before us of life eternal in the everlasting kingdom of our God."

At the conclusion of the speaker's discourse, Mr. and Mrs. Jones and Fannie went forward and made "the good confession." When asked by the preacher if they were then prepared to obey the Lord in baptism, Mr. Jones replied:

"Sir, I have fully determined to obey the Lord, and to be guided in all things by his word, and as I have spent a large portion of life to no purpose, I wish to begin the Lord's work just as soon as possible. So that I am ready *now* to go to the water and obey him." The other candidates expressed themselves as equally desirous of going the same hour of the night to obey the Lord. It was but a short distance to the water, and the entire congregation were soon assembled there. The ceremony was short, but very solemn and impressive. There was great joy in that little assembly. Some were filled with joy that they had found the way of truth, while others rejoiced to see these willing converts thus yield obedience to the Lord. The meeting continued for several days and a congregation of about twenty was set in order before the preacher left.

The little band continued steadfastly in the apostle's doctrine, meeting regularly every Lord's day. Zeke soon became an efficient preacher. He adhered with strict fidelity to the word of God, and condemned all innovations and departures from it.

At the appointed time Zeke and Fannie were united in marriage. Now that they were *one*, indeed, in Christ, their joy and happiness were complete, and we bid them adieu, knowing that

two hearts thus united in love, and two lives thus consecrated to the service of God, will bring joy and peace here, and life eternal hereafter. They were happy because they had, like Mary of olden time (Luke 10:42), chosen the better part, of learning their lessons of life from Jesus.

Reader, "go thou and do likewise." Remember that "man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:4). Your life in this world will be worth but little to you should you so spend it as to lose the life beyond. Let all your activities, all your energies be engaged in the service of God, and your reward shall be sure. Adhere with unwavering fidelity to the word of God. He has spoken to us by his Son, and given us a perfect rule of action by which to regulate our lives. Look into it—continue in it—and your life will be full of the strong consolation that God's gracious promises beget in us (Heb. 6:17-20).

APPENDIX.

A kind friend and brother writes me that he loaned a copy of "ZEKE AND THE METHODISTS" to a Methodist preacher, who read it and returned it with several places marked, and the word "LIE" written opposite. Here are the references:

Page 9. "All persons should be admitted into the visible kingdom in infancy, because it gives them better opportunities, than they would have out of the kingdom." (G. A., p. 14.) If the preacher meant by his score of "lie," that I had misquoted Mr. Nichols, I simply refute the charge by quoting the exact language of *Grub-Box*, page 14. Mr. N. says: "God had an invisible kingdom, which can not be entered by any one except those who believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and that He has a visible kingdom, into which all persons *should be admitted in infancy*. (Italics mine.) The net (which he says is the kingdom) gathered *all* kinds—big, little, old, young and bad. Taking bad fish into the net did not make them good: nor does taking bad people into the visible kingdom of God make them good, but *it gives them better opportunities of becoming good* than they could have out of the kingdom." Any one can see at a glance, that so far as *entrance* into what he calls the "visible kingdom" "*all, big, little, young and old,*" are equal and all enjoy the same blessings and privileges, viz: "*better opportunities of becoming good.*" Hence I did not misrepresent Mr. N. But may be this preacher meant that such

a doctrine as Mr. Nichols here teaches is a "lie." If so, I agree with him. Babies, being neither able to learn or to use the means ordained for those in the kingdom, can not be benefited by them and "bad" men will not use them.

The second "lie" he charges has reference to babies not entering the invisible kingdom, page 9. "N. No they do not get into *that* kingdom, for we only get into the invisible kingdom by Holy Ghost baptism, and faith is the condition on which it is received." (G. A., p. 15.) By reference to *Grub-Ax*, p. 14, Mr. N. says: "By spiritual baptism, administered to the spiritual man, we are brought into the spiritual kingdom." On page 15 he says: "Jesus, then, is the administrator of Holy Ghost baptism, and *faith is the condition on which it is received.*" (Italics mine.) Again: "The Holy Ghost is applied to the spiritual, or *inward man*, and *washes him, purifies him, sanctifies him*, and *baptizes him* into the invisible kingdom." The query is again pertinent who told the "lie"? Paul speaks of some who "changed the truth of God into a lie" and those who seek to support the popish tradition of infant baptism are often guilty of the same thing.

