

WILLIAM SMOOT – THE CONTEST –

Preface.

We assure our readers that it is not pleasant to record as faithful testimony compels us to do, the weakness and perversion of truth on the part of many formerly held in high esteem among us; and to trace the bitter contest culminating in the division of 1889, among the Old School Baptist in America.

But all must admit, if the position of those of us who were in that contest contending for what we regarded as gospel truth and order was correct, then a plain, faithful statement of the contest itself must necessarily be so. Nay more, it seems important that a faithful record of the causes that led up to, and of the contest itself should be published especially for those who are to come after us.

Those of us who fought what we regarded as the good fight of faith [II Tim.4:7,] in that contest do not consider that we were the aggressors; but that we were forced either to submit to, and be reckoned among those who were in disorder both in doctrine and in practice; or contend against such conditions.

Thirty-four years have passed since this division; nearly all of those engaged have passed away. I was an eye-witness to the scenes that marked its course; the only minister on either side during the fateful days at Quantico, August 1889, now living; and wish it to be distinctly understood that what I state in this volume, is what has come under my immediate knowledge; largely what I have seen with “my own eyes; and heard with my own ears.”

The years that have passed have convinced me of the importance of the position in doctrine and order for which we fought in those eventful years, and maintained among us so faithfully since. To have went with the majority of professed Old School Baptist in those fateful years, would have meant for us, as it has for them, to be drifting today, our God only knows where on the wild ocean of carnal reason; and eventually, infidelity; following the slimy path of all such departures, into the ranks of antichrist.

I have but briefly referred to the bitterness on the part of our opponents in this contest. The late Elder Samuel Trott in his “Calm Reply to Elder John Clark” says that he “had met with more uncandor and malignancy in the contest of 1850-53, than in any contest in which he had been previously engaged,” and I can say that I have met with more of this bitterness in the contest of 1886-89, than in any of all my over half century labor in the ministry.

Similar contests must come up in the future as in the past; and I desire to leave upon record a brief tracing of this important contest; no doubt but what in future scenes of similar character among our people, a repetition of much of what we have passed through in 1886-89, will be experienced by our brethren.

As our God gave ability we were compelled to stand firm. It is written concerning the contest in apostolic days with Judaizing teachers; "To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you." Gal.2:5.

To these dear and faithful brethren in gospel grace who have so firmly and devotedly continued to earnestly and faithfully contend for this apostolic testimony, we affectionately ascribe our publication, dedicated we trust to truth and holiness; and to the memory of those who have gone before in the hallowed path of truth eternal.

W.M. Smoot
Occoquan, Virginia, Dec.1, 1923.

Second Preface.

Occoquan, Virginia, April 1, 1929.

It will be seen that over five years have passed since I wrote the Preface to this work. It was my expectation at that time to push the work forward to an early publication; but constant pressure of other engagements; as well as the realization as the work progressed, that it required more time and labor than I at first thought, have delayed its completion.

I have spared neither time, nor labor to publish an accurate account from the valued records in my office of the stirring scenes through which our churches passed in those trying days of 1886-89 over the same points of doctrine contested in 1850-53 with John Clark and his compeers. It is remarkable that the last contest covered the same period of time as the first – three years. While the first contest is frequently referred to as 1852-53; yet it started as shown in chapter II of this work in active effort in 1850; yet its real causes lay for years back of 1850 as the real causes of the contest of 1886-89 lay for many years back of 1886 as shown in chapter IV of the present work.

As the work progressed it seemed important to add an Appendix in order to preserve important documents relating to these two great conflicts among the Old School Baptist of America; first and foremost comes the Circular of the late Elder Thomas P. Dudley on "The Origin, Nature and Effects of the Christian Warfare." This has been considered by our brethren as one of, if not really the ablest article ever written upon that subject.

Next in order to this Circular and fully measuring up to its ability comes the article by the late Elder J.F. Johnson on Hebrews 2:14,15; the children partaking of flesh and blood; and other articles which the reader will find that we think should be preserved in our records.

These articles are followed by brief notices of the various branches of anti-christ, and then a short biographical notice of a few of the old fathers in Israel – men who stood fearless in maintaining the doctrine and order now so surely believed among us.

These and other articles of minor import we have prepared with care that we may leave upon record for those who, by the grace of God, may succeed us, we fervently hope in maintaining the testimony held so sacred by ourselves and the dear old fathers in Israel, who have long since passed on before us we confidently believe to their immortal home.

The testimony that we have held unpopular as it has been among the great body of those who profess the Old School Baptist name must come to the front in all future contests upon this subject.

“Truth crushed to the earth again shall rise,
All the years of time are hers;
While error mangled rises in pain,
And dies amid its worshippers.”

It shall shine as brightly above the green grass that covers the mortal remains of these dear saints who have maintained it, as it has fallen from their lips in active life.

W.M. Smoot.

“Ye who ask for some new doctrine,
Some new way of gospel life;
Ye who seek for other pathway,
Than our God doth wisely give;
Ye who Heaven itself would lower,
Unto mortal heart and mind,
Think not in these humble pages,
Teachings new and strange to find.

For I love the old, worn pathways,
That I know are tried and true;
Our own dead have passed along them,
To the temple wide and new.
Other teachings – so misleading,

Other pathways – let them be;
But the faith our fathers died in,
Is the only faith for me.”

CHAPTER I

Events leading up to this Contest and Division.

An account of the contest and division under discussion requires some reference to the causes that led up to this condition. Such character of trouble among our people does not come suddenly, but is generally preceded by long seasons of patient bearing on the part of those who stand for truth, until absolute necessity for the preservation of gospel truth and order compels its disciples to stand firm for gospel testimony.

The early Baptist churches fleeing from the priest-ridden despotism of the old world, sought refuge in the wilderness of America, looking for the opportunity of worshipping their God unfettered by human law; but in many instances their ideas of doctrine and order were clouded by carnal tradition. Freed from the galling yoke of religious tyranny in their new found home, through the adoption of the Federal Constitution, their numbers were augmented by nominal professors; men were inducted into the ministry without knowledge of doctrine or order; and thus the way paved for the New School division of 1832.

As an indication of the prevailing weakness in doctrine and order at this time, we notice the size of the Baptist Churches before this division ranging frequently up to hundreds of members. The Columbia Association, one of the largest in Virginia, reported in 1821, a membership of 1565, with a baptism in that year of 114.

The New School division took off a large class of these nominal professors; but there yet remained a large number whose minds were not clear on the points of doctrine afterward contested, resulting in what was termed the contest with the Clark party.

CHAPTER II

The Contest and Division of 1850-53.

The publication of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES by the late Elder Gilbert Beebe was the outgrowth of the New School contest of 1832. The late Elder Gilbert Beebe its able founder was one of the most fearless and faithful ministers of his day. Very soon after the contest with the New School party it became evident that

there was a large element remaining among us who were without understanding of the doctrine of an election in Christ, and the birth of the Spirit.

Contests upon these points of doctrine found their way into the columns of the Signs, Elder Gilbert Beebe its able editor easily taking the lead, assisted by such strong and faithful gifts as the late Elders Thomas P. Dudley; Samuel Trott; R.C. Leachman; D.W. Patman; J.F. Johnson; with many others not so prominent, but able and fearless in the testimony of gospel truth. John Clark easily became the leader of the weak elements about him assisted by William C. Lauck, Thomas Buck, Ambrose Booten and others of lessor note. The contest ranged around the doctrine of the Eternal Union or Oneness of Christ and the Church, and the Spiritual Birth. Clark cunningly misrepresented the views of our brethren; brought in many false and baseless charges, for instance charging Beebe and Trott with denying the eternal Godhead of the Lord Jesus Christ; with other equally ridiculous charges, some of which were never before heard of; and appear to have originated in the fertile brains of Clark and his accomplices.

A more particular account of this contest is found in the "Reminiscences of the Baptist of Virginia, 1766-1902," published in the SECTARIAN office March 1902, to which the reader who desires more information is referred.

We will, however, quote a few expressions held by this Clark party necessary for the present occasion. With reference to the birth, Clark says:

"It is the same man, that was born the first time, that is born the second time. Hence that man that is born again has undergone a change, &c., the feet that were swift to shed blood are now shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; the hands in which were found deeds of violence are now clean, and lifted up, and stretched forth to God; the tongue that muttered perverseness, that framed deceit, and devised mischief, is now filled with singing, and employed as the pen of a ready writer, in extolling God and speaking of his word." [Clark's Exposure of Heresies, page 44.]

Speaking of the warfare, Clark says:

"The warfare, about which so much has been written, is between that part of man that is prepared in regeneration for glory, and the part that is left in its natural state to be fashioned and prepared in the resurrection." [Exposure of Heresies, page 46.]

The intelligent and careful reader will notice the complete harmony of these views with the views of Durand, Chick, Robert Thompson and others in the contest of 1886-89; though changed in phraseology to suit the modern palate. The views also of Beebe, Trott, Leachman, Dudley, Johnson and others in that [Clark] contest fully harmonize with those of our brethren in the contest and division that we are now describing.

The Virginia Corresponding Meeting at her session, August 1848, says:

“This city has her origin in God, - “I saw,” says John, “the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven,” &c., nor can we find in it the depraved natures of even the people of God, but in the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. And these are distinct the one from the other, though inhabiting the same tabernacle.”

Here we have our views clearly presented.

At the Kettocten Association in August, 1850, the late R.C. Leachman made some remarks that were objected to by some of the Clark following present; this was the *active* cause that led to the division, but the *real* cause lay deep under this surface in the absolute difference existing between the contending parties, Elder Gilbert Beebe and his brethren believing in an eternal, *actual* identity of the church in Christ; Elder Clark holding to a time, prospective choice in Christ; Elder Beebe holding to the birth of a spirit [life in Christ;] Elder Clark holding to the idea of the flesh born over again; born of the Spirit, &c.

In an “Appeal to the churches of the Kettocten Association” by Elder Trott in the fall of 1850, issued after the aforementioned session of the Association in August, Elder Trott calls attention to the underhand labor, the misrepresentation, the false accusations circulated in regard to his position; and the position of other brethren agreeing with him in the contest of 1850-53, that is entirely of the character of the sly, deceptive work which our brethren had to meet in the contest of 1886-89.

A meeting was held with the Ebenezer church, Loudoun County, Virginia, in November 1852 [Reminiscences of the Baptist of Virginia, page 46.], to notice the proscriptive measures adopted by the Kettocten Association at her session that year; which finally culminated in a division, the Virginia Corresponding Meeting, and what is commonly termed “The Eastern Association,” standing together. It will also be noticed that the move in this dropping of correspondence originated with and was made by the Clark party; just as the move in dropping correspondence originated with, and was made by the Durrand, Chick, and Thompson party in 1886-89.

CHAPTER III

Conditions Following this Division.

After this division of 1853, which had extended East and West, our churches for a while enjoyed much peace and harmony, though it soon became evident especially in the West that there was yet an element not clear upon doctrine; and

that this element found support among the Eastern Churches; though under such able gifts as Beebe, Trott, and Leachman in the East; Dudley, Johnson, and others in the West, this element kept under cover for some years; ready at the first provocation to come to the surface.

A prolific cause of such contest among our people arises from the careless manner of ordaining and baptizing, frequently prevalent among us, and this was true of the time that we are now noticing.

Some young chap wants to preach; assumes a “voluntary humility;” [Col.2:18] seems indeed willing to swallow the rod, hook, bait, fish and all in self assumed zeal; all of this appeals to a weak element; and it seems always necessary to have such among us; hence we have an ordination. Such preachers generally, and indeed I might say always, must have “souls for their hire,” hence they start out baptizing; and generally those that they baptize are like themselves, consequently we begin to have an *impouring*; followed after awhile by an *outpouring*.

Preachers of this character and sometimes even abler men get the itch to baptize, hence our ranks are swelled by nominal professors. We know of no preacher in the Eastern States that had this itch more than the late F.A. Chick, who seemed always ready to urge baptizing upon any person who seemed willing to listen to his advances. In Acts 6:7, it is written; “And the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly, and a great company of the priests were *obedient to the faith*.” It requires something more than a mere *outward form of obedience* to the faith. We read in John 12:42, of some who believed, [were willing to obey,] but were afraid to make an open confession for fear of being “put out of the synagogue.” After the obedience and baptism of these priests at Jerusalem, we read of trouble among the disciples.

CHAPTER IV

Signs of the Coming Contest.

As the years moved on our ranks continued to fill with preachers and numbers; ominous signs of the coming contest were heard on every hand. Periodicals began to start up West and South enrolling in their subscription list weak elements, who were dissatisfied with the able and fearless manner in which the “Signs of the Times,” was then conducted under the faithful management of Elder Gilbert Beebe. Young elements were coming to the front in the East; preachers had been ordained, and members were coming in who were unstable; and while paying respect to these old brethren, they were unacquainted with “the principles of the

doctrine of Christ;" and ready to slide off at any moment from gospel doctrine and order.

In August 1872 John Gadsby, a prominent Old School Baptist of the Clark variety in England visited the United States, publishing afterward an account of his visit, fully allying himself with the Clark Baptist [They were generally recognized by this name in Virginia; but were really Means Baptist,] in this country. A study of the Gadsby variety of Old School Baptist in England shows that this was a case of "high fellow well met." Mr. Gadsby gives as one of his reasons for visiting the U.S., that he had many nephews and nieces there that he had never seen. "Many of our brethren will bear me witness that we have many nephews and nieces that we have never seen, and that we never want to see; and some that we have seen that we are sorry that we ever had to see." [Gadsby's Visit to America, page 21.] Our relationship has never run along that line. Mr. Gadsby while attending Arminian meetings in this country, although within a few miles of Elder Gilbert Beebe never once sought an interview, hence we are not surprised that he and his variety of English Old School Baptist have ever allied themselves with the weak elements in this country.

It is well, however, to notice that the question that we are discussing is not in reference to whether or not a party is a subject of grace. Mr. Gadsby and others on his side of this subject give evidence of having some knowledge of grace. This is not the question; but whether or not one is a living witness of gospel truth; worthy of, and measured by the gospel rule, evidences a membership in a gospel church; and the organization holding such views, can be regarded as a gospel church.

In the contest of 1850-53, the trouble started by false, unjust attacks upon our preachers, by men of the Clark stamp. I have in my office documents clearly showing these uncalled for attacks, and misrepresentations. As the contest was forced upon Beebe, Trott, and others; so the contest of 1886-89 was forced upon our brethren by would-be-leaders, who meant to level all barriers between us and the Clark element; at whatever cost. They considered that this [Clark] element were more in harmony with their views than we were; and in this they were correct.

The late Elder F.A. Chick was one of the leading laborers in an effort to re-unite our people with the Clark party. In a private conversation with him in one of the first intercourses that I ever had with him [we were about the same age, he a little older,] he argued that Elder Beebe was mistaken in some doctrinal positions that he held; and argued in favor of the Clark position. In November, 1884, I took the train at Rectortown, a station on the southern road a few miles above Manassas, and quite unexpectedly met Dr. C.H. Waters, editor of Zion's Advocate, the mouthpiece of the Clark Baptist in Virginia, and other parts of the country. Dr. Waters read to me a letter from Elder Chick in which Chick invited him to visit the

church at Black Rock, in other words “exchange pulpits,” Waters go to Black Rock and Chick to Front Royal, where Waters preached. In May of the year previous to this, evidently with his approval, an invitation had been sent to, and accepted by several Clark preachers to visit the Baltimore Association, I have no doubt, but with an understanding of opening a correspondence. Mark you this was in 1884. Elder Gilbert Beebe died in 1881; Elder J.F. Johnson was dead, Elder T.P. Dudley was an invalid, confined to the house; the able and faithful ministers who through base slander, misrepresentation, and falsehood from these weak and deceptive elements of professed Old School Baptist, were dead. The late Elder Joseph Staton informed me that after the death of these aged ministers that we have named, Chick wrote to him that the time had now arrived to make great changes in the Old School Baptist; that is, to drop those deep fundamental points of doctrine, and unite on the sandy foundation advocated by the Means Baptist.

I wrote a letter to Elder Clark after my interview with Dr. Waters calling attention to the impropriety of his course. He answered the letter informing me that he had the approval of Elders Durand, Jenkins, Vail, Rittenhouse in his course; but he had concluded as it seemed likely to cause trouble, not to make the exchange *at this time*. I had called his attention to what I supposed was the feeling among the Virginia churches, he closes his second letter with the statement, “I do not expect to go to Front Royal until brethren feel different about it in Virginia. This is in deference to their feelings and a sacrifice of my own.” Copies of my two letters to Elder Chick, and his replies are on file in my office.

At the Baltimore Association, May 1883, the three Clark preachers; Yates, Waters and McInturf, were present by invitation, and the disposition was to invite them to seats in Council. When I learned this I informed Elder Chick and others, that if this were done I expected to withdraw from the Association. I presume that this had something to do in deterring them from going that far at that time; although the Moderator of the Association publicly expressed his pleasure at their presence, and went as far as he could toward expressing his fellowship for them. Sister Jane Ann Grimes and sister Jane Weeden were with me at this meeting and there are members yet living in Virginia, who remember the report that these sisters brought back of the efforts made to ride-rough-shod over all doctrine and order by weak and unsound elements in that Association, and open correspondence with the Means Baptist.

All of these efforts it must be borne in mind were being made without solicitation as far as I am informed from these Clark leaders; and without any acknowledgment of their false accusations against us and our faithful brethren who had fallen asleep. In the very same copy of Zion’s Advocate, the Clark paper, in which is found McInturf’s account of his visit to the Baltimore Association appears

an article from one of their papers, “the Regular Baptist Magazine” from which we quote:

“Let the people study the Bible with their children, pray with and for them, and loose the hands of their ministry. Let them everywhere organize Bible classes; and show interest in the spread of God’s word. Let them consider their poor and labor for their happiness. Let them show interest in their neighbors and concern for their salvation.” [Zion’s Advocate, August, 1883.]

This is the kind of sentiment that Durand, Chick, Thompson of Indiana; and other would be leaders were urging us to fellowship. This reasoning might have suited Elder Chick whose communication in the Signs upon the text in Ephesians 6:4, held that it was the duty of Old School Baptists with a family of children to bring these natural children up in “the nurture and admonition of the Lord.”

During the time that these efforts were being made, in an editorial in Zion’s Advocate on “Reconciliation and Reunion of Discordant Elements,” Dr. Waters, the editor, ignores the unity of Christ as head and the church his body as the basic principle of redemption, but is careful to say:

“The dead sinner is born again; the Adam sinner is quickened into life; the life is not simply an implantation; it is the begetting into the spiritual from the natural kingdom.” [Zion’s Advocate, Dec.1885.]

In the same copy of the “Advocate,” appears a communication from one of their leading preachers containing a proposition for the Reconciliation and Unity of the Old School Baptist of the United States. I quote the first article:

“I suggest as a basis of unity and reconciliation that the doctrine of the Eternal Vital Union, unity or oneness of Christ and the Church, as from everlasting, as a principle or ground of redemption, be abandoned as an outside issue; not tenable by the word of inspiration, but contrary thereto.”

Here is what we were asked to fellowship; here is what was being forced upon us; and we were expected to drop our views upon the fundamental principles of “the doctrine of God our Saviour,” and take this rope of sand as a binding principle instead.

In the same number of the Advocate appears a communication from another of their leading preachers, J.H. Purifoy; in which he speaks of a wonderful revival in his journeyings, twenty-five were added to the churches, “sinners so powerfully wrought upon that they wept aloud over their sins;” “one young lady so powerfully wrought upon that she fell into a trance and remained so for about an hour.”

In the same paper there is a sermon by another of their preachers, J.C. Denten at the organization of an Association in November 1884, from which we copy:

“Surely we should not believe that God had absolutely predestinated Adam’s sin at the time he made him, and gave the law prohibiting his disobedience.” [Zion’s Advocate, dec.1885, page 94.]

In the issue of Zion's Advocate, July 1883, just after the death of John Clark its founder, Dr. Waters succeeding Clark as editor came out in his opening editorial fully endorsing Clark's position in the controversy with Elders Beebe, Trott, Leachman, Dudley, Johnson, and others in the contest of 1850-53; reiterating that position; and announcing that the error of those preachers and their followers had "been clearly pointed out, so that there is now little danger therefrom to the earnest inquirer after truth," and makes a bitter attack upon the doctrine of the Eternal, Vital Union of Christ, the Head, and his church the body. His arguments in that editorial showing conclusively that he failed entirely to understand, not only the doctrine that he was combating; but the position that he held himself. For instance, in that editorial he says; "If Adam is the figure of Christ, of whom is Eve the figure? Answer, of the church. Well, how old is Eve? Answer, just as old as Adam, for she had an existence in Adam, even in the dust of which he was made. Now suppose we declare the Son to be one with the Father. This makes the church as old as the Father too, does it not? So will we have to either drop the argument or preach a created Christ." Now is not this reasoning as clear as mud? Assuredly is Eve as old as Adam in seed substance, *but not in development*; just so is the Church as old as Christ in seed substance, *but not in development*.

The choice in Christ is either *actual or prospective*. It could not have been prospective; namely, simply in prospect as something to occur in the future, for that could have but assured the choice of Adam sinners which really is what Clark, Chick, and Durand all held; but in what way could that have been a choice in Christ; and the testimony is distinct that the choice was in Christ; and that before the world began, to which testimony we desire hereafter to refer. If in Christ it must necessarily have been in him "in the beginning of his way, before his works of old," as he distinctly declares, "from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was," Proverbs 8:22,23; this does not look like a choice of Adam sinners does it, unless we consider the impossible idea, of Adam sinners existing before the creation of their Head.

Can the candid reader decide what influenced men like Durand and others claiming to hold to Eternal Union, and Absolute Predestination, to urge affiliation in gospel fellowship with men who were bitterly opposing these and other gospel principles equally as important, unless it was on the principle that Durand and Co., really did not themselves understand and have love for these fundamental points of doctrine or else they were utterly ignorant of what constitutes order in the church of our dear Redeemer.

But to present at yet greater length the bitter prejudice and lying character of these so-called Clark Baptist we copy additional evidence from the records to prove their uncalled for, and lying attacks upon our able faithful ministers and brethren in the contest of 1852-53; recollect that these attacks were being made

upon such men as Beebe, Dudley, Johnson, Leachman, Trott and many others of the same stamp and ability.

At the session of the Ebenezer and Kettoctan [Clark] Associations in 1878; mark you that this was only about three years before Durand, Chick and Co., began their endeavor to unite our people with the Clark following, the following declarations of non-fellowship against us, were adopted.

After stating that the sentiments for which they were declaring non-fellowship were held by us, they go on to give their idea of what these sentiments are:

1. That Christ as head of the Church is neither human or Divine.
2. That Christ as the fountain of life to his people was created.
3. That Christ is not the substitute of sinners, he being innocent, as suffering and dying for them or in their stead, as there is no law, human or divine, that will allow that the innocent shall suffer for the guilty.
4. That the life-giving spirit of God is a created existence.
5. That while Christ was in the grave there was not a living saint on earth, nor in heaven.
6. That there will be no resurrection of our mortal bodies, but all that ever goes to heaven goes there at the death of each; that the Adamic man dies, both soul and body, and returns to dust of which he was made, and there will be no more of him.

I have not copied all of the trash coupled with the sentiment in each article; but for brevity's sake, have taken the main point presented in each of these articles. The Ebenezer Association makes similar declaration of non-fellowship against us. Both Associations claiming that it was but a reiteration of 1852-53. The Ebenezer Association sums up a declaration of non-fellowship for what they claim that we hold, asserting that we hold to the following sentiments:

1. That Christ, the Son of God the life, and head of the Church is a creature.
2. That sinners are quickened or regenerated by a created existence.
3. That Christ is not the substitute of sinners; that he did not suffer for them, or in their stead.
4. That Christ will not come again to this earth, and there will be no resurrection, nor general judgment, as all that ever goes to heaven goes there at death; which came from heaven; and all that pertains to man; soul, body, and spirit, goes to dust, at death, from which it was made.

We appeal to our readers to bear witness to the character of the above charges, and then continually bear in mind that these were the people that our opponents in the contest of 1886-89 desired to open correspondence with. Their charges are worse than misrepresentations; they are downright lies. I hate to use such language toward any claiming the name of Old School Baptist; but it is language authorized by Scripture. Paul exhorts, even brethren to "lie not one to another." Col.3:9. This, however, does not come under that head; but in James 3:14, we have the

exhortation, “If ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and *lie not against the truth.*” Evidently this covers the case.

I ask the reader to carefully examine the list of charges brought against us first by these people in their Associational gatherings of 1852-53; and reiterated by their Associations in 1878. I ask those who have waited upon my ministry for now over fifty years, and attended our meetings with other brethren – Have you ever heard anything drop from our pulpits like these sentiments? I hear you readily answer, No. We have no more fellowship for such outlandish trash, than these falsifiers have; nor have we fellowship for what they hold, which we desire to present in a later chapter.

I wish also to state that I was well acquainted with the late Gilbert Beebe; he preached the sermon at my ordination; I have traveled with him day and night; have been entertained at his home; and he at mine. I was also well acquainted with Elder J.F. Johnson, have been with him at his home, and he at mine; also with Elder Thomas P. Dudley. I heard these brethren preach many times; and I know that neither of them ever held such sentiments; or at any time ever uttered any sentiment that such deductions could be taken from.

Elders Trott and Leachman died before my day; but the writings of all of these faithful ministers are on record; and not a scintilla of evidence can be found in their writings for such a tissue of lies; and yet these are the men especially, with others not so prominent that the Clark party brought their charges against.

While these efforts on the part of certain Eastern preachers were being made to go over to this Clark party; frantic efforts were being made also in the West, by small fry of the Bob Thompson stamp, headed by such trouble making papers as the Primitive Monitor, and Messenger of Peace.

CHAPTER V

Our brethren finally compelled to take a firm stand.

Again and again we were confronted by cases like this of Chick and Waters; efforts to link our church travel with that of these Clark Baptist.

Durand, Chick, and others were recognized by the Clark element not only to be in full harmony with the Clark view of doctrine; but the disposition was to silence all opposition in our ranks; that we who believed the truth on these points were to be silenced; and if nothing else would do it, dropped from the fellowship of all Old School Baptist. The object of Durand and those with him was to work in harmony with this Clark element in eliminating these deep fundamental principles of doctrine. The Psalmist says: “If the foundations be destroyed, what can the

righteous do.” Psalms 11:3. The foundations here evidently refer to the fundamental principles of truth eternal.

These efforts to force a correspondence with the weak elements [Means or Clark Baptist] were wide-spread East and West, led by men like Durand and Chick in the East, Robert Thompson with his paper “The Primitive Monitor” and other parties, in the West; these leaders were determined *to force* those of us who disagreed with their views either to accept them or be driven out of their ranks; the contest was not of our choosing. We had no alternative. It was either to stop contending for the views that we held, or be separate from the Durand and Thompson element. With this choice forced upon us, our position became clear.

I wish before proceeding further to state that in contests of the character that I am describing, the question contested does not affect the personal experience of the contestants; in other words it is not “Whether or not one has an experience of grace; whether or not he or she is a child of God.” This is not the subject of discussion; but the point is to maintain the doctrine and order of the gospel; to discuss and ascertain where that is and to follow where it leads.

Again is it of equal importance to recognize the fact that when a people once begin to turn away from “the path of the just,” it may be but a very small divergence at first, but the difference from the beaten track increases as time moves on; and as other elements foreign to the steady travel of gospel grace, enter, as the bars are lowered and truth is compromised with error, thus shorn of its unnatural and exalted character, to which the carnal mind [world] must ever be enmity. It is not the numbers that we are after, but the truth of the gospel and the order thereof.

We are commanded in Isaiah 51:1, “Look unto the rock whence ye are hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged.” If we look to Adam as the rock whence we are hewn, instead of to Christ; if we look for an election in Adam, instead of in Christ, then we are looking directly away; exactly opposite from the proper source; like unto a man whose course is due East, if he is traveling due West, he is going directly from the point to which he desires to attain; and the farther he goes the worse he is off; hence the branch of Old School Baptist, no matter how numerous who hold to an election in Adam; with its consequent deductions of the Adam sinner, thus elected, being born of the Spirit, and thus evolved or become a child of God, must be traveling the downward track to the world, all of whose religions embrace the same thought.

The prevailing disposition East and West, as stated was to set aside all further declaration of the eternal, personal election in Christ; and to thus destroy the basic principle of the Eternal Union, for assuredly there could be no Eternal Union of Christ, the Head on the one side, and Adam sinners, the body on the other side; no Eternal Union between an eternal head, and a temporal or mortal body. Here was

the underlying cause of the contest. It was brought actively to the surface first, in the Western churches in an effort to rule off of the stand at an Association in Indiana, men like the late Elder Jesse Jackson and others, who were regarded as firm and able exponents of the doctrine. This move soon spread to Kentucky affecting the Mount Pleasant and Licking Associations.

These two Associations were blessed with able ministers and members; and a rallying point was at once found for the followers of gospel truth in the West. Both of these Associations, however, had an element in them that were led off by Durand and other Eastern preachers, notably among them P.G. Lester, J.G. Eubanks, and A.B. Francis; Durand's plausible efforts in bewitching weak Baptist made him an able assistant to P.G. Lester in this Western field. The contest in these two Associations was of a very bitter character, and soon spread to the Eastern Associations with which the Licking Association was at that time in direct correspondence.

The late Elder John H. Biggs once remarked that "as soon as Baptist left the truth they began to lie;" and this was evidenced during this contest in many ways. As an illustration; when the contest broke out in the Licking Association which at that time had a very large correspondence stretching from the Atlantic Ocean near half way across the continent; it was an order of that Association that they would not send messengers to any Association in their correspondence, but *minutes only*. The object of this was to avoid spreading their trouble into their correspondence, for if they sent messengers, necessarily it would have been members on both sides of the contest, as all acts in that Association was by unanimity; and objection would have prevented any other than a divided delegation. But Durand, Francis, and other Eastern preachers who were ring-leaders of the disorderly faction in the Licking Association reported to the Eastern Associations, that the Licking *had refused to send messengers to the Eastern Associations only*; thus endeavoring to create a feeling in those Eastern Associations against the Licking.

There are members now living in Virginia, who remember Durand's making this statement in the discussion of the subject in the session of the Virginia Corresponding Meeting at Quantico, in August 1889, and my calling his attention to the misstatement reminding him of the importance of confining his statements to facts. It is no pleasure to expose the duplicity of such men, but as the testimony that I am writing, I hope will be in the hands of my brethren, and companions in similar tribulation when I have passed away; it will, I trust put them on their guard to face similar scenes; to meet similar characters when "a lying spirit" spreads abroad in the land.

CHAPTER VI

The issue clearly disclosed, and the resultant division.

We are informed in II John 9: “*Whosoever transgresseth*, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son.” From this testimony it would seem that a departure from gospel truth is first evidenced in a departure from its order, then in the doctrine; mark the testimony, “*Whosoever transgresseth*,” the transgression comes first, and “abideth not in the doctrine of Christ;” denouncing or leaving the doctrine comes next. This is the form in which the departure of 1886-89 assumed.

We have called attention to the manner in which it was started in the West; of putting on the stand at Associations professed preachers neither in our fellowship or correspondence; as at the Conn’s Creek Association of Indiana in 1887 [Defense of Providence Church, by Elder J.G. Jackson, pg.17,] in putting W.F. Knowls on the stand over the head, and against the wishes of the orderly element in that Association; and the effort to force such Means Baptist preachers as Knowls, G.M. Thompson, Buckles and others into the churches of that Association, contrary to the Divine order in II John 10. [“If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed.”] Also, in the effort of Thompson and others to override the act of Providence church, Indiana, in the exclusion of one of her members; a church under the care of Elder Jackson, showing on Thompson’s part a disregard of all order. [Defense of Providence Church, pg.1-8.]

Similar disorders were committed in the East. In 1874, the Juniata Association of Pennsylvania, having been delivered from a disorderly faction of Clark Baptist, applied for and obtained correspondence with the Virginia Corresponding Meeting, where my membership was at that time. Among the churches dropped from the Juniata Association was the Sideling Hill Church. A few miles from the meeting house of this Sideling Hill church, the orderly Baptist erected a meeting house, and organized the Fairview Church. Shortly afterward individuals, it was supposed instituted by Sideling Hill and its disorderly associates broke open the doors of the Fairview meeting house in order to hold service there upon the claim that some of their members and friends had contributed to build Fairview meeting house. Also some six or seven members had left Sideling Hill because of the disorder there, and joined Fairview, having of course been excluded from Sideling Hill.

In October 1887 at the session of the Juniata Association, Sideling Hill church applied for membership. In her membership at that time were three members who had been baptized while she was among the Clark Baptist. The messengers of the Tygarts Valley River Association, with which the Juniata was also in

correspondence opposed the admission of the Sideling Hill church, rightly holding that these three members should be properly baptized or that the church should come without them. The matter was laid over until the next session, when Sideling Hill was received, its disorderly baptism thus being recognized; presenting the spectacle, not only of endorsing this baptism, but also receiving a church who had excluded six or more members; and another church in the same Association having received said excluded members, considering them in order, in leaving, neither church having taken any steps to set this matter right, thus endorsing a principle that would disrupt all orderly church travel.

At the session of the Juniata Association in 1887, Elder E.V. White, a messenger of the Corresponding Meeting of Virginia and others with him, vehemently urged the reception of the Sideling Hill church; and in 1888, they were again present, backed by the disorderly party in the Virginia Corresponding Meeting, and I might say entirely through the efforts of this party, the Juniata Association became involved in this disorder. In company with the late Elder H. Zinn, I was present at the Juniata Association when this disorderly act was consummated, arguing against it, Elder Zinn and myself on one side, White and others in opposition; and we there had a fair sample of the spirit animating this class of Baptist East and West, and which was shown a year later [August 1889,] at Quantico by the Virginia Corresponding Meeting, in riding rough shod over all arguments, order, or doctrine in order to carry out their intentions.

Many cases might be cited, almost without number of this party East and West in violation of gospel order. The late Elder J.M. Demaree in "An Expose of Cane Run and Sulphur Fork churches, and the so-called Mt. Pleasant Association," [a pamphlet] gives numerous examples of the high-handed course of P.G. Lester, in forcing himself upon churches under the care of Elder Demaree; and of the gross disorder of this Lester party in the Mt. Pleasant Association; and the faction led off by Lester claiming to be the Mount Pleasant Association was the body received into correspondence of the Eastern Associations complained of in the letter of the Occoquan Church to the Corresponding Meeting in 1889.

But having noticed the transgression [II John 9,] let us now notice the falling away from the doctrine which is the next inevitable step when a party leaves the order. Durand in the Signs of the Times of January 15, 1888, wrote a lengthy communication heading it with the caption "Two Questions Considered." The first of these questions: Was the man who was to be born again in order to see the kingdom a sinner? The next question, covering the notion that the Elect were Adam sinners. In a later issue of the Signs, April 15, 1888, Durand attempts more fully to explain his position in the January issue. We copy the following:

"The main points in my article were; 1. The man who cannot see the kingdom of God except he be born again is a sinner; and it is proper to say, The sinner is

born again, or, The sinner is the subject of the new birth. 2. The child of God, as he is manifest in this world, has two distinct natures, the one earthly, derived from the earthly Adam by a natural birth, the other spiritual, derived from the Lord Jesus Christ, by a spiritual birth; and that these are antagonistic the one to the other. 3. The elect are sinners of Adam's fallen race, chosen from the beginning unto salvation; that they have eternal life, which was given them in Christ before the world began."

To my view Durand evidences his failure to properly understand his subject by placing the life from which he claims these children proceed as the last point to be considered, evidently it should be the first. To take it up, however, in the order that he names. 1. If, as he claims the man who sees the kingdom by being born again is a sinner, we inquire by what process this sinner whose life is earthy, can be born of a life in which he has no seed existence, for assuredly a seed identity always precedes a birth; and the absolute order is that the seed should be in itself; namely, in the life producing it; and after "his kind," Genesis 1:11,12. Again, if the sinner is born of the Spirit he becomes spirit; John 3:6, and the Saviour says "a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." Luke 24:39.

But Durand, in his 2 paragraphs, claims, that the spiritual child then has two natures, one earthly, the other heavenly; one flesh, the other spirit. What a monstrosity! A being with two distinctly different and antagonistic natures. We challenge all nature to produce such a creature. The Durand idea is exactly the John Clark idea. Clark says: "The warfare, about which so much has been written, is between that part of man that is prepared in regeneration for glory, and the part that is left in its natural state to be fashioned and prepared in the resurrection." [Clark's Exposure of Heresies, page 46.]

The 3rd paragraph of the Durand doctrine informs us that the elect are Adam sinners chosen in Christ; that is, they were chosen before they were created; an impossible theory, which simply means a choice in Adam, when the Scriptures plainly declare that the choice is in Christ. In his article in the Signs of April 15, 1888, he makes a labored effort to prove that what he held was the position of the late Elder Thomas P. Dudley. To show his duplicity in this effort I call attention to his quoting from Elder Dudley's writings as follows:

"I then saw the antagonism of the two natures possessed by every one born of the Spirit, out of which grows that warfare which so pain the hearts of the Christian."

He evidently in this quotation desires to show that Dudley held to *two natures in one man*; but the fact is that always in treating of this subject in such connections Dudley in using the term nature means to apply it to the one man that he is discussing, and not to a part of a man. I quote from his Circular on the warfare:

“Whence these various distinctions between the OLD and the NEW MAN, if indeed, there are not TWO MEN? The children of the first Adam are born for earth; of the last Adam are born for heaven. Those of the first Adam are born of corruptible; those of the last Adam, are of incorruptible seed. The first necessarily partake of human; the last, of the Divine nature. The antagonistic principles attached to the two men necessarily result in the warfare.”

Mark you, Durand says the warfare is between two natures in one man; but Dudley says that it is between two men produced from two distinct orders of life, each man possessing the nature received from its own order. To more fully show that Dudley means by using the word nature in such connections, the man either in Adam or in Christ, whose nature he is discussing, I quote again:

“We have said, Christians are compound beings; by which we mean that there are two men – two whole and distinct natures, inhabiting the same tenement. The old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, whose genealogy we trace back to the first Adam, &c., the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.”

Again:

“Hence it is seen that the two men derive their nature and disposition from two distinct elements.”

These quotations from the writings of Elder Dudley plainly show what he means by the use of the word *nature*; also it shows Durand’s duplicity in selecting extracts and forcing a construction at war with the intent and meaning of the writer. This was his usual course in quoting from Dudley or G. Beebe’s writings upon this subject.

The first Durand article as previously stated was published in the Signs of the Times, Jan.15, 1888. I replied to this article in the Signs for March 1, 1888, stating my inability to agree with him; and giving my reasons, quoting Scripture to sustain them. I had previously promised to call upon him in a visit through that country as he had presented some views of the resurrection with which I was unable to agree. And in this visit at his home we were as far apart in conversation as we were in writing; and I left him in this condition. What was my surprise to find in the Signs in March 15, 1888, just after this visit, a second communication from him stating that in the conversation at his home upon this subject, I had finally acknowledged the correctness of his position. I am at a loss to ascribe this statement from Durand to anything else but a deliberate intention to falsify my position, for I assure the reader that I had no such a thought of agreeing to his position; that I then, and do yet regard it as distinctly at war with the Scripture testimony upon those two points of doctrine – the election and birth.

I was in the West when March 15th issue of the Signs came out; and I immediately wrote to Durand inquiring what I had said that led him to such a

erroneous conclusion. He replied that when he [Durand] said that Christ was the life of the Church, I [Smoot] replied that I believed this also. This much might have been correct; but then came the radical difference between us in the manner in which this life was thus hidden in Christ, Colossians 3:3. He held it as a mass of life to be given to an Adam sinner in some unaccountable manner which he or no one else has ever been able to describe.

Their common description of this impossible idea is that “the sinner is born again and thus partakes of the Divine nature, retaining his old nature; and these two natures in one man war each against the other.” The Saviour says; “Every kingdom divided against itself, is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself, shall not stand.” Mt.12:25. It would certainly seem from this testimony, that a man divided against himself would be of similar character; in other words unable to be of any separate personality; and we might well inquire in what possible manner such an organism could exist; one half, natural-earthy; the other half, spiritual-heavenly.

Our brethren held that this life in Christ was a personal unit; like life in Adam, a personal identity, to be developed by a birth; and that the birth of this personal unit in Christ, developed the prior existing child; spirit born of Spirit; not flesh [sinner] born of Spirit. And that this spiritual child; [the new man,] developed in a mortal body [the old man,] is the seal of the salvation of that mortal body [the Adam sinner] and of the resurrection from the dead. We have quoted extensively from Durand in presenting that side of the subject, as he was their recognized leader; and fairly presented what they held.

The reader will notice that these events took place in the spring of 1888. They were followed rapidly by serious breaches in gospel order by the Eastern Associations under the leadership of Durand, Francis, Eubanks, Chick and others of similar character. After having fomented the strife; and done all in their power to encourage the disorderly elements in the West, especially in the Licking and Mt. Pleasant Associations of Kentucky, the next effort of these Eastern preachers was to get the “Eastern Associations” to open correspondence with these disorderly parties of the West that they had recognized; and had been so active in leading off. As a sample of the deception practiced by these Eastern preachers in misstating the trouble among the Western churches we quote the following to which allusion has been previously made. From the minutes of the Licking Associations of Kentucky held at Georgetown, Sept. 1888, the 5th item in Saturday’s proceedings reads:

“On motion and second we send Minutes only to sister Associations.”

As previously stated the object of this was to prevent sending their troubles into the bounds of their correspondence; as might be done by sending messengers, as necessarily it would have to be a divided delegation. But these Eastern preachers in order to stir up a feeling against the Licking Association reported that the Licking

had refused to send messengers to the “Eastern Associations only,” hence in the minutes of the Delaware River Association held at Hopewell, May 1889, acting undoubtedly upon the advice of these preachers, we find the following in the 14th item:

“The Committee appointed to take into consideration the correspondence of the Licking Association, reported that they find that at the last two meetings of that Association, the Minutes mentioned that messengers would not be sent to the Eastern Associations.”

The committee examining the minutes of the Licking Association could have easily seen from Item 5 in the Licking Minutes that the act was *to all Associations*, in the correspondence of the Licking, but evidently they preferred to take the interpretation of this act made by Durand and Co., who had in the meantime met in a Council in Kentucky and organized a rump Association out of the disorderly element in the Licking, and John G. Eubanks was present at this session of the Delaware Association as a messenger from this disorderly party who now claimed to be the real Licking, while at war with the doctrine so steadily maintained by that Association.

It was generally understood that this wave of liberalism; this tissue of lies and misrepresentations sweeping over the East was expecting to meet its first opposition at the Virginia Corresponding Meeting at Quantico the coming August. The Delaware River Association at this session, May 1889, appointed as messengers to the Corresponding Meeting, Elders William J. Purington, Benton Jenkins, and Elijah Lee. Durand was not appointed, but when the Association met at Quantico in August 1889, neither of these who were appointed were present; and Durand *who was not appointed* appeared as messenger from the Delaware River to the Virginia Corresponding Meeting.

The Eastern preachers who had largely instigated and certainly did all in their power to divide especially the Baptist of Kentucky, had enjoyed fair sailing for their false propaganda up to this time. As far as I am informed no opposition had been encountered in these Eastern Associations; all appeared ready to take without further inquiry the wild and false tales manufactured by these men, who hitherto had been held in fairly high esteem by orderly Baptist, and upon the arrival of their company at Quantico the memorable Wednesday morning before the 3rd Sunday in August, 1889, A.B. Francis, who was a messenger from the church at Fryingpan Spring, remarked that they had come to put down all opposition to their theories; they came flushed with victory; though they had really had no antagonist to encounter.

The Occoquan and Quantico churches had been fully warned of their approach. The watchmen upon the walls had sounded the alarm; and by the grace of God they were ready for the onslaught. The Occoquan church in their letter to the

Corresponding Meeting called attention to the disorder in the Juniata and Eastern Associations in opening correspondence with the disorderly so-called Mt. Pleasant Association of Kentucky.

It might be well to call attention for any future reference that the Virginia Corresponding Meeting at this time was composed of ten churches, all of its churches with the possible exception of Mill Creek were represented at this session. The Occoquan and Quantico churches were represented as follows:

Quantico: Ezekiel Lynn; J.M. Barbee, Sr.; J.W. Chapman; L.A. Lynn.

Occoquan: Elder W.M. Smoot; Orvis Maxfield; Enoch Grimes; C.S. Stone; James Posey; James Clark; J.F. Grimes.

A fair sample of the order prevailing in the Corresponding Meeting at this time is evidenced by the Clerk of the Corresponding Meeting, the late G.G. Galleher, adding to the list of the messengers from Occoquan the name of J.W. Davis, a man who though present at this session of the Association had never been appointed a messenger from the Occoquan Church; thus establishing the precedent that the Clerk of an Association had power to appoint a messenger from the Church to the Association. This was a fair sample of the order observed among this class of Baptist; and matched the action of the Juniata Association, previously referred to in admitting Sideling Hill Church, whose members had broken open the doors of Fairview meeting house, and held meetings there over the head of Fairview Church, and who had excluded members which Fairview had received; and yet was received in the Juniata Association, side by side with Fairview Church without any acknowledgement, whatever.

CHAPTER VII

The Contest at Quantico.

The Virginia Corresponding Meeting met with the Church at Quantico, Wednesday, August 14, 1889. Silas H. Durand represented Delaware River, though the Association at their session in May previously had not appointed him; William L. Beebe was present as messenger from Delaware, and Warwick. F.A. Chick and Milton Dance were messengers from the Baltimore Association. Hence we had representing the disorderly Baptist of the East, as preachers: Durand, Chick, Beebe, Francis, and Badger, the last two, members of the Corresponding Meeting.

The Occoquan and Quantico Churches had been fully advised of the situation; and we trust by the grace of God, prepared to meet the coming storm. At the session of the Corresponding Meeting held at New Valley the year previous,

August 1888, an effort had been made to force upon us their view of Election and the Birth in the Circular of that year; a public attack was made from the stand upon our views, although up to this time the churches of this Meeting had claimed to hold the sentiments that they now proceeded to discard. In the year from 1888, up to the session of 1889, misrepresentations, falsehoods, and downright lies were circulated against us, and it became clear that we were hopelessly separated from those who were determined to force us to accept their views or as previously stated drive us from their ranks; and we considered that it was useless to prolong the contest.

The Occoquan Church in their letter to the Corresponding Meeting called attention to the disorders in the Juniata Association requesting the Corresponding Meeting to drop that Association from her correspondence as Juniata had been labored with in vain; also that the Eastern Associations had opened Correspondence with the disorderly element in the Mt. Pleasant Association, and requested that their attention should be called to the matter. The letter of the Occoquan Church was written in a courteous and brotherly manner; there was nothing in it calculated to give offence to orderly Baptist.

It should be borne in mind that at this session of the Corresponding Meeting the disorderly party had a majority of messengers; hence they were able to outvote us. I copy from the Manifesto of the Churches, page 9, the proceedings in connection with the reading of our letter:

“The letter from the Occoquan Church was read from the stand with the letters from the other churches. Our brethren who were present remember the uncalled-for and disorderly attack made upon that letter from the stand the evening after it was read, by a minister who came among us uninvited, and undesired by our churches, but who was imposed upon us by the majority party in the Virginia Corresponding Meeting, as a messenger from the Eastern Associations.

Our brethren also remember the remarkable discussion, if we may call it a discussion, the following morning, Thursday, August 15, in the Corresponding Meeting upon the motion to drop the correspondence with the Juniata Association. At the proper time in the order of business, in Thursday’s session, and in obedience to the instruction of the church of their membership, the messengers from the Occoquan Church moved that the correspondence with the Juniata Association be dropped. Then followed a remarkable scene. Instead of properly and fairly discussing the motion made by authority of one of the churches of her membership, an attempt was made by the majority party to implicate the brother who made the motion in some inconsistency as though he was under trial. We repeatedly urged to discuss the matter, declaring our ability then and there to prove the statements made in our letter. They as continuously fought against the discussion, attempting to force upon us in its stead a personal wrangle. In the midst

of the excitement and while our motion was still before meeting, *never having been either considered or voted upon*, another motion was made by one of the majority party as follows: “Resolved, That this Association does not consider it in her province to interfere in the internal affairs of Corresponding Associations.” The mover of this resolution was pleased to term it an amendment to the original motion, and we were informed that it could be conceded and voted upon instead of our motion, we suppose, under “general parliamentary law.” Of course it was of no use for us to inform the Virginia Corresponding Meeting that we were not under “general parliamentary law,” but in this particular were governed by the fair, Old School Baptist regulation, so uniformly observed in orderly Old School Baptist Churches, that every motion, properly seconded, shall be conceded and voted upon, unless withdrawn by the brother who made it; and that a *second* motion cannot be entertained while the *first* is under consideration. The motion which we made was not voted upon, not even fairly discussed. When we saw that the design was to substitute this so-called amendment for our motion we informed the majority party that the adoption of that “amendment” would be considered by our people as an endorsement, on the part of those who voted for it, of the disorders of the Juniata Association. Believing that it could be easily shown that this amendment was not in order and did not apply at all to the case under consideration, we arose to discuss it, but were informed that discussion was not in order, that one of the objects of the amendment was to *shut off discussion*. With a total disregard for order, and of the feelings of the minority party, with no opportunity to fairly discuss it, this so-called amendment was rushed through the Virginia Corresponding Meeting by a majority vote, and our two churches were given to understand that, if we were not satisfied, we could withdraw from the Corresponding Meeting. This last information, however, was unnecessary, as thanks be unto the God of heaven, the keys of our churches were not in their hands, and we were not dependent upon them to know what gospel order required of us at the proper time. But let us glance a moment at this “amendment” to our motion: “Resolved, That this Association does not consider it in her province to interfere in the internal affairs of Corresponding Associations.” We ask the candid reader, had we requested the Corresponding Meeting to interfere in the internal affairs of the Juniata Association? We came to the Corresponding Meeting charging the Juniata Association with disorder, which charge we were ready and abundantly able to sustain, had we been given the opportunity. Has one Association a right to drop another for disorder? All orderly Baptist will answer promptly, Yes. This was the simple case at issue.”

We have copied this statement from the Manifesto at length because it fairly represents the case. The Occoquan church had expected from the general disregard of either our views or feelings by these people that they would pay no attention to

our request; hence it had been decided when we adopted the letter, that if this course was pursued our churches were instructed to withdraw from the Association, notifying them that the church had so ordered.

The letter from the Occoquan Church was read as stated with the letters from the other churches on Wednesday, August 14, 1889. Thursday, August 15th in obedience to their instructions the messengers of that church moved to drop correspondence with the Juniata Association; upon the refusal of the Corresponding Meeting to pay any attention whatever to our request, it was evident that the time had arrived for our withdrawal, but we concluded to wait until Friday morning in order to give the Quantico church opportunity to consider the situation.

The Occoquan Church as previously stated had instructed her messengers to withdraw from the Corresponding Meeting in case our request was refused, but we desired to give Quantico an opportunity to act with us if they so desired. As Moderator of the Association I had an influence in the appointment of preachers to fill the stand, and as the majority party had shown their desire for weak things, I concluded to arrange to have the stand filled that Thursday p.m., with the weakest preacher we had – F.A. Chick.

While he was preaching we arranged to call a special meeting of the Occoquan Church to consider the situation; and sent a messenger to all the members present on the ground, to gather at the meeting house, which resulted in a full attendance of the membership with the exception of the two male members, J.W. Chapman, and L.A. Lynn who had decided to go off with the other party. The matter was fully and thoroughly discussed at this church meeting, and upon motion the church decided to withdraw with the Occoquan Church from the Corresponding Meeting. The act of the church was unanimous on the part of all present with one exception J.M. Barbee Sr., who stated that while his mind was not clear to move in this manner, yet he would not oppose the church in her action; and to his credit be it said that after seeing more of the course, of the disorder and doctrine of our opponents he became fully satisfied with our position; and many pleasant visits our members have enjoyed with him at his hospitable home, as in former years.

I was authorized by the messengers of the churches to make this known to the Corresponding Meeting on Friday morning, which I did at the proper time in the proceedings of the meeting. I copy from the Manifesto, pages 12 & 13, in regard to the action:

“Friday morning, August 16th, Elder Smoot, in obedience to the instructions of the Occoquan and Quantico Churches, and in behalf of the messengers of those churches informed the Virginia Corresponding Meeting of our withdrawal from said Corresponding Meeting, because of its disorder. Then followed a remarkable scene of confusion and disorder for which this class of Baptist have become so famous.

Any one at all acquainted with Old School Baptist or gospel order, and especially with the organization and character of the Virginia Corresponding Meeting, well knows that our churches had an unquestioned right to withdraw from the Corresponding Meeting at any time they choose to do so. All that was necessary on the part of the Corresponding Meeting was simply to record in their minutes this act of withdrawal. Instead of this, our brethren who were present remember the excitement, the wild, reckless assertions of some of the ministers of that body, and its correspondence, from the stand, the personal abuse hurled at our ministry and churches. It was a kind of “go as you please” harangue. No attempt was made to confine it to any kind of order, each speaker seemed disposed to say he chose without regard to any particular subject, and the whole proceedings wound up with a declaration on the part of the messengers of the Virginia Corresponding Meeting that when Occoquan and Quantico Churches *excluded members, their churches would receive them.*”

The order of the Corresponding Meeting required the pastor or preacher serving the Church where the meeting was held, to be its Moderator without any vote on the part of the messengers, hence as serving the Quantico Church, I was the Moderator of the Association. When the discussion took place Thursday morning, I called J.F. Newlan, one of the messengers from the Ebenezer church to act as Moderator in my place, while I took part in the discussion. J.F. Newlan represented the majority party in the Association, but was a calm, conservative man; and as the majority party could by their votes control the action of the Meeting, it did not matter so much in regard to the position of Moderator.

Upon the withdrawal of our churches, Friday morning, my service as Moderator closed, as I was one of the messengers withdrawing, and the majority party elected J.N. Badger to serve the few remaining hours as Moderator. The Messengers from the two withdrawing churches promptly met and arranged for a Council to be held, Providence permitting, with the Occoquan Church at their meeting place at Oak Grove, Monday after the 3rd Sunday in August to consider the propriety of, and if they deemed proper to proceed with the organization of an Association.

The action of the two churches in the Corresponding Meeting in withdrawing from that Association; and organizing the Virginia Annual Meeting finally closed our ranks so far as gospel fellowship is concerned against any further religious recognition of the Durand party recognized as Means Baptist, because of their affiliation with the Means elements in the West; and the similarity of their views on many points of doctrine with these weak elements, while our brethren took the name of Anti-means.

It is important in this record to bear in mind that at the time of this contest at Quantico in August 1889, the Eastern Associations with whom the Virginia Corresponding Meeting was in full correspondence, had at their session in May

and June, 1889, opened correspondence with the Mt. Pleasant Association of Kentucky, which was a creature of the Means Division, fully representing their doctrine and order; hence the orderly churches in the Virginia Corresponding Meeting were compelled to withdraw and organize an Association in order, or drift with the disorderly elements of the Virginia Corresponding Meeting and its Eastern Correspondence.

CHAPTER VIII

The Misrepresentations by the Leaders in this Division.

The leaders [Isaiah 9:16,] of this disorderly party continually stated that their object was not to slide off among Means Baptist. These statements were made more especially to hoodwink the blind followers of these self appointed leaders who appeared to take a delight in; and it seemed supposed that they were engaged in holy service in their effort to lead our people away from the strong position [doctrine and order] maintained by the old fathers in Israel, and unite them with these bitter enemies of the cardinal principles of gospel grace.

Some of these would-be-leaders as in the previous reference to Durand, claimed that they were holding the same doctrine that Beebe, Dudley and others held. We have already showed Durand's duplicity. We desire now to show the subtle manner in which this effort was conducted. We quote from the Circular of the Baltimore Association, May 1890:

“There have been instances of alienation and separation among brethren and churches which have continued for a long time, and which have given rise to great strife and bitterness, but which have never led to declarations of non-fellowship. In such instances it would seem that there need be no difficulty about coming together when these alienations and differences shall have been removed by better acquaintance.”

The reader will notice the subtle character of this expression turning upon the phrase, “which have never led to declarations of non-fellowship.” The people to whom this message was sent, [The Ebenezer and Ketockton Clark Associations] had in the most bitter manner declared non-fellowship for our people; and for over thirty years there had been no church fellowship.

Again, we quote:

“Grounds which may have led unavoidably to the separation a few years ago may no longer exist. If not, the separation need no longer exist.”

That is; the able and faithful men like Beebe, Dudley, Johnson, Leachman, Trott and others are now dead; and we younger chaps do not believe what they preached, hence let us all come together on the principle “birds of a feather flock together.”

The Corresponding Letter [sent to the Associations of their correspondence] by the Baltimore Association that year [May 1890,] “let the cat out of the wallet” boldly and appealing to these Means [Clark] Associations for recognition.

We quote:

“Our hope is that God has chosen us, poor sinners, and redeemed us by the blood of Christ, and quickened us from the dead. We desire expressly to make known our opposition to the heresy that eternal spirits, and not sinners, are made alive unto God.” [Circular & Corresponding Letter, published in the Signs, June 11, 1890.]

This last clause is about the way that John Clark would have put it. We would like to know whoever held “that eternal spirits are made alive unto God,” in the way these chaps figure it out; so far as “the spirit born of the Spirit” [John 3:6,] is concerned that spirit is already alive unto God, as possessing the life of God of which he is born. [John 1:13.]

The Clark Baptist to which this appeal was made were quick to reply. In their paper “Zion’s Advocate,” September 1890, following the adoption of the Circular by the Baltimore Association, the previous May they allude to this Circular in terms of the highest praise. We quote:

“We gladly give room in our columns to the Circular Letter and the Corresponding Letter of the Baltimore Old School Baptist Association.

Sinners are quickened from the dead, and not eternal spirits implanted is the banner unfurled to the world by these Soldiers of the Cross; and, cheerfully do we re-echo the glorious truth. Our people believe and hold that man has an immortal soul. A denial of the existence of the human soul, and of the quickening of the same into spiritual life, gave rise to the eternal spirit implantation theory, which has given so much trouble.”

Our readers will notice that the editor of the Advocate charges us first, with denying the *existence* of the soul, and next that we *deny the quickening of the soul* into spiritual life. Here is an example of the character of their charges. Assuredly if we deny *its existence*; we could not deny its *quickenings*. He also charges us with denying “the *existence* of the soul; the *immortality* of the soul,” calling these things, all one and the same; and mixing them up in true Means Baptist style; and bitterly denouncing any and all who refuse to take a dose of this mixture. We might inquire “If the soul is already *immortal* what is it to be quickened to? Also, Where is the mortal that is to put on immortality? If we are immortal in Adam where is the need of anything additional in Christ? How can they recognize the

supposed immortality of the soul; by which evidently they mean the natural man, with the testimony in I Timothy 6:16, where the record informs us that Christ “*only hath immortality.*” If the Adamic man has immortality, where is the *mortal* that is to put on immortality, I Cor.15:53; also if he already has immortality this is the culmination of all that the heavenly birth embodies.

At the time of the division in August 1889, we were serving a church in Alexandria, Virginia. The church had a very small membership, the majority going with the disorderly party in the Virginia Corresponding Meeting; and as the church was dropped for disorder we severed our relations with it. Sister Ashford, a faithful member of the church wrote to the Deacon in regard to its disorder, to which letter she received the following reply:

Alexandria, Va., July 12, 1890.

Dear Sister Ashford; - Your kind note received by your husband Mr. Ashford. You, I expect have been wrongly informed in regard to the church at Alexandria. There has been no changes made so far as the Alexandria church is concerned. Elder Smoot who was our former pastor withdrew from the Old Baptist last August, at the Corresponding Meeting, and has joined a Kentucky party who do not believe in the salvation of sinners, but that there are spirits that come down and I hardly know what they do believe. I have a copy of their constitution and that is about what it is.

I am very sorry Elder Smoot took up with such people as we thought the world of him. Elder Francis preachers for us now. We will have our next meeting 1st Sunday in August. Come down and see us, and I will tell you all about it.

Yours in hope, J.F. Broders.

Mr. B. tells the truth when he says: “I hardly know what they do believe;” and shows his ignorance when he asserts that we “do not believe in the salvation of sinners.” Sister Ashford handed to us the letter as a fair sample of the charges circulated against us by the Baptist whom we had formerly held in fellowship, evidencing the truth of the testimony, “For it was not an enemy that reproached me; then I could have borne it ... but it was thou, a man mine equal, my guide, and mine acquaintance. We took sweet counsel together, and walked unto the house of God in company.” [Ps.55:12-14.]

The churches that withdrew from the Corresponding Meeting published a Manifesto giving their reasons for their withdrawal. The Corresponding Meeting at their session, August 1890, answered the charges against them. They first state that the charges against them were made by the “unsupported assertion of one man,” when in fact, the charges were made first by the Tygarts Valley River Association, which had dropped correspondence with the Juniata because of its disorder; also the Red Stone Association had dropped correspondence for the same cause from

the Juniata Association. Both of these Associations were located near the Juniata, and were in position to be well acquainted with conditions in the Juniata.

The unsupported assertion of a single individual might be overturned in court, but when the prisoner comes forward and confesses the charge that is another question. We quote from the Reply of the Corresponding Meeting. Referring to their endorsement of alien baptism they say that they believe it a part of his [God's] word to lend a helping hand to their brother and then add:

“Let us call your attention to a case which no one will deny is almost, if not entirely, similar to that of the Juniata Association. Several years ago the New Valley Church of Loudoun County, Va., was in affiliation with the Clark party, so-called, or at least her pastor was. While in that situation one person at least was baptized by him in her fellowship. The church with her pastor applied for membership in the Corresponding Meeting and was unanimously received; and if any objection on account of that member was made, we are ignorant of it, nor was he required to be baptized again.”

The extract is a lengthy one, but we give the pith of it, which the reader will perceive is simply an acknowledgement of the truth of the charge, and their defense was that they had *done the same thing once before and nothing had been said about it*, and why notice it now; which Elder Weaver of Indiana, in his reply to this defense stated that it was the same as the plea of the prisoner brought to the bar for stealing a horse, whose defense was that “he had stolen one once before, and nothing had been done about it, and why make a fuss about it now.”

The fact of the matter is that the case here referred to was *not at all similar* to the one we were objecting to. This took place just after my baptism; I was present as a messenger at that session of the Corresponding Meeting, and opposed the move then made, believing that it would establish a precedent for future trouble; events proved the correctness of my position – although there was no reference to an unbaptized member in said church.

In regard to the charge against them of opening correspondence with the disorderly Mt. Pleasant of Kentucky, they said:

“We have very limited acquaintance personally with the Baptist composing the Mount Pleasant Association. The pastor of some of her churches and faithful ministers of our long acquaintance inform us that the charge that the Association is in correspondence and affiliation with the Means Baptist anywhere is false.”

All necessary to answer this statement was to examine the character of the organization of that Association as denounced by the orderly Baptist around it; also the character of its correspondence and the preachers visiting it; also of the Eastern Associations who had recognized it; when preachers prominent in the councils of the Means Baptist, like H.M. Curry of Ohio, and others of similar caste were hailed

as “high fellows well met,” by the leaders in these Eastern Associations; and fellowshipped by the Associations.

The Reply of the Corresponding Meeting that we are noticing also states that they are contending for the same doctrine that they had ever held. We compare a few extracts from their former position with the doctrine set forth in the Circular of August 1890, in which this statement was made. In their Circular of 1848 they say:

“This city has her origin in God. I saw says John, “the Holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband” ... She came from God and came out of heaven. With such an origin as this can she but be holy? But she came to earth, and is she not likely to have her beauty marred and her comeliness effaced? No! For her God came with her, and will not leave her. “He hath desired it for his habitation,” here will I dwell, saith the Lord. Her provision all comes from heaven her native clime.”

Again:

“To this city there is but one way; the Lord is that way ... If flesh and blood cannot inherit it can we find it among those whose religion consists of a faith and repentance which is the act of their fleshly minds? No. Nor can we find it in the depraved natures of even the people of God, but in the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. And these are distinct the one from the other, though inhabiting the same tabernacle.”

Again in 1852:

“So the children of God are said to have been chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world. If before the foundation of the world, of course when he only as their life existed in God, before sin existed. And if then chosen in him, they were chosen in his election, and must have existed in him, and were as a distinct manner of people in time to proceed from him.”

Again in 1853 at the very church [at Fryingpan Spring] where they met in 1890:

“Notice that this quickening, this raising, &c., is not only together with Christ, but it is in Christ Jesus, it must therefore have been in his being quickened, in his being raised; and therefore as one with him. And, who is it that has the presumption to call in question a truth so divinely testified to by an inspired Apostle?”

This Circular was signed by Elder Samuel Trott, Moderator, and Elder R.C. Leachman, Clerk, clearly showing the position of these preachers and the Baptist of that day on the particular points of doctrine in that contest.

These extracts are made before 1871. I was first a messenger at this session of the Corresponding Meeting, and every session after, up to 1889; writing the Circular several times, taking up these positions in some of them, and reiterating these same doctrinal sentiments which were adopted without opposition. Now let us take the Circular of 1890, the first year after the division in which they state:

“We solemnly challenge anyone to show wherein we or our ministry have departed one iota from one point of doctrine or order held by us ... and by our messengers to our correspondents; and to the world since we had an existence as the Corresponding Meeting of Virginia.”

Very well, let us examine the Record, quoting as stated. The *text* of the Circular was Galatians 3:26 – “For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.” The *argument* of the Circular was that the *natural man becomes a “child of God by exercising faith in Christ Jesus.”* In this Circular we are told:

“The anger,” [evidently they mean “the opposition,” for it is not in anger that we are contending] “of those who seem to have lost sight of the fact that we [natural men and women] are by faith what we are not by nature.” “Faith [in the natural man] gives the evidence that the [natural] man is born again, *yet he remains the same man.*” [The parenthesis in these quotations are ours to show clearly the idea of the Circular.]

Again, we quote:

“If there are any that object to this, they must, it appears to us *without faith.*” One of the most remarkable expressions in this Circular was: “Neither is our fleshly body changed in any sense from what it was by the redemption, *resurrection*, or new birth.”

We quote again:

“We can hardly believe that the apostle meant that the spiritual man is the child of God. If that were his meaning then the spirit would not be the child of God until faith made it so ... then it must be that the [natural] man is a child of God by faith ... So it is by faith that we are the children of God, and by faith poor miserable, sinful creatures.”

Thus it seems from this Circular that faith produces both children of God, and poor, miserable, sinful creatures. The birth and pre-existing seed has nothing to do with the matter. But again we quote:

“And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father. It does seem to us that the apostle does not mean that God has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into the heart of the spirit of his Son, nor into the heart of the Spirit of God, but into the heart of him [natural man] redeemed from under the law ... by the faith of the Spirit in our hearts we Jews and Gentiles are children of God according to our text, For ye are all children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.”

But we must give another quotation:

“The promise was to Abraham’s seed, had it been alone to the fleshly seed, the Gentiles would have been excluded.”

We would like to know where this Association got the notion that the promise was *to the fleshly seed* at all; but to the election in Christ as it is written; “And if ye

be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." [Gal.3:29.] But, we must give another quotation:

"Nowhere according to our understanding does the word "elect" refer to a spiritual or new man separate and distinct from a body of flesh ... The angel did not say to Mary that the Spirit of that holy thing which should be born of her should be called the Son of God ... Paul calls him who was made of the flesh of David the Son of God."

Comment upon these quotations appears unnecessary; and yet the Corresponding Meeting had the nerve to send out this Circular; and proclaim it as the doctrine that they had *always held*. Imagine such men as Leachman and Trott signing their name as Moderator and Clerk to such a tissue of contradictions; and we might add almost unheard of fancies seriously sent forth as Old School Baptist testimony. The careful reader will notice that in the above quotations we are not only gravely informed that the natural man becomes a child of God by exercising faith [which the Scripture says he has not, for it is the fruit of the Spirit,] but also the Circular tells us that the spiritual man is not the child of God, thus contradicting the testimony in John 3:6; also we are informed in this Circular that the natural man becomes the child of God by exercising faith, yet he remains *the same man* that he was before. The identical sentiments expressed in this Circular were advanced by John Clark in his so-called "Exposure of Heresies," page 40; where he says:

"The people of God were in Christ before the world was, and they are in him in time by faith – *become the children of God by faith* in Christ Jesus. We readily admit; yea, contend, that according to the doctrine of predestination, and the purpose of God in election, his people were in him from everlasting ... but shall we contend from hence that they had *actual existence in Christ as early*."

Clark means that the election was prospective and not actual; and this is really what the Durand idea is.

There were present at this session of the Corresponding Meeting; besides Badger, White, and Francis, members of the Meeting, the following preachers: Purington; W.L. Beebe; Jenkins; Hubbell; Vail; Grafton; Chick; Poulson; Lester; Eubanks; all of these preachers were on the Committee recommending the adoption of the Circular; also each and all of these preachers had been busy in writing and preaching that the natural man becomes the child of God by being born of the Spirit, but now they all unite in endorsing in this Circular the absurd notion that he [the natural man] becomes the child of God by exercising faith.

The Scripture quoted in their Circular admits of no such construction, the apostle was warning the Galatian brethren against the efforts of those Judaizing teachers who had crept in among them urging a mixture of law and gospel; and claiming superior rights to the Jewish race under the gospel system. He tells us in

the 7th verse of this 3rd chapter, “They which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham,” and winds up his exhortation in the last verse of this 3rd chapter with the declaration “If ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.” Here is the gist of the subject; faith being *the evidence*, and not the cause of the sonship in Christ, as it is the fruit of the Spirit [Gal.5:22,] and not the spirit the fruit of faith. But this Circular makes faith *the cause* of this sonship in Christ, and not the evidence.

In their Circular as previously quoted of 1890, the Corresponding Meeting challenged “any one, whomsoever he may be, to show wherein we or our ministry have departed *one iota* from one point of doctrine or order held by us, and by *all sound* Old School Baptist.” Evidently they meant “*previously* held by us.” I accepted this challenge; and in the Sectarian, May 1892, drew a parallel between their position in 1890, and previously. I insert a part of this article in this record. As late as 1884 they state in their Circular regarding baptism:

“No organization except his church has ever received such authority. Baptism can be administered only by the ministry held in fellowship of this church ... As error here must ever stand as in the glare of eternal noon, never to be condoned.” [Circular of 1884.]

“We would not by any means seek to justify him [the Clark preacher, who baptized the disorderly members,] or the course he pursued; but this does not justify us in turning our backs upon the Juniata Association.” [Corresponding Letter of 1890.]

The reader will notice that in 1884 they assert that a valid baptism requires the minister to be in the fellowship of the church *at the time* that he administers the ordinance; while in 1890 they say “that while not seeking to justify the Clark preacher who baptized the members referred to, that did not justify them turning their backs on the Juniata Association.”

Now let us compare the doctrine:

“Christ is declared as the elect of God.” [Circular of 1853.]

“Nowhere does the word elect refer to a spiritual man distinct from a body of flesh.” [Circular of 1890.]

Again:

“It is written; “Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same.” Heb.2:14. [Circular of 1853.]

“One inquires, Is it the Adamic man that becomes the child of God? Yes.” [Circular of 1891.]

Again:

“And this spirit which is born of the Spirit. – Circular of 1869 – And these are distinct, the one from the other, though inhabiting the same tabernacle, as was the divinity and humanity of Christ.” [Circular of 1848.]

“We can hardly believe that the apostle meant that the spiritual man is the child of God.” [Circular of 1890.]

In closing reference to this subject I will state that these same preachers who at the Correspondence Meeting in 1890 set forth their view that the natural man became a child of God by faith in Christ, had previously in their preaching, writing &c., been prolific in contending that the natural man or sinner became the child of God by being born of God; and the climax of their absurd notions upon this point of doctrine was reached when at the Virginia Corresponding Meeting held at Mill Creek, West Va., in August, 1891, they tell us in their Circular that they believe first that the dead sinner *is quickened* into life; second that this same dead sinner *is adopted* and after being quickened into life and adopted he [the Adamic man] became the child of God by this adoption; he is then *born again*; then after all of this process, the poor fellow is groaning, waiting to be delivered; namely, quickening, adopting; nor birth seems to have accomplished nothing. Is not all of this “confusion worse confounded?”

At the Baltimore Association some years previous to this the writer of this Circular, the late A.B. Francis and myself were at the Baltimore Association. Elder J.M. Theobald of Kentucky had preached a most excellent sermon, presenting the foundation principles of the testimony at issue. Francis and myself, with other brethren were stopping at the same place for the night, and he remarked to me, “Elder Smoot, can you inform me how a holy child of God can long to be more holy;” evidently alluding to Elder Theobald’s sermon? I replied, “I cannot, but I can tell you how a holy child of God can long to be delivered from that which is unholy; the mortal body; the body of this death in which he tabernacles here.” This illustrates the points at difference.

During the contest of 1886-89, preachers on the Means side advocated the notion that “the sinner was chosen in order to be made holy in Christ;” and we also heard an extreme on the other side “that the child of God was chosen because he was holy.” The first expression was radically wrong; the last did not fully express the testimony. The apostle informs us; “according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love.” [Eph.1:4.] Here is a clear statement of the testimony; that is, in order that the development should be holy; the seed substance from whence such development comes, must necessarily be holy, hence the choice was in Christ the holy seed.

CHAPTER IX

The Coming together of the two wings of the Means Baptist.

In our previous chapters reference has been made to the deceptive pleas of those who were leading their followers from the gospel path, that they had no design or intention of joining the Clark forces; that the doctrine held by them was not the Clark doctrine &c. I desire to place on record testimony to show this was really the design of these men; also that the Clark leaders readily recognized this as their object; and acted accordingly.

We have already referred to the efforts of F.A. Chick in this direction; and we feel safe in calling attention to him as a sample, as he was called to edit the Signs of the Times; also to the pastoral care of one of the leading Eastern churches; and was generally regarded as a leader in this movement. We copy from one of Chick's letters to T.D. Dalton dated October 27, 1896, written from Hopewell, New Jersey. Dalton was the editor of "Zion's Advocate," the leading paper on that side; Chick, editor of the "Signs," the leading paper on the Durand side. Chick writes to Dalton as his dear brother, and winds up in the same style. We quote:

"Dear Brother Dalton; I have had it in mind to write you ever since I received copies of the minutes of the Ebenezer Association. While I learn that the Ketchikan did not take the same action that the Ebenezer did, with reference to re-establishing friendly relations between those who have been so long separate and alienated, I am glad to know that they feel the same way ... Our fathers may have held different sentiments, so much so, that they could not walk together. They were men, weak and dependent, and liable to err, even as we are ... If they made mistakes it is only what we all do."

It looks like the "cat is out of the wallet," again here, and in full flight. The reader will notice the expression; "*Our fathers may have held different sentiments*" Of course, he has no reference to the fathers on Dalton's side, for all knew that Dalton and his compeers were in full harmony with John Clark; but the reference is clearly to the fact that Chick, Durand, and company had repudiated the sentiments of Elder Beebe, and the old fathers upon our side; *and because of this* they were soliciting correspondence with the Clark party.

The action of the Ebenezer Association as recorded in the minutes of 1895, to which Chick refers was an expression of their willingness to open correspondence with the Eastern Associations and Virginia Corresponding Meeting. The following is a copy from their minutes:

"Resolved, that whatever causes of difference may have once existed, we believe that we are now one with our brethren of the Eastern Associations, and with the brethren generally in their correspondence. We therefore desire and ask for a renewal of our former relations with them.

Resolved, that we send each of these Associations a copy of the resolutions, and ask them to receive and consider them in the same spirit of brotherly love that actuates us, as we hope, in sending them.”

In their answer to this expression from the Ebenezer [Clark] Association, the Eastern Association express their gratification at the action of the Ebenezer Association and state that “as churches and as Associations they had not departed from the faith of their fathers, as held and declared at Black Rock in 1832, against the doctrine of Andrew Fuller.” Here is “the Joker in the woodpile,” their disposition to entirely ignore the contest of 1852-53, with Clark, Booten, Lauck, and others, and go back to the contest with the New School of 1832, before the other issues came up; covering over the bitter attacks of this Clark party upon our faithful brethren because of their devotion to these principles of doctrine; and really dropping those fundamental principles entirely; and accepting the false and unsound foundations of this Clark party.

The fact of the matter however, was that these Associations and the Virginia Corresponding Meetings were already in what we term indirect Correspondence with both Ebenezer and Ketockton [Clark] Associations through the Kehukee Association of North Carolina, who the previous year [1895,] had opened correspondence with both the Ebenezer and Ketockton; and at their [Kehukee] session in 1896; E.V. White from the Virginia Corresponding Meeting; he with C.H. Waters and other preachers from the Ebenezer and Ketockton were present in loving embrace and fellowship, preaching from the same stand. All of this we have no objection to, if these parties so desired, but what we are objecting to is their hiding their real sentiments and motives in the contest of 1886-89, and in less than five years; yea, one or two years; ah, more *at the very time* were working to accomplish, and bring about this union or coming together; which they vehemently denied to be their object. This is what largely caused the trouble; their continued plea that they were advocating the same doctrine as held by those who had gone before us, and the membership of the churches that they were leading off were either entirely and surprisingly ignorant of the testimony maintained among us; or putting too much confidence in the statements of their leaders; were entirely unable to see through the deceptive plea, that they were making; perhaps both a combination of ignorance and over-confidence.

At the time these leaders were circulating the notion that our brethren were preaching “new things,” exactly as Clark and his followers declared in 1852-53; that Beebe, Leachman, Trott, and others were preaching new doctrines; when in reality it had ever been held by our churches; ah more, sustained in Scripture Testimony; and the membership unable to comprehend the facts in the case were frightened by this bugbear.

CHAPTER X

The Contest in the West.

We have in previous chapters dwelt more particularly upon events connected with this contest in the East, because from here it seemed to be directed by preachers held in the fellowship of these Eastern Associations; but the contest was as bitterly fought in the West. The able and faithful labors of men like Johnson, Dudley, Theobald, David Caudell, Sr., and others held back for years the weak elements in the West, but as soon as these faithful men were taken away, the western leaders on a par with such men like Chick and Francis in the East, began to show their true colors. For just such an occasion as this, they had been waiting.

In 1885, Robert Thompson, a man of small ability, but able to make considerable noise, began the publication of a paper, "The Primitive Monitor," at Greenfield, Indiana. A paper of similar character termed "The Messenger of Peace," had been started in Missouri in 1874. Both of these papers were pledged to oppose the fundamental principles of gospel grace, but to skim along on the surface without regard to any underlying gospel principles.

The columns of these papers were open to the Means Baptist of the West who freely wrote for them while Durand, Chick, and other Eastern preachers were found contributing also to their pages. These papers openly assailed the testimony held by Beebe, Dudley, and others, but were not of sufficient importance to lead off a party while these old fathers were living. As an evidence, however, of the character of Baptist they represent, both of these papers record instances of their preachers going over-seas in the world war as chaplains, assigned to regiments in the American army; and in the Monitor for April 1919 the wife of one of these chaplains writes of her husband's labors in the army as encouraging him very much "as he preached to these inquiring souls."

The contest started in the West by the effort of these Western leaders to put Means Baptist preachers on the stand, at the Associations. I was present at the Conn's Creek Association of Indiana, when an effort of this character was made, and when the invitation to seats in Council was extended by the Moderator, I refused to accept a seat; arose and gave my reasons for such refusal, withdrew and left the grove where the Association was in session, returning to my own people. Ruth 1:16. In the Licking Association of Kentucky, a bitter contest flared up, dragging along through a period of about three years, and finally culminating in a complete separation in April 1889, just preceding the separation at Quantico.

This separation was brought about especially through the efforts of Durand, and Eubanks from the East. Upon their advice a Council was called by the disaffected members of that [Licking] Association, and these two men were present to conduct

its proceedings, which was done by claiming to be the Licking Association; and like the Virginia Corresponding Meeting a year or so afterward, deceptively declaring that they were contending for the same doctrine that Johnson, Dudley, and others had preached.

Their right to make such a claim can be judged by the intelligent reader when informed that they stated in their declaration of faith “that the man who has been born of the flesh is the one, of whom the Saviour said, Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God,” and in the Durand style *after the birth* they take up the life that produces it, as though the birth makes the life, and not the life the birth. After telling us that this [natural] man when born of the Spirit becomes the subject of two births; they then inform us “that the elect are sinners of Adam’s race.”

In these statements they refer to their believing themselves to be in full harmony with Dudley, Johnson, and others; but in making this statement they belie their own position, for they by their act in following the leadership of Thompson and Durand, put themselves in full harmony and correspondence with those in the West who had been and were then in bitter opposition to those brethren and the Eastern Associations in the days of Elder Gilbert Beebe, Hartwell, Leachman, and Trott; yet at the next session of the Eastern Association they opened correspondence with this pretended Licking; and all hands put themselves in full harmony with their hitherto opponents, East and West.

The same move was made in the Mt. Pleasant Association of Ky., located adjoining the churches of the Licking. They declared themselves to be the Mt. Pleasant, and were endorsed by all the weak elements in the West; also by the Eastern Associations and the Virginia Corresponding Meeting. The troubles in these two Kentucky Associations arose largely from the efforts of weaker elements to *force* preachers into the pulpits of these churches over the heads of members opposed to them; and this was really the trouble East and West; to force upon our churches sentiments that we did not then, and do not now believe.

This was the *active* cause of the trouble in Kentucky, but the *real* cause was the unsoundness of many Baptist who had crept into these churches, professing the doctrine while in heart opposing it.

CHAPTER XI

The Means Baptist.

We have used the term *Means Baptist* frequently in this Book; and it is probably important to define its meaning. The name was applied many years ago to Baptist who claimed that the preacher was an instrument and the preaching or gospel ministration the means in the Lord's hands to quicken dead sinners; and we believe that there are a few who still hold to that idea; but the larger number of those who were ranged under that banner have forsaken it.

In its broader sense the word *Means* refers to those who rely upon *human means* of whatever character to execute the purposes of God; religiously speaking we see this in Sunday Schools; Mission Systems; Theological Schools, &c.; but all of this belongs to the open and avowed enemies of gospel grace; and to their means, we may well add the persecutions to which saints in all ages have been subjected by the first and second beasts *as a means* of getting rid of the true followers of gospel testimony.

Any fleshly effort made to play upon the natural passions of individuals to induce them to join the church; or similar efforts to induce men to enter the ministry; substituting our efforts for Divine power, can be well regarded as *Means*, from an Old School Baptist view-point.

Such Means can but produce a mocking Ishmaelite, but never a real Israelite; and the product of such efforts are seen in contests and divisions, where such characters brought into the church, and rushed into the ministry through fleshly effort, without understanding of gospel doctrine or comprehending gospel order, fly the track at the first contest that arises upon these vital questions.

Wherever fleshly wisdom enters; fleshly assistance; the efforts of poor, puny mortals to either assist, or perform the work of Almighty God, we have an introduction of the means system. This character was more pronounced in the fateful years preceding 1889, among the professed Old School Baptist of the West than in the East. E.H. Burnam, editor of the "Baptist Magazine;" a paper listed by Sylvester Hassell in his "Church History" as a regular Old School Baptist paper, writes in this so-called Baptist Magazine: "If we wish to *perpetuate our organizations* as witnesses for Jesus, we must educate our children, morally, mentally, and *religiously*." Here is certainly the doctrine of Means, contradicting the Anti-means doctrine presented in Acts 2:47 – "*The Lord* added to the church daily such as should be saved."

John Clark in his "Zion's Advocate" of September 2, 1878, writes of this E.H. Burnam: "Such a minister as brother Burnam is a great blessing to any people;" and commends Burnam's idea of "establishing schools to be controlled exclusively

by our people,” we presume he means to teach children their system or idea of Old School Baptist religion. This is the Means systems; the Anti-means system on this point is found in Hebrews 8:11, “And they shall *not teach* every man his neighbor, and every man his brother saying, know the Lord; for all shall know me from the least to the greatest.”

In the same issue Mr. Clark prints a sermon from J.C. Philpot of England in which occurs the following sentiment: “Men little think what it is to reject the truth of God ... they little think of the *responsibility incurred by sitting under the gospel*. If they reject it, they are tying damnation round their necks; and if they live and die with that rejecting spirit, they will sink to rise no more.” Here clearly we have the testimony that the natural man can either receive or reject the gospel at his pleasure; and that his salvation thus depends upon himself, which certainly looks like the preaching of the gospel is *the means* of salvation.

Some Clark Baptist certainly must have believed this notion, for in the “Advocate” for March 1891, Clark having died and Waters succeeding him as editor, Waters refers to following one of their preachers who had spoken from the text: “Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature;” and stated that the preacher had declared “that the gospel is to be preached to all; that *all men* are called upon to believe and to repent.” Waters says that he was in full harmony with this sentiment. The Anti-means doctrine opposing this is the testimony: “*The gospel of the kingdom of God,*” Mark 1:14; not of the world, but of the kingdom.

In the “Advocate,” December 1898, we find the idea endorsed: “The first work of the Spirit in the sinner is a new birth ... they are united unto God in Christ by the act of his Spirit, and so partake of a new life.” This is we presume presented as the manner in which a child of God is identified in Christ; not by choice, but in some unexplained manner united to him by the amalgamation of elements; earth and heaven; human nature and Spirit; that are entirely opposite; and this mixture produces the saint; this building upon a fleshly foundation is another character of the Means system; the Anti-means opposite of which is: “No man putteth a piece of new cloth unto an old garment, for that which is put in to fill it up taketh from the garment, *and the rent is made worse.*” Matthew 9:16.

It would appear that these means ideas had found endorsement among some of the Eastern preachers. For instance Chick writing some years before the contest upon Ephesians 6:4 – “And ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath; but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord,” held that this was an obligation resting upon the [Old School Baptist] fathers of earthly children to bring them up “in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.” He failed to show how such children could be brought up and nurtured in a life that they did not possess. Also Elder Gold describing a visit to the Eastern Associations in 1895, says:

“I was much pleased there to see so many young people at preaching. Mothers brought their little ones, even babies. I can far better endure the crying of a baby at preaching than to see boys and young men going fishing, or playing ball, or marbles, or such like on Sundays. Our people should take their children to preaching, and require them to go in the house and be respectful, and give what attention they can to preaching ... We are sorry to see in some places the children and young people going off and not attending our preaching. This is not as it should be.”

I do not object to seeing young people to meeting providing they behave themselves, and of course it is especially encouraging if they seem to have an interest in gospel truth; but Mr. Gold goes farther than this seeming to hold it as a sacred duty for Old School Baptist parents to take their children; even their babies to their meetings; and see that they “give *what attention they can* to preaching.” This seems to me, to be the very principle advocated by E.H. Burnam; and unquestionably is the Means system. If this idea be correct, Why not organize an Old School Baptist Sunday School? A move of this character has been made by some elements of this class of Baptist, as well as introducing organs in their meeting house. Any character of religious effort that labors to work upon the natural passions of individuals, and thus induce or force them to profess religion can well as we have previously stated, be termed a system of Means, whether propagated by professed Old School Baptist, or avowed Arminians. It is written in “Isaac shall thy seed be called.” [Gen.21:12.] “Now, we brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise.” [Gal.4:28.]

Mr. Gold thought it better for young people to go to meeting whether they want to go or not, rather than go fishing or play ball on Sunday. I would like to know how the preaching is to benefit children forced by their parents [against their will] to attend, unless there is some quickening power or life in such preaching, which is really the claim of the Means Baptist. Is the natural child any better qualified than the natural man of whom the apostle says “received not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” – I Cor.2:14. If our children really desire to attend our meetings, this undoubtedly is encouraging to us; but we do not desire to force or even insist on them doing so against their will.

The apostle in the letter to the Galatians inquires, “Are ye so foolish? Having begun in the Spirit are ye now made perfect in the flesh?” Gal.3:3; and Nehemiah speaks of Jews who “had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab; and their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, *and could not speak in the Jews language*, but according to the language of each people.” Neh.13:23,24. This to my mind is a clear description of Means Baptist; the Bible name of this people should

be according to this testimony: “Ashdod Baptist;” speaking a mixed language of spirit and flesh; or of flesh and spirit.

Baptist who introduce the flesh in heavenly worship; whose systems mix flesh and spirit to my understanding can well be termed Means or Ashdod Baptist. This is not the pure language [Zep.3:9,] of Israel that they use, but the mixed language of Ashdod. All antichrist claim that “the natural man [sinner] is born again,” but none of them make this by special operation or work of the spirit; they see but one man, this is the Moab or worldly part of the language, while the claim that the work of the spirit upon that natural man produces the spiritual child is the effort of the Ashdod to speak in the language of the true Jew or Israelite; so in election all antichrist claim that the natural man [sinner] is the one who is to enter the kingdom; but the Ashdod adds the idea of an election to this Adam man.

During the contest of 1886-89, one of our friends was attending an anti-christian meeting in Covington, Ky., accompanied by her little girl. The child asked as they were returning home after the meeting: “Ma, didn’t that preacher say that the sinner is born again?” The mother answered “Yes.” Well, replied the child, “Isn’t that what Mr. Lester says?” to which the mother replied again, “Yes.” We mention this as an illustration. The whole antichristian world sees but the one man; and make him a child by various natural processes; but Ashdod Baptist add their idea of the Spirit’s work; a half and half process; half flesh and half spirit; thus making a mixture of flesh and spirit; half and half in true Ashdod style.

CHAPTER XII

The Similarity of the position held by Durand and party in 1886-89 to that held by Clark and party in 1852-53.

As we have previously stated the doctrinal positions in the contest with Clark were precisely as held by Durand and those with him in the later contests. Like Durand, Clark puts the birth before the life, as though the birth produces the life, instead of life producing the birth.

[1] “The first existence is in the flesh, and the second existence is in the second Adam ... and it is the same man that was born the first time, that is born the second time.”

[2] “The child of God has two distinct natures ... the one derived from the earthly Adam; the other derived from the Lord Jesus Christ.”

In the above quotations; the first marked [1] is from Clark's so-called "Exposure of Heresies," page 38 & 44; the next marked [2] is from Durand's letter in the Signs defining his position; and that of his followers.