On page 9 are two more scores made by the preacher. "N.—'Children have a right to membership in the church and ought to be baptized,'" and the following: "Zeke.—'Is the church and kingdom of God the same institution?'" "N.—'Yes, sir, it is.'" *Grub-Ax*, page 6, says that "infants have a right to baptism," and page 26 says: "So, you see, children had a right to membership in the church of God in the past, and they have a right to membership in the future."

Throughout the entire tract, Mr. N. uses the words "kingdom" and "church" as synonymous as any one can easily verify by reference to *Grub-Ax*.

As a rule *partisans* are unjust in their criticisms. They aim at *victory* rather than *truth*, and they follow the Jesuistic method of warfare, which is embodied in this principle, viz: "The *end* justifies the *means*." This principle obtains not only among those who pose as critics, but also among those who seek to prove their doctrines by the Scriptures. The preacher above referred to and Mr. Nichols, the author of the *Grub-Ax*, are examples of this class. Knowing as they do, that God has never spoken a syllable in reference to infant baptism or infant membership, but has addressed His message to persons

who can *hear, understand and obey*, they have presumptuously *scrapped* the word of God and constructed a system that if universally practiced, would do away entirely with Christ's command to "Go and preach the gospel."

Now, dear reader, whatever may be your preconceived idea relative to the points herein discussed, do not imitate these men in their methods. Be *honest* toward God. Be *honest* with *yourself*. Study the positions taken in the light of God's word. Remember that the *silence* of that Word must be respected. "God has *spoken* to us." Why should He condescend to address such a poor, frail and sinful creature as man? "He that hath ears to *hear* let him hear what the Spirit saith to the churches." Again, "it is written they shall all be *taught* of God." God speaks then in order to teach. How does He speak to us? "By His Son whom He hath appointed heir of all things." Yes, Jesus, the Son of God, is "made both Lord and Christ," and now "speaks to us from heaven," through His Apostles. You have the Word, study it diligently, for it will thoroughly furnish you with doctrine, correction, reproof and instruction in righteousness. 2 Tim. 3:16-17.

Valuable Books, Tracts and Feaflets.

	Per Copy	Per Dozen
Sincerity Seeking the Way to Heaven (Franklin)	\$.05	\$.50
What Must I Do to Be Saved?05	.50
Action of Baptism (Phillips)05	.50
Honest Man (McCarty)10	1.00
Heartfelt Religion (Young)05	.50
Infant Baptism (Richardson)05	.35
Prayer (J. S. Durst)05	.50
The Holy Spirit and Mission of John (Sweeney)05	.50
Total Depravity (Kidwill)05	.50
The Holy Spirit (Young)05	.50
Righteousness (Vaughan)05	.25
The New Birth (Arceneaux)05	.25
Writings of Elijah Hansbrough50	5.00
Living Words (J. W. Jackson)	1.50	.
Church of Christ and Christian Church (Bedichek)10	1.00
Order of Worship10	.50
Instrumental Music in the Worship (Kidwill)15	1.00

LEAFLETS (Heavy Paper, Large Type).

	Per Dozen	Per 100
Sanctification (Arceneaux)	\$.15	\$.50
The Great Salvation (Ellmore)15	.50
Man—His Creation, Fall and Redemption (Ellmore)15	.50
Two Teachers (Milholland)15	.50
Are There Many Ways to Be Saved? (Hinds)15	.50
Which Church Did Christ Build? (Hinds)15	.50
Is Feeling an Evidence of Pardon? (Hinds)15	.50
Salvation by Grace (Denton)15	.50
Persuasion (Richardson)15	.50
Sprinkling, Pouring or Immersion (Denton)15	.50
On Mormonism—Assorted10	.25
Way of Salvation—A Dialogue (Hinds)15	.50

SONG BOOKS.

	Per Copy	Per Doz.	Per 50	Per 100
Gospel Songs	\$.40	\$ 4.50	\$ 16.00	\$ 30.00
New Songs of Victory30	3.00	12.00	22.50
Zion Melodies15	1.50	6.00	11.00
Tones of Praise Combined35	4.00	13.00	24.00
Glad Hosannas25	2.75		
Gospel Gleaner40	4.50		
New Christian Hymns (Brds.)40	3.85	13.00	25.00
New Christian Hymns (Cloth)50	5.00	16.00	30.00

Firm Foundation Publishing House

Austin, Texas