The careful reader will notice that the sentiment expressed in these declarations are exactly the same; and expressed in almost the same language. In other phrases Clark and Durand, and their followers expressed the same thought in exactly the same form; that the same man who was born first of the flesh was the identical man, who was born the second time of the Spirit; and this I am confident neither of them would deny.

We have already shown that Clark was in full harmony with the Virginia Corresponding Meeting in their position that the natural man becomes a child of God by exercising faith in Christ Jesus; and that the Corresponding Meeting held in their session of 1891, after this man is quickened into life, he is then *adopted*, and after this, born again.

We now quote to show the similarity in the view of both parties that the natural man thus according to their theory born again becomes alive to holiness. The quotation marked [1] is from Clark's "Exposure," page 45; [2] is from the Delaware River Circular of 1891.

[1] "The identical man that was born is born again ... the members which were servants unto iniquity are now servants of righteousness."

[2] "The ears of fallen [natural] men must be opened before they can hear the truth and desire to live in the church of God."

The [1] in the following is from Clark's "Exposure," page 46; the [2] is from Durand's letter in the "Signs," April 15, 1888.

[1] "The warfare is between that part of man regenerated, and that part left in its natural state."

[2] "The child of God has two natures – one earthly, the other spiritual, and these are antagonistic the one to the other."

I wish to emphasize here the theories of these people that the natural man after being born again; he [the natural man] becomes alive unto holiness. The [1] following is from the Advocate, July 1883; the [2] from the Delaware River Circular of 1891.

[1] "Paul reminds this [natural] man that he is bought with a price, "therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's ... not a spirit born of a Spirit."

[2] "No man [the natural state] can see the condition of the fallen race of men unless the blind eyes have been opened."

With reference to election we quote [1] from Clark's "Exposure," page 40; [2] Circular of Virginia Corresponding Meeting, 1891.

[1] “We contend that his people were in him from everlasting ... but shall we contend from hence that they had actual existence in Christ as early.”

[2] “Nowhere according to our understanding, does the word “elect” refer to a spiritual man distinct from a body of flesh.”

In further proof that the view here expressed by these parties were exactly similar, Clark continues on the same page of his so-called “exposure,” to state that “some are in Christ in this sense before others;” referring evidently to the manifestation of election; while the Corresponding Meeting say that “the word ‘elect’ applies to the man whom God hath chosen out from men to serve him;” namely, in the first place Clark contends that this election in Christ takes place at the time that one receives a hope in Christ; and the Corresponding Meeting takes exactly the same position; that is, a person is elected when faith gives the evidence of a hope in Christ; this we state is but the *evidence*, and not the time or cause of such election.

We give one more quotation. [1] is from “Exposure,” page 38; [2] from the Corresponding Letter of the Baltimore Association of 1890.

[1] “It is obvious that the apostle had not in his eye, eternal created spirits, when he wrote, as he begins this chapter [Eph.2,] that dead sinners were quickened.”

[2] “Our hope is that God has chosen us, poor sinners, and quickened us from the dead. We make known our opposition to the heresy that eternal spirits and not sinners are made alive unto God.”

In each instance, both from the Durand wing and also from the Clark wing of these Baptist, they view but the one [Adam] man; they make him the elect child, by having him chosen in *prospect*, and becoming the child by being born again. They seem incapable of comprehending that a system whose keynote starts from Adam can rise no higher, that there must be a higher order of life; and that life in Christ; and that such life can be communicated only by a birth; and this birth can only proceed from him [Christ] who is its seed’s substance; assuredly not the “sinner born again.”

We have particularized the position of the Baltimore and Delaware River Association, as the head of this liberal move was located largely in these two Associations; in the Delaware River under Durand’s influence, and the Baltimore under Chick’s influence; here in the East was the head of this liberal move, but its tail wagged as far west as the Pacific Ocean; and as far south as the Gulf of Mexico. The object was to liberalize the Old School Baptist denomination; the result, to gather into one body all elements under the one banner in defiance of all rules and regulations of gospel grace or order; and this amalgamation has largely been accomplished; weak elements claiming the Old School Baptist name, mixed with Secret Orders; Prohibition; Life Insurance, and other worldly institutions and theories, are ranged under this name; strenuously denying the fundamental

principles of the gospel; *professing to hold* just enough of the peculiar views that mark this people, separating them from the world, to enable such weak elements to retain their standing in the liberalized, and worldlyized Old School Baptist of America; and the result of this is seen in the condition of the elements that we have left; their mixture as Ashdods of old with elements and conditions alien to both the doctrine and order of the gospel.

The letter of the Baltimore Association of May 1890, held the year after the division was carefully worded with special reference to work upon the feelings of the Clark Baptist; an urgent plea for a renewal of correspondence, to which as previously noticed the Ebenezer [Clark] and Kettocton Associations readily responded.

The Delaware River Circular of 1891 from which we have quoted follows in the same strain, showing clearly that the object of these leaders from the start of the contest just following the death of Elder Gilbert Beebe in 1881, was to undo as far as possible the strong, able, and faithful labors of Elder Gilbert Beebe and his compeers; and unite with the weak elements represented by Clark and others.

In the next chapter, we show more clearly the nature of this move on the part of preachers East and West to re-unite these elements into one body; efforts beginning almost immediately with the death of Elder Beebe; and continuing through the years following; while at the same time these would-be-leaders were loudly declaring in their preaching and through their Circular Letters that they were holding the identical sentiments held by the old fathers who had passed away in the full triumph of the faith that they had so long and faithfully held.

It is this deception that we objected to; if they desired to go with that element of Baptist, all right; they certainly were entitled to the privilege; but why endeavor to lead off others under the plea that they were contending for the same doctrine and order; and that those of us who were opposing them were bringing in new things.

We have called attention to the doctrine preached by Beebe, Dudley, Leachman, Johnson, Trott and others who have preceded us, and shown how fully it compares with what we are holding today; ah infinitely more, that it compares; and is in full harmony with the testimony of Scripture.

The expression from the Baltimore Association is simply a slur upon the views of Elder Beebe and others, as they knew if they knew anything, that our people were not contending that eternal spirits were made alive unto God; as they were already [these spiritual children] in possession of eternal life in their seed substance, which is Christ. The careful reader will also notice that in both of these quotations the proof of dead sinners being quickened is found in the phrase in the 2nd chapter of Ephesians, "*hath he quickened,*" this phrase is not in the original Greek, but was supplied by the translators.

The Vulgate translation of the Bible leaves out this expression entirely, as not in the original Greek; and reads, "And you when you were dead," which is evidently the apostolic meaning, referring to their state in nature. The term *quicken* is used first in the 5th verse where the saints [Eph.1:1,] spoken of in this letter are "quicken together with Christ;" the Vulgate translation reads, "quicken together in Christ;" while the Revised translation of 1880 recognizes the corrections of the term "*In Christ.*" I would like to know how we could be "quicken together with" or "in Christ," and raised up and made to sit together in Christ Jesus on any other principle than a vital union with and in him; my hand is quickened with and in my body; both stand and fall together because of the life union existing between them.

In the quotations that I have made from both wings of these Ashdod Baptist, I have been careful to take quotations that illustrate clearly the trend of the testimony that they hold. Also I have not quoted from "out of the way" spokesmen, but from their leading preachers; men acknowledged to be representative of their views.

The reader will remember the claim noticed on previous pages by Durand, Chick, Francis and others that they were contending for the same doctrine held by Elders Gilbert Beebe, Thomas P. Dudley, J.F. Johnson, R.C. Leachman and others. We have noticed this previously. I add to this additional evidence of the falsity of such claim; first the position taken by Durand in his letter in the "Signs of the Times," April 15, 1888:

"The elect are sinners of Adam's race."

I place in contrast to this position the following testimony from the late Elder Gilbert Beebe; refuting the two seed theory of the late Daniel Parker, Beebe says:

"It is not true that the elect as such were created in Adam ... the elect of God as such were created in Christ Jesus, and existed in him before the natural creation took place."

Elder Thomas P. Dudley in his Circular on the Christian Warfare says;

"What then do we learn from the figure? That the bride, and all the spiritual children were created in and simultaneously with the last Adam, [the Lord Jesus Christ] that they were of the same nature with him!"

Elder Beebe urged the adoption of this Circular Letter at the Licking Association some years before its final adoption by that Association. In the same Circular, Dudley says:

"The truth is, dear brethren, the "old man" is precisely what he has ever been since the fall in nature and disposition."

But both the Clark and Durand wing of Ashdods as we have in this chapter shown, tell us that his eyes have been opened to see the truth.

CHAPTER XIII

The Importance of the Contest.

I believe that I have shown to the satisfaction of the honest inquirer after truth that the contest with Durand and others in 1886-89, was upon the identical points of doctrine as that with Clark and others in 1850-53. If the first was unavoidable and necessary; it seems so also of the second. The Durand party it is true claimed that after the Adam man was born again he was not changed; Clark claimed that he was changed; and in this claim I consider Clark more consistent than Durand, for if the Adam sinner were born of the Spirit, assuredly, would he be no longer a sinner, but spirit [free from sin,] yet really Durand and party falsely made this claim, as I have shown in the previous chapter that both parties believed that the sinner underwent a change; assuredly if his eyes were opened, and he was quickened into life as both Clark and Durand believed, why assuredly would there be a change; the resurrection *does no more*.

The contest was forced upon us as noticed in previous Chapters; assuredly can I say that so far as my connection with it is concerned it was forced upon me. On a previous page I noticed the instance of my meeting with Dr. Waters, former editor of "Zion's Advocate," after the death of its founder – John Clark. This was in the fall of 1884; and Waters informed me of his arrangement with Elder Chick to exchange appointments; as stated I wrote to Elder Chick in December of that year, and received a reply from Elder Chick from which I copy evidencing that a movement was on foot that early on the part of those people to unite with the Means faction. In reference to the invitation extended to the Clark preachers to visit the Baltimore Association in 1883, Chick defends this move as follows:

"I fail to see how it can be out of order to invite any body to come and mingle with us, and hear the preaching; and to find out our order at our Associations. I have myself invited many people of various orders to come to our meetings."

The reader will notice the specious character of this defense. To invite friends who are inclined to come to our meetings is one thing, but to invite preachers arrayed with our enemies to visit our Associations with the intention of opening a correspondence is quite a different proposition.

Elder Chick shows more clearly their intention in the paragraph following:

"And further I cannot see how it is out of order for any body to seek to make peace among *estranged brethren*."

In further defense of their efforts to unite with the Clark elements; and referring to the strong, fundamental points of doctrine advocated by Beebe, Dudley, and others, Chick says:

“Even in the Signs, these things are now largely ignored. I know for myself that they refuse to publish extreme letters upon those subjects.”

In proof of the general trend through the eastern Associations to drop strong doctrine, and fellowship those who hitherto opposed this testimony, Chick continues:

“Elder Jenkins agrees with me as he wrote me a month ago, with Elders Rittenhouse and Grafton, and *most all* the brethren in the South and North that I have met. Why then should we not hope that in time *all these differences might be healed.*”

Elder Chick relates several instances to illustrate his views that these two wings [Durand & Clark] in the East were coming together. One among them I notice:

“Last June, a year ago at a church *near the Chemung Association*, Elder Vail and Elder Meinturf [with the approval of Elder Durand,] met and held a two days meeting.”

The reader will notice the phrase “at a church *near the Chemung Association,*” evidently one of the Clark order; and that Vail thus went over to that side in order to hold the meeting.

Chick reiterates in this correspondence, [he wrote to me two letters] what we have previously noticed; their desire to go back to the convention of 1832 at Black Rock in the New School Division, and base the terms of a reunion among them on the simple point of a *professed* belief in salvation by grace; ignoring equally as important contest of later years over doctrinal positions that underlie and are absolutely essential to the doctrine of salvation by grace.

We quote extensively from Chick; he was truly, with Durand a representative man in this liberal move; so regarded East and West; was appointed editor of the Signs of the Times, and as previously stated called to the care of Hopewell, one of the leading churches in the East.

I turn attention now again to Silas H. Durand, and quote from a private letter sent from him to John Weaver, a preacher who had been excluded from his [Weaver’s] church in Indiana, on account of disorderly affiliation with Means Baptist. Durand had no idea that this letter would ever come to light; but Weaver gave it to one whom he supposed to be his friend, and thus it found its way into our camp, a copy of it being sent to me. The “brother George” referred to in this letter was the late Elder George S. Weaver, who was in full harmony with us on those fundamental principles; he was a brother in the flesh to John Weaver.

Southampton, Penn., Sept.26, 1888.

Dear Brother John Weaver, I have just learned from brother Goble of the disorderly work in your church. I want you to write by return mail and tell me some of the particulars. I want to know if your brother George took any part of it. I learn he is going with brother Biggs to Canada ... You may tell George that the

question will be brought up, for I do not propose to have him or anybody else to come where I am held in fellowship with any doctrine that party are contending for ... I want to have a letter from you by next Wednesday, so I can get it before I go to Canada. I want you to come here next year. Your brother in hope,

Silas H. Durand.

P.S. Smoot's own Association are *all against* his doctrine.

This letter now by the man who was where it would have its deceptive effect, contending that he did not believe in making this doctrine a test of fellowship; the man who had professed to believe and preach it in the days of Gilbert Beebe; Thomas P. Dudley and others; but evidently who had never really understood the doctrine in question, or covertly hidden his real position. The reader will notice the authoritative manner that this self-appointed leader [Isaiah 9:16,] talks to one of his followers. "*I want to have a letter from you by next Wednesday. I want you to come here next year.*" The command found prompt obedience. John was on hand next year at the Eastern Associations as their minutes record, and preached side by side with Purington, Durand, Eubanks, Chick, Francis, and others. The "disorderly work" referred to by Durand was the exclusion of John Weaver and some others from the church of his membership in Indiana. The brother Goble referred to, lived at Greenfield, Indiana, and was on the alert to notify Durand of any movement West, that he [Durand] might be kept posted upon the subject. Durand's gratuitous slur at me that "Smoot's Association are *all against* him" was proven false at Quantico in August 1889.

Not only were there two churches, but also sufficient membership in a third church in this Corresponding Meeting that came out from that Meeting, organizing the Annual Meeting. This statement of Durand is on a par with his, Francis, Eubanks, and others in regard to the Licking Association refusing to send messengers to the Eastern Associations, which we have shown to be false on pages 37 & 38. These reckless, misleading, yea, false statements, characterizes this character of leadership, we met at almost every turn in this contest. Our quotations from Clark's so-called "Exposure of Heresies," show how he misrepresented Elders Beebe, Trott, and others. In an "Appeal to the Churches of the Ketockton Association," published in pamphlet form by the late Elder Samuel Trott in 1850, a copy of which is on file in my office, the identical character of misrepresentations and charges are noticed as used against him and others in that contest as noticed in this connection against our brethren. Accusations were made against Thomas P. Dudley and the church at Bryant's Station, of similar character to which I may refer later.

Durand's assertion was very much like one by Francis to me in a letter now on file in my office, dated January 8, 1888, in which he says; "I am in hearty accord

with every member of Fryingpan church [he was then a member of the church at Fryingpan Spring,] there are no schisms among us. *We all believe* that the poor sinner of Adam's race ... the sinner is by the Spirit of God quickened and made alive from the dead ... and thus born again." At that very time, and in that very church were a group of Baptist who afterwards came out, and were recognized as the church at Fryingpan Spring. I mention these facts to illustrate; and the Baptist who come after me will learn that just as soon as such characters among us leave the truth of doctrine and order they begin to lie.

It is written in Revelation 2:2, of the church at Ephesus; "I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil; and thou hast tried them *which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars.*" Again in I John 4:2,3 – "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God. And this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world." In what may we inquire can Jesus Christ come in the flesh? Only as the generation, of which he is the seed substance, is developed in the fleshly bodies; the mortal tabernacles in which these children dwell. And upon this particular testimony it looks to me hinges our character as living witnesses; and we may well add the quotation: "Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error." I John 4:6.

We might add numerous instances of similar character to those mentioned in this Chapter. We are discussing the importance of the contest; the proof we insert is designed to show that the contest was forced upon us. The doctrine to which Durand referred was especially that of the Eternal Vital, or Actual Union of Christ and his church or people in the one eternal seed [Christ;] and the birth of the personal unit [child] thus existing in that eternal [seed] substance. Durand claimed to hold to the doctrine of the Eternal Union; but really he held merely the shadow without the substance; the shell without the kernel; a mere perversion of the doctrine.

In the next chapter I desire more especially to discuss this doctrine; but in closing this chapter, to especially remind the reader to bear in mind that the disposition of these leaders was to force us to give up our position; as Durand stated in his letter from which we have quoted that Elder Weaver would not be allowed to preach it in Canada or anywhere else where he [Durand] was held in fellowship. As previously stated the move to unite with the Clark people came first from the Durand and Chick side. Previously, we called attention to the fact that Elder Joseph Staton informed me that Chick, after the death of our aged ministers wrote to him "that the time had now arrived to make great changes in the Old School Baptist denomination." Elder Staton informed me that he replied to Chick

that “he [Staton] hoped that the preachers who wanted to make those changes would let those alone who did not want them.”

But men of the Chick stamp were not disposed to do this. Elder Beebe died in 1881; Elder J.F. Johnson had already passed away; Elder Thomas P. Dudley died in 1886; D.W. Patman of Georgia was dead; Theobald of Kentucky, and others; and these leaders of the Chick variety East and West began their efforts for their re-union, throwing out a strong smoke screen to hide their intention, for the Baptist in their correspondence East and West had too high an opinion of these old fathers in Israel to turn at once and stamp upon their faithful labors, and cease to honor their memory.

Elder Gilbert Beebe died in May 1881; the underhand work of some of these Eastern preachers began to show openly in May 1883 as representative preachers from the Clark side among them Dr. C.H. Waters editor of their paper, “Zion’s Advocate,” were invited and attended the Baltimore Association with no other object whatever, but that of opening a correspondence. In the fall of 1884 the work had advanced so far that Chick and Waters had arranged to make an exchange; Chick going to Front Royal, and Waters to Black Rock. The correspondence that I have inserted here between myself and Chick, shows that the matter was now in the open. Dalton who was now associated with Waters in editing the Advocate, laid down the terms in which this reunion was to be accomplished. The matter had been dragging heavily along like “the wheels of Pharaoh’s chariot,” the Clark element insisting on the other [Durand] wing giving up all form of Eternal Union. Sylvester Hassell had come out with a basis of reunion in which he termed this doctrine and others held by Beebe, Trott, and Leachman as heresies. In reality, however, both wings were together; an indirect correspondence between the Virginia Correspondence Meeting and the Ebenezer and Ketchton had been opened as previously stated through the Kehukee of North Carolina; and preachers from both sides were meeting, preaching, and in full fellowship with each other.

I quote from the Dalton editorial in the Advocate of November 1896.

“The doctrines set forth by Elder Hassell as a basis of union between us we readily and heartily endorse, but if we must take in Eternal Vital Unionism, and Unlimited [Absolute] Predestination in order to have union between us, it is better that we remain separated as we are, for we would be all the time in a wrangle.”

Chick had anticipated the necessity of giving up the doctrine of the Eternal Union and kindred fundamental principles in order to effect this getting together. In his letter to me of December 17, 1884, urging us to ignore all contests since 1832, at Black Rock, Md., with the New School party, he says:

“The sentiments of Eternal Union &c., was not considered vital then. Why should they be now?”

From these statements, the candid reader will readily perceive:

First: That it was the intention of the Durand party to entirely ignore the doctrine of the Unity and the basic principles of the gospel in their amalgamation with the Means Baptist.

Second: That they as fully intended to force all within their correspondence to stop preaching these first principles of gospel grace, as quoted from Durand to John Weaver on a previous page, "I do not propose to have him or anybody else to come where I am held in fellowship with any doctrine that party are contending for." Again from Chick: "The sentiments of Eternal Union &c., was not considered vital then. Why should they be now?"

These declarations of the leaders of this liberal move were eagerly acknowledged by their followers; 'tis true here and there was found an opponent within their ranks, but such opposition was drowned in the mad rush in the wake of this self-appointed leadership. The fact of the case was that many of these people, most of them a young membership, were not acquainted with, or established upon the principles of the gospel; and really believed that our brethren were introducing "new things," while many others were at heart opposed to the testimony, because absolutely ignorant of its vital bearing in gospel grace.

CHAPTER XIV

The Doctrine in Question.

We come now to notice more fully the doctrine that has caused this contest among the old order of Baptist in the United States for over 75 years resulting in two divisions. The doctrine is in many respects the key that unlocks the treasure house of gospel grace; *The Eternal, Unconditional, Personal Election of the church in Christ, the chosen seed thereof.* To an honest intelligent seeker after gospel truth the only evidence required for proof in any statement is Bible testimony clearly bearing upon that particular point; and evidencing its truth. We know of no class of professed Old School Baptist, who deny Election as a Bible doctrine, but the trouble arises regarding the particular application or meaning of the term. All classes of Old School Baptist except our order [Anti-means] claim that Elect or Election means the *prospective* choice of Adam sinners; as Durand put it; "The elect are sinners of Adam's race." As this is one of the most important

subjects discussed in this publication, I propose, if the Lord will, to enter into a somewhat exhaustive discussion of it.

The word Elect comes from the Latin verb, *Eligo; Eligere*, to choose; elect. This Latin word *Eligo* comes from the Latin verb “*Lego, Ligere*,” meaning, to gather, to choose, with the prefix E, meaning in Latin “In out of, from, of the matter.” And Webster the acknowledged authority in this country for the definition of English terms, defines the word Elect as meaning, “to pick out, or make choice of.” Several other definitions are given in both Latin and English Dictionaries on similar lines of the meaning of this term [Elect,] but we have selected the definition that the Bible testimony shows to be the correct one, which one we expect hereafter to show. Take the Latin derivation or definition of the word Elect, we have *E*, meaning In, *Lego*, choice or chosen, clearly meaning “choice in,” some *actually existing* person or substance. There can be no choice of a thing that is not actually existing at the time of such choice.

Let us however, lay aside all of these worldly definitions of the term [Elect,] and come to the Scriptural explanation of its meaning, which is the only way that we can prove anything pertaining to gospel doctrine and order: “comparing spiritual things with spiritual.” In Isaiah 42:1, we have the testimony: “Behold my servant, whom I uphold; *mine elect*, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my Spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles.” There can be no question but that *Christ* is here referred to as the *Elect* of God. But lest some fine spun critic might claim that this election of Christ was simply to “bring forth judgment to the Gentiles,” I quote again: “Wherefore also it is contained in the Scripture, I lay in Sion, a chief corner stone, *elect*, precious; and he that believeth *on him* shall not be confounded.” I Peter 2:6. Certainly Christ is the character described in this testimony. Yet again we may be met with the criticism that Christ is here simply as a corner stone; very well, we quote again: “For both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are *all of one*; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren.” Heb.2:11. The term, *sanctification*, has a similar meaning to election: “*a setting apart*,” and here the testimony declares that both Christ and those who are sanctified in him *are one*; a truth so plain that it does not need argument to sustain it.

It is well to remember, however, in all discussion of Scripture Testimony that such knowledge comes only by Revelation; and unless one has such revelation we might quote the most pointed Scripture declarations without the slightest effect. It is absolutely impossible for an individual to have any conception whatever of Divine Truth, only as Israel’s God is pleased to reveal it; and this revelation is not to the natural; but to the spiritual mind; it is in this mind that we receive spiritual teaching; knowledge. The natural mind not only does not; *but cannot* receive such testimony, for so declares the inspired apostle in the oft quoted declaration in I

Cor.2:14 – “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.”

But let us show still further where this choice is. In Ephesians 1:4, the apostle referring again to Christ, says: “According as he [God] hath chosen us in him [Christ,] before the foundation of the world.” Most assuredly here is the choice or election of Christ “before the foundation of the world,” and his people in him. The most fastidious critic among professed Old School Baptist will not deny, but what the church is the object of election; and Chick in a published article held that this church was composed of “*nothing* but sinners of Adam’s race.”

Durand as stated in previous chapters of this work, held the same notion in his published statement that the elect were “*sinners of Adam’s race.*” Let us then pursue this subject further. The apostle tells us in Eph.1:22,23, that the “church is *the body of Christ.*” As the head therefore is eternal, most surely the body is eternal; assuredly then the body cannot be sinners of Adam’s race, as such are mortal. Again in I Thes.1:1, we have the testimony “the church which is in God the Father, and *in the Lord Jesus Christ.*” Both Durand and Chick with Clark and others claimed that this church is in Adam, while the apostle declares it to be in Christ. But let us have another quotation, Paul writing by inspiration to “the Church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified [elected] in Christ Jesus,” declares “Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular,” I Cor.12:27; again “For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ ... For the body is not one member, but many.” I Cor.12:12, 14. This 12th verse in the Vulgate translation reads: “For as the body is one, and hath many members; and all the members of the body, *whereas they are many, yet are one body*; so also is Christ.” Our opponents inform us that Christ as the head is the only member of that body; they hold him not as the head [Eph.1:22,23;] not as a seed substance [Gal.3:16;] not as “the first-born among many brethren,” [Rom.8:29;] all of the brotherhood being born of the same parentage [God,] John 1:13. They entirely ignore the absolutely important testimony in Rom.5:14, of Adam as “the figure of him [Christ] who was to come;” that just as Adam’s bride was created in him; so the bride [church] of Christ was set apart in him in seed substance, to be developed in time by a birth: “spirit born of Spirit.” John 3:6. The doctrine has ever been held important in the travel of Old School Baptist churches. It is found affirmed in one of the very oldest Baptist Confessions of Faith; that of Philadelphia, a copy of which is on file in my office. This Confession was adopted from the London Confession, first by the Baptist Association met at Philadelphia, Sept.25, 1742. In this Confession we have reference to “Those whom God hath accepted in the Beloved.” Also “The Lord Jesus Christ,” is brought to view “as the head of the

church,” though it required the contests of later years upon this and other vital points to more fully develop and bring out the testimony in the travel of the churches.

The late Elder Gilbert Beebe in the Prospectus of the Signs of the Times, as published in the first Volume, contends for “*Eternal, and unconditional Election;*” and his writings clearly show what he means by this expression; that the Election is in Christ; the Elect Head; in his Editorial of June 15, 1845, he describes the church as in Bible testimony, “Descending from God, out of heaven, adorned as a bride for her husband; so say we; so says the Scripture; “a *chosen generation, a royal priesthood.*”

CHAPTER XV

The bearing that this testimony has upon Salvation.

The opponents of the Election in Christ among professed Old School Baptist, shy at “a man of straw,” claiming that the Election in Christ, and not in Adam, does away with the salvation of the sinner. This has not the slightest foundation in fact for the entire economy of gospel grace culminates in the salvation of the lost and helpless sinner; we might say that in many respects this is its crowning glory.

But the sinner is not saved by Election, but by the blood and righteousness of Christ. When I speak of our opponents not believing in an Election in Christ, I do not mean but what *they claim* such a belief, but when they talk of such an election, and then add that it is of Adam sinners; this couples it with an impossibility, as Adam sinners *are in Adam*, and not in Christ.

When we talk of the salvation of sinners, we must remember that “the wages of sin is *death*,” Rom.6:23; and that nothing short of *death* could pay the penalty for sin. Christ died for sinners, but unless there is some *vital* relationship between him who died and those for whom he died, his death would surely affect one sinner as much as another; and universal salvation would result.

We are told in Hebrews 2:14, that; “As the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he [Christ] also himself likewise took part *of the same*; that *through death* he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and *deliver them* who through fear of death were all their life-time subject unto bondage.” Here is a testimony of the doctrine underlying the atonement. The children [of God] partake of flesh and blood [not made up out of flesh and blood,] Christ partakes of the same, He [Christ] then possesses two *whole and distinct* characters

of being; he is both God [I John 5:20,] Spirit [John 4:24,] and man [I Tim.2:5;] both Spirit and flesh for God is a Spirit, John 4:24; hence these two characters of God and Spirit refer to the One. As Christ partakes of two *whole* and distinct characters of being, Spirit and flesh; so his people are partakers of the same, Rom.8:2 & 4. Here are not simply two natures as Clark, Durand, and their followers held; but two manner of children, the one born of the Spirit, the other born of the flesh; and these two are distinct, and so far as the nature of each is concerned, wholly separate children, are brought to view in the testimony: “The *old man* which is corrupt, according to the deceitful lusts;” “The *new man*, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.” Eph.4:22,24.

In I John 4:2, we have similar and corroborative testimony to that recorded in Heb.2:14; “Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God.” Evidently the apostle means “in the flesh of his people;” he partook of flesh as they partook of flesh; and he [Jesus] partook of flesh to redeem them [his children; his people] from the bondage of sin and death. The apostle so testifies in Romans 7:24,25 – “Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.” Here then is an explanation of the testimony, “Thou shalt call his name Jesus [Saviour;] for he shall save *his people* from their sins.” Mt.1:21. It appears from Ruth 4:1-7, that in Israel the right of redemption lay with the *nearest of kin*. This at least is one of the basic principles of the atonement. The reader will notice that the testimony in Hebrews 2:14, does not say “that the children *were*,” but that “the children *are*” &c.; this corresponds to Rev.21:2 – “And I John saw the holy city ... *coming* down from God out of heaven.” In each instance we are to consider the development of the bride; [Rev.21:2;] the body [Col.1:18;] these are the “his people,” [Mt.1:21,] that he come to save. They are “his people,” because they were given unto him, John 17:24, not merely “in covenant relation,” as Means Baptist hold, but by actual “choice in him,” as we have already shown; these are the characters that he came to save. He came to save sinners, all declare; very well and true, but if there was no vital relationship between him and those he came to save, his death most assuredly would as we have shown, affect one sinner as much as another.

In their eternal, spiritual, personal relationship in Christ, this people are not sinners, for “whosoever is born of God sinneth not,” I John 5:18, because they come from a sinless head; but these people in their mortal relationship in Adam can do no otherwise but sin, Rom.7:25, because emanating from a sinful head; and here is the warfare not between two natures in one man as held by the Clark and Durand party, but between two separate and distinct characters of life; the one spirit, the other flesh.

Therefore when his body, his bride, his people were and are involved in sin in their Adamic relationship he came “*in their flesh*,” I John 4:3; he assumed a body

of flesh like unto theirs, declaring, "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all *which he hath given me* I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." John 6:38,39. It required this character of offering; the sacrifice of a sinless body, as it is written, "And ye know that he was manifested to take away *our sins*; and in him is no sin," I John 3:5; tempted *in all points* like unto his people, "yet without sin," Heb.4:15; in this sinless life he came under the law that demanded the death of the transgressor, "to redeem them [his people] who were under the law." Gal.4:4,5. As his people in their Adamic relationship were under the law of sin and death, he came [a sinless offering;] and died for them, Heb.2:9; he paid the penalty of their transgression [death;] the law required the death of the Adamic life that sinned; and this is the life that Christ laid down, canceling the debt against his people. He said, "I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." John 10:18.

The inquiring reader will take notice to the fact that this vital oneness between the head and body; Christ and his people, was not only the principle upon which the debt was paid as held against the church in her Adamic relationship; but also it was the Divine warrant that the church or body of Christ should come up from under the law with the head; namely, the church arose from under that law, in her living and eternal head.

"One in the tomb, one when he arose,
One when he triumphed o'er his foes.
One when in heaven, he took his seat,
While seraph's sung all hell's defeat.

This sacred bond shall never break,
Though earth should to her centre shake;
Rest, doubting saint assured of this,
For God has pledged his holiness.

This sacred tie forbids their fears,
For all he is, or has, is theirs,
With him their head, they stand or fall.
Their life, their surety; and their all."

From this testimony the intelligent reader will recognize the doctrinal principle underlying the atonement.

First: The eternal, life union in the Spirit between Christ and his people that he came to save.

Second: Because of this eternal vital relationship; this oneness of life, Christ partook of flesh and blood, and died for their sins "according to the Scriptures." I

Cor.15:3; Rom.5:6; they died in him as surely as they were raised up *together with and in him*; the *vital* relationship was the cause of each.

Third: Because of this relationship, his death cancelled the debt [death] against his people, “Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us,” Rom.8:34. “For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead.” II Cor.5:14.

Fourth: Because of this same eternal, vital union between head and body, when the head arose from under the law, the body arose also; as it is written, “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again to a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.” I Pet.1:3. “And he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first born from the dead.” Col.1:18. This does mean simply the resurrection from the dead, but the Regeneration; the begetting again of the generation of Jesus Christ from under the law and under its curse into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. The reader will turn to I Pet.1:3, and see that the *us* who are “begotten again unto a lively hope,” are the “Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father.”

Now many place the manifestation of Election for the thing itself. We see its manifestation in this separation from among the sons and daughters of Adam; this, however, is not the calling of some from among the seed of Adam, and leaving others of the same seed on any principle of an election in Adam; but it is the manifestation of an election in Christ, as each elect child is developed in a mortal body, “curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth.” Ps. 139:15. As previously touched upon, Election in a Bible sense is not taking a part from a multitude, for the election in Christ, is the taking of the whole body [of Christ] the seed substance, as previously quoted, “He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; *but as of one*, and to thy seed, *which is Christ*.” Gal.3:16. “My dove, my undefiled is but one; she is *the only one* of her mother, she is the choice one of her that bare her.” Song 6:9.

It was written of Jesus; “Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me,” Heb.10:5; the Vulgate translation reads, “a body thou hast fitted to me;” which seems to me a very proper rendering of this testimony. Assuredly as a body was prepared for the head, so for each member of the body of Christ, as it is written; “Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth;” evidently referring to their Adamic relation, “What? Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you.” I Cor.6:19. “For we know that if our *earthly house of this tabernacle* were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.” II Cor.5:1. The word tabernacle here evidently

refers to the new man; the “earthly house,” together with the body in the previous quotations to the old or outward man; and in each instance reference is made to all that comes from the Adam man, spirit, soul and [physical] body. I Thes.5:23; this is the body [temple] in which the Holy Ghost; the new man; the man that is born of God dwells.

CHAPTER XVI

Eternal, Vital Union.

From this doctrinal testimony comes what is termed among us, “Eternal, Vital Union;” sometimes called, “Eternal Vital Unity,” or “Eternal, Vital Oneness.” I prefer the expression “Eternal, Vital Unity,” or “Oneness.” The expression simply means that the union or unity of the head and body is eternal, which is an unquestioned fact. If the head is eternal; and as Christ is the head, it must be as previously stated eternal, so the body *must be* eternal; for the same act that begat the head, begat also the body; they must necessarily be of the same organic life. It looks like such a plain position as this would be unquestioned.

But the Clark and Durand position, and that of their followers as before stated is that the head is eternal; the body - mortal [Chick says nothing, but mortal;] the head – spiritual; the body – natural; the head Christ - the body Adam. We presume that our readers will readily recognize the folly of such a position; yea, its impossibility, to which we have also called attention in previous chapters.

As thus presented, especially in the preceding chapter [XV,] that the death of Christ, the head, could have no possible effect upon *any special class* of Adam sinners unless there was some doctrinal principle [relationship] underlying this death [atonement,] that made it effectual in their salvation; and this principle we traced in the vital relationship between Christ the head, and his church; his people, his body. But even this would not fully reach the case without the fact, that this body, children of God, “born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, *but of God;*” John 1:13; these children of God partake of flesh and blood, thus the head becomes involved, and “*likewise* took part of the same,” Heb.2:14; the object of the head thus partaking of flesh and blood was as previously noticed, “to deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage,” Heb.2:15. The head [Christ] because of this vital relationship to his body, had a legal right to bear their griefs, and carry their sorrows, Isa.53:4; “who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree.” I Pet.2:24; the same relationship that laid the sins upon the head, caused the deliverance of the body, as its head was “brought from the dead,” sin was canceled; and everlasting righteousness brought in; as it is written, “we also joy in

God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement.” Rom.5:11. The reader will notice that those who have thus received the atonement are the “beloved of God,” Rom.1:7; “the *elect of God*, holy, and *beloved*,” Col.3:12; who in their Adamic relationship are sinners; and who have been saved from their sins by Christ.

Also it is absolutely important to know that this vital relationship [Eternal Vital Unity] that thus led Christ to follow his people; namely, partake of flesh and blood as they partook of flesh and blood, resulting in his being *one with them* in the flesh; and because of this oneness, his death [the death of the head] was their death [the death of the body;] this we repeat, was equally important in securing the resurrection of the body from under the law and under its curse, as it is written: “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ which ... hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead;” and also upon this same Eternal Oneness rests the resurrection to immortal glory, according to the testimony: “But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept.” I Cor.15:20.

In the world of antichrist the underlying notion of the work of Christ is that of a *volunteer*; that Christ seeing the fearful condition of the human family volunteered to die for their sins; and that all who choose to make his death effectual could do so by some legerdemain which they called “embracing the overtures of mercy;” this was doing their part according to the theory.

Does it look like a volunteer in the types; prophecies; and the substance of those testimonies, Christ himself? We notice first the type; the order was; “And take thou unto thee Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him, from among the children of Israel, that he may minister unto me in the priest’s office.” Ex.28:1. “And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.” Heb.5:4. Aaron’s wishes or choice were not consulted. The Aaronical priesthood in a measure typifies the priesthood of Christ, as it is written; “So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, today have I begotten thee.” Heb.5:5.

And it must also be borne in mind that these high priests called from; set apart; and thus chosen to the priesthood were not only vitally related to the Israel for whom they ministered; but their ministrations were confined to this chosen people. As the high priest stood before the ark in the Holy of Holies, engraven upon the ephod borne upon his shoulders; and upon the breastplate worn over his heart were the names of the twelve tribes of Israel. Here is certainly a typical testimony of the doctrine we term Eternal Vital Unity.

But let us notice the prophecies. “Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulders; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counseller, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of

Peace.” Is.9:6. Luke testifies to this typical Israel, “For unto us is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.” Luke 2:11. The LORD declares in Ps.2:6,7 – “Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion. I will *declare the decree*; the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.” There is certainly no volunteer here, but a *decree declared* in the wisdom and power of Almighty God, by which his only begotten Son; born to that end; chosen for that purpose, was set apart; “set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.” Proverbs 8:23. Come now to the substance of those prophecies: Christ Jesus. We find in Hebrews 2:11 – “For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified *are all of one*; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren.” Here certainly is Unity: “All of one;” and it must be eternal for he that sanctifieth [Christ] is eternal, and it necessarily follows that those who are sanctified in him are eternal, as sanctified in his sanctification.

Again; “And gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body the fulness of him that filleth all in all.” Eph.1:22,23. What can be more united than the head and body; and as Christ is here declared to be the head, assuredly as the head is eternal, so also is the body eternal. Again; “I am the vine, ye are the branches.” John 15:5. Can there be anything more of vital oneness than the vine and its branches. Here Christ refers to himself as the vine, hence the branches or membership of this vine must be one with the vine; and as eternal as the vine itself.

The position assumed by the Clark and Durand following does not deny the unity of the [eternal] life, but claims that this life is communicated in some way that they find it impossible to explain, to the dead sinner; and the sinner then becomes alive unto holiness; and thus related to Christ.

Durand took a step or so in advance of the Clark party. He [Durand] held to *the form* of this unity; but denied its substance. The Clark party deny both form and substance.

It is folly to talk of an eternal, vital oneness between head and body; and of the sinner or Adam man being born of that eternal life; just as it is equally so, to talk of the human family being developed from and one with and in Adam, only as being born of Adam for to be one with and in Christ, thus personally identified in him necessarily calls for a development or birth from Christ; the seed substance of the spiritual family. Gal.3:16.

The difference between these two positions; the position of John Clark from that of the late Elder Gilbert Beebe in 1850-53; also that of Silas H. Durand, our self and others in 1886-89, is this; the Clark and Durand following, held that the natural [Adam] man became a child of God by being born of God; that through this so-called birth eternal life was communicated to the Adam sinner. Neither of these

leaders, however, explained how this was to be accomplished; a birth without a prior seed existence.

The position held by the late Elders Gilbert Beebe; Trott; Dudley and others, identical with that held by our brethren in 1886-89, was and is the *personal* life identified in Christ, is developed by a birth; in no other way could we have the testimony, “born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” John 1:13.

In the discussion of the doctrine of Election and Eternal Oneness the reader will notice a similarity; in fact it may be called one and the self-same thing as noticed previously; each is, and both are spoken of as a key to the gospel system; and as such embody the substance of the gospel testimony. I believe that the doctrine of this Unity between Christ and his people to be but another name for Election; as it embraces the church both head and body in one eternal substance; namely, here is the application of the gospel term Elect.

We find a remarkable exhibition of this vital oneness of Christ and his bride in the testimony of Jer.23:6, referring to Christ, we are told; “And this is the name whereby *he shall be called*, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.” In chapter 33:16, referring to the bride, who here takes the name of her husband, we are informed; “And this is the name wherewith *she shall be called*, the Lord our Righteousness.”

We notice also that if the Adam man or sinner were born again; and as Clark held, *entirely changed* in his nature; and as the Durand element hold, *half changed* in his nature, this would certainly develop a different order of beings; and the offspring of such, would show some superior qualities of life; instead of this the children of the most pious Old School Baptist, are frequently inveterate enemies of gospel truth; yea, more like the children of Jacob guilty of the most wicked acts, revealing the fact that they came from the same earthly head that produced Cain. The Canaanites were lineal descendants of Noah; the Moabites of Lot; the Edomites of Isaac; and the lodges; so-called churches; and other ungodly organizations today swarm with multitudes of members, children of the most pious parents. Occasionally we find as in primitive days, children of pious parentage who love the truth of the gospel, but this is not inherited from their parents; but comes from the same character of life; born not of flesh, but of God.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion I desire to make a brief summary of the subject matter of this publication noticing:

1. Attention has been carefully called to the fact; and to my understanding abundantly proven, that the Eternal, Vital Unity or Oneness of Christ and his people, is in a large measure the key that unlocks the storehouse of gospel grace, because of the three following gospel facts.

a. That the Elect in their earthly standing as partakers of flesh and blood come under the law of sin and death.

b. That in order to their redemption it was absolutely essential that there should be such a relationship between the Redeemer and redeemed, that they should be identified in his death; die in him; one with and in him in death, and one with and in him in his coming up from under the law; thus was he “delivered for our sins and raised again for our justification.” Rom.4:25.

c. This vital relationship must be eternal for in that life alone could Jesus come up from under the law; “death hath no more dominion over him;” Rom.6:9; “I am he that liveth, and was dead; and behold, I am alive forevermore;” Rev.1:18; thus he brought his people; who died in his death; and came up with and in him; “quicken together with Christ;” [Eph.2:5;] from under the law, and under its curse.

d. Hence this Eternal Vital Unity of Christ and his church unlocks the rich storehouse of gospel treasure. “And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulders; so he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open.” Isaiah 22:22.

2. While Clark bitterly opposed the doctrine of this unity, Durand *claimed* to hold it, yet Durand, like the man who was found driving the frame of the roller over the field to mash the clods, *without the roller in it*, held simply the form, without the substance, for he held to the impossible idea of an eternal head [Christ] and a mortal body [sinners of Adam’s race.]

3. We might have gotten along with the Durand element, as our fathers Beebe, Dudley, Trott, Johnson, Leachman, and others had before us, had it not been for men of the Durand, Thompson, and Chick character, who persisted in their efforts to force their views upon us; and, as noticed especially in preceding pages, compel us to give up ours, and accept theirs. This we could not do.

4. They were equally as arbitrary in their effort to force upon us their view of the spiritual birth. We must have accepted the idea of the “sinner born again” or be accused of believing the most absurd ideas; and of bringing in new things among the Baptist; all of which accusations were hurled against us during the three years of the contest.

Since the division of 1889, the great body of professed Old School Baptist have gone farther off the gospel platform. It is clear that our churches could never have reached the exalted stand, to which we hope we have by the grace of God attained, had we remained together; the division opened the way for further advancement –

Life Insurance – Labor Unionism – Woman Suffrage, with all the unrighteousness bred in these cesspools of iniquity; through an exhibition of the goodness and mercy of our God, now lie behind us.

In the preceding pages we have written plainly, not more so, however, than we think the occasion demands. We have called names when necessary, following the example of the apostles, I Tim.1:19,20; II Tim.2:17, 4:3; III John 9. We are told in Isaiah 9:16 – “For the leaders of this people cause them to err; and they that are led of them are destroyed;” that is, lose the fellowship of gospel life; and eventually like the salt that has lost its savour is “trodden under foot of men.” Mt.5:13. Thus the element under the leadership of Clark, Booten, Lauck in 1852-53 have gone rapidly toward New Schoolism; and there is but the same downward path before those who follow the leadership of the Durand elements.

When divisions take place among us; as when individuals are excluded from our membership, we do not consider the question of whether or not such characters are children of God; in that sense we are not to judge, but the question is whether or not one’s life meets the order required for church membership; or whether certain party or parties in church contests hold to the doctrine and order, as it is written; “Ye shall know them by their fruits.” [Mt.7:16] And in regard to the leaders in such contests we have the Divine command: “Now I beseech you brethren, *mark them which cause divisions and offenses, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.*” Rom.16:17.

We believe that many of those opposing us were children of grace. We have held sweet intercourse with them in days that are passed; “took sweet counsel together; and walked unto the house of God in company.” Ps.55:14. In fact, subjects of grace are found sometimes in the Babylonish organizations around us; if such were not, there would be no force in the command: “Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.” Rev.18:4.

Referring to contests among our people of the nature that we are describing, the late Elder R.C. Leachman pertinently remarks:

“This opposition will not always come from the open enemies of truth, but perhaps more frequently from its professed friends. This makes it harder to bear, and more difficult to deal with. We do not like to impute evil motives to those we have been accustomed to regard as brethren; nor do we like suddenly to discard them as enemies to the truth. We cannot convince them that they are in error; no matter how clear it may be that they are; and an attempt to do so will probably only excite their anger and make them our enemies. Whatever may be the consequences to either friend or foe, the faithful minister has no right to consider them, or to swerve one hair’s breath from what he feels called upon to contend for, for fear of

some unpleasant consequences.” [Reminiscences of the Baptist of Virginia, page 37.]

Elder Leachman’s testimony upon this subject clearly describes my own experience.

While *apparently* a large majority of the Old School Baptist in this contest were really ignorant of its underlying causes; failing to understand the doctrine and order involved; and entirely indifferent regarding the matter; many going in the wrong direction because that was the popular side; blinded by the misrepresentations and actual falsehoods busily circulated by the self-appointed leaders engaged in the effort to undermine and destroy the foundation so ably laid, [I Cor.3:10-14,] by the devoted and faithful ministers who had fallen asleep; substituting the “wood, hay, and stubble,” which they were preaching; some in the East seemed to hesitate to hear me, I think because I was, I suppose they considered but a stripling in age compared to those opposing us, yet they might have considered that a stripling of 40 years, was not such a stripling after all. This view of the matter came to me when upon my invitation, the late Elder R.M. Thomas of Missouri visited the Corresponding Meeting during this contest, his preaching was well received; even William L. Beebe, under whose Editorial management the Signs of the Times was drifting from its moorings, gave Elder Thomas the hand of fellowship. I was sitting by Elder Thomas when Elder Beebe endorsed his preaching; and I remarked to Elder Beebe, that I wished “he would preach that way himself.” Elihu said, “I am young, and ye are very old ... great men are not always wise; neither do the aged understand judgment.” Job 32:6-9. Elder Thomas preached ably what we all held, and while they received it from him; they called it a new doctrine when preached by some of us who were younger.

In the same line of testimony from Elder Leachman, previously quoted from the Declaration of the Virginia Corresponding Meeting at their organization, October 1836, regarding their withdrawal from the Columbia Association, because that [Columbia] Association had gone off with the Missionary system into New Schoolism.

“We in thus withdrawing our fellowship from you, do not believe that we leave no christians behind; but we do believe it to be our duty to separate from such, so far as they depart from the word of God, leaving them in the hands of God to reclaim them from their errors in his own good time and way. At the same time we would warn such of the chastening rod which awaits them, if they will, with the light of God’s word before them, thus continue to sanction the placing of the devices of men on a footing with the institutions of the gospel.” [Reminiscences of the Baptist of Virginia, page 22.]

The term Christian used here evidently meant subject of grace; the term Christian [Acts 11:26,] means a follower of Christ; and those parties going off into

Sunday Schools, protracted meetings, mission systems &c., could certainly not be called Christians; but properly anti-christians, I John 2:22.

There are members now living in Virginia, who remember that on the Friday morning August 16, 1889, I made a similar declaration to those from whom we were withdrawing, to that just quoted from the Corresponding Meeting of October, 1839; my statement was howled down by our opponents in an effort to divide our ranks; disrupt and destroy our churches.

It was thus that, through the efforts of Durand, Eubanks, and others, the Eastern Associations opened correspondence, as noticed previously, with the so-called Mt. Pleasant Association of Kentucky, an organization of excluded and disaffected parties in Kentucky, used by Durand and Eubanks to bring the matter East; together with a Council of their own devising, and of the same character of membership, as the self-styled Mt. Pleasant, held in the bounds of the Licking Association of Ky., April 26, 1889, Durand and Eubanks directing. The Council held in the midst of a cluster of orderly churches, not one of which was represented; and not a single western preacher present, except the excluded John Weaver, a puppet of Durand. Eubanks was appointed their messenger, Durand not appointed, but left free to engineer their recognition at his own Association. This was in April 1889, just in time for the purpose; one month following in May 1889, at the Delaware River Association, John Weaver being present according to orders, the Delaware River opened correspondence with this aforesaid Mt. Pleasant; and started the Durand and Eubanks Licking on the way to recognition next year, when we find this Licking recognized in full fellowship with J.G. Eubanks as its messenger at the Virginia, Corresponding Meeting, August 1890; he [Eubanks,] with the other preachers present recommending the Circular of that year maintaining that the Adam sinner becomes a child of God, *by exercising faith in Christ Jesus*; and gravely declaring that this was what the Corresponding Meeting *had ever held*; yea, more, what had ever been held by such men as Trott, Gilbert Beebe; Leachman; Dudley; Johnson; Patman and others. Shades of the departed fathers, what irony! Confusion, worse confounded!

As stated in preceding paragraphs, I had intimate acquaintance with the ministers on both sides of the 1886-89 contest; especially those on our side; and know that our position was on the defensive; to let the other party do the work; show their colors; and go "out from us, but they were not of us," I John 2:18,19. It is true that in the Licking Association there were two overzealous preachers: I.R. Greathouse; and the late Elder J.H. Wallingford who became obsessed of a zeal without knowledge, [Rom.10:2,] Wallingford especially being provoked by preachers opposing his views, pushing themselves into and meddling with the churches of his care. Our brethren held these man back; and they were both finally excluded for disorderly walk, Wallingford dying out of church fellowship; and

Greathouse joining and becoming a prominent minister and writer in the periodicals, and for the Means Baptists; among the very people whom he had denounced; and against whom he had fought with fleshly zeal.

It is true that we are few in numbers, but the promise is to the little flock; and we are informed in Proverbs 15:16,17, “Better is little with the fear of the Lord, than great treasure and trouble therewith. Better is a dinner of herbs where love is, than a stalled ox and hatred therewith.”

It is better to be in a small company with peace and harmony, than a multitude with strife and confusion. In the Declaration of withdrawal adopted by the Virginia Corresponding Meeting organized at Oak Grove with the Occoquan Church, October 1836, the old fathers in that organization declared that they followed principles, not man; and I am sure that those who were brought through the fiery scenes; the flames of the conflict of 1886-89, could truthfully proclaim the same sentiments; while I am equally sure, that the multitudes who were led off by the Durand following in that contest were more careful to follow men without regard to principles. The apostle commands: “Be ye followers of me, *even as I also am of Christ;*” I Cor.11:1; that is, we follow the minister only as he follows the testimony and teachings of Christ.

We can well quote in this conclusion the testimony of David, which seems to bear directly upon contests of this character. The “strange children” to which reference is here made are characters of the nature that continually afflict the church; members who seem strangers to its doctrine and order.

“Blessed be the Lord my strength, which teacheth my hands to war, and my fingers to fight ... Send thine hand from above; rid me, and deliver me out of great waters, from the hand of strange children; whose mouth speaketh vanity, and their right hand is a right hand of falsehood ... Rid me, and deliver me from the hand of strange children, whose mouth speaketh vanity, and their right hand is a right hand of falsehood; that our sons may be as plants grown up in their youth; that our daughters may be as corner-stones, polished after the similitude of a palace; that our garners may be full, affording all manner of store; that our sheep may bring forth thousands and ten thousands in our streets; that our oxen may be strong to labor; that there be no breaking in, nor going out; that there be no complaining in our streets. Happy is that people, that is in such a case; yea, happy is that people, whose God is the Lord.” Ps.144:1,7-8,11-15.

Well indeed might we conclude here, but let us lay under this forcible testimony the broad foundation recorded in Isaiah 7:25 – “And on all hills that shall be digged with the mattock, there shall not come thither the fear of briers and thorns; but it shall be for the sending forth of oxen, and for the treading of lesser cattle.”

APPENDIX

PREFACE TO APPENDIX

There are some articles that I desire to see preserved among our brethren, and I know of no better way than to append them to this publication; as well as a few additional facts coming under my observation since the preparation of the main body of this work.

First and foremost in these articles for preservation readily stands the Circular on the Christian Warfare by the late Elder Thomas P. Dudley, regarded as by far one of the clearest articles ever written upon that subject, and having the hearty endorsement of the Baptist Fathers of that day, including such men as Beebe, Trott, Leachman, Johnson and others.

In the Biography of Elder Thomas P. Dudley, by the late Elder J.T. Moore, page 85, we are informed that Elder Dudley was appointed to write the Circular of the Licking Association for 1846. He had prepared this Circular “on the origin, nature, and effects of the Christian warfare,” but finding that some of the members of the Association were not prepared to accept its teachings, he withdrew it. In 1847, the Committee on the Circular Letter, could not accept one written, perhaps by an Elder Gossett, Elder G. Beebe who was present when the report of the Committee was under discussion, having read, and fully endorsed the Circular on the Warfare, suggested its adoption instead of the one prepared by Gossett. When the Circular was read, however, some “two or three members suggested their inability to concur in all of its teachings, but said that if the Association thought proper to endorse it, they would go with the majority. Elder Dudley immediately arose and said, “I have no misgivings as to the truth taught in the Circular, but I would not intentionally be the means of embarrassing the minds of the brethren, consequently I object to the Circular being received.” [Biography of Elder Dudley, pg.88.] But before a year had passed such gross misrepresentations of the teachings of this Circular were circulated, by bitter opponents that Elder Dudley had a thousand copies printed at his own expense that brethren might examine it, and compare it with Scripture testimony. I have a copy of this original publication in my office. In later years, however, Elder Dudley lived to see the adoption of the Circular by the Licking Association with unanimity.

CIRCULAR ON THE CHRISTIAN WARFARE.

To the Churches composing the Licking Association of Particular Baptist; their Messengers wish grace, mercy and peace multiplied.

DEARLY BELOVED; It occurs to us that we could not select a more appropriate subject, because none possesses more intrinsic merit, for our present annual address, that the ORIGIN, NATURE, and EFFECTS of that warfare which so painfully disturbs the peace and quiet of the Children of the Regeneration.

It is confidently believed that much embarrassment and many doubts and fears with regard to their interest in a Saviour's shed blood, have resulted from misconception of this important subject. How often does the troubled saint exclaim;

“If I love, why am I thus?
Why this dull and lifeless frame?
Hardly sure can they be worse,
Who have never heard his name.”

That the warfare, invariably follows regeneration, or being “born again,” is not, we believe, controverted by any experimental Christian. But whilst some of us maintain, that the warfare results from a conflict of elements within; others, and perhaps the larger number contend, that in regeneration, the man is changed from the love of sin to the love of holiness.

We inquire, by what power is the supposed change affected? The answer is, by the Spirit of God. Moses informs us, “He is the Rock, his work is perfect.” Deut.32:4. Now we ask, if indeed, in regeneration, the man is changed from the love of sin to the love of holiness, and this change is perfect, does it not necessarily follow, that he will be as wholly and entirely devoted to holiness subsequently, as he had been to sin antecedently to regeneration? If, as is contended by many, the enmity of the heart is slain in regeneration, whence arises opposition to the dispensations of God's providence? Irreconciliation to his will? And whence the exclamation, “O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?” Rom.7:24. That the Christian is a compound being, is a truth so fully taught in his history; as given in the holy Scriptures, that we wonder it should be controverted by any who have tasted that “the LORD is gracious.”

“But though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day.” II Cor.4:16. “For I delight in the law of God, after the inward man.” Rom.7:22. “Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him.” Col.3:9,10. “Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature.” II Cor.5:17. “For in Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.” Gal.6:15.

Whence these various distinctions between the old and new man, if indeed there are not two men? If man is only changed in regeneration? If the language that “man is changed” were appropriate, there would be but one man; his feelings and affections having been changed; there would be no conflict and hence no warfare! We presume that none will contend that the old is the new man, or the new is the old man. This would be to confound language and make it unintelligible.

We affectionately ask brethren to consider that the matter of making christians, is no where, in the Scriptures represented as Reformation, but as a Creation. Hence it is said, “But be you glad and rejoice forever in that which I create; for, behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy. And I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people; and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying ... for they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them.” Isaiah 65:18,19, 23. None, we presume, will deny, that the last quotation has exclusive reference to Gal.4:26 – “But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all.”

“But now, thus saith the LORD that created thee, O Jacob, and he that formed thee, O Israel. Fear not; for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name; thou art mine ... Fear not; for I am with thee, I will bring thy seed from the east, and gather thee from the west; I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back; bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth; even everyone that is called by my name; for I have created him for my glory, I have formed him; yea, I have made him.” Isaiah 43:1,5-7. “How long wilt thou go about, O thou backsliding daughter? For the Lord hath created a new thing in the earth; a woman shall compass a man.” Jer.31:22. “For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.” Eph.2:10. “Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me.” Ps.51:10.

But why need we multiply proofs on the point, when they are set forth so palpably in the Scriptures, and realized in the Christian experience?

The Bible furnishes the following history of the natural family. “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.” Gen.1:27. “And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.” Gen.2:7. “Man and female created he them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created.” Gen.5:2. Hence we learn that all “living souls,” were created in, and simultaneously with their natural progenitor.

They all descend from him by ordinary or natural generation. They necessarily partake of his nature, and subsist upon the same elements upon which he subsisted. The breath of life communicated to man, whence he became a “living soul,”

constituted him a rational, intelligent, responsible being, the subject of law and of earthly enjoyments, capable of subsisting upon the products of the earth; but incapable of other and higher enjoyments.

Deprive him of the soul, mind, or rational faculties; and what would distinguish him from the brute? Deprive him of life, and he would be like other dead matter. In the absence of soul, or body, he would have been incapable of filling up his destiny upon earth.

It is said in the Scriptures, “And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden, to dress it, and to keep it. And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die. [The life which Adam had, could be forfeited by transgression.] And the Lord God said, it is not good that man should be alone; I will make him a help meet for him.” “And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept; and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof. And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto him. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh.” Gen.2:15-18, 21-24.

Now, we ask, if the woman had been different in nature and disposition, if she had been incapable of earthly enjoyments, of subsisting upon earthly productions, of breathing a natural atmosphere; in a word, had her susceptibilities been entirely different from Adam’s, would she have been an “help meet” for Adam? But she was part of him, possessed the same nature, and was, consequently, an “help meet.” Here too, we see the declaration, “male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam,” carried out.

And unto Adam he said: “Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying: Thou shalt not eat of it; cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return. And Adam called his wife’s name Eve; because she was the mother of all living.” Gen.3:17-20. Did God address a rational, intelligent being in the foregoing quotation, and was he capable of realizing the curse pronounced? The characteristics of this family are strikingly marked in the Scriptures – “And Adam lived a hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his own image; and called his name Seth.” Gen.5:3. “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.” Ps.51:5. “The wicked are estranged from the

womb; they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies.” Ps.58:3. “Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” Rom.5:12.

From the preceding verses and arguments it is manifest that the family of the “first Adam” is not capable of rendering acceptable service to God, but the antagonist nature and principle of the two families [the natural and the spiritual,] out of which grows the warfare, are made still more manifest by the contrast introduced by an Apostle. And so it is written: “The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterwards that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.” I Cor.15:45-50.

Is it not evident then, that all “living souls” were created in and simultaneously with the “first man Adam,” that they all, being born of him, necessarily partake of his nature, “and he called their name Adam?” And that all “quickened spirits” were created in and simultaneously with the “last Adam” – that they all, being born of him, “born of God,” as necessarily partake of his nature? That all living souls no more necessarily descend from the first Adam than all quickened spirits necessarily descend from the last Adam; that the seed of the “first Adam” disclose his nature, and the seed of the “last Adam” make manifest his nature.

The children of the “first Adam” are born of the flesh and are earthly in all their feelings and affections; the children of the “last Adam” are born of the Spirit and are necessarily heavenly or spiritual in their feelings and affections. The children of the first are born for earth; of the last Adam, are born for heaven. Those of the “first” are born of corruptible; those of the “last Adam” are of incorruptible seed. The first necessarily partake of human; the last, of the divine nature. The antagonistic principles attached to the two men necessarily result in the warfare. If all living souls were not vitally united to the first Adam, how could they be so directly and fatally effected by the first transgression? How could the original act of transgression be considered their act? “And so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” “There is none righteous, no not one.” Rom.3:10.

If all quickened spirits were not vitally united to the “last Adam,” how could his mediatorial work effect them in their deliverance from the wrath to come? “This is his name whereby he shall be called, The LORD our righteousness.” Jer.23:6. The transgression of the “first man Adam” involved all his family in guilt and ruin. The mediatorial work of the “last Adam” met all the claims of the law and satisfied

divine justice in behalf of the chosen seed. But as the transgression of the “first Adam” did not disqualify his family for heaven, neither did the obedience and death of the “last Adam” impart to his chosen seed a qualification for the enjoyment of heaven.

The earth being the natural abode of the “first Adam’s” family, they are necessarily born of the flesh in order to its enjoyment; heaven being the ultimate abode of saints, they are as necessarily born of the Spirit in order to its enjoyments. “Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” John 3:5. Here we are presented with two distinct births of two distinct elements, which necessarily produce two distinct beings. The first, of the flesh, producing beings incapable; the second, of the Spirit, producing beings capable of entering into the kingdom of God. The first producing simple; the second compound beings. The first having but one; the second two natures. Of those born of the flesh, it is said, “Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.” Of those born of the Spirit, “But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now, if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.” Rom.8:7-9. “All men have not faith.” “But without faith it is impossible to please him.” Faith is a “fruit of the Spirit” – “the gift of God,” to the “new creature.”

The development of the natural family has been progressing for near six thousand years, and yet the last one born, like the first, gives proof, demonstrable proof of the source whence he sprang. The spiritual family has been developing with and since the days of Abel, and each one “born of the Spirit” gives evidence of the source whence he sprang. “I delight in the law of God after the inward man.” No contingency can prevent the entire development of each, the natural and spiritual family; and we are warranted to believe that the last one who shall be developed of each shall be like the first of that family, whence he sprang.

The sturdy oak of the forest, with all its roots, its huge trunk, every limb, every twig, yea, and every leaf, which has been, is now being and shall be developed, were once enclosed in a small acorn, whence they all sprang, all are of the same nature, each a part of the whole. Had not the acorn been providentially committed to the ground whence it underwent decomposition and germination, there had been no development; so with the corn of wheat. “Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit. He that loveth his life [his natural life] shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world, shall keep it unto life eternal.” John 12:24,25. Adam the first, could no more produce a spiritual being, than the “thorn” could produce grapes; or the “thistle” figs.

We learn from the Scriptures that the husband [Christ] was composed of two whole and distinct natures; divine and human. The human composed no part of the divine; nor yet, did the divine compose any part of his human nature. Now examine the figure; if the bride is not composed of two whole and distinct natures, or if the human composes any part of the divine, or the divine composes any part of the human nature in her, can she be “an help meet for him?” Unless she partake of the same distinct natures, can she enjoy him, or he her, in this world; or in that which is to come? But we find the “two men” sustained upon radically different elements. The earth which is the mother of the “old” now, as formerly, feeds the “old man.” The “new” is fed upon that “bread which cometh down from heaven.”

“If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world ... Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.” John 6:51, 53.

The creation and development of those destined to inhabit both the natural and spiritual world, are distinct propositions. Hence the Psalmist, personating Christ, says: “My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth; thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them.” Ps.139:15, 16. “For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.” Eph.5:30.

Creation was instantaneous. Formation is progressive. Though we were created simultaneously with and lay dormant in the “first Adam,” for thousands of years, yet the time arrived, the purpose of God is carried out, and we were born of the flesh, elemented alone for a natural state of being, susceptible alone, of fleshly enjoyments, adapted to a natural world, capable alone of being sustained upon earthly food, and possessed alone of natural life; all of this family, “bear the image of the earthly Adam.” This includes Adam the first and all his natural seed. “And he called their name Adam.” We should not forget that Adam the first, is said to be “the figure of him that was to come.”

What then, do we learn from the figure? That the bride, and all the spiritual children were created in and simultaneously with “the last Adam.” That, they are of the same nature with him, and being born “of the Spirit,” they are possessed of eternal life, which qualifies them for a knowledge of “the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.” John 17:3. Antecedently to this birth, and the imparting to them, this life [which it is the province of their spiritual Father to impart, John 17:2,] they are entirely ignorant of the “true God,” and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent. “The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God.” “No man can say that Jesus is Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.” I Cor.12:3.

Although all the spiritual seed were chosen in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world, and had “Grace given them in Christ Jesus before the

world began,” and were “sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ,” though they were hidden in their spiritual father as the first Adam’s children, the time comes when they are born of the Spirit, when the “hidden ones,” are made known to each other. When their hearts being fashioned alike, the “Sun of Righteousness,” shines in their hearts, “to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.” II Cor.4:6.

As the light of the sun, the great luminary of day, shines upon the sons and daughters of the natural world, so the “sun of righteousness” affords light to the spiritual world. “I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, keep not back; bring my sons from afar, and my daughters from the ends of the Earth; even every one that is called by my name; for I have created him for my glory, I have formed him; yea, I have made him.” Isaiah 43:6,7. Here again, we see the figure carried out. All the family of the “first Adam,” created in him, are called by his name, “and called their name Adam,” all the spiritual family of the “last Adam,” are called by his name, “Even every one that is called by my name.”

Here we have two distinct families, propagated by two distinct heads; each deriving the nature of his progenitor, and each looking to his appropriate elements for sustenance. The first – mortal beings, sustained upon corrupted elements. The second – immortal, sustained upon uncorrupted elements. The first, earthly; the second, heavenly beings. We ask, is not the “old man” sustained upon the same identical elements, subsequently upon which he was fed and sustained, antecedently to regeneration? Can those elements sustain the “new man”? Do we not partake of earthly food, until our soul is satisfied, without imparting a particle of nourishment to the “new man?” Does not the “new man,” “setting under the droppings of the sanctuary,” feed sumptuously upon the provision of the gospel, without imparting a particle of food to the “old man?” “Feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.” Acts 20:28. “Feed my lambs, feed my sheep.”

Being “born of the flesh,” we are born into a natural state of consciousness, capable of investigating natural subjects, of participating in natural enjoyments, sustained upon natural elements, so long as we retain, and until we yield up that natural life, which we received in our natural head, “Adam the first.” Being “born of the Spirit,” “born of God,” we are made partakers of the divine nature, are susceptible of spiritual instruction, of investigating spiritual subjects, participating in spiritual enjoyments, sustained upon spiritual elements; nor can the being thus born, cease to be. “I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish.” John 10:28. “Because I live, ye shall live also.” John 14:19. “When Christ, who is our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory.” Col.3:4. Hence we see, that the death of the “old man,” cannot destroy the life of the “new man.”

The law was violated, and the curse incurred by man in the flesh. The law was magnified and made honorable, and the curse removed from his chosen seed [who sinned in their Adamic, or natural relation] by “God manifest in the flesh.” “For as much as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death; that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham.” Heb.2:14-16. The whole humanity of the Lord Jesus, both soul and body, was involved in that deliverance; because the whole “old man” both soul and body, was involved in transgression. “When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands.” Isaiah 53:10. “Now is my soul troubled.” “My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death.” “Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye are healed.” I Peter 2:24.

We have said, Christians are compound beings; by which we mean, there are “two men” – two whole and distinct natures, inhabiting the same tenement. The “old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts,” whose genealogy, we trace back to the “first Adam,” who “was made a living soul,” and who discloses the corrupt nature of the fountain from whence he sprang.

Adam “began a son in his own likeness; after his image” – an enemy to holiness – a hater of God. The “new man,” which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness,” and who exemplifies the declaration; “If the root be holy, so are the branches.” “And they shall call them, the Holy People; the redeemed of the Lord; and thou shalt be called, Sought out, A city not forsaken.” Isaiah 62:12. “Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.” I John 3:2.

Will he appear with two whole and distinct natures? If he shall so appear, shall we be like him, unless we too, have two whole and distinct natures? Hence it is seen, that the two men derive their nature and disposition, from two distinct sources. Each has a life peculiar to himself, yet common to his species. The first, natural – the second, spiritual life. The first is a corporeal – the second, an incorporeal being. The first, an earthly – the second, an heavenly being. “As is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly.” “As he is, so are we in this world.”

Nothing pure or holy, is attached to the “old man.” “But even their mind and conscience is defiled.” Titus 1:15. Nothing impure or unholy is attached to the “new man” – “Unto the pure, all things are pure.” Titus 1:15. “Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.” Mt.5:8. It is contended by some, yea, many professors of religion, that the soul is regenerated. We confess we know but little

about the soul. But we inquire, what is it, that renders man a rational, intelligent, responsible being? What is it, that exercises volition for the body? "When lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." James 1:15. "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart." Gen.6:5,6. If the soul were regenerated, would it not be as wholly devoted to God, subsequently, as it had been to sin, antecedently to regeneration? If it be the soul that exercises volition for the body, and that soul is "born of God," and consequently "cannot sin," how are we to account for the wicked actions of David, of Peter, and thousands of other christians, even down to the present day?

But, it is contended, that the same soul, exercises wicked volition for the "old," and holy volition for the "new man?" If so, is not the soul divided against itself? Others tell us, it is the mind which exercises volition for the body. We have heretofore proven that "their mind and conscience is defiled." But we are asked, when, and how, are the "old" and the "new man," to be united; and how will they appear hereafter? We answer, "Now we see through a glass darkly," but when we shall learn how the soul and body of the "Redeemer," "Husband," "Friend," now appears; and how they are gloriously united to his divinity, then, and not till then, may we undertake to say more in regard to the future state of the soul and body, and the "new man," composing the "Bride, the Lambs wife."

It is sufficient for the present, for her to know, that "when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." I John 3:2. Until which event shall roll on, the wise man describes her thus, "What will ye see in the Shulamite? As it were the company of two armies." Song.6:13. It is vain to tell us, that the flesh, independently of an intelligent principle, call it soul, mind, or what you may; will rebel against God.

Some brethren, conclude that the warfare is to be explained, by "mind and matter." Have they forgotten that it requires both, to constitute an intelligent responsible being? We have shown that "even their mind and conscience is defiled." That "the carnal mind is enmity against God." Matter would be incapable of vice or virtue, in the absence of mind!

Nor are those more successful, who attempt to explain the warfare, by the different colors blended in the rainbow. Have they forgotten that those colors harmonize, and that it is the entire want of harmony between the "old and new man" which necessarily produces the warfare? Have they forgotten the declaration, "For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world?" I John 2:16. If the "old man" is "born of God" he cannot sin, and there would be no warfare. But is this true? Let

the christian experience answer: “For that which I do, I allow not; for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I.” Rom.7:15.

In conclusion, we submit to your serious and prayerful consideration, the foregoing pages, hoping that God may bless us with an understanding of the truth; and dispose us to reduce it into practice, that he may guide us with his counsel and afterwards receive us to glory, is our prayer for the Redeemer’s sake. AMEN.

Next to the Circular on the Warfare, and equal to it in importance as bearing upon the doctrine discussed in these testimonies, is an article by the late Elder J.F. Johnson, published originally in the Signs of the Times, and later published in the volume of his writings, page 298. [*A Compilation of J.F. Johnson’s Writings*, 1876.]

In I Tim.5:17, it is written: “Let the elders that rule well, be counted worthy of double honour, *especially they who labour in the word and doctrine.*” The Elders from whose writings we are quoting in proof of the Testimony maintained in this publication; such men as Gilbert Beebe; Thomas Dudley; J.F. Johnson; Robert Leachman; Samuel Trott and others, were Elders of the character named by the apostle; and according to our acquaintance with them well worthy of the “double honour,” referred to.

The following is the communication of Elder Johnson:

PARTAKERS OF FLESH AND BLOOD.

“Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same.” [Heb.2:14]

This text, together with its connection, presents to our view some of the most important things pertaining to the salvation of poor, lost sinners. Jesus is exhibited as the great High Priest and Apostle of our profession, seated at the right hand of the Majesty on High, angels and authorities being made subject to him, there to reign without a rival, until his enemies be made his footstool, or, until all those enemies be put under his feet, the last one of which is death. From that highly exalted position, or from heaven, God has spoken to us by him, and therefore, the apostle says we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip, or pass without due attention; because much of the comfort and assurance of the saints depends upon a careful and earnest heed of those matters; and not only that, but neglect of those important matters is wrong, and certain to bring upon us, who neglect so great salvation, the Lord’s chastising rod, from which there is no escape.

He then shows the dignified station in which man was placed in his first creation. Being made a little lower than the angels, he was set over the works of

God's hands, having all things put under him. "But [continues the apostle] now we see not yet all things put under him." So signally has he fallen from the exalted position he occupied and the rule he exercised over the beast of the earth, the fowls of the air, and the fishes of the sea, that he is made to shudder at the approach of many of them, who are permitted to tear him to pieces, or otherwise destroy him. "But [adds the apostle] we see Jesus who was made a little lower than the angels [precisely where man was placed] for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he, by the grace of God, should taste death for every man." Yes, he was [in the past tense] made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, but that suffering ended on Calvary, and therefore, "Death hath no more dominion over him." But, we see him [now in the present tense] crowned with glory and honor, that he, by the grace of God [not by suffering,] should [in the future tense] taste death for every man. So that when Arminians attempt to quote this text, "He *tasted* [in the past tense] death for every man," they pervert the language of the Scriptures by using the past instead of the present tense. This death is to be tasted "by the grace of God," and alludes, in my humble opinion, not to his suffering on the cross, but to the presence of Jesus by his grace in the hour of the death of his brethren, to thus taste or take away its sting, and finally, to not only taste, but swallow it up in victory, or totally destroy it so far as his brethren are concerned; and the brotherhood consists of; Both he that sanctifieth [setteth apart] and they who are sanctified [or set apart] who are all of One [Father,] for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren.

In this connection then, the holy writer alludes particularly and exclusively to Jesus and his brethren, those "many sons," which he engaged to bring to glory by the great and important work of salvation which he accomplished by taking part of the same flesh and blood of which they are partakers. In the next verse preceding the text, he says. "Behold, I and the children which God hath given me." Here is portrayed a close and endearing tie of kindred relationship, or vital unity, and that relation based upon a sameness of parentage, for they are all of one Father. Christ is "The only begotten Son of God," and the younger brethren have their sonship in him, and are thus the children of God, as the children of Isaac were the children of Abraham. This sonship is a spiritual relationship, for they are all "Born of God," and "God is a Spirit;" and these "Holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling," that Paul addresses "are built up a spiritual house to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." But as these children have a fleshly as well as a spiritual relationship, it was necessary that he should "be made like unto his brethren," sustain a like relationship, in order to bring those "many sons unto glory." "*Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same.*"

My sister wishes to know; “When the children were partakers of flesh and blood, was it in their natural or spiritual birth?” Had she asked when the children *are* partakers, the question would seem to me more in accordance with the text, for the apostle does not use the word *were*, referring to the past, but *are*, the plural of the present tense of the verb to be. This expression, then, cannot refer to the children as having partaken of flesh and blood originally, but in Paul’s day it had reference to the then present time, and is to be so used in all time. Had he referred to the past by using the word *were*, we might, with some show of propriety, conclude that the children partook of flesh and blood in Adam, as some suppose; but I should then be puzzled to know what children they were that thus partook in that relation.

The Saviour says: “That which is born of the flesh is flesh,” and I suppose he meant what he said. If he did, he did not allude only to the fleshly fibers that cover our corporeal frames, but to all that is born of the flesh. In our natural birth then, according to Christ’s definition, we are wholly and totally flesh, although all the component parts of the fleshly man, such as blood, bones, muscles, sinews, mind, soul, spirit, &c., make up his composition; yet the Lord includes all in the general term flesh, for all these are born of the flesh, and as before observed, “Which is born of the flesh is flesh,” and Paul says, “The children of the flesh, these are not the children of God.” Again, if they are flesh, as Christ says, what would such a partaking be, but flesh? And what more would the child be after such a participation than a fleshly one? What advantage would accrue to that child by such a partaking? What comfort could he draw from such an idea? Can we claim, by our natural birth, any vital relationship to any but a natural father or his natural offspring? On what would rest our hope of immortality beyond the grave? Is not that hope based upon a vital and indissoluble unity with Christ, that we are partakers of the divine nature as well as the fleshly one? Convince me that there are no children to partake of flesh and blood, but the natural ones in the natural birth, and then my hope of a glorious resurrection, and succeeding consummate bliss beyond the grave’s dreary dominion, will be paralyzed forever. Now, if the children of the flesh are not the children of God, as Paul says, where shall we go to find them delineated? I shall go first to John 1:13, for there he tells us of those “Which were born, not of blood, nor the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God;” and I conclude that those who are born of God are the children of God. Am I not right in this conclusion? Next let us go to John 3:6, “That which is born of the Spirit is spirit.” Are not those who are born of the flesh the children of the flesh? And are the children of the flesh the children of God? Paul says not. Are not the children of the Spirit, or those who are born of the Spirit, the children of God? I know of no spirit they are born of, but God; for “God is a Spirit,” and conclude, that they are the children of God. Let us next go to I Peter 1:23, “Being

born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.” Is not that incorruptible seed Christ? And is he not God? Yea, “The true God and eternal life.” Hear him, “Yet I am the Lord thy God from the land of Egypt, and thou shalt have no God but me; for there is no Saviour besides me.” Hosea 13:4. Is not the conclusion inevitable, then, that those who are “born of God,” “Born of the Spirit,” “Born of incorruptible seed,” are the children of God.

Is not the conclusion inevitable, then, that those who are “Born of God.” “Born of incorruptible seed,” are the children of God, and that when one of those children are thus born, that child is a partaker of flesh and blood, or, takes its residence in a body of flesh as did the Saviour? Let us see whether this conclusion is corroborated by the plain language of the text; for that should always govern us in forming our opinions. “*He also Himself Likewise* took part of the same.” This little adverb also, signifies, “in the same manner,” and likewise, “in like manner.” Now, if we can ascertain the manner in which he partook of flesh and blood, we may rest assured that it is “in the same manner” – “in like manner” that his children partake of it. When he partook of flesh and blood, he “came down from heaven,” when a body was prepared him, which served as a temple for him to dwell in. John 2:19-21. John saw his children, “the Holy City, new Jerusalem, [in like manner] coming down from God out of heaven.” Rev.21:2. And Paul says, “What! Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God?” See I Cor.3:16 & 6:19. Moreover, he is not of the world, “in like manner,” his children are not of the world. John 15:19 & 17:16. Then, the manner in which Christ partook of flesh and blood, was to come down from heaven, and therefore, is not of the world, but dwelt in a temple of flesh and blood. “In like manner,” or “in the same manner,” his children came down from God out of heaven [being born from above,] are not of the world, but dwell in a body of flesh and blood.

We anticipate something beyond death; still, we have nothing originating in our natural birth for that hope to rest upon. But when the child that is born of the Spirit, and which “is spirit,” is sent to take his residence in the body, and thus partake of flesh and blood, it brings the evidence of our “Adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body;” and we are then permitted to lawfully claim God as our Father, and have a testimonial of a free passport through the valley of the shadow of death, and onward to the glorious dawn of the morning of the resurrection; and a legal title to all the bliss and brilliant glory of that bright eternal day.

Thus the question is solved how the children of the flesh can be put among the children that are born of God, for it is by the law of adoption that they are legally entitled to the inheritance of a spiritual patrimony, and have Paul’s assurance that, “If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised

up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.” When that auspicious day arrives;

“The trump of God shall rend the rocks,
And open adamantine locks;
Call forth the dead from death’s dark dome,
And Jesus take his ransom’d home.”

This will be the consummation of the most stupendous scene of condescension that ever was transacted upon this globe, the most amazing stoop of humility that mortals can contemplate upon. Wonderful exhibition of inimitable love! Inconceivable display of benign favor! The Son of God, though immaculate, bathed in sweat, blood, tears and overwhelmed with sufferings. “Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered. And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him.” In order to accomplish this transcendently glorious work, he must be a partaker of flesh and blood, for “it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest, for the sins of his people.”

And think of the majesty of him who put on this robe of flesh to complete this work of eternal salvation for poor, lost, rebellious sinners! Think of the exceeding, surpassing glory that so brilliantly adorned him before the world was, and then think of his dressing himself in a robe of suffering flesh and blood, like the brethren! Think! O, brethren! Think of his dignity, his sublime parentage, think of Him, “Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.” What unspeakable joy, what an earnest of unutterable glory it affords us to have an evidence by the Spirit of adoption that God our heavenly Father has “predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the Beloved.” But, although we have received the Spirit of adoption to evince the legal initiation of the natural or fleshly child into the spiritual family, according to the law of adoption, like Paul, and all his brethren who have received the first fruits of the Spirit, we must wait for the complete and consummate adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body, and groan within ourselves until our change comes; then shall we realize more fully the sublime mystery and great utility that Christ should take part of the same flesh and blood of which his children are partakers, “That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.” “Then shall we be satisfied when we awake with his likeness, when we behold his face in righteousness.” Then, and not till

then, shall we see him as he is, and be like him and enter into the full possession of the inheritance of the saints in light.

We copy the following Editorial from the Sectarian of August, 1920.

THE SPIRITUAL BIRTH.

As stated in our July issue, while at the University of Virginia, during our recent Western visit, we had the opportunity with the assistance of a good Greek scholar of examining in the University Library, a New Testament, written in the original Greek text.

A careful examination was made of the texts John 3:3; I Peter 1:23; and we found that the word *again* was an improper translation from the original Greek text in both testimonials. In the contests upon this subject of former and later years, our opponents have continually harped upon the word *again*, contending that it presupposed a previous birth in the one and self-same character. No one put this more clearly than the late John Clark; in the contest with Beebe, Trott, and others, Clark said:

“Christ so taught Nicodemus, when he said, ‘Except a man be born again.’ Now to be a man he must have been born once – which is of the flesh – and this is to be born the second time, or again; and it is the *same man*, that was born the first time, that is born the second time.” [Clark’s Exposures, pg.44.]

We inquire that if this position had been maintained by the late Elders Gilbert Beebe, Samuel Trott, R.C. Leachman, and others, then what cause would there have been for the contest of that day.

Notice, Clark here says, “Now to be a man he must have been born once, which is of the flesh.” Mr. Clark seeks to enforce the idea that the word “man” can be applied only to a fleshly one, yet in the same chapter Christ is termed the Son of man; and more particularly in I Cor.15:47, it is written: “the first *man* is of the earth, earthy; the second *man* is the Lord from heaven,” and still more so in I Tim.2:5, we have: “For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, *the man Christ Jesus.*”

We quote below first the text in John 3:3, in the original Greek, and under the Greek word; its English meaning:

Apekrithe Jesous kai eipen auto Amen, Amen
Answered Jesus, and said to him; Amen, Amen;
Lego soi ean me tis gennethei anothen on
I say to you if not any one be born from above, not
Dunatai idein ten basileian tou Theou
Will he be able to see the Kingdom of God.

The strict interpretation of the text reads, "Answered Jesus, and said to him; Amen, Amen, I say to you, if not any one be born *from above*, not will he be able to see the kingdom of the God." The interpretation of this text in connection with the contest of former and recent years, often hinges upon the translation of the Greek word *anothen*. This term comes from a combination of two Greek words, *Ano* = above & *Then* = from; and its primary meaning is "*From above*." In our translation of the Bible, a marginal interpretation of this nature [*above*] is given; but the word above should be in the body of the text. As previously stated in our columns with reference to the translation of the Bible, both in the days of King James of England, A.D. 1611; and that authorized in 1870, we have no doubt but that the translators in both instances desired to render a proper translation from the Hebrew of the Old Testament, and the Greek of the New, to our own language; but these men of course were uninspired men, and as far as we can judge mostly, if not entirely controlled by false religious influence [The translation in the reign of King James was under the direction of the Episcopal hierarchy; and the last translation, that of 1870, was under the direction of none different Protestant orders,] hence liable to be by such instincts in giving the construction of a text or construing the peculiar idiom of one language into that of another. Hence, as men of this character like the late John Clark, know of but one man, and he of the flesh, they would naturally construe the language of Jesus as Nicodemus did to mean *one man born of another*, spirit, born of flesh.

But that the seed existence of the spiritual child was in the spiritual head [Christ,] as the seed existence of the earthly child was in the earthly head [Adam,] thus each and every seed must necessarily produce *his* own kind; hence the dual life of the Shulamite. Not the absurdity of *one man with two natures*, but two men in one dual character; each representing the life of his respective seed; one antagonistic to the other; the flesh lusting against the Spirit, as it is written; "For the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." Gal.5:17. There could be no such a thing as one man with two natures, according to the Durand theory; with one nature warring against the other; the warfare must necessarily come from two distinct characters of life, developed from two distinct headships, and by two separate and distinct births.

While at the University we also examined in the original Latin and Vulgate translation of the Bible [in use among Catholics,] and found that this translation, which as is commonly known was made at a time when knowledge and literature was at its lowest ebb in Roman life, had substituted for the Greek word *anothen* [from above] in the original text, the Latin word *Denuo*, which means *anew, afresh, again*, and inserted again in the English translation. No reference is made in the translation of the Vulgate to the English, of this word having any other

meaning, but would fasten upon Catholic subjects, the idea presented in the Clark theory of the one man born twice.

The second testimony examined at the University is contained in I Peter 1:23 – “Being born again, not of corruptible seed &c.” We found here the same meaning in the original Greek. The phrase “being born again,” translated from the Greek word *anagegennemenoi*, meaning in English “having been born from above.” In the Vulgate translation, a copy of which we have in our office, this Greek word is substituted by the Latin word *renati*, which means “having been born again,” and this rendering is followed by later translations. But to return to the rendering of the original Greek text: “*Answered Jesus, and said to him: Amen, Amen, I say to you, if not any one be born from above, not will he be able to see the kingdom of God.*” The word *above* to our understanding destroys much of the force of the arguments based upon the erroneous translation of the Greek word *anohen*. The idea entertained by Nicodemus was the same as entertained by Means Baptist, and Nicodemus had a clearer idea than most of his followers. “How can a man,” he says “be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother’s womb, and be born.” Evidently this presents the only mode by which the natural man or sinner could be born again. But this is not the testimony that the Saviour presented; this idea of Nicodemus was answered in the reply, “That which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. That is, the development of two distinct headships, one of the flesh, the other of the Spirit. Nicodemus came as “a ruler of the Jews,” a man of the Pharisees;” he came from a class of religionist whose school was earthly, and whose subjects were of an earthly character, hence in the very opening of his testimony the Saviour emphasized the fact that this school of earthly religion, and all of similar nature could never comprehend heavenly things. His language was a rebuke not only to Pharisees, but to all religionist of similar caste, who seek by earthly wisdom to know the things of God. The very first expression of this lesson to Nicodemus is contained in the text: “If not any one *be born from above*, not will he be able to see the kingdom of the God.” That is, this man who sees the kingdom; namely, understands the things that Jesus taught, must come *from above*; the life not of earth, but of heaven; not of the flesh, but of the Spirit.

No thought is presented here of the one man born twice, but of the “new man,” coming from a higher, a more exalted life, and in that holy, heavenly, spiritual, immortal life capable of comprehending, of enjoying the things of the heavenly kingdom; the life produced by and from the previously existing seed.

The word *anohen*, is listed as an adverb of *place*, and according to a Greek idiom, its meaning, “from above, from on high,” is presented by way of contrast as the opposite of the Greek term *from below*. In this the dear Master would emphasize the lesson he sought to teach, contrasting the two systems or characters

of life, the one from above, the other from below; the one of the earth, the other of heaven. "If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things? And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." John 3:12,13.

Here is a clear presentation of Gospel teaching, illustrating the necessity of the opening declaration of the Saviour; that the man, termed in Romans 7:22, the "inward man," and in Ephesians 4:24, the *new man*, who sees and delights in the kingdom of God must be born from above, must come from above, because his seed existence is in the life of that kingdom, thus partaking of the life of him "who only hath immortality." I Tim.6:16. "And of Zion it shall be said, This and that man was born in her." Ps.87:5.

In the light of this testimony how absurd the idea that the Saviour was teaching the notion that the natural man was to be born the second time, or that the spiritual man was to be made up out of the natural; in this theory the sinner must be born of a life in which he had no previous seed existence, ignoring the whole testimony bearing upon a birth, not even understanding as the Master stated "earthly things," the visible things, the things "that are made," [Rom.1:20,] through which the invisible [spiritual] things are seen. For in the first chapter of Bible testimony, we might say the first declaration bearing on a birth, we are told the seed of every development "is in itself," Gen.1:11; and again producing or developing "after his kind." [verse 12.]

It is admitted that the translators have made a serious mistake in translating the Greek word *zoon* and *therion*, making them represent in each instance *beast* in Rev.4:6-9; and in Rev.17:1-4; whereas in the first instance the rendering should be *living creatures*, as rendered from the Hebrew in Ezekiel 1:5, so it seems clear a mistake has been made, as previously stated, in translating the Greek word *anochen*, as *again*, instead of from above; a combination of two words, *ano* = above, *then* = from.

In Liddell & Scott's Greek and English Lexicon, a standard work of its character, we are told that the idea of repetition is ascribed to this word, *anochen*, as a secondary meaning, coming from *ano*, which sometimes means "*spreading all over a space throughout*." It would seem that the lover of this Arminian fad, the one man born twice theory, would seize upon this far-fetched idea of again from this secondary and distant interpretation of this first part of the dual word, *anochen*, to convert the meaning of the term to suit the natural idea, that the man born of the flesh, must necessarily be the same man, who is born of the Spirit; a spirit born of Spirit, as the late Elder Gilbert Beebe properly termed it; and if spirit after the birth, assuredly must it have been spirit previous to its birth, on the very same

principle that if corn after its growth, it must have been corn before its growth, otherwise every seed would not be after its kind. Gen.1:11.

John Clark in the pamphlet before referred to, tells us that the term rendered born again in the original means “to be again, implying an existence antecedently;” and then proceeds to argue *a la* Means Baptist style, that this of course means, that the natural man, or sinner becomes the child of God, by birth, ignoring the doctrine of adoption entirely. Now in the first place, the term in the original, means no such a thing, and in the next place if it did, it could not possibly be subjected to any such conclusion.

It is comforting to realize notwithstanding blunders made in translating the testimony of truth, or misrepresentations of truth by designing men, purposely to blind the eyes of children of grace, that the living witnesses of truth eternal cannot be led away from the Testimony.

The truth of this testimony is written in their hearts, as engraven upon Bible pages and the Holy Spirit will not allow them to be misled. This is the one and only teacher. While many children of grace are frequently led away by such designing characters, it follows as fact that the living witnesses, called out for the special purpose of bearing witness to truth eternal, cannot be falsely led, but their mind [which really is the mind of Christ] is clear upon the principles of truth eternal. As it is written; “Rooted and built up in him, and stablished in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving. Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, *after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.*” Col.2:7,8.

Our readers will notice that there is not a worldly religious order anywhere, but who believe that the natural man or sinner is born again, and he the sinner, becomes the child of God by such birth. But to the living in Jerusalem we write, “But ye have not so learned Christ; if so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus.” Eph.4:20,21.

We publish the following communication from the late Elder Samuel Trott. The original manuscript from which these extracts are taken was given to us by a relative of Elder Trott after his death; and we suppose from the preface that it was designed for publication as he states; “either before or after my departure.” It bears the following address:

“*Addressed to the Churches which I serve – Ebenezer; Fryingpan Spring; Mt. Pleasant in Virginia; Black Rock in Maryland, Old School Baptist Churches.*”

“In approaching our subject, that of a Oneness of life of Christ and his people; it may be proper to notice certain objections which have been made evidently to prejudice the mind of brethren against it.

A cry of ‘New Things,’ has been raised, and how new this doctrine is in the revelation of God, we shall see in examining the Scripture. We shall find that the

very first type or figure of Christ points directly to this life union &c. So long as I have known much of the Baptists I have known those who believed that the new birth was a being born of a distinct life of which Christ is the Head &c. Another objection urged against the doctrine of Christ and his people possessing one and the same life, is that it makes him a created Saviour, and some have said a created God. But this must be mere smoke raised to dim the eyes of others from seeing the truth. I say this because those who have made the charge, are men of too much discernment, not to know that the advocates of this union have contended strenuously contended, that *he is absolutely God*, the self existent God.”

“To show that the doctrine of oneness of life of Christ and his people is sustained by the Scripture; in I John 5:10, we are informed that a *not believing the record which God gave of his Son is making God a liar*. A record is a written testimony such as the Scriptures, a record which God has given. Paul said; ‘Yea let God be true, but every man a liar.’ We receive God’s testimony then in preference to men’s. We are informed in that same chapter what the record of God is: ‘And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.’ This record is direct and plain, that God hath given to his people eternal life, and given it *in his Son*. This life in his Son was so that ‘*he that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.*’ Was not the life God gave us in Adam so one with him, that when he died, we died in him? So is not this eternal life in the Son of God so one with him that he that hath the Son hath life. Is it not then manifest that as Adam was the created head of natural life, so the Son is the fountain of spiritual life.”

“Brethren, can you approach these texts with a proper reverence for God’s word, and not acknowledge that their uniform and manifest testimony is, that the believer’s life which is given him of God, *is Christ*? Can you then with consistency deny that there is a union of Christ and his people, which consists in a oneness of life and that Christ is that life? We therefore, see that the testimony of Scripture presents Christ to view in such relation to his church, as her life, her husband, her head, as that the law could rightly look to him for satisfaction, and he could legally meet its demands in behalf of his people. Thus the law is actually honored and fulfilled by the death of Christ, and an adequate atonement made for the sins of his people. Such as has been shown could not be the case without an actual life union of Christ and his people.”

Samuel Trott.

After the withdrawal of the two churches from the Virginia Corresponding Association in August, 1889, these churches called a Council for the purpose of organizing an Association. The Council met with the Occoquan Church at their

meeting place at Oak Grove, Prince William County, Virginia, on Monday, August 19, 1889. The following account of their organization we copy from Reminiscences of the Baptist of Virginia, page 71.

ORGANIZATION OF THE VIRGINIA ANNUAL MEETING.

The following brethren were present as messengers. Elder W.M. Smoot, brethren Orvis Maxfield, Enoch Grimes, James Clark, and James Posey, from the Occoquan Church.

Quantico Church sent brother Ezekiel Lynn.

1. The Council was organized by appointing Elder W.M. Smoot, Moderator, and brother James Posey, Clerk.

2. Upon motion and second, Elder Levi Bavis of the Indian Creek Association of Ohio, and brother J.S. Wallingford of the Licking Association of Kentucky, were invited to seats with us.

3. After discussing the present condition of affairs affecting our churches, and recognizing the necessity for such an organization, the Council unanimously decided to enter into the organization of an Association, after which the Council adjourned until 2 p.m.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Council met after praise and prayer, and proceeded to business.

4. Upon motion and second it was unanimously decided that this Association should be designated and known, by the name of the VIRGINIA ANNUAL MEETING of Anti-Means, Old School Predestinarian Baptist.

5. The Articles of faith of the Occoquan church were adopted as the faith of this Meeting.

In these articles the absolute Sovereignty of our God over all worlds, creatures and things is affirmed, his "Absolute Predestination of all things whatsoever cometh to pass," and that the Holy Scriptures are his inspiration, and our only rule of faith and practice; the Revelation that he has been pleased to make of himself as Father, Word and Holy Ghost, and "these three are one." I John 5:7.

The eternal, unconditional, and personal election of the church in CHRIST, the chosen seed, before the world began; the total depravity and just condemnation of all in Adam; the Atonement and Redemption are for the elect who are "partakers of flesh and blood," and thus involved in sin in their Adamic relation; that the elect are the subjects of gospel address; the preservation through time and eternal happiness of each and all of this people.

The Eternal Vital Union or Oneness of CHRIST and his Church. That the spiritual birth reveals the life hid with Christ in God the Father before the world began, not the natural man born again; the Resurrection of the dead and final

Judgment. In a declaration of our order we affirm our belief in baptism and the LORD'S Supper for believers only, that baptism is only valid when performed by a regularly ordained minister held in the fellowship of the church at the time the ordinance is administered, and a believer the only proper subject, and that the communion is to be observed only by such baptized believers.

Our non-fellowship for Missionary organizations, Sunday Schools, and all such unfruitful works of darkness.

Our non-fellowship for any member or members who may remain in the organization of, or become identified in any way whatever directly or indirectly, with any secret worldly society or oath-bound organization of any character, after such member or members have made a public profession of Truth.

We wish it distinctly understood that any individual who can not give up a lodge of Masons, Odd Fellows, Grangers, or any organization of any such a character, for the Church of God, shall stay there so far as we are concerned, and out of our membership.

Our non-fellowship for the Means Baptist, and all who have any religious connection with them whatever.

6. Upon invitation of the members living in the village of Occoquan, Virginia, our next annual session was appointed to be held, by Divine permission, in that village, to begin Wednesday before the fourth Sunday in August, 1890, at 10 a.m., and continue the two following days. Upon motion and second it was unanimously decided to invite brethren of like precious faith to meet with us.

After some appropriate remarks by our brethren in reference to the importance of our present position, the Meeting adjourned to the time and place of our next annual session. The proceedings throughout were harmonious and orderly; attended by a large and attentive congregation of brethren and friends; altogether, we trust, a day spent in the Sanctuary of our God, much to the encouragement and enjoyment of the lovers of Truth who were present.

W.M. Smoot, Moderator.

James Posey, Clerk.

WAS THE CONTEST WORTH WHILE?

Forty years have passed since the active opening of the contest traced through the pages of this book, and thirty-seven years since its close in a division. 'Tis true that it had been slumbering in suppressed tones for years since the division of 1853. The real cause was the division of sentiment among professed Old School Baptist upon these fundamental principles of gospel grace; the active cause was the effort to force our brethren to abandon their position upon these essential, and absolutely fundamental principles of truth eternal.

As previously stated of the ministers who stood upon our side in the contest we are describing [1886-89,] I am left alone; and but very few of the devoted, faithful membership of the churches that stood so firm, are now living. Nearly all have passed from the cares, toils, and conflicts of time, I confidently believe to their immortal home.

As I stand in the shadows of frail mortality, the close of “life’s little day,” ah more; at the Judgment Seat, [Rom.14:10; II Cor.5:10] of Israel’s God; solemnly we inquire “Was this contest, with its conflicts; its bitterness; its fearful scenes of fraternal strife; *was it worth while?*” Solemn inquiry this.

Rom.16:17, “Now I beseech you brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences *contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned*; and avoid them.” The careful reader will notice the italicized clause. The admonition hinges upon this clause. The Inquiry at once arises: “Was the contest of 1886-89 with those who were contending for sentiments contrary to the doctrine which ye [we] have learned?”

My mind goes back over the scenes of those fateful days “on the firing line;” the anxious days and nights when so many important events seemed to tremble in the balance. I can almost hear the voices of these dear ministers and devoted members; they come before me again in solemn form, as in the days when we endured a great “fight of afflictions,” Heb.10:32; I hear them join with me, answering this Inquiry: “Absolutely, Yes,” those with whom we then contended were making an effort to force upon us sentiments contrary to the doctrine which we had learned.

We may well refer the whole subject to the decision of the well-tutored child of grace; the living witness of today. Examine the testimony that we have produced; yea, more, go to the writings of those who have succeeded in the footsteps of the Clark and Durand following; read their published statements, and there will be found the same statements, an election in Adam; namely, sinners of Adam’s race; the identical idea put forth by Nicodemus, “the same man [sinner] that was born of the flesh is now born again of the Spirit.” There also will be found but a mere nominal Eternal, Vital Union; for when one talks of a union between an eternal Head and a mortal body, such an union exists in name only and so on down the list.

We are admonished; “As ye have therefore *received* Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him.” Col.2:6. The term received in this quotation to my understanding is of similar import to the term *learned* in the quotation from Romans, but the last quotation more clearly presents the line of testimony that we are discussing, for in the very next verse, the apostle states, “rooted and built up in him, and *stablished in the faith*, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving.” From this testimony it is evident that maintaining the doctrine we have learned; that we have received, and been taught, is necessary to our being “stablished in the faith.”

So far as I am personally concerned, I can truthfully declare that if I have learned Christ at all, that this election, this choice of his bride was absolutely as shown in previous pages, an election in him; as surely as Adam the figure of Christ “who was to come,” Romans 5:14, was created with his bride existing in him *then and there* as he stood fresh from the hands of his great Creator. If Eve had been made, created, formed, evolved from some dead, inanimate matter, then might we talk of the bride of Christ as brought forth from a substance dead in sin; “sinners of Adam’s race.”

But returning to Adam the figure, we find the anti-type in Christ who was “set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was,” [Pv.8:23.] In the previous verse he says; “The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way.” And in John 1:1, we have the testimony, “In the beginning was the Word.” Here is certainly the “Beginning” of the way of Redemption, hence when faith grasps the way of Gospel Grace, we find its opening so far as its development in time is concerned in this choice of the church in Christ. “All things,” we are told, “were made by him.” In the Revised translation this John 1:3, reads in the margin, “All things were made through him;” and in Col.1:16, the testimony covering the same ground informs us, “By him were all things created ... all things were created by him, and for him.” The Greek rendering here evidently brings to view the fact that these *all things* were brought into being for the development of this Word. The argument all through this chapter points to this unerring conclusion as “the mystery which hath been hid from ages and generations ... to whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory.” Col.1:26,27.

“Set up as the head of his mystical frame,
He honored the records of time with his name.”

Here then we have the Arch, “The Chief corner Stone” of the whole Gospel system. “The Beginning of His way.” To lose sight of this “Beginning” is to fail in a proper or Gospel view of the whole system. Can one be “taught of the Lord” [Isaiah 54:13;] learn of the Father [John 6:45,] without understanding the alphabet of this Gospel system, for Jesus declares himself to be “the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end” of this system.

But from yet another view-point, we inquire; “Was the contest worth while?” In any departure from the doctrine comes first a departure from the order; as noticed earlier. The transgression comes first, then the departure from doctrine. And our readers will notice that this is the manner in which this departure came in the contest that we are describing. Carefully read chapters VI & VII in the body of this book, and this fact will be seen.

The travel of the church has also shown that when once a people have started from the right [gospel] path, they continue on the downward trend. Could our

people have ever attained to their present position in the order of the Gospel, had we been held back by the elements that gained and in a large measure yet hold control of the great body of professed Old School Baptist in our country? Decidedly not! Secret orders; Family ties as superior to church operations; Life insurance; Prohibition; Woman Suffrage all have come up, and by the grace of God been successfully met, and set aside in our church travel; while this mongrel breed more or less are found in the councils of all Old School Baptist outside of our own order. Following the division of 1832 with the New School came a breed of institutions on the order of the Y.M.C.A.; Y.W.C.A., and other such antichristian societies, dishonoring the Baptist name; and with the contest of 1852-53; 1886-89, have come among some element of Old School Baptist another breed of worldly Isms on the order that we have named which cannot help but mar the peace and harmony of any people who are alive from the dead; and have conceptions of Gospel truth.

The normal travel of the church of our Lord Jesus Christ is in peace and harmony. Can any well taught child of grace conclude that such gospel peace is found in a mixed multitude contending and bitterly opposing in divers opinions on Predestination; Election; Adoption, &c.; winding up in a failure to grasp the doctrine of the Resurrection of the dead.

And last, but not least in summing up the testimony of the doctrine that we have learned, we call attention to Paul's clear and vivid inspired revelation of his experience in Rom.7:18-25. Will any one acquainted with the nature of this testimony claim that the *I who would do good*, is the same *I who would not do good*? The apostle himself testifies it is not. He says; "It is no more I that do it." This personality is traced from to point to point all through this testimony revealing two distinct; separate, antagonistic personalities, showing that the *I* who delights in the law of God, is certainly not the *I* that does the evil.

This is more than merely antagonistic elements in the *one* personality; but separate and distinct personalities developed from separate and distinct heads; the one heavenly, the other earthly; and "as is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly." I Cor.15:48.

Assuredly has each and every heaven-born heir learned Christ in his or her personal experience, as the apostle so learned. The child may not clearly understand the lesson of his personal travel; it may be that he has become lame from bad [preaching] nursing, [II Sam.4:4;] but the experience is there; "For the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do *the things that ye would*." Gal.5:17.

We do not now remember of any time since immediately after the organization of the church and the death of the apostles, that contest among those who may well

be termed the people who “follow after righteousness,” Is.51:1, tracing them through the dark days when they were hounded unto prison, and unto death in the days of the first Beast; and afterward under the Protestant Monster; we do not remember that more important questions have come up than the doctrinal points discussed; and contended for in the contest with John Clark and his followers; and with Silas H. Durand and those who followed him.

In fact the contest commencing shortly after the division with the New School Party in 1832 ran along until culminating in the division of 1853; but in our ranks kept smoldering along occasionally breaking out in spots until the death of strong and able men to whom we have made previous reference, when it overleaped all bounds led on by R.W. Thompson with his Primitive Monitor in the West; and other equally violent men, spreading East. Durand, and his party readily took up the same bitter opposition to the points of doctrine that we have discussed culminating in the final division at Quantico, August 1889, when our churches finally, and so far as we are concerned irrevocably for all time repudiated the testimony of an Election in Adam; and the production of a spiritual child from a natural, sinful seed.

In closing this particular branch of our labor in the publication of this book, we desire to again repeat though in a somewhat different form of expression that there are three particular points in “The Doctrine of God our Saviour” discussed; contented for in this publication.

In this review we emphasize what we have several times stated, that in any discussion of this Gospel testimony, Election comes first – the whole gospel system revolves around it, but there are three points of this Doctrine that we wish to emphasize; fundamental principles underlying the whole system coming from; growing out of the Eternal, Unconditional, and Personal Election in Christ. These three points are: THE SPIRITUAL BIRTH; THE ATONEMENT; and THE REGENERATION. We desire to leave upon record the views maintained; “most surely believed among us.” The apostle in referring to the salvation of the Jews declares; “The election hath obtained it,” Rom.11:7. Election in Christ evidently stands at the fountain source of salvation by Christ.

“What think ye of Christ is the test,
To try both your state and your scheme;
You cannot be right in the rest,
Unless you think rightly of him.”

We have traced this elect child who existed in a personal unit in Christ the seed in and from all eternity “and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth,” Ps.139:15, namely, partakers of flesh and blood. This first important part of this subject has already been sufficiently described. I do not think that I can more clearly present a view of the second of these three parts than in reprinting an

Editorial on the Atonement from the SECTARIAN of April, 1927. In doing this I may restate some principle points noticed in chapters XV & XVI, but I have in this work somewhat followed the custom of restating important testimony in different forms, lying on one side as required of the prophet; Ezekiel 4:8,9, that is, preaching the same thing in different forms; in order that its importance may be clearly presented and “the living in Jerusalem” established therein.

THE ATONEMENT.

“For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.”
Heb.10:14.

Since our article in February issue upon the spiritual birth we have felt impressed to make some reference to the atonement of Christ, especially as we have recalled that the charge was frequently made during the contests of former years upon this subject, that to maintain the testimony, “That which is born of the Spirit is spirit,” is to deny the salvation of the sinner.

In any consideration of this subject it must be borne in mind that the eternal salvation of the sinner is not predicated upon a birth, but upon the blood and righteousness of Christ. The birth does not change the sinner’s nature or condition so far as he being involved in; and under the curse of the law of sin and death, is concerned. Before the Civil War, a child born of parents who were slaves, resulted in the child being a slave; if the parents were free the child was free. During the Johnstown flood a woman on a raft upon the rushing waters gave birth to a child; the dangerous character of the surroundings imperiled the child after the birth as before. It is written that we are conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity, Ps.51:5; and so far as our birth in nature is concerned, that we “are estranged from the womb” speaking lies. Ps.58:3. All of this clearly shows that the birth of the flesh simply develops the pre-existing life without in any sense changing its nature; if conceived in sin, such a sinful life is in no way changed by its development in a birth.

It must be remembered also that there is a Divine order in the gospel system of salvation. It is called TRUTH from the fact that one part is true to another; the working of a perfect system. During the Beebe and Clark contest on this subject one of the preachers on the Clark side claimed that the birth, generation, and regeneration were terms used interchangeably to express the same thing; very erroneous indeed this position; for, each of these gospel terms have their gospel meaning. We can not place the birth where there is no generation; if there were no generation there could be no birth. Durand in his article upon this subject termed *Two Questions Considered*: “1. The man who cannot see the kingdom of God except he be born again, is a sinner. 2. That the elect are sinners of Adam’s race”

showing his failure to understand his subject by putting the birth before the election [life]. Life must certainly precede a birth.

Suppose in passing by a field our reader should see a man plowing over the field helter-skelter fashion; first on one side, then on the other; now in the middle, then crosswise, would not the desire to inquire why this man could not lay his field in regular rows, and plow it in order; so in the gospel system there is an order in the salvation of the sinner; and we desire, if the Lord will, to discuss this under the doctrine of the ATONEMENT.

This term occurs but once in the New, but frequently in the Old Testament; and can readily from its Scripture meaning be divided into three syllables: AT-ONE-MENT; "For by ONE OFFERING." The common idea of salvation is that God beholding the sad plight into which the human family *had brought themselves* by sinning, sent his Son, who *volunteered* to leave the mansions of bliss for the love he bore to dying sinners, and his desire to help fallen humanity, and die to make a way possible whereby through Christ's help the sinner might save himself.

First, we wish distinctly to repudiate the notion of Christ as a volunteer in this atonement. Did it look like a volunteer when in anguish of soul in Gethsemane he cried; "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me;" and when after the resurrection he told his disciples: "*Ought not* Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory." Do we find a volunteer in the typical offerings of this atonement, for instance the two goats [Lev.16:7-10,] taken as the sin-offering of the congregations of Israel, one offered upon the holy altar or yet the "ram caught in the thicket" that Abraham offered instead of Isaac. It is acknowledged that Christ died to save sinners; we inquire "how does this salvation become effectual?" It is not universal for "the wicked shall be turned into hell;" it cannot be based upon the work of the sinner for it is declared to be by grace. II Tim.1:9. Hence as this salvation is not universal, upon what principle does it reach some sinners and not others? We are told that Justice and Judgment are the habitation of his throne. Psa.89:14. There would be no Justice in condemning an innocent man as *a volunteer* to die in the place of a guilty man condemned to die. There must be such a relationship existing between Christ and the sinner for who he died, that his [Christ's] death paid the penalty of death demanded of the sinner; and this relationship or union must be not merely in name but *actual and vital*, as it is written; "For both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified *are all of one.*" Heb.2:11. Nor is this union based upon Christ partaking of the Adamic nature of his people for the testimony is that he partook of their nature [flesh & blood] because of *the eternal life oneness between him and them.* Heb.2:14.

Upon no other assumption could their redemption from the curse of the law be maintained, but from the fact that because of this relationship, Christ stood in their law place fulfilling its demands, not as a volunteer or substitute, but as "the head

over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.”

Adam “is the figure of him that was to come,” and that Eve was “bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh,” thus it is evident when she fell under the law there was *that much of Adam under the law*; and when these children; and if you inquire “What children?” – we readily answer; “Behold,” says the Redeemer, “I and the children which God hath given me;” carefully read Heb.2:14, and connections; and it will be seen that these are the children that partake of flesh and blood; not made up out of flesh and blood by being born again, but *partake* as Christ himself partook of flesh and blood; and it is there shown that Christ did not thus partake of the flesh of his people by being born first of the flesh and then of the Spirit; but a body was prepared him; as it is for his children. Heb.10:5.

Consequently it follows as effect follows cause, that when these *members of the body of Christ* partook of flesh and blood there was that much of the body of Christ under the law; and this testimony from Hebrews informs us that he partook of their fleshly nature that “through death he [Christ] might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.” Heb.2:13-16. This brings us to our text; “*For by one offering* he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.” In the daily offerings made under the Jewish law, there was but a continual remembrance of sin. It was not possible we are told “the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin.” The blood of the offerings that daily streamed off those legal altars like the offering of Abel pointed to the atoning blood of Christ. It was essential that the atonement for sin should be of a higher character than the offerings under the law; that it should be a sinless offering; hence we find Christ the High Priest of gospel grace brought forward “not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life – holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners.” Heb.7:16, 26.

Unlike the priest under the Aaronical priesthood, whose offerings were “for the people, *so also for himself*, to offer for sins,” Christ comes free from sin, and by the shedding of his own blood forever cancels the debt against his people; he comes in the flesh [I John 4:2,3,] partakers of their nature; the law demands death as the wages of sin [Rom.6:23,] he lays down his life; and because of this vital union they are one with him in death, as it is written, “For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, *then were all dead.*” II Cor.5:14. And just as certain as they in eternal, vital union died with him and in him on the cross, so sure did and shall they in vital oneness rise with him from the dead; his atoning blood forever canceling their sins.

“With him his members, on the tree,
Fulfilled the law’s demands;

‘Tis ‘I in them, and they in me,’
For so the union stands.

Since Jesus slept among the dead,
His saints have naught to fear;
For with their glorious, suffering head,
His members sojourn’d there.”

“For by one offering *he hath perfected forever* them that are sanctified.” As the offerings under the law were but “a shadow of good things to come,” and could never “make the comers thereunto perfect,” Heb.10:1; they were but a continual remembrance of sin; and pointed to a more perfect offering. When the high priest under the law went into the holy place “to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year,” Lev.16:34, he bore an ephod upon each shoulder upon which were engraven in gold the names of the twelve tribes of Israel; also a breast-plate *over his heart* similarly engraven in gold [Ex.28:6-43;] thus typifying him who was to come [Heb.9:7,8 & 24,] who should bear the sins of his people, loved with an everlasting love [typified by the breast-plate over his heart] though involved in sin in their Adamic standing. Aaron’s offering failed to perfectly cancel, but was simply a reminder of the transgressions of Israel, but the offering of Christ who in his own sinless body received the stroke [Zech.13:7,] from the flaming sword of divine Justice raised against his people forever frees them from the penalty of sin; and presents them perfect in his own spotless purity.

“For by one offering he hath perfected forever *them that are sanctified.*” As before noticed the high priest made the atonement for Israel, the name of the twelve tribes were engraven upon his shoulders, and over his heart; this was an atonement for a certain class of people, so also was the atonement of Christ made for a certain class: *Them that are sanctified* – “sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called.” Jude 1. We presume that no one with any conception of Scripture teaching will question the fact that the term sanctified in this connection has reference to the election or setting apart of the saints in Christ, as “chosen in him before the foundation of the world.” Eph.1:4. “Sanctified in Christ Jesus.” I Cor.1:2. “For both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, *are all of one.*” Heb.2:11. “That they all may be one; as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.” John 17:21. “So we, being many, *are one body in Christ*, and every one members one of another.” Rom.12:5.

This last clause of our text clearly expresses the characters for whom the atonement of Christ was made; it was for those who were chosen in him; “members of his body.” Eph.5:30. It is folly to talk of a *prospective choice*; the choice or election was of *an actually existing* seed substance; sanctified or set apart to be developed by a birth; partake of flesh and blood, and thus *in their Adamic life*

to come under the law; under the bondage of sin. As before stated when these members *of his body* were in their Adamic standing under the law, there was already that much of the body of Christ involved; hence he, Christ the head, followed them, by partaking of their nature. “For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham,” Heb.2:16; was made “a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death,” Heb.2:9; that through death he might deliver “his people” [Mt.1:21,] from the bondage of death. Christ was sanctified by the Father, “and sent into the world,” John 10:36, evidently as “the first-born among many brethren,” Rom.8:29, and we are told that for this cause; because of this eternal vital oneness, “he is not ashamed to call them brethren,” as they partake of the same life that he has. Heb.2:11. The elect were chosen [sanctified – set apart] in Christ, not in Adam; and the election runs through the life in Christ; and absolutely not through the life which they receive from Adam, and the atonement of Christ was made for them in this dual character; and because of their standing in Adam; and in that condition they were involved in sin, “For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward *us*; in that, *while we were yet sinners*, Christ died for us. Much more then, being justified by his blood, *we* shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, *we* shall be saved by his life. And not only so, but *we* also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom *we have now received the atonement.*” Rom.5:7-11.

The apostle uses the pronouns *us*, and *we* here referring to himself, and those at Rome, “beloved of God” [Rom.1:7,] assuredly confining his testimony to those who were loved in Christ “that the purpose of God according to election might stand.” Rom.9:11-13; and he makes it plain in this, the only connection in the New Testament where the term *atonement* is used, that this atonement was made for his elect people, the new creature in Christ Jesus [II Cor.5:17,] of which creation, Christ is the first-born [Col.1:15,] to deliver them “from the bondage of corruption,” [their bondage under the law of sin and death in their Adamic standing] “into the glorious liberty of the children of God.” Rom.8:21.

Now if inquiry is made under what particular point of doctrine the Adam sinner comes in the order of this Gospel system, we readily have the answer in the connection of this last quotation from Romans; “we ourselves groan within ourselves, *waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.*” [8:23.] The word *body* here evidently refers to all that comes from Adam in the complex and dual character of the children of the regeneration; and this outward man is the subject of adoption; not of birth; the man born of the flesh was the purchased possession; for which the redemption was made. Eph.1:14. These children were sinners in their Adamic relation, and it was the life he received from Adam that

Christ laid down; this was the life required to pay the penalty of their transgression. “Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.” John 15:13. He had power, he tells us, to lay down his life, and to take it up again, and hence in this [his] ascension from the dead, Christ has abolished death in the behalf of his people, “and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel,” II Tim.1:10; and they in eternal, vital union or oneness with and in him are “made alive from the dead,” Rom.6:13, and are admonished; “If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God.” Col.3:1.

We cannot separate the inward man [born of the Spirit] from the body [born of the flesh] in which he dwells. Paul says “I [the *I* he describes in Rom.7:22,] keep under my body, [the body of sin and death referred to in Rom.7:24,] and bring it in subjection [the power of its indwelling life accomplishes this, Phil.2:13,] lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway [like many others in this and in former days].” I Cor.9:27.

These children in their Adamic relation have received “the adoption of sons,” Gal.4:5, have received “the Spirit of adoption,” and dwelling in this mortal tabernacle are “waiting for the adoption,” as previously quoted, “to wit, the redemption of our body.”

In the contest of 1886-89, it was frequently quoted by our opponents that the Adam sinner through the Spirit cried “Abba, Father,” but the testimony is that the *Spirit itself* cries “Abba, Father.” Gal.4:6. This spirit which is born of the Spirit is the same spirit that seals these children, Eph.1:13; II Cor.1:22 – “unto the day of redemption,” [of the purchased possession,] Eph.4:30; and is the Divine warrant of the salvation of the sinner.

Thus the Atonement of Christ is the antitypical substance of all the offerings that have gone before. This At-one-ment, *one offering* forever cancelled the sins of “his people,” and brought in everlasting righteousness to them that are sanctified; each and every one of whom in all ages, conditions, and climates; whether they were under the devouring flames of that law that clothed Sinai with “blackness, darkness, and tempest,” before which terrible sight, the trembling, awe-stricken tribes of Israel stood, and even “Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake,” or upon the favored summits of the delectable mountains [visible churches, Ps.133:3;] whether in the ice-bound regions of the north or the vine-clad fields of the sunny south; it is written, “I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back; bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth; even every one that is *called* by my name.” Is.43:6,7. “Sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and *called*.” Jude 1.

His people are chosen in the furnace of affliction. They do business in deep waters. The All-Seeing Eye is upon them, he bottles all their tears and all their

wanderings are in his book. Ps.56:8. They cannot wander beyond his sight; they cannot get from under his everlasting arms. They are borne in his chariot, covered with purple, Song 3:9; this purple covering representing the blood of the Atonement, shields them from all harm; and this chariot or church bears them onward and upward to brighter scenes where faith gives way to endless sight and hope dies in glorious fruition.

Next in this order comes The Regeneration. We insert an Editorial from the Sectarian of June 1927, upon that subject.

We hope that the careful and instructed reader will notice throughout this work our arguments and testimony have been to bring to view the important fact and what may well be termed the key-note and triumphant glory of the gospel system: "The Lord Jesus Christ," as the seed substance; the elect head, and the atoning sacrifice of and for his people.

Other orders of Old School Baptist may claim this distinction, but assuredly is theirs but a mere nominal claim; existing in name only; like all anti-christian organizations they know but the one man Adam. The Adam sinner is quickened; regenerated; born again, as they put it; little thinking that either of these proposed measures if exerted upon the mortal would make him immortal.

For instance, if the dead sinner were quickened into spiritual life, he would most assuredly become spirit; if he were regenerated by some process that they have never yet explained, how he could be reproduced from one organic seed to a distinctly separate character of life; yet if he were thus regenerated from flesh to spirit, he would assuredly be spirit; or if he were born again, he would be spirit, so the Saviour declares; hence, in either instance he would be spirit; and this would be all that would be done for him in the resurrection as sown a natural body, and raised a spiritual body. [I Cor.15:44.]

REGENERATION.

"And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me. In the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Mt.19:28.

The particular point in this testimony that we desire, if the Lord will, to discuss is the Regeneration. In the contests of former years we frequently heard the expression that the sinner was regenerated and born again, and that regeneration; or the term regeneration was used interchangeably for the spiritual birth &c. Such notions ignore the fact that if the sinner was regenerated and born again, nothing more is required, he would no longer possess flesh and bones, Luke 24:39; but would become spirit, John 3:6; be clothed with immortality.

The Virginia Corresponding Meeting in 1891, gravely stated that the sinner was quickened into life, then adopted; then born again, and after all this the poor fellow “is groaning, waiting to be delivered from his bondage of corruption.” We call attention to this in order to illustrate the confusion of thought prevailing upon this important doctrine during these contests. In the first place, notice the fact that the division of the Scripture in chapters, verses; and the punctuation were made by the translators; and while we believe that these men, generally speaking, were honest in their intentions, yet we have no evidence that any of them, though professing Christianity, were acquainted with gospel truth, hence mistakes upon these and other important particulars necessarily follow.

In the text under discussion they have placed as follows, “Ye, which have followed me, in the regeneration,” - this comma [,] is all right as far as it goes, but to our understanding, does not go far enough, but should be a period [.] indicating a full stop as we have inserted it at the head of this article; “Ye who have followed me. In the Regeneration, when &c.” The manner in which this phrase is punctuated by the translators somewhat indicates the construction often put upon it, that the Saviour had reference to the disciples following him in the Regeneration, which certainly was not the subject under discussion, nor was it implied in Peter’s inquiry or in the Saviour’s answer.

Peter evidently at that time knew nothing about the Regeneration, but was concerned more from a natural standpoint about the position the disciples should occupy in the kingdom; they had forsaken all, he [Peter] said to follow Christ, “what should they have?” The Saviour’s answer is to them which have followed him. This marks the characters described.

Now comes the answer, “In the Regeneration,” this had not yet taken place, but he tells us that it shall be, “When the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory;” and then directly answers Peter’s inquiry, “Ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.” This is in direct confirmation of prophetic testimony, “Behold, a King shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment.” Isaiah 32:1. Christ referring evidently to the gospel dispensation which he had come to establish; the bringing in of “a better hope,” Heb.7:19; a “lively hope,” through the fulfillment by the Redeemer of the law’s demands upon his people; and their re-birth in him from those demands into the glorious light and liberty of gospel grace.

The further answer of the dear Redeemer to the inquiry of the apostle fully reveals the character of that inquiry, that the following of Jesus on the part of his disciples, some supposed reward was alluded to; the reply touched this but went to the depth of the subject “every one that hath forsaken houses or brethren ... for my names sake.”

The term Regeneration occurs but twice in the New Testament, and not once in the Old Testament; hence it is distinctly a New Testament term; it took place in the New Testament dispensation. The term generation, however, is used in the Old, as also in the New Testament; for instance in Ps.22:30 – “A seed shall serve him; it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation.” Christ is evidently the seed here spoken of, and this is the same generation alluded to in Mt.1:1 – “the generation of Jesus Christ.”

Regeneration, from the Latin root, *Generare* = to engender, to cause to assume form; to produce, to beget; and the preface *Re* = to beget again; the term clearly and accurately expresses the doctrine designed to be set forth. This is evidently its meaning in I Peter 1:3 – “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy, *hath begotten us again* unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.” Who are the *us*; the subjects of this “begetting again?” They are those addressed in this epistle, “Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father.”

We have here presented “the generation of Jesus Christ” as partakers of flesh and blood [Heb.2:14;] they were first begotten, set apart, or chosen in Christ; for the same act that begat the head, necessarily begat the body also; and it is this same generation who were under the law, that Christ came to redeem, “made of a woman, made under the law to redeem them that were under the law.” Gal.4:4,5. These are they who were “begotten again” [regenerated] in Christ as he came up from under the law, as we have previously quoted, “begotten again ... by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.”

The only other instance in which the term regeneration is used in the Scripture is in Titus 3:5 – “According to his mercy he saved *us*, *by the washing of regeneration*, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.” Here are the same *us* spoken of and to, in previous testimony, for Paul writes “according to the faith of God’s elect.” Titus 1:1. This “washing of regeneration” evidently; refers to the washing “us [the same us] from our sins in his own blood,” Rev.1:5; viewing these children [this generation] as involved in sin in their Adamic relation, brought up from under the law of sin and death, in Christ as it is written; “After two days will he revive us; in the third day he will raise us up [the same us,] and we shall live in his sight.” Hosea 6:2. “Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us [the same us] *together with Christ.*” Eph.2:5.

Mark you “quickened together with Christ;” namely, quickened in him as members of his body. “For as we have many members in one body ... so we being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another.” Rom.12:4,5. “Christ is the head of the Church; and he is the Saviour of the body.” Eph.5:23.

Considering the fundamental principles underlying this term, “Regeneration,” reaching back to its origin, for before Regeneration, there must be a generation to regenerate; and we cannot conceive of the regeneration of a generation totally dissimilar from its own inherent life, on the same principle that we regard it as impossible for the birth of a child from a life in which it had no previous seed existence; and radically different from its own seed substance; in other words we regard the terms generation and regeneration in the subject under discussion, comprehending the same character of life [eternal;] and not a natural generation made over into a spiritual. This does not in any sense question the fact of the redemption of the Adam sinner and the resurrection change, and glorification of the body, in which he dwells [I Cor.15:44, 47–49;] but this is not accomplished under the doctrine of the Regeneration.

The term beget in a measure differs from either the term generation or birth, yet vitally connected with both. We are told that “Adam ... begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth.” Gen.5:3. Here was a manifestation of the generations of Adam; but we cannot use the term beget in connection with a life differing from its own character of development; Adam nor none of his posterity could beget a life differing from their own; for the word begat refers “to generate as a father or sire.”

“The generations of Adam” came from a created [earthly] head; the generation of Christ comes from an uncreated [heavenly] head.

The term Regeneration, therefore, in the sense in which the Scripture testimony that we are discussing uses it, cannot apply to a natural generation. It is written of Christ, “Who shall declare his generation? For his life is taken from the earth,” Acts 8:33; as he died without issue, his could not have been a natural generation; but are sons of God the Father in the sonship of Christ. It is written; “Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee,” Ps.2:7; and the many brethren [Rom.8:29,] of which Christ is the first-born were begotten in that begetting; chosen in that choice; set up in Christ the head “from everlasting, from the beginning or ever the earth was.” PV.8:23.

The generation of Christ as traced in Mt.1:1-17, through the forty-two consecutive generations of Adam, is evidently referred to by Christ the head of the body in the prophecy: “Bind up the testimony; seal the law among my disciples ... *Behold, I and the children* whom the Lord hath given me are for signs and wonders in Israel from the LORD of hosts, which dwelleth in Zion.” Isa.8:16-18.

These are the children; this is the generation [Heb.2:13,14,] that partake of flesh and blood, and were in bondage under the law of sin and death [Gal.4:3-5;] and it is this generation that were “begotten again,” brought up from under that bondage; regenerated “by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.” I Pet.1:3.

And this Regeneration abolished death in their behalf; and “brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.” II Tim.1:10. He tells us in the text that Regeneration is: “*When the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory.*” The throne of his glory is the church where he sits enthroned as King; and the apostles in their respective places in judging the tribes of Israel. This is the woman [church] that John saw; “clothed with the sun [gospel,] the moon [law] under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars,” [the apostles.] Rev.12:1.

The typical testimony of this doctrine is found first in the tabernacle service in the wilderness, in the laver [wash-basin] mentioned in Exodus 30:18-20, put between “the tabernacle of the congregation and the altar;” in which the priests were to wash their hands and feet. “When they go into the tabernacle of the congregation they shall wash with water, that they die not; or when they come near to the altar to minister, to burn offerings made by fire unto the Lord.” This washing by the priests showing that they were also “compassed with infirmity, and by reason thereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins.” Heb.5:3, Lev.9:7; and in all these offerings there was but the remembrance of sin; but the offering of Christ, being a sinless offering forever cancelled the sins of his people.

The Laver of the tabernacle service was taken over by the sea in the temple worship: II Chron.4:2-6. This sea like the Laver was made of brass and “stood upon twelve oxen, three looking toward the north, and three looking toward the west, and three looking toward the south, and three looking toward the east; and the sea was set above upon them, and all their hinder parts were inward.” In this sea’s under surface round about were covered the similitude of oxen. Here are the Gospel ministry [oxen] resting upon the apostolic ministry [the twelve oxen] looking to the four quarters of the earth and time. Mark 16:15.

As the priest before engaging in the tabernacle or temple worship washed in the laver or in the sea, the typical effect of this washing and of the blood flowing from the altar; pointed to the cleansing character of the blood and water [John 19:34,] that flowed from the side of Jesus.

“There is a fountain filled with blood,
Drawn from Immanuel’s veins;
And sinners plunged beneath that flood,
Lose all their guilty stains.”

The service of the legal dispensation was administered by blood and water [Heb.9:19,] and Christ came by water and blood, I John 5:6. In this last testimony the water is placed first as typifying, we presume his [water] baptism unto death [Luke 12:50,] and the blood of his crucifixion; but in the crucifixion the blood is named first, John 19:34, as flowing from his side, which I understand as pointing especially to his death [blood] and the water the cleansing effect [washing of

regeneration] of the shed blood of the Saviour of his people [Mt.1:21,] from their sins. Especially was this typified in the atonement offered once a year under the Aaronical priesthood [Heb.9:7,] offered with the shedding of blood, and the priest was required to wash himself before and after this offering [Lev.16:4,24,] thus offering an atonement for his own sins, and the sins of the people, typifying the cleansing properties of the blood of Christ “who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God,” Heb.9:14, forever justly and righteously cancelling their sins in this “washing of regeneration,” by his resurrection from the dead. Truly, “These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.” Rev.7:14. “And the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.” I John 1:7.

Well indeed can they be called “The children of the Regeneration,” as “begotten again unto a lively [living] hope.” The Vulgate translation reads, “hath *regenerated us* unto a lively hope.” The hope that animates the *us* is full of life; a sure and steadfast anchor of the soul; and holds them surely amid all the conflicts, trials, cares, and tribulations that beset them in their pilgrimage here.

Of the things which we have written this is the sum; That the generation of Jesus Christ set up in him as the head of the body [Eph.1:22,] as the seed substance of the development of this holy generation [Gal.3:16; Mal.2:15; Ps.139:14-16,] thus begotten in him [Isaiah 66:8,] developing the generation of Jesus Christ [Mt.1:1,] as partaking of flesh and blood; and thus coming under the law of sin and death in their Adamic development; the head [Christ] follows the body [Church] in this development; stands in the place of his people; lays down his [Adamic] life [John 10:15,] for that was the life that sinned, and such was the life that the law required, hence Christ died as the Son of man, *absolutely not as the Son of God*; and having power to thus lay down his life [John 10:18,] and take it up again; as born from the dead [Col.1:18; I Cor.15:20,] [begotten again, I Pet.1:3,] he forever cancels by paying in full the debt against them, covering their sins [Ps.32:1; Rom.4:7,] as it is written; “Thou hast forgiven the iniquity of thy people, thou hast covered all their sins.” Ps.85:2.

Now seated in the throne of his glory, “as judge of all,” [Heb.12:23,] “he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out,” [John 10:3,] as before him are gathered all nations, and he separates them “as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats.” Mt.25:32. “I have,” he says, in his prophetic prayer “finished the work which thou gavest me to do.” “I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world; thine they were and thou gavest them me; and they have kept thy word.” “I have given them thy word, and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.” John 17:14.

“Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me, for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.” John 17:24.

We have now traced the elect through Christ the seed substance [Ps.139:16; Gal.3:16;] born of God the Father [John 1:13; I Thes.1:1;] partakers of, but not made up out of flesh and blood [Heb.2:14; I John 4:2;] brought up from under the law and from under its curse. Mt.19:28; I Pet.1:3.

And we may well close this testimony with a reference to its crowning glory; “The Resurrection of the dead;” yea, “The Resurrection from the dead,” for assuredly is Christ “preached that he rose from the dead;” “but now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept.” “Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.” I Cor.15:12,20,57.

We must bear in mind, however, that any discussion of the “Resurrection of the dead,” Phil.3:11, must witness that “*It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body,*” I Cor.15:44; that is, the same body, *the identical body* deposited in the grave is the body brought up from the grave, but changed in the resurrection from natural to spiritual.

“Wherefore, comfort one another with these words.” I Thes.4:18.

We pass now to consider the organization of the Gospel church as described in the Scriptures of eternal truth, showing her origin of heaven from whence came her living head; also showing the origin of her enemies [Rev.12:3;] the various branches of anti-christ.

THE GOSPEL CHURCH.

“Which is in God the Father, and in the Lord Jesus Christ.” I Thes.1:1.

Upon this Rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” Mt.16:18.

In regard to the origin of the Gospel church there can be no question. The testimony is explicit upon this point. It was at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost; and while the dates of Bible events are not clear, yet surrounding circumstance give color to the date. A.D. 33.

Christ was crucified at the Passover, Ex.12:3-12; Luke 22:1-20. He was evidently the paschal lamb foreshadowed through this typical offering. We might term the paschal supper in Egypt as the beginning of the travail of the birth of the Jewish nation, so as Christ partook of that supper and instituted the communion [Luke 22:17-20,] preceded the organization of the Gospel church.

The term Pentecost is a Greek term signifying fifty. It was the first day of the week and the fiftieth day after the resurrection. It was a harvest season, when the “first fruits” of their harvest were brought to the LORD. Deut.16:9-11.

In this we have the peculiarly appropriate time selected in the wisdom of Israel’s God for the organization of the Gospel church as a witness through succeeding Gospel ages as the Jewish rites witnessed through preceding legal ages; evidencing His power and glory.

On that eventful day we are told that there were gathered “at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven.” Acts 2:5. The same unseen hand accomplished this that gathered into the typical ark from forest depths and airy heights seven by seven, and two by two of *every living thing*. Gen.7:2,3.

On this memorable and eventful Pentecost, we are told that “they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting ... and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.” Acts 2:1-4.

Here we have unmistakable evidence of the origin of the Gospel church in clear contradistinction from the origin of the various branches of antichrist, hereafter noticed; the one class “coming down from God out of heaven,” [Rev.21:2;] the other “coming up out of the earth;” [Rev.13:11;] out of the “multitudes, and nations, and tongues of earth.” Rev.13:1,2 & 17:15.

At the very moment of time when this wonderful display of Divine power was manifest, the enemy was there with the mocking cry: “These men are full of new wine,” just at the very instant the church comes forth “clothed with the sun” [gospel;] “the great red dragon” appears for her persecution. Rev.12:1,3.

We can trace this church through all the ages of time, not by particular descent in any one locality, but we must trace her through the testimony that they hold and the order that they observe; as in direct line with this organization on the day of Pentecost they continued “steadfastly in the apostles doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.” Acts 2:42.

This church as thus organized; and that maintained the apostolic testimony is the recognized standard of the gospel church for all ages, conditions, and climes. The apostles warned the churches of departures that should take place after their death, and even in their day they had trouble of this character; and have left on record ample testimony for our instruction.

And thus it has been through all the succeeding ages of the travel of this apostolic church, men have risen up; crept in among us, speaking perverse things. To *pervert* is not to oppose; but to claim to hold the real testimony, as to blind the eyes and deceive the simple minded, yet absolutely come no where near the truth. You will notice that the apostle speaks of perverters, as well as grievous wolves;

both characters are found in the gospel church; perverters perhaps more dangerous than wolves, because not so easily detected; on the principle that the nearest to the genuine a counterfeit comes the more dangerous.

Solemn indeed were the closing words of the apostle Paul to the Elders at Ephesus, and through them to the churches of that day. "I have," he declared "kept back nothing that was profitable unto you ... And now behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there; save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying, that bounds and afflictions abide me ... And now behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more. Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men." Acts 20:20-26. Then came the solemn warning: "I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also *of your own selves* shall men arise, speaking *perverse things*, to draw away disciples after them." Acts 20:29,30.

And so it was division after division took place. We trace the church through the dark days of her persecutions by the first beast under the general name of Ana-Baptist, the name given them we suppose because they would not take the baptism of other orders, but insisted on all who came to them with an experience of grace who had been received and baptized by parties not in their fellowship, should be baptized in order, hence the name of Ana-Baptist was given them as a reproach meaning Re-baptisers. In fact a baptism by disorderly parties is really no baptism at all.

The enemies of the church in those dark days sometimes in their ignorance named the true followers of Jesus after some prominent preacher among them, who stood the brunt of the onslaught from these bitter opposers; and thus in some localities they were called Novatians, Waldenses, &c.

But in a straight line we trace the church of today back to her organization on that eventful and fateful day of Pentecost; her enduring travel revealing the truth of the Divine assurance; "Because I live," declares her living Head, "ye shall live also." John 14:19.

Hence the church that bears the mark of the apostolic testimony, revealed on that day of Pentecost; fully measures up to the doctrine and order of that apostolic church, is known as the church which has come down in regular succession from the apostolic days. We cannot trace her as a successor of a church once standing in good order, unless such an organization is today standing in the apostolic doctrine and order.

As an illustration, under the ministry of Elder Jeremiah Moore, a church was organized in Alexandria, Virginia. This church divided in the New School division of 1832. The majority party going off with the New School, and according to the

Virginia law taking the house. This New School party then went off into Sunday Schools, Mission Systems; and all other antichristian clubs.

A short time ago these chaps had a large gathering unveiling a *tablet to the memory of Jeremiah Moore*; this New School organization in Alexandria bears about as much relation to the church organized under the ministry of Elder Moore as a turkey-buzzard does to the American Eagle. Jeremiah Moore was a strong and able preacher of the Old School order. Three times he was sent to jail in Alexandria by the Episcopalians for preaching the gospel; and one judge sentenced him “to remain in jail for life for preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ.” These New School Baptist are as merciless enemies of gospel truth as ever the Episcopal persecutors of Jeremiah Moore. Hence we cannot trace the church through any such character of descent.

But let us now pass from CHRIST to Anti-christ; from the Gospel church to her adversaries:

CHRIST and ANTICHRIST.

“Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is Christ.” I John 2:22.

“And every spirit that confesseth not *that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh* is not of God. And this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is in the world.” I John 4:3.

“Even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time.” I John 2:18.

Here we find “the enemies of the cross of Christ;” as it is written, “The Lord hath commanded concerning Jacob, that his adversaries should be round about him. Jerusalem is as a menstrous woman among them.” Lam.1:17.

Under this head we call attention to the various groups of antichristian orders springing from the two beasts mentioned in Revelation, chapter 13.

The first of these evidently refers to the Catholic hierarchy who is noticed immediately after the “woman clothed with the sun, the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars.” Rev.12:1.

In the third and fourth verses the great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his head ... stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born.”

In this testimony we have the rise of the first beast. We have in previous pages traced the rise of the gospel church from heaven on the day of Pentecost, now we find the first false claimant rising “up out of the sea;” and we are told that this sea [water] which John saw “where the whore sitteth are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues.” Rev.13:1; 17:15.

As previously stated; even in the days of the apostles, evil spirits had crept into the fold; but after their departure the grievous wolves referred to were found among them; and of their own selves men arose speaking perverse things, so that before the close of the first century the church began to slough off from her membership the corrupt elements that sought to befoul her travel.

The Catholic hierarchy became the washpot [Ps.60:8;] for these corrupt elements; and the breeding place for the development of the seven-headed monster referred to.

These corrupt elements claiming Christianity multiplied with alarming rapidity in the Roman empire and soon made their presence felt; just as their successor the Protestant beast has multiplied in the United States, and has made his presence felt to such an extent that at this writing [July, 1928,] of the thirty Presidents of the United States, all with the possible exception of Thomas Jefferson have been identified with the Protestant religion; and parties offering for office find it convenient to espouse some religious creed in order to secure an election.

Thus with converts crowding into this corrupt, Pagan Christian fold, persecution began to tone down toward this newly found sect, but the real Christian church was as much the subject of persecution as ever. Finally the emperor of Rome, Constantine evidently on the same principle that parties who seek office in our country today, professed Christianity; and at once 'Christianity' became popular, especially as Constantine appointed solely such puppet christians to office.

The literal meaning of the term Catholic is universal and it was applied to the Roman hierarchy which claimed to be the universal and only church and really for several centuries dominated the Roman world; the real church being hidden in the wilderness [Rev.12:6;] and what visibility was manifest, was of such a nature; so unpopular; hounded to prison and to death; and not recognized of any sacred character whatever.

We have previously called attention to the difficulty of correctly ascertaining dates from profane history. There may be, however, some difference of opinion even among our brethren regarding the proper date to notice the rise of this Catholic monster; different opinions arising from the different view-point, also the different object designed to be brought forth in its connections, but for our present purposes we will date the firm establishment of this beast in the saddle of human government from the Edict of Milan, 313 A.D. This was an Edict of Constantine, then Emperor of the Roman empire establishing this Roman Catholic religion by law. To trace other testimonies connected with this Roman beast we might start at a different date for Roman Catholicism, entered into the life of the Roman empire much before 313 A.D.

While this Catholic beast had its conflicts within itself; its wars and jangles, yet it drifted along its destined course filling its allotted days [Rev.13:5,] when it gave way to its successor the Protestant beast. Rev.13:11,12. The date of the rise of this second beast like the rise of the first can be counted from different years depending upon the particular phase of its development that we are considering.

Martin Luther was born at Eisleben, Germany, Nov.10, 1483. John Calvin was born at Noyon, France, July 10, 1509. Both of these men were born and bred in the Catholic fold. I regard these as the “two horns like a lamb” [Rev.13:11,] of the Protestant Beast. Other men were raised up to assist in the work, but Luther and Calvin were the leaders in the movement. All they did at first was to *protest* against Catholic corruption, but Catholic tyranny soon dropped them and their followers, and they soon became the leaders of what was termed the Reformation; a reformation it was out of the Catholic fryingpan into the Protestant skillet, for these Protestants were as bitter enemies to the Ana-Baptist as were the Catholics; and as great tyrants when getting control of government and forcing their views upon helpless people as were the Catholics.

Some have claimed that the two horns of this Protestant beast were Ecclesiastical and Civil power; namely, a union of church and State; but while both the Catholic and Protestant beasts sought and used this in the ages which we are discussing, the two men that we have named were the leaders in organizing, developing, and putting into effect this Protestant movement.

Our readers will notice that the Gospel Church had no connection whatever with the Protestant movement. Protestantism came into existence over a thousand years after the true church. Protestant theology came out of Catholicism; and these various Protestant branches are simply daughters of the “Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the earth.” Rev.17:5.

In the meantime, Henry VIII, King of England came into notice, by divorcing his wife, Catharine, and marrying a young woman, Anne Boleyn, and because the Pope of Rome had objected to this, Henry excommunicated the Pope and organized a church of his own, setting himself up as its head, which the British Parliament by an act, Nov.3, 1534, confirmed, making Henry VIII, “supreme head of the Church of England.” Thus began the Church of England, also called the Episcopal Church, which now holds her head so high, the proper name of which organization as at first given was the Church of England.

The origin of this denomination was the lust of Henry VIII for this young woman. Henry was a very brutal man. In a short time he charged Anne with unfaithfulness, and had her executed. She left one daughter who afterward became Queen Elizabeth of England. After Henry had beheaded Anne Boleyn, in fact the very next day he married Jane Seymour, who died the year after their marriage. Henry then marries a German Duchess, Anne of Cleves, but in a short while tired

of her and divorced; the English Parliament readily granting this order of divorce. In the space of about two weeks Henry married his fifth wife [Catherine Howard], but soon found it convenient to get rid of her. She was condemned and met the same fate as Anne Boleyn. The next year, the great head of this proud and haughty Episcopal church made his sixth venture on the matrimonial sea, this time marrying a widow, Lady Catharine Parr; and as Henry lived only four years after this last marriage, his widow survived him. Here we have a remarkable exhibition of that character of religion that comes from the carnal mind.

We have been particular in describing the rise of this Episcopal branch of Protestantism; showing the corrupt fountain from whence it came. It was designed later to play a most important part in settling the second beast in the saddle of human government.

It will be noticed that of the six wives of this “head of the church,” two were divorced; two were executed, one [Lady Seymour] died a year after her marriage and after the birth of her son. There is no telling what would have become of her had she lived long; nor is there any telling what would have become of the last wife had Henry lived long after his sixth marriage.

As previously stated this departure of England from the Catholic fold had much to do with the success of the Protestant cause on the continent of Europe. The Protestant cause had rapidly spread over Europe, and finally became the *established* religion of the Netherlands which was done according to Mosheim’s History, Volume 4, page 128, in 1573.

This seemed to be the turning point in Protestantism, and while war and conflict continued, the Protestant beast seemed firmly established in its control of government, sufficient to send armies and fleets to war, and now began to wage war within its own ranks. The ascension of Elizabeth in 1558 as Queen of England had much to do with the establishment of Protestantism. She was the daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn; and was what may be termed a masculine woman. A ban had been placed upon her by the Pope of Rome on account of her father’s marriage to Anne Boleyn and hence her rule over England rested upon her embracing the Protestant religion, which like her father, Henry VIII, she did from policy. Policy evidently was the cause of Constantine professing the Catholic religion upon his becoming emperor of Rome in A.D. 306; and without question it is the reason of an overwhelming majority of our public men who seek office professing some religious creed because they consider it as an assistant to their election.

It may be well to notice one branch of this Protestant beast, because of its influence in the early settlement of this country. We refer to the Puritans. This was a branch of the Episcopal Church of England. These Puritans had formed organizations separate from the Church of England; and in line with other branches

of this Protestant beast, the “church of England” party, persecuted them to such an extent that they concluded to emigrate to America.

These are the celebrated “Pilgrim Fathers” that are talked so much about; and in some quarters lauded so high in this country. They came over to this country, the first party of about one hundred landing at Plymouth, Massachusetts, and organized a church with as drastic laws, compelling obedience to their own ideas of religion, as forcible as the Episcopalians of England.

This is one sure mark of antichrist; a desire to compel all to bow to their own creed; and to gain control of government in order to force by law their own system upon all who may unhappily fall under their control; the Baptist coming under their revengeful wrath.

Thus was established by law this form of Protestant religion in this settlement of its baneful influence, spreading in surrounding territory; while the church of England [Episcopal] was established *by law* in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, and surrounding territory. It will be noticed that these Puritans were descendant’s of the Episcopalians, and a grand-daughter of the Mother of Harlots.

An English Peer by the name of Baltimore obtained a grant from the English Crown to settle some of the eastern uninhabited parts of Virginia; and settled upon them a Catholic colony, which territory was finally divided into a separate state and called Maryland; named after the wife of King Charles of England, Henrietta Maria. Charles I was the king that gave the grant for this colony to Earl Baltimore, and Charles’ wife was a Catholic, which I presume was the cause of Earl Baltimore’s obtaining a grant to settle a Catholic colony as stated.

The first city laid out in this colony was called Baltimore. Virginia made a struggle in opposition to the separation of this [Maryland] territory and it was several years before the matter was finally settled.

After the death of Charles I, a movement was inaugurated by the Protestants of Virginia to force these Marylanders to drop their own [Catholic] religion and observe the forms of Protestantism; and for a while it seemed successful, the Roman Catholics were denied the right to worship after their own forms, but were restored to their rights under Oliver Cromwell, who gave command to these colonies, “not to busy themselves about religion, but to settle the civil government.”

The Puritans took their name from the claim *that they were the pure in religion*; and of course they considered it their duty to work to make everybody else *pure like themselves*.

METHODIST

Next in order we notice another branch of this second or Protestant beast. The Methodist. They derived their name from the claim of having a special method in

their work of saving sinners. This movement was started in England in 1729, by John & Charles Wesley, and George Whitefield. These three leaders were ordained ministers of the Episcopal hierarchy, hence as this church of England was a daughter of Rome, we find the Methodist like the Puritans, a grand daughter of this “mother of harlots.” John Wesley, like Martin Luther who tried to be a Catholic and a Protestant, sought to retain his membership in this “church of England,” really lived and died in full relationship with his Protestant mother; but his people finally became a separate organization; and in the religious census of 1916, seventeen different branches of this people are given in the United States.

We have not space to enumerate these various branches of anti-christ, but simply give a short notice of some who have taken active lead in our country in an effort to undermine and destroy the fabric of human liberty upon which our government is founded. We are told in Revelation 13:18; that the number of the various branches of the beast “is the number of a man; and his number is Six hundred, three score and six.” “Here is wisdom,” for wisdom has numbered the branches of anti-christ.

NEW SCHOOL BAPTISTS

It is well in noticing the branches of this beast, to make some reference to the New School Baptist, who are as much a slough off from the real Baptist church of today, as were the Catholics in the early centuries. These New School Baptist are in full harmony with all of the distinguishing marks of the Protestant beast, as it is written; “Ye shall know them by their fruits.” Mt.7:16.

We desire to emphasize the clear distinction between the Gospel church, as in her heavenly origin she is “coming down from God out of heaven,” – the holy city, as separate and apart from all the systems and isms of earth, Rev.21:1,2; while the branches of anti-christ spring “hair and hide” in all of their origin, development, and aims; from the corrupt fountains of earth. Their gods are of the character that Saul saw “ascending out of the earth,” I Sam.28:13; and to which the apostle alludes in the testimony; “there be gods many,” I Cor.8:5; gods in olden days hewn out of wood, but in after days hewn out of the depraved minds and imaginations of their worshippers.

In this damnable infamy of Prohibition, one of the greatest curses ever imposed upon this country; brought about especially through the agency and work of this Protestant beast, the Methodist and New School Baptist take the lead in a movement to override all human rights by imposing the most cruel and brutal laws in an effort to enforce an unenforceable law.

In the Presidential election of 1928, we have a fair sample led by Methodist and New School Baptist, of the effort of this beast to gain control of government by dictating to, and endeavoring to force their followers to follow their political lead; and any one at all acquainted with the past history of either the Catholic or

Protestant beast will easily perceive its ear-marks in the Presidential contest of 1928.

It has *always been the custom* of these anti-christian leaders to claim “a great moral principle” or some such subterfuge at stake that leads them to take a hand in a political movement; and thus by fair words and fine speeches lead astray the unwary. They come with a lie in their mouth [II Thes.2:11; Rev.22:15;] “with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish;” to work upon the feelings of weak men and silly women; “after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders.” II Thes.2:9.

We take up considerable space in our description of these two branches of anti-christ as these two in the present day take the lead in this country in wild gassy talk; claiming Christianity, they would put the Lord of life and glory himself in jail, were he to do in one of their Prohibition towns what he did in Cana of Galilee. John 2:1-11.

LUTHERANS

There are quite a number of Lutheran organizations in the United States. This is one of the oldest branches of the Protestant beast, representing more nearly the views of Martin Luther, one of the two horns of that beast, just as the;

PRESBYTERIANS,

of whom there are also a number of bodies in the United States representing more especially the views of John Calvin, the other horn of that beast; and from these two Protestant sources come the various Protestant organizations that spread over our country to the serious detriment of its social and political life.

ADVENTIST

We have here an offshoot from the New School Baptist, and like all such it follows the slimy trail of error, going deep and deeper in the mire until it is lost in the Russellites or as they call themselves the “International Bible Students” of the present day.

This offshoot was one time termed Millerites, just as they are now termed Russellites. It is written: “Every house is builded by some man” and the foundation of this Russellite house was laid by William Miller of Massachusetts. William Miller concluded that the interpretation of certain testimony in Daniel pointed to the second coming of Christ about 1843 or 1844; and when these dates passed, the time was changed to suit the notion of the leaders to later dates. The Russellites may not wish to be described as the followers of Miller. They have enlarged upon Miller’s theory; and have gone farther into Arminianism than ever Miller did; but they evidently belong to the same group of antichrist. They oppose the Protestant branch of antichrist, but plunge into the same fundamental theories that underlie both Catholic and Protestants; namely, the ability of the natural man to change his

conditions from a natural to a spiritual being; to save himself by the exercise of his own will from death in Adam.

We requote the testimony from I John 4:2,3 – “Every spirit that confesseth *that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh* is of God. And every spirit *that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh* is not of God; and this is that spirit of antichrist.” Measuring these Russellites by this rule they clearly evidence the position that they occupy as opposed to Christ. They do not have a clear view of the manhood of Christ, much less of his God-head. The very name “International Bible Students,” show their ignorance of the Gospel, for the Gospel is a revelation [Mt.16:17;] and so the Scripture testimony of that Gospel in all of its typical import; and language is a revelation, which cannot be taught in Sunday Schools, self-styled Christian Associations; Mission Systems, or International Bible Student’s Associations.

We are told that “the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night,” [I Thes.5:2;] it cannot therefore be so far as the particular date is concerned, foretold, published from the house tops as Miller, Russell and other leaders in this movement claim to have done, and are doing. Miller, like Russell printed several periodicals circulating his views, sent missionaries, like these I.B.S., broadcasting his heretical opinions; taking sometimes a tent capable of accommodating from three to five thousand people to listen to his lectures; creating immense excitement in his day, especially as the year [1843] came.

But the Russellites have been more cute in their second coming of Christ. They tell us that he came exactly on their schedule time, but it was so quiet the world did not know of it, hence they are recommissioned to notify all mankind in order that all the human race should profit by an event; that the Scripture plainly declare is in the hands of Almighty God for the accomplishment of his own wise decrees.

To confess “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh,” one must first have knowledge of Christ as the Son of God, “God manifest in the flesh.” I Tim.3:16. Next, he must be brought to know that this testimony refers to Christ coming *in the flesh of his people*; his partaking of their flesh & blood [Heb.2:14,] as we have several times alluded to in this work.

The Russellites in common with all other branches of antichrist have the children of God made up out of flesh and blood; in other words knowing only the one [Adam] man, transfer him to heaven; from mortal to immortal by the exercise of his [the natural man’s] will to triumph over sin and death, and reach the shores of immortality. Like Miller, these Russellites are very loose in their calculations; and when it suits their fancy, can easily make a chronology of their own.

The fact is no date is given in the Scriptures as to *when* Christ shall come the second time, the declaration is made that “unto them that look for him, shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.” Heb.9:28. And as he ascended the angels said to the disciples; “This same Jesus which is taken from you into

heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.” Acts 1:11.

But these Russellites have discovered a “mare’s nest,” which has made them “wise in their own eyes” [Is.5:21;] wise above what is written in the Divine testimony; and they not only claim to tell us the time of the coming of Christ, but assure us that he has already come; and *that there are thousands now living who will never die*. What folly! They appear to have no knowledge whatever of the spiritual nature of the kingdom of God; and of its subjects; of the election in Christ; and of the incapability of the carnal mind to comprehend the character of that kingdom, but simply regard the kingdom to be made up out of natural men and women, who by their own efforts prepare and qualify themselves for entrance into this heavenly kingdom.

Assuredly we cannot bring a clean thing out of an unclean, as it is written; “Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit.” Mt.7:16,17. So we can trace each and every branch of these several Catholic or Protestant religious streams back to the corrupt source from which each came. Yet, these are they who seek control over the lives and fortunes of all who are so unhappy as to fall under their despotic sway; blind leaders of the blind; at their best estate they are but “whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men’s bones.” Mt.23:27.

It is folly to talk of a love for gospel truth and yet have affiliation with the enemies of truth. David says; “Surely thou wilt slay the wicked, O God; depart from me therefore, *ye bloody men*. For they speak against thee wickedly, and thine enemies take thy name in vain. Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate thee? And am I not grieved with those that rise up against thee? *I hate them with a perfect hatred*. I count them mine enemies.” Ps.139:19-22. The Saviour declares; “He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth abroad.” Mt.12:30. “No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.” Mt.6:24.

ANA-BAPTIST

We desire to make further brief reference to this “sect everywhere spoken against.” Those who under this name passed through the fiery scenes of the early centuries.

Mosheim, a Protestant historian in his history admits that the origin of this sect “is hidden in the depths of antiquity.” He can trace the rise of other systems through Profane history; but not this people, who are not “reckoned among the nations.” Numbers 23:9.

But we must not confound the real Baptist under this name with others who bore the name, but did not have the testimony, as there are those bearing the name of Old School Baptist to-day that do not hold the testimony. Evidently the sect named by their enemies Ana-Baptist were the real Baptist church of that day; and as they required all who came to them, though such had a gospel experience, and had been baptized in other orders, to be re-baptized, they were called Ana-Baptist, or Re-baptisers.

As noticed in our reference to this subject previously; frequently in these early centuries the true followers of gospel grace were named by the world after certain noted preachers, whose public labor had brought upon them the relentless opposition of the enemies of truth. But we cannot correctly trace this gospel church only as the apostolic [doctrine & order] mark is laid upon her; and she is found to measure up to this standard.

Hence when we find a Baptist organization in the days of the Roman beast declaring, as was done in that day, that “the Catholic hierarchy is the whore of Babylon,” [Rev.17:1,] we find a good start for a gospel church. And when we find such an organization declaring a complete separation of church and state; we find a second mark of the Gospel church; and we venture then to search their record for evidences of “the apostle’s doctrine and fellowship,” [Acts 2:42,] the distinguishing evidence that marks the Gospel church as we have previously stated in all ages; conditions; and climes.

From the time that the church came out from her hiding in the wilderness [Rev.12:14,] she has been known as a Baptist church; and most surely as Christ is her head; and as he was an Old School Baptist [the Baptist before any division,] so must his church be an Old School Baptist church. But just as there were departures from the church in early days, so in later days there are those who depart from the faith which we hold and claim our name; as it is written; “In that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel; only let us be called by thy name to take away our reproach.” Isaiah 4:1.

As we close this brief sketch of CHRIST and anti-christ; considering the long, eventful travel of this chosen people, confronting as they have and do, the world with all of its baneful influence, the governments and powers of earth through all the ages of time, we may well repeat the declaration of the Psalmist:

“If it had not been the LORD who was on our side, now may Israel say; If it had not been the LORD who was on our side, when men rose up against us; Then they had swallowed us up quick, when their wrath was kindled against us; Then the waters had overwhelmed us, the stream had gone over our soul; Then the proud waters had gone over our soul. Blessed be the LORD, who hath not given us as a prey to their teeth. Our soul is escaped as a bird out of the snare of the fowlers; the

snare is broken, and we are escaped. Our help is in the name of the LORD, who made heaven and earth.” Psalm 124.

Also; “They that trust in the LORD shall be as mount Zion, which cannot be removed, but abideth forever. As the mountains are round about Jerusalem, so the LORD is round about his people from henceforth, even forever. For the rod of the wicked shall not rest upon the lot of the righteous; lest the righteous put forth their hands unto iniquity. Do good, O LORD, unto those that be good, and to them that are upright in their hearts. As for such as turn aside unto their crooked ways, the LORD shall lead them forth with the workers of iniquity; but peace shall be unto Israel.” Psalm 125.

Not only are we given the marks that are to identify the apostolic church under all conditions, but are also given the marks that are to identify what the prophet Jeremiah calls her adversaries. Their cruel, bitter, merciless, and lying attacks; their perversions, opposition, and deception as well. Those of us who passed through the fiery scenes of 1886-89, can well testify to the truth recorded in these Psalms. “If it had not been the Lord who was on our side, when men rose up against us.” Ah, most surely so, “Then they had swallowed us up quick, when *their wrath was kindled against us.*”

Let those who come after us as they pass through similar scenes, take notice and take courage as well; for remnant as we are the day is not past, but what perverters and wolves are to enter in among us “not sparing the flock.” No one unless such an one has had experience with this character of people who have went out from among us can ever realize the cruel characters; the merciless wrath that controls them; the lying character of their efforts to destroy.

In summing up the closing articles in this Appendix, we desire to emphasize one of the leading thoughts presented, namely; the character of the Protestant beast as being in every respect as cruel and blood thirsty as its Catholic predecessor. Why not? Let the reader carefully read the description of the two as recorded in Revelation 13, and connections. It is written that the dragon gave power to the first beast; equally so to the second beast who “spake as a dragon;” with the same blood thirsty spirit to destroy all opposition.

Not only this, but with their false, deceptive cry of a great moral issue, they lead their dupes to follow their blind and treacherous leadership, when really the only issue in the case is their effort to gain control of government, and force all to bow to their will, as quoted from Ridpath [another Protestant historian,] the difference between the two beasts in this respect is the same as the difference between six and a half dozen.

We have traced their past record and have clearly shown their character in all of their past history; and no well instructed saint, but what can recognize that history in our own country. In its early settlement; and all the way down to the present, as

they have sought, and are yet seeking to gain control of the public schools, and poison the minds of the young with their pernicious doctrines.

Their drags and nets [Hab.1:15,] are thrown out [Sunday Schools; Y.M.C.A. – Y.W.C.A.; and others of the same breed,] to catch the simple minded who are “void of understanding” [PV.7:7,] to catch them with their much fair deceptive speeches; and flattering words.

The second beast was deceptive as more lamb-like, more apt to lead astray the public, but when required, both wings of this dragon monster could flop together, for instance in persecuting the true witnesses; as we are told that this lamb-like monster “had power to give life unto the image of the beast ... and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast *should be killed.*”

The first beast is called “The great whore that sitteth upon many waters;” and the waters “are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues.” Rev.17:15. This beast was arrayed “in *purple and scarlet* color,” evidently representing her bloody character; as “drunken with the blood of the saints.” She showed the dragon spirit concealed in her deceptive course.

We are told that “great is the mystery of godliness.” Great indeed! Beyond all human power to fathom! That such persecutions to prison, and to the most brutal death should follow the living witnesses of eternal truth.

But the development of this chosen people as such witnesses is evidently in “the furnace of affliction” as “made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth.” Ps.139:15,16. So in the dealings of Israel’s God with his people in their travel here. Truly we are brought to exclaim, “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out.” Rom.11:33.

Ribpath in volume V, page 233 of his History, says of what was called this *Protestant Reformation*:

“The new churches which the Reformation established in the countries that fell under their sway, became as abusive as the mother church had been before them. True it is that in certain moral purity – a certain inner cleanness of the organization, the new church was better than the old, but her practices were equally abusive, and her logic worse; because she could adduce in justification of her conduct no major premises which had not belonged to Rome for centuries. So when Protestantism came into ascendancy in Germany, Switzerland and England, began to commit the same crimes in the name of religion, *the very crimes* of which Catholicism had been guilty, and to justify them by the same arguments, it was not wonderful that sarcastic Rome turned upon her rival a withering glance.”

But why further discuss the question, when as we have already shown “The Great Red Dragon” gave power to, and worked through each of these two beasts, and all of the branches as well. We find simply a multiplicity of the serpent’s

[Gen.3:1,] breed; and we in this country have to deal with the snake [Protestant,] before us, not the one [Catholic] that has been scotched behind us.

MOHAMMEDANISM

It seems important in tracing the Adversaries of Zion to make some reference to this branch of anti-christ. Mohammed was born in Mecca, a city of Arabia about the year A.D. 570; began preaching A.D. 610. He was a descendant of Ishmael; the subject, from his childhood, of epileptic fits; and was evidently an insane fanatic on religion. But after some drawbacks and opposition, he established a denomination that spread over parts of Asia, and at one time had gotten a large foothold in Europe. Mohammed's religion allowed a multiplicity of wives on earth and in heaven, which made it very popular; also that man was saved by his good deeds, being therein a branch of the religion of Cain. He believed in propagating his religion by the sword, which was and is the character of all false systems of religion. Their bible is called the Koran, and much like the ecclesiastical books of other worldly religious orders contains a lot of nonsense; crotchets hatched in the brains of self-appointed teachers of this world's systems of religion.

So we trace the religions of earth reaching from Cain to the Temanites; the Shuhites, and the Zopharites in Job's day; the Canaanites in the days of the Patriarchs; the Philistines in the days of the Judges; the Amorites, Moabites, Amelikites, and other *Ites* who flourished in the days of Israel in Palestine; the Agagites to whom Mordecai would not bow in the days of Queen Esther; the Scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees and others in the days of the Saviour; and so on down to Catholics and Protestants in the present days of the travel of the Gospel Church.

NOTICE OF GOSPEL MINISTERS

We close the present work with brief notice of some of the able and faithful men whose ministerial labors are interwoven with the travel of the church in our country, and to some of whom reference has been made in our columns.

First, let us notice in this list the men who were persecuted and bitterly assailed by the Protestants in the early settlement of the American colonies.

In this list Elder **Jeremiah Moore** easily takes a place in the front rank. Jeremiah Moore was born in Prince William County, Virginia, June 7, 1746. He was baptized by Elder David Thomas and soon after was ordained to the work of the Gospel ministry. He was arrested and committed to jail three times for preaching, and one time the sentence read that "he was to remain in jail until he should rot for preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ." He was committed to jail in Alexandria, Virginia, and afterward a church was organized under his ministry in that city. This church continued in active travel until the division of 1886-89, when it went off with the Durand party and soon lost its visibility. The New School Baptist in that city lately unveiled a tablet to Moore's memory, but they bear less resemblance to Moore's ministry than a hawk or buzzard does to the American

eagle. Elder Moore died Feb.24, 1815. He was the author of several Baptist publications in his day.

Elder **David Thomas** was one of the very first Baptist ministers that labored in Virginia though born in Pennsylvania, August 16, 1732. Under his ministry, the church at Occoquan was organized, also the church at Broad Run in Fauquier County. He was the first pastor of the Occoquan church. He lived to an advanced age and finally died in Kentucky.

Elder **James Ireland** was born in Edinburgh, Scotland in 1748. He removed at an early age to America settling in the northern part of Virginia. He was baptized and ordained to the work of the ministry, and suffered great persecution, having been arrested and thrown into jail for preaching. He died May 5, 1806.

Elder **William Fristow** was born in Stafford County, Virginia, in 1742. He was baptized by Elder David Thomas about the year 1762. Elder Fristow was an able and influential minister. He published in 1808 a history of the Ketchikan Association, which at that time was an orderly Association of Baptists. He died, August 14, 1828.

Elder **John Leland** was born in Grafton, about 40 miles west of Boston, Massachusetts, May 14, 1754. In 1776 he moved to Virginia, where he remained until 1791. Elder Leland was a man of considerable ability, and a preacher of some note among Baptist of his day. A book of considerable size was published in 1845, containing a biographical sketch of Elder Leland, and a collection of his writings; many interesting incidents of his life and labors are here recorded. Elder Leland died Jan.14, 1841.

Elder **Thomas P. Dudley** was born in Fayette County, Kentucky, May 31, 1792. He was the son of Elder Ambrose Dudley who emigrated from Virginia to Kentucky in 1786. Elder Dudley passed through some severe scenes in the War of 1812, with England; he was taken a prisoner and experienced trials among his Indian captors, the Indian allies of England in that war; and after his return to Kentucky was baptized and ordained to the work of the ministry, becoming one of the most able and fearless ministers of his day. Died 1884; in his 92nd year.

Elder **Samuel Trott** was born in 1784, and died in Fairfax County, Virginia, Oct.30, 1866; after an active life of over sixty years in the ministry. The late Elder R.C. Leachman, referring to Elder Trott's ministry pays it the following glowing tribute:

“His ministry was not with him as; alas, it is with too many, a work of convenience or of secondary importance, but regarded as the great and leading business of his life. Through sunshine and storm he was faithful to his appointments, and seemed to be always laden with gospel treasures. No man seemed to feel more sensibly his dependence upon God, and none seemed to be more constantly furnished unto every good word and work. It was my privilege

and pleasure to hear the last discourse he ever publicly preached, which was at the Baltimore Association in May last, from the text: 'Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God.' His preaching seemed to me like a voice from the grave, rebuking the foul spirit of fanaticism, and testifying that the boasted and boastful religion of the time amounts to nothing. His last moments were marked by no special demonstration. Yet his death was just such a one as I would wish to die; with no particular disease, his body not racked with pain, his mental powers in full exercise to the last expression he was able to give, he quietly fell asleep like an infant in its mother's arms."

Elder **Robert C. Leachman** was one of the most remarkable, yes, one of the ablest ministers of his, or of any other age. An extended account of his life and labour is found in Volume X, numbers 4 & 5 of the SECTARIAN. Much of the firm, steady travel of our Churches of later years can be traced back to his ministry. Bold and fearless in the proclamation of gospel truth; he readily became a target for its enemies, and subject to their cruel and malignant abuse. He was blessed with a clear, discriminating gift in preaching, with a wonderfully deep and comprehensive view of the Scriptures. He regarded neither the frowns or smiles of men in his ministerial labour. With the exception of a short time spent as a refugee in North Carolina during the war of 1861, he lived within the limits of his native county. In early youth he was fond of worldly pleasures up to about twenty years of age, when quite a change came over him. He dropped the company of his gay associates, became grave and serious, and finally applied for membership and was baptized. Very early in his ministry it became apparent that his gift was of a most remarkable character; a "Boanerges," a son of thunder, and a son of consolation. We copy the following pertinent remarks from the pen of Elder Leachman which indicates the nature of his gift:

"This opposition will not always come from the open enemies of truth, but perhaps more frequently from its professed friends. This makes it harder to bear, and more difficult to deal with. We do not like to impute evil motives to those we have been accustomed to regard as brethren; nor do we like suddenly to discard them as enemies of the truth. We cannot convince them that they are in error, no matter how clear it may be that they are; and an attempt to do so will probably only excite their anger and make them our enemies. Whatever may be the consequences to either friend or foe, the faithful minister has no right to consider them, or to swerve one hair's breath from what he feels called upon to contend for, for fear of some unpleasant consequences."

Reference has been previously made to this testimony of Elder Leachman, but we so fully endorse it that we give it double notice.

Elder **Gilbert Beebe** was born in Connecticut, November 25, 1800. He was baptized in 1811, and ordained in 1823. In common with Elder Trott and

Leachman he withstood the onslaught of the “Clark” party in the division of 1852-53, standing firmly upon the same points under discussion in the division of 1889. Elder Beebe began the publication of the *Signs of the Times* in 1832, moving to Alexandria, Virginia, in 1836, and remaining there until 1840. He died May 2, 1881, in the 81st year of his age, and having been in the ministry about sixty-three years.

FINIS

We have in this book previously called attention to the fact that the great body of professed Old School Baptist from whom we do now and should continue to stand apart, have gone farther and farther astray. There seems to be hardly any line of distinction drawn. We hear in their periodicals no complaint against that damnable, infamous Protestantism, Prohibition; nor yet of Woman Suffrage, and other such ungodly things which to our understanding clearly reveals the fact that there are members among them mixed with these evils.

Nor does there seem to be any real knowledge at this writing of the fundamental principles of the Eternal Election in Christ; and the birth of the child of the [Spirit] life in which he was chosen. Without this knowledge there can never be any proper understanding of the principles of Gospel truth, but those who believe in an election in Adam; that is of Adam sinners; and that the sinner is born again will go farther and farther from Gospel doctrine and order, until lost in wild systems of earth.

Some Terms used in this work.

Correspondence between Associations is where one Association corresponds with another by exchanging messengers and Minutes.

Direct Correspondence is where this is done by each such Association, direct the one with the other.

Indirect Correspondence is where these Associations do not correspond by sending minutes and messengers direct to each other, but do correspond with each other through another Association.

Baptism is considered orderly when the minister performing it is at the time of such performance held in the fellowship of a church, which at the time of such administration, held in the fellowship of orderly Baptist.

There are three ways of uniting with an orderly Old School Baptist Church; either and all of which is predicated upon an orderly baptism. 1. By baptism. 2. By a letter of dismissal from an orderly church. 3. By Confession of Faith.

Confession of Faith is where the church where such an one is held in fellowship has dissolved or gone down in good order without giving letters; or where such an one leaves a church because of its disorder, yet having been baptized while the church was in good order, and by a minister at that time in order, now comes before this orderly church on Confession of Faith, that is relating his or her experience and belief in Gospel doctrine and order.

END OF ORIGINAL COPY.

*Printed & Bound at the Office of the Sectarian, Occoquan, Va.,
1923-24.*

SUPPLEMENTARY ARTICLES OF RELATED DOCTRINAL INTEREST:

THE HEAVENLY BIRTH.

Dear Brother Beebe: - I have been a reader of the "Signs of the Times" for thirty years, and I do not remember that I ever read anything in them that inspired the same degree of pleasure as the communication of Elder J.F. Johnson in the 22nd number of the 35th volume. [On the subject of Regeneration.] Not that he presented any new truth, or because he presented the old in a new dress; but because it seemed to be presented with such force and beauty as to carry conviction at once to the mind of the reader that it was the truth and nothing but the truth. I have not the vanity to suppose myself capable of adding anything to either its force or beauty, nor is this communication designed for any such purpose. But as the doctrine as expressed by brother Johnson has encountered considerable opposition, I thought perhaps it would afford him some little gratification if even I should endorse the doctrine, as I fully and emphatically do.

Old School Baptists have ever been distinguished for the pertinency with which they have insisted upon the necessity of the new birth. But alas for many, when their views of what constitutes the new birth are investigated, they are found to be certain vague and ill defined ideas about the operations of the Spirit of God upon the human soul, changing it from natural to spiritual, or a birth without pre-existence or regeneration.

If there is a spiritual birth without pre-existent spiritual existence, why should not that birth as often develop a devil as a saint? It is only because every seed produces its like; that "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." If that which is born *did* pre-exist, it was either self-existent or it was begotten. If the latter, it follows as necessarily that there must be a progenitor as a progeny, or in other words, that this spiritual seed must have a spiritual life and head as necessarily as that the natural seed must have one. Some plants and vines may be propagated by cuttings, but however much they may be multiplied by this process, all may be traced to an original seed, and the fruit will ever show the original kind. Hence we have the two Adams. "The first was made a living soul; the second a quickening spirit." It is no more marvelous that the whole spiritual family existed in Christ than it is that the whole natural family, including his wife existed in Adam before any of them were born, or that two *nations* should be in the womb of Rebekah. Those [so-called] Old School Baptists who believe in making a spiritual man out of a natural one, only differ from their *christian friends of other denominations* as to what is necessary to be done in order to effect this change. Both virtually repudiate the new birth, and both contradict the apostle, who

declares, “The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. If the natural man can receive the things of the Spirit of God, with what consistency can any man oppose any or all of the systems that are employed for educating, scaring, or otherwise imparting such conception? Or whence arises and necessity for his being born again? If it be necessary that a man should be born again in order to his seeing the kingdom of God, it must be because nature, or the fleshly birth, furnishes no faculties, no matter how highly they may be improved, or how diligently applied, that can comprehend or receive the things of the Spirit of God. The new birth must therefore be a development and bringing forth of other faculties, and these of a higher order, else nothing is gained by being born again.

Brother Johnson has shown so clearly that everything that is born must first exist, that it would look like plagiarism for me to attempt to argue the subject further. He has also shown with equal clearness that the term “regenerate” refers to their first begetting, and not to being born or bringing forth. I have often felt a curiosity to know how those persons who believe regeneration and the new birth are synonymous expressions, and that when it is effected the natural man is changed into a spiritual man, or at least that the soul, which is the life and ruling principle, is so changed, get along when they find any remains of carnality, or any propensity towards evil. It seems to me they ought at once to abandon either their hope or their doctrine. I cannot see how they can still maintain both. The Bible view of the doctrine, however, teaches how one may be a sinner, and yet a saint – how he may exhibit the fruits of the flesh and the fruits of the spirit, and how he may die and yet live. All truth is calculated to strengthen and encourage the hopes of the believer, and the only effect of error is to confuse and confound. The same spirit that indited the effusions of prophets and apostles writes that same truth in the hearts of God’s children. Hence, whenever the truth is proclaimed it finds a ready response in the experience of the children; and whenever doubts and fears arise, it is always from a misapprehension of what the truth is. Thus “I see so much evil and indwelling corruption in my nature, I fear that I have not been born again,” is a conclusion that could only be reached by supposing that the new birth eradicates all this corruption, and makes the person holy. But if the truth teaches that in the new birth there is imparted and brought forth a new principle, that is at variance with all the workings of nature, without destroying or changing a single one of all the affections, passions, or lusts that belong to nature, and the christian, like the apostle Paul, finds a law in his members warring against the law of the mind, or “the flesh lusting against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh.” That fact, while it may make him often cry, “O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death?” Yet is a sure guarantee that he is the subject of this spiritual birth, for so the gospel teaches.

But I will not pursue this subject further at this time.

Yours, very truly,
R.C. Leachman

Mannassa, Virginia, Nov.19, 1867.

From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.36 {1868}

ABSOLUTE PREDESTINATION.

“Eternal God whose lofty throne,
Extends beyond all mortal sight,
To puny man thou art unknown,
Revealed in faith’s exalted flight.”

“In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.” Eph.1:11.

We have before us a copy of the “Messenger of Truth,” a periodical claiming Old School, published at Laurel Fork, Virginia. In this paper, one of the leading articles is an Editorial attack upon the doctrine of PREDESTINATION. In the same paper appears communications relating experience to which we think no serious objection can be found. We have frequently been made to wonder how any one with an experience of Gospel grace could object to the doctrine of the Eternal, Irrevocable, and Absolute Predestination of All Things, Whatsoever Cometh to pass?

We are not at all surprised to find opposition to this truth in the world, for the natural mind of man revolts at the sovereignty of God; “is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.” Rom.7:7. But we are greatly surprised that anyone who has ever really felt the touch of the Divine presence, “the powers of the world to come,” should ever question, this most precious, soul cheering, and God honoring doctrine. The prophet tells us, however, that, “The leaders of this people cause them to err.” Is.9:16. It was bad nursing [II Sam.4:4,] that caused Mephibosheth’s lameness. And it is false preaching, false teaching that often poisons the minds of the children of God against Gospel truth.

The editorial to which we refer is written in the ingenious manner which characterizes writings of this character, opponents of the doctrine being apparently

in fear that the character of God is assailed by the doctrine of Absolute Predestination; and rush to the front to vindicate the character of Him, whose infinite purity and holiness cannot be called into question; and is therefore not in any sense involved in any discussion of this or any other point of doctrine.

We will quote a few paragraphs from the article in the Messenger:

“God said to Adam, concerning the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, ‘Thou shalt not eat of it.’ Did that mean that Adam could not eat of it? Or did it mean that he should not or ought not? If it had meant that he could not, that he was not and never could be able to eat of it, the penalty would not have been affixed, or if it had been affixed, it never would have been executed.”

Now in this extract, we have a man of straw set up, and demolished. The reader will notice the ingenious manner in which the terms *could not*, *should not*, and *ought not* are used. The writer slyly steps aside from the force and meaning of the Scripture that he is discussing. He fails to quote the whole verse, but clips from it one clause, leaving out the essential part. The verse reads, “But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.” That God did not intend or predestinate that Adam should eat of this tree, as declared in the editorial to which we refer, is absurd in the face of the declaration: “*In the day that thou eatest thereof.*” Here is not only the prophecy that he should eat of the tree, but the day appointed in which it was to be done. How could this language have ever been used; if there was to be no day of the kind named? This declaration reveals not only the foresight of Jehovah, but his predestination. When the full verse is quoted the sense in which the word *shall* is used is clearly seen. “Thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” That is, Adam “*should not*,” or “*could not*” eat of the tree, and remain in the state of his original creation. The day that he ate of the tree should mark his fall. The changeless “shalt not” of his Creator was evidenced when he fell from that original state, fell under the law of sin and death, and reached the fulfillment of the second shall, “Thou shalt surely die.” The meaning of the first *shall*, is as clear as the second; the first calls for the second. We might transpose the verse, and it would not lose its force: “In the day [predetermined time] that thou eatest of the tree ... thou shalt surely die; for thou shalt not eat of it [and remain in your present condition in Eden.]”

We might here inquire in what way could the coming of a Saviour have been absolutely predestinated, and the entrance of sin, left out of such predestination, left to chance. Saviour and sinner, salvation and sin are relative terms; the one calls for the other. The same eternal purpose or predestination that absolutely provided, pre-determined, ordained, predestinated the coming of Christ as the Saviour of sinners, as absolutely, and irrevocably ordained the fall of Adam, and the consequent entrance of sin.

“Lo, in the fall we are led to espy,
‘Twas all for the lifting of Jesus on high.”

Adam in the original creation was simply an earthly man fitted only to occupy an earthly sphere; he was not fitted for heaven. The fall of Adam was essential to the revelation of gospel grace in the face of Jesus Christ, and how could such an important factor be other than as the Scripture declares: “For if by one man’s offence, death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.” Rom.5:17. Leave out the fall of Adam and what would have become of the whole economy of Redemption; hence both sin and salvation must have been embraced in the one full and complete design, purpose, or predestination of God.

When an artist designs a picture, the lines of light, and shades of darkness are embodied in the one design; the dark background must be there to bring out the life lines of the picture. It is written: “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. And the earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep ... and God said, Let there be light; and there was light.” Gen.1:1-3. Was not this darkness as much a part of the creation as the light? Did not both spring from the one creative word which made the heavens and the earth and “all the host of them?”

The Scripture so declares and also gives us the typical meaning of the darkness and light: “I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things.” Isa.45:7.

The editor of the *Messenger* sums up his view of the fall of Adam in the following paragraph:

“Did God mean that he would not suffer Adam to eat of the tree? No; but he meant that Adam should not do so; that he had no right from God to eat of it. It was Adam’s duty to obey his Maker, but he disobeyed him of his own will; he knew better and was not deceived. So the penalty ‘Thou shalt surely die,’ was a just recompense for his disobedience. By the disobedience of this one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin. And had it not been for the intervention of mercy through the atonement of Jesus Christ, all men without an exception, would have remained in death under the penalty.”

Here is Arminian “Free Agency” pure and simple; from which it is clearly seen that the writer, instead of placing the fall of Adam to the Predestination of Almighty God, places it upon Adam himself, as an old preacher in West Virginia used to say, “Adam made himself a sinner.” And but for the intervention of Jesus Christ all his posterity would have remained in death. That is, the intervention of Jesus Christ was an after consideration, a revelation of the mercy of God at the expense of his justice, in order to extricate Adam from the pit into which he had placed himself. This is in line with the Article of Faith of the Kehukee Association

of North Carolina, that God made Adam “able to stand, but liable to fall.” What improvement does this make upon the Divine character. Assuredly He must have foreseen that Adam would fall, *if left liable to*; and why not, we ask from the standpoint of human wisdom, was not Adam made unable to fall, and thus left without immortality to roam at will in the Garden of Eden, an earthly paradise? Such questions like the “wisdom of this world are foolishness with God.” But we quote again from the *Messenger*:

“The believer has been created in Christ Jesus unto good works. These good works come in after creation; after regeneration; to the saints, after they have been quickened.”

Here of course is the “sinner born again doctrine,” which is the heart’s delight of Means Baptist; the quickening and regeneration of the natural man. Again, we quote:

“If we boast of the ‘wills and shalls’ of Jehovah, let us know how to do it. If they are as some affirm, and the commandment, ‘Thou shalt not steal,’ is addressed to all men, then no man ever stole or committed a theft.”

This is the first time we have ever seen in a periodical *professedly* Old School, the assertion that such commandments, in the peculiar sense in which they were given, were addressed to all men.

The writer warms up in his discourse, and closes with the following:

“Those who preach that God purposed Adam’s transgression have no authority for what they preach; they draw on their own imagination, or use the imagination of others. It contradicts the Bible, sets at naught God’s word, and makes prayer, preaching, exhortation, rebuke, reproof, and admonition vain things. We verily believe that many good brethren and sisters are deceived by this theory.”

Have we not here an example of the character described by the apostle: “But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them ... shall *speak evil of the things that they understand not.*” II Pet.2:1,12.

In the writings of such honored elders, and Old School fathers as Gilbert Beebe, J.F. Johnson, R.C. Leachman, Samuel Trott, Thomas P. Dudley, Philander Hartwell, David Patman, J.M. Theobald, and a host of others, the doctrine now so bitterly assailed was clearly proclaimed. It has remained for a crop of youngsters who have crept [II Tim.3:6,] into the Means Baptist ministry to assume superior knowledge to the Baptist Fathers of former days; and more important still to “holy men of God” who spake as they were “moved by the Holy Ghost.” [II Pet.1:21.]

But let us pass to more fully consider the subject at the head of our article: ABSOLUTE PREDESTINATION. We have but little use for the term *absolute*, only as it more clearly distinguishes the doctrine to which our enemies object. The

word as we use it with Predestination, means Predestination *without limit*. Yet Predestination when used alone certainly means this also. The character of God is above reproach; can never be measured by human reason, or comprehended by the natural mind. "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." Mt.11:27. The revelation which he has been pleased to make of himself manifests his eternal self-existence. "I AM THAT I AM." Ex.3:14. "I am the LORD and there is no God besides me." Isa.45:5. "There is no power but of God; and the powers that be, are ordained of God." Rom.13:1. We might quote without limit testimony clearly revealing the infinite self-existence; the boundless power, and wisdom of God.

Self-existence is an attribute of Sovereign power. Eternity, nor time can hold but one self-existent Being, and that Being is the great "I AM;" all other beings depend for existence upon him who "is before all things, and by him all things consist." Col.1:17. PREDESTINATION is a new testament term, and used but few times. It is somewhat similar, but not entirely in meaning to the word *purpose*, a word used more frequently, and in both Testaments. Paul instructed Timothy to rightly divide the word of truth. II Tim.2:15. To rightly divide the word of Truth is to place each point of doctrine in its proper place, for each point of the "doctrine of God our Saviour" has a certain bearing in the great work of Redemption.

The apostle connects the doctrine of Predestination with Election, placing Predestination immediately after Election. "For whom he did foreknow, he also did *predestinate* to be conformed to the image of his Son." Rom.8:29. "According as he hath chosen us in him, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love; having *predestinated* us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will." Eph.1:4,5.

From the order in which these two points of doctrine are placed in this and other New Testament connections, it is evident that Election is one, if not really the basic principle of the Gospel system; and that Predestination is the Divine warrant of the eternal triumph of the election of grace. The full verse from which we have partly quoted reads: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified." Rom.8:29,30. Predestination is here given, insuring the call, the justification, and glorification of the election of grace.

"In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." In this text we have both the word *purpose* & *predestinated* used with a slight

difference only in the meaning of the two words. Predestination is used here as in other Scriptural testimony, connected with the “inheritance of the saints in light.” The choice in Christ is first referred to, and Predestination insures in all the heirs of promise the security of their redemption in Christ Jesus.

“ *According to the purpose of him who worketh all things.*” The all things to which reference is here made may be more especially the calling, justification, and glorification of the election of grace; but the doctrine of Predestination covers all this ground; not only directly, but all that has, what may be termed an indirect connection. In the revelation of the stupendous work of Redemption; crowned with the glory and honour of the Lord Jesus Christ, it was necessary that an arena be provided where this work should be done, hence time was brought into being for God’s good pleasure, [Rev.4:11,] and for the manifestation of the wonders of his will.

In the verse preceding the text the apostle clearly presents the work of Predestination: “That in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ.” Time and time’s creatures were created for the development of this great work; it was to be made manifest “in the dispensation of the fulness of times.” Hence all created things directly or indirectly tend to the one great end for which they were created, under the master hand of the great Architect of the universe; the Creator of all worlds; and the Disposer of all events.

Who dare question that this all powerful God, Jehovah, the I AM THAT I AM, who purposed in eternity; and holds complete control of all the eternal developments revealing the salvation and glorification of his chosen family, would fail to securely keep in the grasp of his Almighty power the manifestation of this eternal purpose through all the changing scenes of time; or that he would create anything which he could not govern; or that the far reaching revelation of the purpose or predestination of God should leave out of its secure, accurate, and irrevocable ordination a single event, to come by chance, permission, [permissive *decrees,*] or any other agency save alone the eternal decrees, the purpose and predestination of Almighty God. He alone is responsible, as he alone possesses absolute power. He has not delegated such responsibility to any of his creatures, whether men or devils. He seeks not to evade such responsibility, but entirely assumes it in the testimony before quoted: “I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil; I the LORD do all these things.” Isa.45:7.

As stated the *all things* in our text may refer to the varied exhibitions of his grace in the salvation of Israel; yet they cannot ignore, but must necessarily embrace the scenes of time in which these displays are made. For instance the crucifixion of Christ was necessary, but wicked men must be raised up, a cross supplied, a wicked king enthroned; all these visible, temporal things must be provided [predestinated] at the proper time “by the determinate counsel and

foreknowledge of God.” Acts 2:23. And all these wicked agencies were raised up as Pharaoh was raised up and his heart hardened [Ex.7:13;] “For to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done.” Acts 4:28.

The crucifixion of Christ so far as being a result of Predestination, was neither an isolated, nor an exceptional case; but an example of all time’s developments; all absolutely all, whether good or evil, large or small, must have some bearing direct or remote upon the glory of God in Christ Jesus; the objects for which all worlds and things were created of God.

“*Predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things.*” For the only and best of causes he can work *all things*; “For by him were *all things* created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; *all things* were created by him, *and FOR HIM.*” Col.1:16. We are aware that those who would pervert this testimony are experts in playing upon words, and might take exception to the phrase “*worketh all things;*” that it could not be construed to sustain the doctrine of Predestination, the reader will notice that this clause is not the important clause of the text; but that the purpose and predestination of God, are the essential factors in the text; “Being *predestinated* according to the *purpose* of him who worketh all things.”

Let us transpose this part of the verse, and while retaining its force, we see more clearly its meaning, “He who works all things hath predestinated according to his purpose.” That is, the inheritance referred to in the text is obtained [experienced] according to the purpose and predestination of God. Predestination then secures the execution of the purpose; the development of the eternal design; the Divine medium through which this development is secured; and this Predestination is “according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.”

Predestination also is the absolute ordination of the “all things” embodied in this purpose, and embraced in this working. The apostle in the 8th chapter of Romans covers this same ground, but in a somewhat different manner. He tells us of the “all things” predestinated and *working together* for the good of the saints; and for the glory of God. In the all things are named tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril, and the sword. Death, life, angels, principalities, powers &c. These are among the “all things” alluded to in our subject; and these can be termed of a temporal character - things of time.

We might take up the things to which the apostle refers one by one, and see how clearly we can trace the predestination of God; his ruling hand in each event. No depths of poverty [famine] to which saints can be subject, no peril, misrepresentation. No depths of great sorrow [tribulation] or sore bereavement &c. These things are essential to the development of that people who are chosen in the

furnace of affliction; and the apostle concludes his summary of these things that attend their pilgrimage with the promise: "All things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose."

From what we have written then it will be seen that the Scriptures teach that God has created all things, and works all things in the sense in which he has predestinated them according to his good purpose to work together for the good of his elect; that these things must cover the things of time, as time itself was brought into existence for the good pleasure of God, and the development of his purpose, as purposed in Christ Jesus before the world began.

The enemies of the doctrine object to it, more especially upon the principle of the predestination of evil things. They assume to themselves ability to measure the character of Jehovah. What blasphemy! To claim ability to measure the character of that great, Almighty God clothed in the dazzling splendor, the infinite purity and holiness of heaven; and to measure his character by that wisdom which he is pleased to term foolishness [I Cor.3:19;] and all this in the face of the declaration; that the world "by wisdom knew not God." I Cor.1:21.

The text tells us that the *all things* which we have discussed in this article are working "*after the counsel of his own will.*" Mark the positive assertion: "his [God's] *own will.*" He does not consult with men or devils. "For who hath known the mind of the Lord; or who hath been his counsellor?" Rom.11:34. "Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?" Rom.9:20. These are pertinent questions to such foolish criticism. The entire question regarding the predestination of evil things, as the fall of Adam, rests upon what God himself declares upon the subject. Could there be, or has there been an act of greater wickedness than the crucifixion of Christ, and yet what saith the Scripture of it? "For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed; both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together for to do *whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done.*" Acts 4:27,28. To this Scripture we will add a few quotations of similar import. "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." "Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field, which the LORD GOD had made." Gen.3:1.

Does not this Scripture do away with the foolish notion of a self existent devil? Again, let us quote: "THE LORD hath made all things for himself; *yea, even the wicked for the day of evil.*" PV.16:4 "I make peace, and *create evil; I the LORD do all these things.*" Isaiah 45:7. "Shall there be evil in the city, and the LORD hath not done it." Amos 3:6. "I have created the waster to destroy." Isaiah 54:16. "Vessels of wrath fitted to destruction." Rom.9:22. "And I will harden Pharaoh's heart." Ex.7:3. "Declaring the end from the beginning." Isaiah 46:10.

Will opponents of the doctrine inform us how the end could be declared from the beginning, and events between left out? “He doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou.” Dan.4:35. “Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.” Rom.9:18. “He turned their heart to hate his people.” Ps.105:25. “And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie.” II Thes.2:11. We quote but a few from abundant testimony upon this subject. Evidently prophets and apostles were not afraid of the doctrine maintained in this article.

Events must take place by predestination or by chance; and how can anything be secured by chance; as a single chance shot may at any time destroy the whole structure. If they take place by predestination, it must be of God, of men, or of devils; and how by the devil who is but a creature of God, and could not even go into the swine without permission, Mt.8:32; or yet in man whose breath “is in his nostrils” Isa.2:22. Then absolutely and truly of God who does what he pleases “in heaven, and in earth, and in the seas, and all deep places.” Ps.135:6.

“O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been his counsellor? Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: To whom be glory for ever. Amen.” Rom.11:33-36.

W.M. Smoot.

From: THE SECTARIAN: Nov.1912.

THE SPIRIT OF ANTICHRIST.

“And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God. And this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.” I John 4:3.

Instead of the loose and ready acceptation of everything that passes under the head of religion by the vain world around us, the apostle solemnly exhorts the “Beloved,” to “believe not every spirit, but try the spirits *whether they are of God*; because many false prophets are gone out into the world.” I John 4:1. This certainly presents the *true* and the *false* in religion, and justifies the position

maintained by our people of measuring every religious profession by the unerring standard. “To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is *because there is no light in them.*” Isaiah 8:20.

This language admits of no double meaning; “There is no light in them.” In the verse immediately preceding the text the apostle gives us an evidence of the Spirit which is of God; “Hereby know ye the Spirit of God; Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God.” The manner in which Jesus Christ “is come in the flesh” is explained in Hebrews 2:14 – “Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same.” “And the Word was made flesh.” John 1:14. He evidently existed before he came in the flesh. For the Word which was made flesh “was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God.” John 1:1,2. The flesh in which he came was but a mortal temple for the indwelling, and eternal Word; as it is written; “*A body hast thou prepared me.*” Heb.10:5.

If the children come as he came as shown from the quotation [Heb.2:14,] then they must have been identified in his identity, existing in him “from of old, from everlasting.” Micah 5:2. Their existence was something more than a mere mass or body of life to be communicated to an Adam sinner, but a *personality* in that life; and each personal unit developing a living, eternal, spiritual child – chosen in Christ, to be born of the Spirit, and partake of flesh and blood. “For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ.” I Cor.12:12.

If Christ is the head and his church is the body [Eph.1:22,23,] each member of that body, each personal unit identified in its life, must have existed in eternal, vital oneness in the life of the head, having been set up in the head “from the beginning, or ever the earth was.” PV.8:23. As the earthly family is given the one name Adam, being simply Adam developed. “Male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam.” Gen.5:2. Here is a figure of the second, or heavenly family. “Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.” Gal.3:16. Hence, the development of the natural family is the development of Adam; and that of the spiritual family is the development of Christ; “*So also is Christ.*”

Then to confess “that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh,” is to confess or maintain that he is come in the *flesh of his people*, as quoted from Heb.2:14; it is to maintain that the generation of Jesus Christ is being made manifest, “coming down from God out of heaven,” [Rev.21:2,] these children of God taking up their abode in mortal tabernacles, that are born of Adam; and thus is the life of Jesus “made manifest in our mortal flesh.” II Cor.4:11. The generation of Jesus Christ is developed; each chosen, eternal spiritual child identified in the seed, developing

that generation, is made manifest in the body [born of Adam] afore prepared for this heavenly child. The body is one thing, and the child that inhabits it another. The body of flesh in which the spiritual child dwells, while in his mortal pilgrimage, includes everything that comes from Adam: soul, body, and spirit of the natural man. It is all earthly, fleshly; the mind just as much as the corporeal body.

“And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God.” The line here certainly seems clearly and fully drawn. A testimony is presented which cannot be easily counterfeited or perverted. We may trace the systems of the Arminian world around us, and not the slightest evidence can be found of this confession that *Jesus Christ is come in the flesh*. And from this group of religionists we may go to each separate worldly religious order and the same barrenness of this deciding testimony can be found.

It is written in I John 2:18 – “It is the last time; and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there *many antichrists*; whereby we know that it is the last time.”

The apostle locates the particular character of antichrist to which he here calls attention: “They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be manifest that they were not all of us.” He certainly here names a class who were visibly identified in the fellowship of his chosen people, with whom they once took sweet counsel, “and walked unto the house of God in company.” Ps.55:14. And it is important for the saints of our God to remember that antichrist masquerading under the guise of Old School Baptist, is antichrist just as much as under any other name, not a whit better. Indeed in a ministry reaching into fifty years we have found more treachery, deceit, duplicity, and downright lying among parties claiming the name of Old School Baptist, but who have left the doctrine and order, than any other religious class that we have ever had any character of intercourse with. Not the slightest credence can be given to the word, or dependence placed upon the most solemn obligation of such people, *in anything pertaining to religion*, if they find it to their interest, and opportunity is presented to break the most solemn promise, or resort to the basest treachery.

Having therefore established from this testimony that “*even now are there many antichrists*,” who like the chameleon can change their color to suit any worldly religious order, we would emphasize the fact that no matter what the character or color, the failure to confess or maintain that “Jesus Christ is come in the flesh;” is the direct mark of antichrist; and is evident that there must be a knowledge of Jesus Christ, which can come alone by revelation, before we know anything of his coming in the flesh; for “no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.”

Mt.11:27. It is the revelation of Christ Jesus that draws this line of distinction between him that serves God, and him that serves him not.

“It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing.” John 6:63. The revelation is in the spirit, to the spirit, and by the Spirit; and it is the same Spirit “that raised up Jesus from the dead.” Rom.8:11. It is the spirit “that is born of the Spirit,” [John 3:8] that turns to its living, eternal fountain source or head, as the needle turns to the pole. It is not by any means the spirit of the natural man, born of the Spirit of God; but it is the spiritual child, existing in the eternal/spiritual seed – which is Christ; developed by the spiritual birth [birth of the Spirit] that knows Jesus Christ, for “the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.” I Cor.2:11.

All religion based upon anything short of this spiritual revelation is antichrist, of whatsoever form, character or name. It is antichrist as opposed to Christ, for it “*confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh.*” “*And this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.*” If it was in the world in John’s day, much more now *in the last time*, are there many antichrists, for they must fill up the measure of the number of the beast: “six hundred three score and six.” Rev.13:18.

It is of the “many antichrists” that the apostle speaks in this chapter. “They are of the world; therefore speak they of the world, and the world heareth them.” Their testimony requires no revelation to understand, it is of nature, and it speaks, and appeals only to the natural mind. The wild harangues of the Billy Sunday type are of the very lowest order of antichrist in the development of the “mystery of iniquity” [II Thes.2:7;] truly “*the world heareth them.*”

But the apostle draws a contrast: “We are of God; he that knoweth God heareth us, he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.” Again he says: “Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God.” I John 4:15. Does not this clearly show that it is the indwelling Spirit of God that comprehends Truth; that recognizes Jesus Christ is come in the flesh; that bears witness; for “he that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself.” I John 5:10.

And it is equally true that in the absence of that Spirit no one can know that “Jesus Christ is come in the flesh.” One may learn the outward form of Old School Baptist order, as of any other order; but no person can ever truly learn that “Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” only by the revelation of the indwelling spirit; which is the spirit that is born of the Spirit of God; and the spirit “whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.” Eph.4:30. As like attracts like; as nature attracts nature; so does this heavenly Spirit draw to itself its kindred life; “From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint

supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.” Eph.4:16.

“Great is the mystery of godliness.” It seems wonderful that in the development of the body of Christ, the manifestation of this membership, their pilgrimage through time, it should be needful for an antichrist. Yet “the Lord commanded concerning Jacob, that his adversaries should be round about him.” Lam.1:17. And in the creation it took the evening [darkness] and the morning [light] to make the day. So it was decreed that the development of the body of Christ should be in a world of enmity and idolatry; all of which our God controls, and tempers it all for the good of his people, and the manifestation of that body which is “curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth.” Ps.139:15.

He has not promised us that weapons shall not be formed against us; but he has promised; “No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn.” Is.54:17.

“The saints in all this glorious war;
Shall conquer though they die.”

The refining flames of trial and conflict shall develop the body of Christ, purified and made mete for the heavenly inheritance. The enmity and persecution of antichrist is a necessary part, a means to the end of this heavenly development. “The Mystery of Godliness.” – “The Mystery of Iniquity.” The testimony calls for each in its place; the one over against the other; and all must result in the lifting on high of the Lord Jesus Christ; the revelation of the gospel of the grace of God.

But brethren; “Ye are all the children of light, and the children of the day; we are not of the night, nor of darkness. Therefore let us not sleep, as do others; but let us watch and be sober.” I Thes.5:5,6. “But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; how that they told you there should be mockers in the last time, who should walk after their own ungodly lusts. These be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit. But ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life.” Jude 17-21.

W.M. Smoot.

From: THE SECTARIAN: May 1915.

THE REGENERATION.

Brother Beebe: I have received and read several letters responding to a communication written by me on the subject of regeneration, and published in No.9 of the present volume of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. I had carefully examined the subject before I wrote, and felt then, as I do yet, that the sentiments therein contained were in complete accordance with the revelation that God had

given on the subject. It is a subject that, so far as I was advised, had not been particularly investigated, the importance of which, as I thought, claimed some attention. I gave it the closest attention that my humble capacities would permit me to do, not knowing at the time that any other person entertained the same views on the same subject, and very far from desiring to urge them upon anyone who could not see that they were sustained by the Scriptures. The concurrence of a number of my brethren and sisters through the SIGNS, and by private letters, among whom are some of the ablest ministers of the New Testament that I have had the pleasure of an acquaintance with, has confirmed me in the views that their humble servant has expressed on this momentous subject.

But others of my brethren have differed with me, and no doubt as honestly as I have entertained my own sentiments. It is certainly their privilege to do so, and not mine to complain of them for so doing. Some of the brethren in writing to me use what I consider harsh language, which I shall carefully aim to avoid. One serious objection to the sentiments expressed in the above named communication is the fact that I have spoken of a spiritual seed or family in Christ that have ever stood identified and in union with him, and that these spiritual children are born of God. This family is styled; “Brother Johnson’s imaginary and ideal beings.” Well, I do *imagine* that there are such beings, and shall endeavor to show in the following part of this communication whether they are merely *ideal* or *real*. I believe that one general idea will comprise all the objections to my views that I have noticed, which is, as expressed by one of the objectors, that “The regeneration and the new birth are identical, different expressions meaning the same state.”

Now, to meet this main objection, it is only necessary for us to pause a moment and think dispassionately on the meaning of the two words, their roots and the derivatives. To generate is *to beget*, to be born is to be *brought forth*. Only think of a begetting and being born “meaning the same.” If to beget means to generate, to beget again means to regenerate, and not to be born again. Hence Peter decides the matter when he says, “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath *begotten us again*, [not brought us forth,] to a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.” I Pet.1:3. If the two terms “mean the same,” we need a new Bible to express that meaning, new Lexicons to define it, and a new order of things to develop it; for who ever knew of a person, beast, bird, fish or reptile ever being born without a *previous* generation? Therefore it is a self-evident fact, exhibited and known everywhere around us, that to be generated or begotten means one thing, and to be born means another and very different thing. So to be “begotten again,” or regenerated, means one state, and to be “born again” means another and very different state.

Let it be noted that the regeneration is never spoken of as occurring in the future, but in both instances where the term occurs, as having taken place in the

past; while the new birth is spoken of in the past, present and future tenses. See John 1:13; 3:6,7 & I Pet.1:23.

The only objection to my views on Mt.19:28, so far as I am advised, is that the language was spoken by the Savior before his death and suffering, but it is evident that he refers more particularly to the time "*when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory,*" and when the twelve apostles "shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." And further, it is very frequently the case that the Lord and his holy writers speak of future things as though they had transpired, as in Isa.53:5-9; Isa.63:1-3 &c.; and also in the revelations made to John on the Isle of Patmos. As to the other text where the word regeneration appears [Titus 3:5,] my brethren appear to differ as much with each other as with their humble servant. While one thinks "the washing of regeneration" means water baptism, another thinks it means washing by the word, another the new birth. I think if it had been the design of the apostle to convey either of these ideas, it would have been as convenient for him to have said "water baptism, the word or the new birth," as to have used the term "regeneration;" an expression that differs radically and essentially in its meaning from each and all of these terms.

Again, one brother thinks that the text in Isa.26:19, has simply reference to those saints whose graves were opened and whose dead bodies arose; but it appears to me that that occurrence took place "*after* his resurrection," [Mt.27:53,] and not "*together with*" his body, as he says. Another supposes that the quickening together with Christ and raising up together with him [Eph.2:5,6,] had reference only to the work of the new birth, and not to his and their *resurrection* together.

Well, I shall not stop here to argue this point, but leave the brethren to enjoy their deductions and conclusions, while their humble servant feels satisfied with the belief that the apostle meant what he said. I have not learned that any of the brethren have attempted to show that the prophet [Hos.6:2] meant anything more or different from what he expressed when he said, "After two days will he revive us, in the third day he will raise us up," &c., nor have any informed us what condition an individual is in when regenerated and not born, for the two phrases *have different meanings*. As the principal objection of the brethren to the views that have been expressed by me on the subject seems to originate in the belief that the regeneration and the new birth are identical, my prime object in writing now is to treat upon that birth, as some of my brethren seem to conclude that my ideas on regeneration amount to supersedure, if not a denial of the new birth. But let me entreat my dear brethren not to entertain that idea, for it is an inflexible and eternal truth that "except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." Such is the importance, as well as the necessity of that birth that God has, as I conclude, exemplified the principle upon which it is based in his creation, developed in his

providence, and will finally crown it by his grace to the glory of his hallowed name in the eternal salvation of his people.

It is evident that the great end and grand design of God in his work of creation was to reveal himself, and thereby to exhibit his glory and enunciate the profound mystery of his reigning grace in that great salvation.

“A scheme too profound for a seraph to pry,
And all for the lifting of Jesus on high.”

To reveal *himself*, therefore, must necessarily exemplify all the rest, for the effulgence of his glory communicated to and seen by his people is the consummation and crowning work of the whole sublime mystery; namely, to “see him as he is,” for in himself he is all glorious, intrinsically so.

“All over glorious is my Lord,
To be beloved and yet adored.”

Now let us turn to the first chapter of Genesis, and I think that we shall see there that he is delineating himself in the works of creation, as well as presenting the principle or base on which the new birth is predicated.

I shall not attempt to comment particularly on the formation of the earth and waters, their division, the light and darkness, the heavens and earth, as brought to view in the first ten verses of the chapter, which constitute the grand theatre upon and the elements by which the whole is to be perpetuated, but dwell more particularly on the eleventh and some of the following verses, as bearing more directly on the subject under consideration.

“And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed and the fruit tree yielding fruit *after his kind, whose seed is in itself* upon the earth, &c. And the earth brought forth grass, and herb yielding fruit whose *seed was in itself* after *his* kind.” Here we discover the grass, the herb, the tree, each containing its seed in itself, and each after *his* kind; each in itself and in its place, metaphorically and exquisitely revealing the divine Creator, the grand prototype of all, who contained at and long ere that period *his seed in himself* – yes, that very [not ideal] spiritual seed that were chosen “in him before the foundation of the world.” Here, too, we note that the masculine gender is used in each particular herb and tree, more vividly to represent him whose *seed* should serve him and be accounted to him for a generation. In the 14th to 19th verses, inclusive, are brought to view the sun, moon and stars, for *signs* and seasons, and days and years. We have here also the division of day and night. The sun, illustrious emblem of its divine author, which not only throws a lucid glow of radiance over the vast creation, but also imparts a vitalizing, energizing power, at the same time garnishing the works of the Creator with all the beauty and variety of the rich scenery displayed, and invigorating the whole of the productive creation, causing it to grow, mature and bring forth, each its offspring, “*after his kind.*”

Had we space, time and knowledge, it would be pleasant to contemplate this beautiful, emblematical display of God and his creation by more particular reference to the literal sun, the great luminary of the natural world, as the “SUN of Righteousness” is the wonderful embodiment of “the true light” that sheds an effulgence of glorious brilliancy over the entire spiritual world; the moon and stars that, though dark bodies in themselves, reflect the light of the sun, and lessen the dreary darkness of night, as the Sun of Righteousness shines on bodies of denser darkness, as when he shone on the countenance of Moses, or the law dispensation, such was the splendor of the lucid glory that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold his face; or when he shines in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

But we cannot now treat particularly upon those emblematical portraits, as the prime object of our research; at present is a more thorough knowledge of the *birth* before alluded to. Gen.1:20 - “And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly, the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven. And God created great whales, and every creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly after their kind, and every winged fowl after *his* kind,” &c. “And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful and multiply and fill the waters in the sea; and let fowl multiply in the earth. And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after *his* kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after *his* kind; and it was so. And God made the beast of the earth after *his* kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the earth after *his* kind; and God saw that it was good.”

One step further and we reach the crowning piece of creation. Verse 26. “And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness,” &c. Verse 27. “So God created man in his *own image*, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.” Shall we now take a brief retrospective view of the whole creation? Then we shall see that a generation was complete in every herb, every tree, every creeping thing, beast, fowl, fish, and up to man, where God stamped his image, *before* a birth could possibly occur. Now, an image, a likeness in this sense, must be a complete similitude, must bear an exact resemblance of the thing designed to be represented; as when we look into a perfect mirror we behold an exact image or likeness of ourself.

We ask, then, In what respect did Adam present a true image, a precise likeness of his Maker? It could not have been in his corporeal form, for “God is a spirit,” and had no such form. It could not have been in his nature, for although it was uncorrupted for a time, it was corruptible, susceptible of corruption, and finally was corrupted, while God is incorruptible, insusceptible of corruption.

I find no trait in him, then, that presents an *image*, a like-ness, but in the fact that he contained in himself, and was the complete embodiment of all his unborn seed. In this sense Adam is an exact “figure of him that was to come,” having his offspring all in himself, after the foundation of the world, as him by whom all things were created had his offspring all “chosen in him before the foundation of the world.”

Let us pause for a moment and scan the vast producing creation everywhere around us, and still remember that from the minutest insect up to the monstrous whale that cleaves the deep ocean, or the hugest mammoth that ever trod the earth, and up to man, the crowning work of all creation, and all; all proclaim in telling notes, in unmistakable language, that the seed or offspring must necessarily exist in the parentage *before* a multiplication, an offspring, a *birth*, can possibly occur; and that the offspring, when born, must inevitably possess precisely the nature of the parentage. Hence we must know that the generation and the birth are *not* “the same state,” and therefore their derivatives, “the regeneration” and “the new birth,” do *not* mean the same.

Let us now attend more particularly to the birth; and while so doing, let us not forget the different significations of the two words, to generate and to be born, nor of their derivatives, to regenerate and to be born again. Webster says, “Generate, to beget; to procreate; to propagate; to produce a being similar to the parent.” Every animal *generates* his own species; while to be born is to be brought forth from that state of generation. Then, to be born is not to *change* a being from one nature to another. If the Lord should take a natural man and change him, or any *part* of him, to a spiritual one, that would have no resemblance to a birth, and therefore the word *change* is never used in the Scriptures relative to that birth.

With these absolute and self-evident facts before us, we at once see the necessity, as well as the vast importance of a birth, for without it a generation would be a nullity, no offspring could be developed, no descendent could have any knowledge of its parent. So also in the case of the new birth; without it regeneration would be a nullity, no spiritual offspring of God could be developed, no child of God could have any knowledge of God its Father; until we are the recipients of that spirit that is “born of God,” we cannot cry, “Abba, Father,” nor can we possibly see his kingdom. Now these spiritual subjects descend “from God out of heaven,” [Rev.21:2,10] they are “born of God,” [John 1:13] “born of the Spirit, and are spirit,” [John 3:6] “born not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God.” I Pet.1:23. Under the former dispensation, or before the coming, suffering, death and resurrection of Christ, they were born of God, as I suppose, the consequence of their having been antecedently generated in him. In all the former dispensation we have no historical account of regeneration, the term is not there used, and I cannot venture to add the interpolation. In the latter

dispensation those subjects are “born again,” the consequence, as I suppose, of an antecedent regeneration in Christ; and in each case, like everything else, the offspring exhibits precisely the nature of its parent, each a partaker of the divine nature.

Nor does the birth change the subject born, neither the fleshly or spiritual child, though the circumstances of both are changed. Yet “that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.” The flesh is born of corruptible seed and is corrupt; the spirit is born of incorruptible seed and therefore cannot be corrupted. “Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin because he is born of God.” That person who receives “the spirit which is of God” is at once a compound character, possessing two different and antagonistical natures, because born of different parents. One is born of a fleshly or earthly parent, the other of a spiritual or heavenly parent; and “as is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly.” Each recipient of that spiritual, heavenly, or “new man,” is a subject of two births, is born of two different parents, of two different natures, and is therefore a composite being. That composite or complex being is what I understand to be a *christian* or *saint*; and although often addressed or spoken of as such, and as a simple being, it is nevertheless a compound one. How else are we to account for their sometimes being spoken of as “sinners,” and at others as being “righteous before God;” sometimes “carnal,” at others “clean;” once “black as the tents of Kedar,” and again “comely” or “as the curtains of Solomon”? The whole mystery is solved in the fact that they are born of two different parents, of radically different natures. It is a seeming paradox to say that the *saint* or *christian* is a sinner and not a sinner; but Christ at one time said to Peter, “Get thee behind me, Satan,” and at another, “Ye are clean;” and I believe that Erskine told the truth when he said:

“To good and evil equal bent,
I’m both a devil and a saint.”

In one relation they are the subjects of redemption, in the other, they “cannot sin,” and therefore need no redemption. All the evil is consequence to the first birth, all the good to the second. The seed of the herbage drops into the earth, and there is a production and growth of the same nature of the original. “The holy seed,” [Isa.6:13,] or “godly seed,” [seed of God in the margin, Mal.2:15,] is communicated to our earthly bodies, and there is an “inner” or “inward man,” a child of God, a production of the same nature of the original, a growth in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord.

It is certainly a pleasant contemplation for us to look around us and behold all the works of God revealing, developing, and thereby praising him; and with adoration we may exclaim with David, “The heavens declare the glory of God, and

the firmament showeth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge.” And again, “All thy works shall praise thee, O Lord, and thy saints shall bless thee.” – Ps.19:1,2 & 145:10. When that spirit which is “born of God” has a lodgement within, it being the spirit of life and of light, we are vitalized and illuminated, and hence we feel and see – feel our malady and see the justice of our condemnation; feel and see that God is holy, and we unholy in our polluted birth; feel and see that “the law is holy and the commandment holy and just and good,” and that we are “carnal, sold under sin.” Now here is a saint, a subject of two different births, born of two different parents, of two different natures, each developing *his* kind, like everything else we see around us.

My brother, my sister, should we not take courage from these wonderful revelations that God has made of himself in his creation, providence and grace, while it affords us so many testimonials that we are “born of the Spirit” as well as “of the flesh”? It is well for us when we can look upon the light as well as upon the dark shades of the picture. Then we can say with the poet, as I have quoted in a former communication:

“What then is evil, but a shade?
By wisdom is the picture laid;
To make his love arise and show,
Its brightest glories to our view?

Nor yet could sin forgiving grace,
‘Mong all the creatures find a place,
While all were good, no room could be,
For mercy’s aid to misery.”

Brother Beebe, I have written the foregoing lines hurriedly, and by piecemeal, in consequence of professional and other matters that have occupied my time. My earnest desire has been to write the truth, nothing more, nor less, and to prove it by the scriptures. How far I may have succeeded or fallen short in accomplishing that, to me, desirable end, is submitted respectfully to yourself and others of more profound natural and spiritual attainments than my humble self. I am aware that it has been a long cherished custom with many precious brethren in the ministry, as well as others, to identify regeneration with the new birth, as it is frequently termed. I am apprised, too, that it is not the easiest matter at all times for us to yield opinions that have been long entertained and often expressed by us. We are advised also that *new* ideas are often discarded simply because they are new. All this in many cases may be very well, but in many others not so well. I have often been reminded of using incorrect expressions, and felt thankful to my brethren and friends for correcting me. They are our best friends who point out to us our faults in a friendly manner. May God enable all his dear children to earnestly seek after

and know the truth, to love it for the sake of its own intrinsic value, and then to walk in it, and thereby “adorn the doctrine of God our Savior.”

Should this communication get to the readers of the SIGNS in the homely, weak and imperfect manner in which it is written, the anxious wish of the writer is that they may faithfully examine and carefully compare it with the word of truth, and should it be found not to accord with that perfect measurement, may they not only reject whatever may be found incorrect, but point out the delinquency in a christian spirit and in that clearness that will enable us all to detect it. Moreover, should errors be discovered in the foregoing remarks, I trust my brethren will have the charity to attribute the wrong to the fallibility of a very weak and erring brother, and not to a design or desire to mislead.

In conclusion, I have not cultivated a spirit of controversy in this effort, nor have I the least desire to urge my sentiments, nor crowd them on any who cannot see that they are sustained by the Scriptures, and the writer alone rests under the responsibility.

Very respectfully your servant and brother,
J.F. Johnson.

From: A Compilation of J.F. Johnson's Writings.

Dated: October 18, 1867.

INCARNATION OF THE CHILDREN OF GOD.

With a consciousness of the magnitude of the subject involved, and of our incompetency to elucidate the subject so as to remove all darkness or doubt from the contemplation of it, we propose to submit such views as we have, to the consideration of all who feel an interest in the investigation of a subject which is so profound as to excite the admiration of angels, and so boundless as to mock every human essay to comprehend its limit. The incarnation of our blessed Redeemer is, without controversy, a great mystery. “God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory” [I Tim.3:16;] and yet the participation of the children of God of flesh and blood, and the incarnation of the Son of God, are placed on the same ground, and based upon the same principle, by the inspired apostle in his epistle to the Hebrews: “Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same.” [2:14] To our mind, this text is a key to the subject, so far as we may be favored with the Spirit’s teaching

to enlighten us on the subject. So far, therefore, as we can comprehend the mystery of godliness in the one case, we have an illustration of it in reference to the other. When we read that Christ is come in the flesh, that the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and that he also likewise took part of the same flesh and blood of which his children are partakers, we very naturally and unavoidably infer that he had an identity and did exist as the Son of God, as the Head, Life and Immortality of his body, the church, before he partook of flesh and blood; and that his participation of the same was not to make him the Son of God, nor to make him the life and immortality of his church [for he was their Head and Life before;] but he took part of the same for the purpose which is distinctly stated in the text, namely, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. That Christ did so exist before his advent, is so fully established by Scripture testimony, that but few have the audacity to deny it. But whether denied or admitted by men, the matter is settled in the divine testimony, "But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son." Gal.4:4. He had a Son to send, and he was a Son before he was sent, when he was sent, and shall continue to be the Son of God after he shall have delivered up the kingdom unto the Father, and the Son, as such, shall be subject to him that hath put all things under him, that God may be all in all. I Cor.15:28. "Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things." Eph.4:9,10.

It being established that Christ did exist, not only as God, but also as the Son of God, the only begotten of the Father, and as the first-born, and before all things, and at the appointed time, when the fulness of that time had come, he was sent forth, and the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us; so the doctrine of the incarnation of his children, together with that of their previous existence in him, is exemplified. They were created in him, chosen in him, preserved in him, saved and called, according to the purpose and grace which was given them in him before the world began. And all spiritual blessings [past, present, or to come, that the saints ever have, or ever will or can enjoy] were given them according as God hath chosen them in him before the foundation of the world. Eph.1:3,4. Their spiritual, eternal life was given them in Christ before the world began, as their earthly, fleshly life was given them in the earthly Adam, in time. John says, "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." I John 5:11,12.

We now pass to consider the development of these relations. These children in Christ were, in the matchless wisdom of God, destined to partake of the life of the

natural Adam. This participation, however, had nothing to do in making them the children of God, any more than the incarnation of Christ had in constituting him the Son of God; for the relationship of sons or children was, as we have proved, as perfect before, as subsequently to that participation. The two headships were, according to the counsel of God, to be developed. The first, in the order of time, was that Adam which is of the earth; the second, is that Adam, or seminal head, which is the Lord from heaven. The one is natural, the other is spiritual. In the creation of the earthly Adam we have the creation of all that constitutes the outward man, or earthly bodies of the children of God; and the reception by them of this earthly nature is that wherein they are made partakers of flesh and blood. This, of which they were to partake in Adam, was provided for them in his creation, marked and identified in the foreknowledge, predestination and election by which they were chosen and ordained to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the great pleasure of his will.

Viewed now in either headship, they were the chosen and peculiar people of God. And as there was a fixed period when the Son of God should take upon him the seed of Abraham, or in other words, when also himself should likewise partake of flesh and blood, so there was and is an appointed time when the spiritual, eternal life which was given to the saints shall be made manifest in them personally and individually, and when they shall be born of the Spirit, of an incorruptible seed, by the word of the Lord, which is immortal.

In the exemplification of this by the incarnation of Christ, we have to consult the inspired record. The explanation of the angel Gabriel, who was sent from God to a city of Galilee, unto the virgin Mary, is clearly in point. The inquiry of the virgin Mary embraced the mystery: How can that spiritual, eternal life which God gave his people before the world was, become identified with that natural, earthly life which he gave them in the earthly Adam? To which Gabriel replies, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Luke 1:35.

So, after this example, that life by which God's people were identified in Christ before all time, is implanted in those persons, by which God's chosen people were identified in the earthly Adam. The Holy Ghost comes upon them, and the power of the Highest overshadows them. The incorruptible seed, not by the agency of man, but by the word of the Lord, which liveth and abideth forever, implants in them that spiritual, eternal life which was and is hid with Christ in God, by which is given to them "power to become [manifestly] the sons of God;" and they are "born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." John 1:13.

That body which Christ assumed when he was made of a woman, was a body prepared for him, and he adopted it, or in other words, took it on him, and thus became a partaker of the same flesh and blood that his children are partakers of; in that adopted or assumed body he suffered death; that body was laid in the grave, [but saw no corruption] was raised up from the dead, and finally ascended up into heaven, a spiritual, immortal body. And so these earthly bodies of his saints are predestinated to the adoption of children, and have received the spirit of adoption, or implantation of the Spirit, and are sealed unto the day of redemption. Yet, even we who have received the first-fruits of the Spirit [in receiving the spirit of adoption] even we ourselves do groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body. “But if the Spirit that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.” Rom.8:11,33 & Eph.6:30. “Now this I say unto you, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.” I Cor.15:50. But though there is no flesh and blood heirship securing to us an incorruptible inheritance of glory, these adopted bodies from the Adamic stock shall be changed by the Spirit of him that raised up Christ from the dead; and this spirit of adoption shall quicken the mortal bodies in the resurrection of them from the dead, and they shall put on incorruption and immortality, and mortality shall be swallowed up of life.

That life which is born of God requires no adoption, for it was never out of the family; it was always identified with Christ, who is our life; but that which is to be raised up from the dead, being alienated, must be made nigh, and brought by adoption into the family of God. “I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless, I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.” Gal.2:20.

As Adam is our natural life, and in him, and in all that is Adam [which includes all that is born of the flesh,] we all die, so Christ is our life, our immortality, and in him we live. “I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness.” Psalm 17:15. “For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though, after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another, though my reins be consumed within me.” Job 19:25-27. “Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure.” I John 3:2,3.

The subject contemplated in the foregoing remarks is by no means exhausted; it is rich, boundless and glorious; it involves the ground of our hope for heaven and an incomputable inheritance. If what we have suggested shall be blessed to the

edification and comfort of any of the lambs of our Redeemer's fold, we shall not have labored in vain. Let the readers compare what is written, with the divine standard. What is not sustained by the Scriptures reject; but see that ye reject not what the testimony of God sustains. And may the Lord give you understanding in all things, for the Redeemer's sake; so prays one who claims to be the chief of sinners, and less than the least of all saints.

Gilbert Beebe.

Middletown, N.Y., Sept.15, 1856.

From: Signs of the Times; Vol.24.

HEIRSHIP; ETERNAL, VITAL UNION.

In reading an article in the *Gospel Messenger* for October, 1879, written by our esteemed brother, Elder T.J. Bazemore, one of the editors and publishers of that periodical, we are led to believe that he has misapprehended the views which are entertained by us, and by those generally who hold the doctrine of the eternal, vital union of Christ and the church, and also of the true basis of the heirship of the sons of God. We do not design to inaugurate a controversy or unpleasant discussion; for widely as we may seem to disagree in our understanding of these subjects, we feel confident that a calm, dispassionate investigation will obviate our seeming discrepancy of views.

If we had not on former occasions fully expressed our convictions on these two cardinal points of the doctrine of Christ, we would feel more hesitancy in entering upon a discussion of the subjects involved; but having frequently presented our views, which we presume brother Bazemore is aware of, we feel called upon to either retract or establish what we have stated, or at least to labor for a more full and clear understanding of each other. Let nothing however that we may write be construed so as to indicate any unfriendly feeling towards the publishers of the *Messenger*, both of whom we highly esteem and respect.

First. The heirship of the sons of God we have held to be exclusively founded upon their sonship in Christ Jesus, as made known to them by their spiritual birth, in which they receive, not the adoption, but the spirit of adoption, whereby they cry Abba, Father, [Rom.8:15;] for in verse 23 of the same chapter we are told that "we who have received the first fruits of the spirit groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, *to wit*, the redemption of our body." And in Eph.1:13,14, "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, after that ye believed, [or were born again,] ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption

of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory.” In this first chapter to the Ephesians the apostle speaks of our being predestinated to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ unto himself; and in the tenth verse he says, “That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are in earth, even in him; in whom also we have received an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will; that we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ. In whom ye also trusted &c.” The reception of this spirit, by the new birth, is the earnest or certain assurance that the purchased possession [the people redeemed from the family of mankind, which is all the purchased possession of Christ that we have any knowledge of] shall be ultimately disrobed of mortality, and clothed with immortality, after they shall have been changed and fashioned like the glorious body of their risen and glorified Lord. For this adoption we are now waiting and groaning, but for it we are now sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise.

If then we have rightly understood the Scriptures on the relationship of sons, that sonship develops a vital relationship to a parent in whom our spiritual vitality existed before it was made manifest by a birth. A birth is not the origin of life, either spiritual or natural; it is the bringing forth a life which existed in the parent before the birth. If life did not exist antecedently to the birth, it never could exist subsequently to the birth.

The apostle says, “For as many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the sons of God.” And, “The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.” The heirship is thus made to depend on the vital relationship of children; and as the heirship is a joint heirship with Christ, so also must the relationship on which the heirship is predicated be a joint relationship with Christ, for he himself is the life of all who are joint heirs with him. For the life of all the saints is hid with Christ in God. “When Christ who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.” Col.1:3,4. If then our spiritual life, sonship, and joint heirship is so identified with Christ, as the only begotten of the Father, that our life is hid with Christ in God, it is based on what we call ETERNAL, vital union, and not on the birth either of our flesh or spirit, which develops, but does not originate, the relationship and consequent joint heirship.

But brother Bazemore says, “There is a doctrine called eternal, vital union, which is in our view a strange and unscriptural doctrine;” and asks, “How can there be a *vital* union between the living and the dead? How can there be a *vital* union between that which is, and that which is not? In a state of nature the sinner is dead in sin, without eternal life, without spiritual vitality or motion; and how, then, can there be any actual, vital union between him and Christ while he is in that state of

death and sin? Christ is life, a quickening Spirit; and how can there be any vital union between him and the sinner, while the sinner is dead in sin?"

We have never understood our brethren who hold and content for the scriptural doctrine of eternal, vital union, to hold that this sacred union of life was given to the children of God in the earthly Adam, nor that it eternally united the two natures of which the children of God are partakers while in the flesh, for neither before, nor after the new birth do we find any union, harmony or agreement between the flesh and the spirit, of which two natures they are partakers; for these are contrary the one to the other, causing a continual warfare in them until their final change shall come, or until death shall be swallowed up of life – until God shall change our vile body, and fashion it like the glorious body of our risen Lord.

We shall not be likely to differ on the simple signification of the words – eternal, vital union. That which had its origin in God the Father, and was given to the body and members of Christ before the world began, must be eternal; and that which the inspired word of God calls eternal life, must be vital; and that which joins in indissoluble relationship the Head and body of the church of God, we call union. Can this be what our esteemed brother calls philosophy and vain deceit, and of which he warns the saints to beware? Is this doctrine taught in the Bible, and by the spirit of divine inspiration, or is it only after the traditions of men, and after the rudiments of the world? Let us see. The apostle Paul says, "The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life." [Not through the earthly Adam, but] "through Jesus Christ our Lord." When did God give us this eternal life? Rom.6:23. If eternal life is a spiritual blessing, it was given us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, [not in Adam,] according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world. Eph.1:3,4. The most solemnly attested record which the Bible contains, which is borne in heaven by the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost, and witnessed in earth by the Spirit, the water and the blood, which all agree in one, is summed up by the inspired apostle John in these emphatic words, "And this is the record, that God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life." I John 5:7,8,11,12,20.

We learn then that the life which was given to the saints as members of the body of Christ, was with and proceeded from God the Father, and was given to them in Christ by the Father, and is, in the unrestricted meaning of the word, absolutely *eternal life*; not only everlasting, but eternal, without beginning or ending, not created, but begotten of God the Father, and given to all the sons of God in Christ before the foundation of the world, and they all, in their spiritual

relation to God in Christ, were sanctified or set apart by God the Father, preserved in Christ Jesus, and ultimately called by him; “Who hath saved us and called us with a holy calling; not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.” II Tim.1:9.

Some of our brethren have admitted that all this was true in *purpose*, but was not *actually* done in eternity, before the world began; but when God has said that all the spiritual blessings in heavenly places were given us in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world, it seems to us presumptuous to deny that this unspeakable gift involved an act or action of God. We hold that the gift was actually given us in Christ, and safely secured to us in him, just exactly as God has stated it in the words of inspired truth. Christ himself is the life – the eternal life of all his members, and God did actually love them with an everlasting love, and therefore with loving-kindness does he draw them; and no man can come unto Christ except the Father which sent him draw them.

Now let us inquire whether this eternal life or vitality which God has given us in Christ Jesus actually unites Christ, the Head, and his church, the body of Christ; and whether it is an eternal, or only a time union. We do not ask whether this vital union was manifested and experienced by any of us here in the flesh before the world began, for that is not claimed by any. Our life which was given us in the earthly Adam is not that life which is begotten of God, and given us in Christ Jesus before the world began; for if it was, then all mankind would be the children and heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ. But all the children of God are children and heirs of God by virtue of being begotten of the eternal Father, and recipients of eternal life in Christ Jesus from everlasting. And of them, as the children of God in Christ, it is said, “Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he [Christ] also himself likewise took part of the same.” – Heb.2:14. It was not their partaking of flesh and blood that constituted them children of God, any more than it was Christ’s “*also likewise* [or in like manner] *partaking of the same*” that constituted him the Son of God. He was as perfectly the Son of God before he partook of flesh and blood, as he was after his assumption of flesh and blood; but his being made flesh, made of a woman, and made under the law, made him manifest as the Son of man, of the seed of David, after the flesh. As his Sonship of the Father was in no sense changed by his partaking of flesh and blood, so neither was the spiritual relationship of his members changed by their partaking of flesh and blood. But his coming in the flesh of which his children are partakers, brought him under the law which they in their earthly nature had transgressed. And thus we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, taking on him, not the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham; not to make him the Son of God, for that he had always been; but as his children in their earthly nature had sinned in the flesh, he took their nature on him, that he might suffer in

the flesh, and under the law which they had transgressed, and redeem them unto God by the sacrifice of himself, and rise again from the dead for their justification.

Now, we ask brother Bazemore, if the law of God could have recognized in the blessed Jesus the right to redeem them from its stern, but just demands, if they were not his property before they sinned and fell in the earthly Adam?

Our Lord Jesus Christ, as the Son of God and life of his body, the church, is called the “only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth ... and of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace.” John 1:14,16. In this chapter John testifies concerning him; “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men.” And the same inspired apostle, as we have already shown, in his first epistle, first and fifth chapters, declares that this life which was and is in him, was with the Father, and was manifested, and that God hath given us [his children] eternal life, and this life which God hath given us is in his Son. Let this testimony be admitted, and we think no God-fearing man will deny that this eternal life is eternal vitality, or that this life is a unit. It is one undivided and indivisible life in its nature, because it is hid with Christ in God; and although it extends from the Head of the church to all the members, permeating the entire mystical body of Christ, it cannot be separated from him. For he that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life; consequently it is the unity of Christ the Head with the church as his body, and the fulness of him that filleth all in all. This union of life in Christ Jesus is what we understand our brethren to mean by the words – eternal, vital union; and if it is not so taught in the Scriptures, and in the experience of the saints, we confess that we have read our Bible for almost four score years to but little, if any profit. If it be only philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, then we have long rested upon a fallacious hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began.

We are not contending for an eternal, or even a time union, between the flesh and spirit of the children of God and heirs of glory, for such a union has not yet taken place in us. We find no harmony between our flesh and that spirit which we hope and trust we received when we were born of the Spirit; but from that hour when Christ, who is our life, was revealed in us, we have felt most painfully and continuously the warring of our flesh against the spirit, and a law in our members warring against the law of our mind, bringing us into captivity to the law of sin which is in our members.

But can this doctrine of vital union of the Head and body of the church, which we have so sweetly enjoyed so many years, now that we are about to lay off our mortal tabernacle, be but a delusive phantom? Have we in melody of heart, in

joyful and melting strains, joined with the poet in the delightful theme of his songs;

“Twixt Jesus and the chosen race,
Subsists a bond of sovereign grace,
That hell, with its infernal train,
Can ne’er dissolve or rend in twain.”

Or,

“In union with the Lamb;
From condemnation free,
The saints from everlasting were,
And shall forever be.

In cov’nant from of old,
The sons of God they were;
The feeblest lamb in Jesus’ fold,
Was bless’d in Jesus there.

Its bonds shall never break,
Tho’ earth’s old columns bow;
The strong, the tempted, and the weak,
Are one in Jesus now.”

And this oneness of vital relationship is in Jesus, not in the earthly nature, which has yet to be changed, and fashioned like Christ’s glorious body. Adam, we are told, [Rom.5:14,] is the figure of him that was to come. And if there had not been a union of natural life extending to his posterity, his transgression could not have involved them in the condemnation and death that by his offense passed upon all of his undeveloped race. “Therefore, as by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; EVEN SO by the righteousness of One, the free gift came upon all men to justification of life. For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of One shall many be made righteous.” As in Adam, who is the figure of Christ, God made of one blood [or life] all the nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation, &c., [Acts 22:26,] so that eternal life which is begotten and born of God, which was given to the heirs of God in Christ their Head, is one life – a unit, and not a plurality of lives. It was given to them in the Son of God, as the same eternal life which was with the Father, and is the same in all the members of the body of Christ. It is in Christ, and it *is* Christ. He says, “I am the resurrection and the life.” John 11:25. “I am the way, the truth, and the life.” John 14:6. “I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.” Gal.2:20. “For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.” Phil.1:21. “Set your affections on things above,

not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.” Col.3:2-4.

These scriptures, if we rightly understand them, prove two important propositions; first, that our life which is in Christ Jesus is eternal life, or vitality; and secondly, that this eternal life, being in Christ as the Son of God, and with him hid in God from everlasting, is a unit of life; and Christ, who is our life, although living in all his members, is not divided. As there is but one Head of the church, so there is but one body belonging to that one Head. “There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, and one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.” Eph.4:4-6. The apostle speaks of those who would beguile the saints, by “not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.” Col.2:19.

Our natural life, on which death has passed by reason of sin, was given us in that Adam which is of the earth, earthy; but our spiritual - eternal life was given to us and securely preserved for us in that Adam which is the Lord from heaven. Our natural or earthly life began when man became a living soul; but our life which is in Christ Jesus is as ancient as eternity, for it is eternal life, and has its origin in God. Therefore that life which is born of the flesh is born of corruptible seed, and is mortal. But they who are the subjects of regeneration and the new birth, are born of God, of an incorruptible seed, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever; and they are a “chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people.” And, “Now are they the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what they shall be; but we know that when he [Christ] shall appear they shall be like him;” for God has predestinated those whom he did foreknow to be conformed to the image of his dear Son, that he may be the first-born among many brethren. I John 3:2; Rom.8:29. In the vital unity of this eternal life, between the Head and body of the church, Christ is not ashamed to call his members brethren; for in his Mediatorial relation to them he claims them as his body, his flesh, and his bones.

“Hail, sacred union, firm and strong,
How great the grace! How sweet the song!
That worms of earth should ever be,
One with incarnate Deity.”

Again we will assure brother Bazemore, that notwithstanding the seeming difference in our views on the doctrine of the eternal, vital union of Christ and his body, the church, and the basis of the heirship of the saints, we esteem him as a beloved brother in Christ; and we have read many of his articles in the *Gospel Messenger* for the year past with pleasure, and this is the first we have noticed

from his able pen from which we seriously dissent. And we hope and believe that on more mature consideration of the subject, he will greatly modify the doom to which he has [we think unintentionally] consigned us, together with a very large majority of the Old School or Primitive Baptists of our acquaintance, who hold the doctrine of eternal, vital union as the very foundation of our hope of that inheritance which is incorruptible, undefiled, and which cannot fade away.

Gilbert Beebe.

Middletown, N.Y., Nov. 1, 1879.

From: Signs of the Times; Vol.48.

REPLY TO ELDER LEMUEL POTTER'S PAMPHLET.

Entitled

“Unconditional Election Stated and Defined, or Denial of the Doctrine of Eternal Children, or Two Seeds in the Flesh.” By Elder Lemuel Potter, Member and Pastor of the Baptist Church, Grayville, Illinois.

A copy of this work has been sent us, probably by the author, and courtesy requires an acknowledgment of the receipt of it. It may also be expected that we should review the work. We have not the time to examine it as carefully and thoroughly as would be requisite to form a judgment of the merits of all that is contained in the 125 octavo pages. From the cursory glance over some of its pages, we find much to approve, especially in his scriptural arguments in defense of unconditional election, and in refutation of what is commonly known as the Two Seed doctrine in the flesh of the human family. But of what he denominates the “Doctrine of Eternal Children,” it being a doctrine of which we do not remember that we ever heard before, brother Potter must excuse us for asking for more light. On pages 51 and 52 he says:

“This is not news to the Lord; he knew this would be the state of mankind, as well in the very dawn of eternity, so to speak, as he does now; and he made a choice in Christ before the world began of a people for himself, out of the polluted race of Adam. In this he showed mercy to the objects of his choice. Hence, he chose them in Christ before the foundation of the world; not because they were holy, or possessed any degree of holiness, but that they should be holy and without blame before him in love. In the covenant of grace in Christ before the world began, all the means necessary to their redemption and final salvation were ordained in Christ, and this is what the apostle means when he says, ‘Who hath

saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began (I Timothy 1:9).’ Those people were given to Christ in the covenant, and have sustained a covenant relationship to him ever since, or from all eternity. They are his by gift, not that they are his because they were in him, as the plant is in the seed, and have emanated from him in that sense. This people are a special people to the Lord all through the Bible; and as a distinguishing mark between them and the others, he calls them sheep, and the others goats. This difference is made between them by the mercy of God in choosing them to salvation. In the covenant with Abraham, they are embraced in the promise, ‘In thee, and in thy seed, shall all the families of the earth be blessed.’ This is the seed that David speaks of: ‘A seed shall serve him, and it shall be accounted unto the Lord for a generation.’ Here is the Lord’s seed; and the fact that they are called a seed does not argue that they are as old as the Lord. But we are told that they must be everlasting children, for Christ is said to be an everlasting Father, and there could not have been an everlasting Father without everlasting children. ‘And his name shall be called, Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace (Isaiah 9:6).’ This is a prophecy; and a prophecy is not the telling of what has been, but what shall be. He shall be called, The everlasting Father; not has eternally been. The believer in Christ shall have everlasting life, or hath everlasting life. Does that argue that he eternally had everlasting life? Then those people are called sheep, and they are in every inhabited portion of the earth. ‘My sheep wandered through all the mountains, and upon every high hill: yea, my flock was scattered upon all the face of the earth, and none did search or seek after them.’ Ezekiel 34:6.”

We fail to comprehend how God made choice of a people in Christ if that people did not in any sense exist in Christ when the choice was made. We do not understand that the flesh and blood of the people chosen in Christ existed in him, nor that he himself existed in the flesh until his incarnation, for in their flesh and blood relation they did not exist until their creation in the earthly Adam, in common with all others of mankind. Still we are informed in the word of divine revelation that the saints at Ephesus and the faithful in Christ Jesus were blessed by the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places IN Christ Jesus, according as he hath chosen them in him (not *into* him) before the foundation of the world. We cannot conceive of the existence of Christ as the Son of God, begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, only in his Mediatorial relation to his eternal Godhead, as the Father, and as the Head over all to his church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all. We have understood that he is the Word that was with God, and also that he is the Word that is God. The Head of the church is Christ, and the Head of Christ is God. The

fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily in him. He could no more sustain his Mediatorial relation if he and the Father were not one, than the church could inherit eternal life if they were not one with him, even as he and his Father are one. We think we agree with brother Potter, if we understand him, that Christ did not exist in flesh and blood (except in purpose) until he was made flesh by incarnation, by being made of a woman, and conceived by and born of the virgin Mary. But we do believe that he did exist as the Son of God, as the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, from everlasting. His Mediatorial names or titles, Jesus and Christ, are expressive of his relation to the Father as a begotten Son, and to the church as her Head and spiritual and eternal life. The name Jesus signifies Savior; and he is the Savior of his body, the church, which he could not be if he were not truly God, for he says, "I am the Lord, and beside me there is no Savior (Isaiah 43:11)." This is all expressed in his name Jesus. Christ is a name or title signifying *Anointed*, used interchangeably to signify the same, which will be seen by comparing Psalms 2:2 and 45:7 with Acts 4:25-27. Both titles are applied to the Mediatorial relations borne by him to the Father and to the church, without the least disparagement of his eternal power and Godhead, and the Word which was and is and must forever continue to be the "true God and eternal life."

If we have read correctly the record which God has given of his Son, as the Head of the body, the church, he, as the Head of the church and Savior of the body, is not only the begotten, but the *only* begotten of the Father; and we infer that the begetting of the Head includes the begetting of the spiritual body, and all the members of the body of which he is the Head. We know of no other way in which the members of Christ's body can be partakers of the divine nature, or inheritors of eternal life. If the life which was given us in the earthly Adam was eternal, it could not die; but the life which was with the Father, and was manifested, according to I John 1:2, and which was given us in his Son, according to I John 5:11,12, is emphatically *eternal* life, which was with the Father, and is hid with Christ in God. And this life which was given us in the Son of God was included, with all other spiritual blessings, in the unspeakable gift of God's dear Son. Brother Potter says (but by what authority he has failed to tell us), that "Those people" (of whom Paul speaks in II Timothy 1:9) "were given to Christ in the covenant, and have sustained *a covenant* relationship to him ever since, or from all eternity;" and that "They are his by gift, not that they are his because they were in him, as the plant is in the seed, and have emanated from him in that sense."

Here it seems to us that brother Potter fails to discriminate between the life which was given us in the Son and was and is so identified with his Sonship that no man can have it separately from him as the Son of God, as John says, "This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life; and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." The

eternal life of which the record speaks is so identical with him that no man can have the one and not the other. We say that, as it appears to us, our brother has failed to discriminate between this eternal life given us in the Son, and that mortal life which was given to us in, and emanated to us from, the earthly Adam. Death has passed on all the posterity of the earthly Adam, for that all have sinned. But the life given us in the second Adam, who is the Lord from heaven, being hid in God, is pure, for it is Christ, the anointed Head and eternal life of the church, which is his body. In the earthly Adam we all die. Eternal life is not an extension of our Adamic life. As the sons of Adam, we are creatures of God; but as sons of God in Christ, we are children and heirs of God, and *joint heirs* with Christ to an inheritance which is incorruptible, undefiled, and cannot fade away. If our spiritual, immortal and eternal life had been given us in the earthly Adam, all the children of the earthly Adam alike would, in being born of the flesh, have derived it from him, and would not, after being born of the flesh, require to be born again, of an altogether different seed, to develop in us a spiritual life, as the production of an incorruptible seed, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.

As to a covenant relationship from all eternity, to our dull comprehension, brother Potter has not made this matter clear; in fact, we are so much in the dark, that we do not know in what part of the Bible such a relationship is recorded. Until very recently, we do not remember to have ever heard of it before. But he describes it negatively, as not proceeding from Christ, as plants from the seeds which produce them. If we understand the assertion, it denies that the people of Christ were his children at all, only that they are children of Adam which the Father has given to him in a covenanted gift; but this covenanted relationship is sustained by gift. Now, if brother Potter can explain to us what *vitality* a simple gift or covenant can impart, he will tell us what we confess we do not know. We read of many covenants in the Bible. God made a covenant with Noah, Abraham, Moses, Israel and David; but we are not aware that any of these brought those who were embraced in them into any vital relationship to himself. We have read also of a covenant which God has made with his chosen, in which he has sworn unto David, in which David, according to the testimony of the apostles, personifies Christ; but this covenant recognizes both the type and the anti-type in seminal and vital relationship to their respective seeds. "I have made a covenant with my chosen: I have sworn unto David, my servant." What are the provisions of this most solemnly attested covenant? "Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations." "He shall cry unto me, Thou art my Father, my God, and the Rock of my salvation. Also I will make him my first born, higher than the kings of the earth." This is a clear declaration of *vital relation*, even that of Father and Son. My Father, my First Born! And this covenant and oath of God secures to Christ, as his first-born Son, a seed which shall serve him, and be counted to him

for a generation. (See Psalm 22:22.) This first-born son, as the anti-type of David, shall be a progenitive Head, shall have children as his own seed, which were chosen in him, and blessed with and in him with all the spiritual blessings which are secured by the covenant of the sure mercies of David. "My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven (Psalm 89)." Was David a type of Christ? Did his seed exist in him before they were born? Did his children proceed from him as plants from the seeds which produce them? If so, by what authority shall we say that the seed of Christ did not exist in Christ as their seminal Head, and proceed from him as the vine from its roots, as the branch from the living vine, and as plants from the seed? Jesus used a similar figure in relation to himself, with a solemn double asseveration: "Verily, verily I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit (John 12:24)." Peter testifies that those who are born again, are born of incorruptible seed, by the Word of God, and that the subjects of this birth are a chosen generation; and all generations are produced by the seed of which they are generated, as plants are produced by the seeds in which their existence and vitality were contained before they were brought into visibility.

We presume that brother Potter believes, as we certainly do, that the Son of God is the begotten Son of the eternal Father, and stood in that *vital relation* to the Father before the world began, as the Son. Now if the children of God were chosen and blessed in him before the foundation of the world, and we accept the testimony of Christ himself, and of his inspired apostles, that they are the body of which he is the Head, would it not be a singular anomaly that a head should be begotten and born, and the body and members of that head only adopted? The Scriptures abound with figures illustrative of the union and relationship of Christ and the church. We are told that Adam is the figure of him that was to come; and that Adam was first formed, then Eve (I Timothy 2:13). In the book of the generations of Adam it is written, "In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created (Genesis 5:1,2)."

We cannot think that Adam was like God in the supreme glory of his eternal perfections; for if like God he had been immutable, he could not have fallen in sin and transgression. If he had been like God in any of his infinite attributes of wisdom, power and dominion, he would have been independent, and not a subordinate being. Yet he was created in the likeness of God, in the sense intended in the declaration referred to, and in the sense in which God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of

the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them (Genesis 1:26,27).” So, in this manner, according to this purpose, was man created, and to this extent did he, as an image, delineate and figuratively portray the second or anti-typical Adam, who is the Lord from heaven.

Our Lord Jesus Christ, in his Mediatorial Sonship, is the image of the invisible God, the brightness of his Father’s glory, and the express image of his person; the appointed heir of all things; by whom also he made the worlds. (Hebrews 1:1-3; Colossians 1:15.) Adam as a type, “is the figure of him that was to come.” He was created in the image and likeness of Christ, as the heir of all terrestrial things, having dominion over all created things, and as the seminal head and progenitor of his race; and of him, when he, not being deceived, had followed his bride into the transgression, it was said, “Behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil, etc. (Genesis 3:22).” The inspired writer to the Hebrews, in Chapter 2, verses 5-10, explains very clearly in what sense Adam was created and made in the likeness of his Creator, and is the figure of him who was with God, and who was God, and whose name is called “the Word of God.” He took not on him the nature of angels, for they could not set forth his dominion. “For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak. But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of thy hands: thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him. But we see Jesus, [the glorious anti-type of whom Adam is the figure] who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man. For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.”

Adam’s name and life and posterity were all called Adam; so the church of God had her spiritual and eternal life hid with Christ in God, and named in his name, living in his life, and in him blessed with all spiritual blessings, according as they were chosen in him before the foundation of the world. In all this the earthly Adam is the image or type of him that was to come. Adam, as the seminal head and progenitor of all the race of mankind, is the figure of Christ, as the seminal Head and spiritual progenitor of his spiritual seed, which he saw when his soul was made an offering for sin. He is their life, and that life in him is eternal life. It was with the Father, and given to his seed in the Son, or Sonship of the only begotten of the

Father. It is only in this begotten relation that any *vital* union can be developed between God and the sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty. No covenant contract of conveyance, or gift, or adoption, can constitute *vitality*. Our union to God must, to be a *vital union*, be begotten of God the Father in Jesus Christ his only begotten Son; as it is written, “The gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

We hope that it is not in any derisive, sarcastic or scoffing way that any of our brethren would speak of the eternity of the existence of the children of God in Christ, as the head and source of all spiritual union and communion with God through Jesus Christ our Lord, as “eternal children.”

It is with deep concern that we have observed of late, among some who claim to be Old School or Primitive Baptists, a disposition to sap the foundation of the Christian’s faith and hope in God, by ignoring the *vitality* of our union to and with God in Christ. They are willing to admit an eternal union, if we will give up the *vitality* of it, and call it a covenant union, or in any way deprive it of vitality; but it seems to us that a union without life would be a dead union, it could not make us partakers of the divine nature. But when we claim that the life on which our relation to God as his children rests was given us in Christ Jesus, with all other spiritual blessings, before the foundation of the world, although this heart-cheering doctrine is so fully declared in the Scriptures, an effort is made to call down on us, and what is far worse, on the doctrine, the obliquity and ridicule of those who do not entertain the same views that we do.

Much of the confusion in the minds of the saints, we think, arises from a failure to discriminate between Adam and Christ. In the earthly Adam we all die. Why? Because we were all in him in the transgression. By that one offense sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. Did all men sin in the first offense of Adam? That occurred almost six thousand years before the birth of any of the men of the present generation. But if we had not been in Adam as our seminal head and progenitor, could we have sinned in him? Could death have passed on us as men that had sinned, if we were not in him as his posterity or children? If we were not children of Adam when he transgressed, and death thereby entered and passed upon us, when did we become his children? Did Adam call his wife’s name Eve because she was the mother of all living before any of her living children were born? Did Levi pay tithes to Melchisedec before or after he was born? Were Jacob and Esau children before their birth, or was it not until afterward? These questions relate to our natural life, as children of the earthly Adam, and who is the figure of him that was to come. Then tracing the analogy of the figure, we ask, Are we the children of God in Christ today? If so, were we his children yesterday? He is the same yesterday, today and forever. If we are his seed, or children now, were we his seed almost two

thousand years ago, when his soul was made an offering for sin, and when we saw his seed and was satisfied? If we were the children for whom he hung bleeding on the cross, nearly two thousand years before any of us were either born of the flesh or born again, how long have we been counted to the Lord for a generation? Can any one tell more accurately than did the inspired psalmist? "Lord, thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God (Psalm 40:1,2)." Our earthly life was given us in Adam when Adam was formed of the dust of the ground; but our spiritual life was given us in Christ when Christ was given to the Head of the church, and all spiritual blessings were given us in Christ before the foundation of the world, even as all earthly or temporal blessings were given us in Adam after the foundation of the world. Through the earthly Adam sin has reigned unto death, even as grace has reigned through righteousness by Jesus Christ our Lord. God's children were children before they were partakers of flesh and blood, even as Christ was the Son of God before he took part in like manner of the same flesh and blood. So he partook of our nature to redeem us to God, who in our fleshly nature had sinned; and we whom he has redeemed, in being born of his incorruptible seed, receive of his spirit, of his life, which was given us in him before the world began, and so are we made partakers of his divine nature.

We have not attempted to review the pamphlet, nor have we even read it all, as our time is closely occupied; we have offered our objections to some views, but in no acrimonious spirit. We candidly believe that much of the discord that has disturbed the saints has arisen from a want of clearer understanding of each other's views.

Gilbert Beebe.

Middletown, N.Y., June 1, 1880.

From: Signs of the Times; Vol.49.

HEBREWS 2:14,15.

Dear Brother Beebe; Being confined at home today by affliction and inclement weather, I have concluded to offer a few thoughts in connection with the following, but which is at your disposal:

"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear

of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.” Heb.2:14,15.

In this connection Arminians and Universalists claim proof of a general atonement, when Jesus is spoken of as having tasted death for every man; but take the connection and it appears to prove to the contrary. Two headships are spoken of, namely; Adam, the head and representative of his natural family, was created by Jehovah, and made a little lower than the angels, crowned with glory and honor, and all things put under his feet, and there was nothing left that was not put under him. This of course referred to all the natural creation of God, because the apostle changes the subject and speaks of the other headship, saying; “But now we see not yet all things put under him. But we see Jesus, [the life and immortality, head and representative of the church of God,] who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man, for it became him for whom all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons [every man] unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings, for both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one, for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee.” So it plainly appears that the term *every man* referred to his brethren, the church of whom he was the life, head and representative. These his brethren, or chosen people, the children of God, being partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same. If we can scripturally determine what is meant by the children of God, then we may more easily progress with the subject. We read in Rom.9:8 – “They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God.” Again in I Cor.15:50 – “Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.”

From these texts we can see that nothing belonging to mortals has anything to do with constituting them the children of God, nor cause them to inherit the kingdom of heaven. The children of God must be so spiritually, having their life and being of God the Father, in his only begotten Son Jesus Christ. In proof read John 1:12,13. “But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name, which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” “That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.” John 3:6. “Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.” I Pet.1:23. “And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.” I John 5:11. The generation of God’s children spiritually had their existence in Jesus Christ from eternity, even as the generation of Adam’s children naturally had their existence in him from his creation – of the earth, earthy; and have been manifested by ordinary

generation. So the children of God have been manifested by taking up their abode in flesh and blood in men and women, chosen to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to God the Father, according to the good pleasure of his will. In this way the children of God have been partakers of flesh and blood from the earliest age of the world. The people of God's choice are called vessels of mercy which he had afore prepared unto glory, such as he calls, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles. Which are first born of the flesh, and when called by grace, are born again, of incorruptible seed, by the word of God, or of the Spirit of God. Hence they are denominated the children of God, and spoken of as the new man, created after God in righteousness and true holiness, as in the following texts: "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit; if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his." Rom.8:9. "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." Rom.8:15,16. "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away, behold all things are become new." II Cor.5:17. It seems, too, that his place of abode is changed, for before he was under the law, or ministration of death and condemnation; but now he is under grace, or the ministration of life and peace; was before under the power of darkness, but now is delivered from it, and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son. They are thus spoken of because of the superiority of that heavenly birth they are subjects of, which shall finally result in the redemption or resurrection of their bodies in the likeness of their glorious Redeemer, to be with him and behold his glory forever, because he has taken part of the same flesh and blood with his children, and for his people, the object of which was that for them he through death might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, which he has through his life, death and resurrection, and now he holds the keys of death and of hell, and though his people fear death, and his children that cannot sin are subject to bondage while they remain in these earthly houses, yet when they shall fall in death, deliverance will be realized, and in the resurrection the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads, and sighing and sorrow shall flee away.

It is worthy of notice that Jesus did not come into the world to redeem and save his *children* from their sins, speaking of them in their spiritual existence, but to save sinners, men and women, chosen to the adoption of children. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his *people* from their sins." "The Lord's portion is his *people*, Jacob is the lot of his inheritance." The distinction in one sense seems to be clearly made between his children spiritually and his people according to the flesh, and yet his people are chosen and redeemed, and in them his children take up their abode, after which his people are denominated the children of the living God,

the sons of God. They, his chosen people, are sometimes spoken of prospectively as sons and daughters, and as children of the promise, counted for the seed. The relation in which Jesus stood to them in oneness of life and immortality, and in the covenant of redemption, is represented, first, speaking of Jesus, as husband of his bride, and her life; secondly, as the great Shepherd of the sheep, responsible for their trespasses. It is wonderful indeed, and well may the apostle, when speaking of the vital and covenant relation in which Jesus stood to his people, say; "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones; for this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the church." Eph.5:30-32. This eternal-vital union of Christ and his church is as mysterious as that of the human and divine natures existing in the same person, and each retaining all their original qualities. That which was born of the flesh, remaining flesh, with all the carnal and evil propensities it had before; and the divine nature, holy as God is holy, cannot sin because born of God. John, well acquainted with the christian warfare, says, "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." Again, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." Paul, who was equally acquainted with the warfare, says, "For the law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under sin." "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." "When I would do good, evil is present with me, so that the good that I would, I do not; but the evil that I would not, that do I ... O, wretched man that I am; who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord; so then with the mind I myself [divine nature, or new man] serve the law of God, but with the flesh [human nature, or the old man] the law of sin." "Return, return, O Shulamite, what seest thou in the Shulamite? As it were a company of two armies." These two armies represent the flesh and the spirit, constantly at war, but the victory is given through our Lord Jesus Christ; and the spirit being the stronger, shall surely prevail, and the old man fall in death, to be quickened and raised by the Spirit in the likeness of Jesus, in the morning of the resurrection.

Yours in love,
D.W. Patman.

Orlethorpe County, Georgia, March 15, 1868.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.36 {1868}

Is Love the Bond of Union?

Brother Beebe:—As we sometimes hear some of our ablest preachers say that love is the bond of union between Christ and His church and people; I have presented the above query hoping that some who thus assert will show us by good authority and argument that it is so; or failing, become convinced that they have been asserting for revelation, a traditional or self-invented notion. But in proposing the query for the consideration of others, I presume I may be allowed to accompany it with a statement of some of my objections to the idea. It is true, the advocates of the idea that love is the bond of union sometimes say in proof of it that love constitutes the union of husband and wife. But the proof fails from its own falsity. Love may unite a couple in affection, but it is not that which unites them as husband and wife, neither legally or scripturally. Not legally; for many couples have loved each other who have never legally become man and wife; whilst other couples, it is apprehended, are legally united as one flesh who never loved each other. Scripturally, it is a becoming one flesh that constitutes the relation of husband and wife. Hence Paul after exhorting "husbands to love their wives as Christ loved the church" goes on to say, "So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife, loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh." (Eph.5:29) In the case of Adam and Eve, in which is the true representation of the union of man and wife, and a true figure of union of Christ and His church, the ground of their union as assigned by Adam was that she was "bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh." (Gen.2:23,24) One more remark I will make before assigning my objection, viz. that the life in which Christ and His people are one is love, it is the spirit of the law, it is love to God, and therefore the union in this defined sense I admit is one of love. If brethren in speaking of love as the bond of union were thus to explain and define their meaning as characterizing the holy nature of that life in which Christ and His people are one, I should not object to the idea. But in speaking of love as the bond of union, persons are generally understood as conveying the idea that the exercise or feelings of love each toward the other is what constitutes the union; and in fact it is mostly so represented.

My first objection to the idea that love is the bond of union as generally understood is that, as the love must be mutual in order to constitute the union between parties, this doctrine represents Christ, if a head, a head without any existing body until man was created, and as even now having but parts of a body united to Him; many predestinated members not yet being brought to love Him. For though Christ's love may have gone forth from eternity to His members as existing in purpose, yet it is evident His people never love Him until born of God. A loving head without a living body united to it would be a monster.

My second objection to the idea that love constitutes the union of Christ and His people is that it represents love as a distinct existing principle, contrary to every authorized conception we ever had of it; for according to such authorized conception love is but the acting of a pre-existing living principle, toward an existing object, or is the characteristic of such a living principle; it also contradicts the doctrine generally understood by Old School Baptists to be taught in the Scriptures concerning God's love toward His people and their love to Him. It is written, "God is love;" but it certainly is not understood by this that He who is revealed as God is only love in the abstract. I understand it as representing the distinguishing characteristic of Him who is the living God, the almighty and self-existing Spirit. His being love presupposes His existence as God. God's special love to His people even when they were dead in sins, has always been understood by consistent Baptists, as extending to them, not as in themselves considered, but as in Christ, not through Adam but through Christ; this implies that they had a previous existence in Christ which was the special object of God's love; and if a previous existence in Christ, then of course a previous union with Him. Consequently according to this, God's love to them, instead of constituting their union to Christ, was the fruit of such union. Again, consistent Old School Baptists, do not admit that our Adamic nature, prune it and cultivate it as you will, can truly love God; our loving God, then presupposes the implantation in us of a distinct principle of life capable of loving God, whence is this new life derived but from Christ as the head and is therefore the Spirit of Christ in us? If then that living principle by which we love God is derived from Christ as the Head it must have previously existed in Him, and thus in that life we must have been one with Him before ever we loved Him. But if love is the bond of union, we had no union and therefore no existence in Christ, previous to our loving Him. And if we love God we must love Him with the powers of our Adamic nature.

The third objection I have to the doctrine that love is the bond of union between Christ and His people is that, it contradicts the apparent import of many texts of Scripture which speak either directly or indirectly in relation to a union of Christ and His people. I will notice a few. John 3:3-6 represents a new birth, and that a being born not of the *flesh* but of the *Spirit*. Are we to understand that here being *born again* means nothing more than a change of the current of the affections to a loving of God? Or are we to understand by it what is plainly expressed in the word, a being brought manifestly into a distinct state of existence? If the latter, then we must remember that to be born is distinct in idea from being created. To be born implies a previous creation in a head, as our natural birth implies our previous creation in Adam. As this new birth is not a fleshly birth, it cannot be from the fleshly head Adam; and as the Scriptures reveal no other head but Christ and Him as a spiritual head, it must imply a spiritual creation and therefore a previous actual

spiritual existence in Him. So in the texts where Christ's people are spoken of as His *seed* (as in Psalm 22:30; Isa.53:30) the same idea of a previous existence in Christ is fully conveyed, and consequently a created living union with Him. Again, Col. 3:3,4, "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life shall appear....", plainly declares a *oneness* of life in Christ and in His people and that Christ is this life. According to this text, the union of Christ and His people consists in life and must be as old as the existence of Christ as such. May we not then with confidence proclaim the *eternal union* of Christ and His people as a revealed doctrine? Hebrews 2:11, "For both He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren," I will lastly notice under this objection. I presume it will be admitted that Christ is here intended by the *He that sanctifieth*, and His people by the *they who are sanctified*. If so, the expression *all of one* ought to be admitted to express something more than a union between them formed by love; it positively declares a perfect unity, a one, and that in the very origin of their existence; all of one; that is, in the sense in which they are each here spoken of; their existence in a brotherhood, according to the latter part of the text, is the sense in which they are spoken of. It therefore neither refers to Christ's essential Godhead, nor to His people's creation in Adam. The expression *all of one* is so unlimited in the declaration that we may not confine the oneness to any one idea connected with the existence of a brotherhood without being guilty of limiting the declaration of God. According therefore to the declaration, they must have existed in Christ's existing as their brother and from the same source; as Adam's posterity existed in his existing and from the same source, the creating power of God. So we shall find this unity in relation to the brotherhood carried out in the Scriptures. Does brotherhood imply the idea of father, here the Father is one? Says Christ, "Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God and your God." (John 20:17) Does the idea of brotherhood imply a begetting; if Christ is the Only Begotten of the Father, (John 1:14) they must have been begotten in His begetting for they are born of God, and as showed, He is their Father? Does it imply a birth, and is Christ the first born *of every creature*; (Col.1:15) His people must have been born in Him, for they existed in Him before the foundation of the world, were the *chosen in Him, had grace given them in Him*, etc.? Does a birth as before showed presuppose a creation, and is Christ the beginning of the creation of God (Rev.3:14), here the unity also is found, for they are God's workmanship created in Christ Jesus, etc.? (Eph.2:10) Does the brotherhood imply sonship, here the unity continues? Is He a Son, so are they sons, and in their sonship have the Spirit of God's Son *sent forth into their hearts*, etc.? (Gal.4:6) And does sonship imply heirship, and is Christ *appointed heir of all things*, (Heb.1:2) His people *are joint heirs with Him*. (Rom.8:17) If then the union of Christ and His people is a

oneness of life and of existence, how can love be the bond of union?

A fourth objection to the idea that love is the bond of union is that Paul plainly teaches that the headship of Christ is not the bond, but the source or fountain of union of Him and His people, and charges some with a defect in this thing. See Col.2:10, "And not holding the Head from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God." Here the Head is that from which the body has its increase, its nourishment and is knit together, etc. In a word, I object to the term *bond of union*, as not being Scriptural in idea nor in expression. In the text just quoted, whilst there are joints spoken of indicative of the distinct action of the several members of both, and bands, showing the binding together of those members, all is from the Head as the fountain. We might as well talk of binding a stream to its fountain, as of binding the church and people of God to Christ their Head. The church is not something bound to Him to make Him full, but is the *fulness of Him that filleth all in all*. (Eph.1:23) The grand mystery of the gospel is not that we are bound to Christ, but it is "Christ in you the hope of glory." (Col.1:27) And Christ, in speaking of the unity of believers, does not speak of binding them more closely by eternal bonds, but says to His Father, "I in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one." (John 17:23)

I will here leave these objections for the consideration of those who preach that *love is the bond of union*, hoping some one or more of them will let us hear from them on the subject.

S. Trott.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia, July 21, 1848.

From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.16 {1848}

A REVEALING EXTRACT FROM A BOOK BY WALTER CASH.

"While writing on the subject of eternal vital union, I will give some particulars of the trouble Little Flock church of St. Joseph, Mo., had with Elder H.S. Cloud over this doctrine ... he soon developed very extreme views, and his expressions were objectionable on the subject of predestination. Then he went further and published a book without submitting it to the church or the members of the church. The title was: "The Bride, the Lamb's Wife." He professed, like so many others who put forth heretical ideas, that the matter of the book was revealed to him, and that he wrote it as it was revealed. The book advocated the eternal vital union theory, representing the church to be co-equal with Christ as to duration of

existence, then being manifested in the persons of the Adam family, and so being drawn under sin. Then Christ, because of His relation to His bride, was drawn under the law, and so to death because of the fall of His bride in Adam, and the final deliverance of the church from earth. He rejected the idea of the adoption of the Adam family, and left it in the grave.

Charges of heresy were brought in the church against Elder Cloud. Copies of his book were submitted to Elders F.A. Chick, editor of the *Signs of the Times*, S. Hassell, editor of the *Gospel Messenger*, R.W. Thompson, editor of the *Primitive Monitor*, and myself, editor of the *Messenger of Peace*, and S.H. Durand. These all pronounced the book heretical, and Elder Cloud was excluded, as were seventeen others who adhered to him. These excluded members claimed to be the church in order and sent up a letter to the Nodaway Association, but they were rejected, and the Salem church also dropped out as a result of this trouble. There is but one minister at this writing [Jan.1925] who advocates this theory in northwest Missouri, and but few holding it in the state. There are some sections in other states where this doctrine is preached. Back some years ago there was a paper called *The Sectarian* which upheld it, but that has gone down. Elders Ker and Lefferts, editors of the *Signs of the Times* during the year 1916, and in the August 1st and the Sept. 15th issues of that paper both took a stand for the eternal vital unity doctrine, although Elder F.A. Chick, while he was editor, called it heresy, as did Elder S. H. Durand, and other well known ministers of high standing.” {From “Autobiography & Sermons,” by Elder Walter Cash, 1925; pg.63, 64}

* * * * *

THE END.

