



THE CONTEST OF 1886-89

**ETERNAL VITAL UNITY
ELECTION IN CHRIST;
THE SPIRITUAL BIRTH**

Call To Remembrance the Former Days. – Hebrews x, 32.

Hath God assayed to go and take him a nation from the midst of another nation, the temptations, by signs, and by wonders, and by war, and by a stretched-out arm. – Deuteronomy iv, 34.

If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do. Psalm xi, 3.

Copyright, 1929
By, William M. Smoot



This e-book has been republished electronically by Tom Adams for “A Sweet Savor” web-site. It is being distributed free of charge for the edification of those that are of like precious faith. My hope is that it will prove a blessing to you as much as it has been to me!

Tom Adams

<http://asweetsavor.info>

Table of Contents

PREFACE.....	5
SECOND PREFACE.....	6
CHAPTER I.....	8
Events leading up to this Contest and Division.....	8
CHAPTER II.....	9
The Contest and Division of 1850-53.....	9
CHAPTER III.....	11
Conditions Following This Division.....	11
CHAPTER IV.....	12
Signs of the Coming Contest.....	12
CHAPTER V.....	17
Our brethren finally compelled to take a firm stand.....	17
CHAPTER VI.....	19
The issue clearly disclosed, and the resultant division.....	19
CHAPTER VII.....	25
The Contest at Quantico.....	25
CHAPTER VIII.....	29
THE MISREPRESENTATIONS BY THE LEADERS IN THIS DIVISION.....	29
CHAPTER IX.....	37
The Coming together of the two wings of the Means Baptist.....	37
CHAPTER X.....	39
THE CONTEST IN THE WEST.....	39
CHAPTER XI.....	41
THE MEANS BAPTIST.....	41
CHAPTER XII.....	44
CHAPTER XIII.....	48
THE IMPORTANCE OF THE CONTEST.....	48
CHAPTER XIV.....	53
THE DOCTRINE IN QUESTION.....	53
CHAPTER XV.....	56
The bearing that this Testimony has upon Salvation.....	56
CHAPTER XVI.....	59
ETERNAL, VITAL UNION.....	59
CONCLUSION.....	62
FINIS.....	67
PREFACE TO APPENDIX.....	68
APPENDIX A.....	69
CIRCULAR LETTER ON THE CHRISTIAN WARFARE.....	69
APPENDIX B.....	77
APPENDIX C.....	81
THE SPIRITUAL BIRTH.....	81
APPENDIX D.....	85
APPENDIX E.....	87

ORGANIZATON OF THE VIRGINIA ANNUAL MEETING.....	87
APPENDIX F.....	89
WAS THE CONTEST WORTH WHILE?.....	89
APPENDIX G.....	93
THE ATONEMENT.....	93
APPENDIX H.....	98
R E G E N E R A T I O N.....	98
APPENDIX I.....	103
APPENDIX J.....	104
THE GOSPEL CHURCH.....	104
APPENDIX K.....	107
CHRIST and Antichrist.....	107
Methodist.....	111
New School Baptist.....	111
Lutherans.....	112
Presbyterians.....	112
Adventist.....	112
APPENDIX L.....	115
Ana-Baptist.....	115
APPENDIX M.....	116
Mohammedanism.....	117
APPENDIX N.....	118
NOTICE OF GOSPEL MINISTERS.....	118

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 Baptists in America.

But all must admit that, 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 (2 Timothy iv, 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 to-day, 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 in 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." Galatians ii, 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, Va., December 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 contests among the Old School Baptist of America; first and foremost comes the Circular of the later 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 ii, 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 up frequently 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 as 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 Elder 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 lesser 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, ** 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.”¹

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.²

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

1 Clark's Exposure of Heresies, page 44.

2 Exposure of Heresies, page 46

that (Clark) contest fully harmonize with those of our brethren in the contest and division that we are now describing.

The Virginia Corresponding Association 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. ** 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 Ketocten Association in August, 1850, the late Elder 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 “An Appeal to the churches of the Ketocten 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 with our brethren had to meet in the contest of 1886-89.

A meeting was held with the Ebenezer church, Loudoun Country, Virginia, in November 1852,³ to notice the proscriptive measures adopted by the Ketocten Association of her session that year; which finally culminated in a division, the Virginia Corresponding Association: 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 Durand, Chick, and Thompson party in 1886-89.

3 Reminiscences of the Baptist of Virginia. Page 46.

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;” (Collossians; ii, 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 being to have an inpouring; 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 vi, 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 xii, 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 yet 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 Baptist⁴ 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."⁵ 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." Our relationship has never run along that line. Mr. Gadsby while attending Arminian meetings in this country, although in 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 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. 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: 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 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

4 They were generally recognized by this name in Virginia; but were really Means Baptist.

5 Gadsby's visit to America page 21.

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 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 unit on the sandy foundation advocated by the Means Baptist.

I wrote a letter to Elder Chick 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 like 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 this 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 there 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 with 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 them 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.⁶

This is the kind of sentiment that Durand, Chick, Thompson of Indiana: and others 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 vi, 4, held that it was the duty of Old School Baptist 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:

6 Zion's Advocate August, 1883.

“The dead sinner is born again; the Adamic sinner is quickened into life; the life is not simply an implantation; it is the begetting into the spiritual from the natural kingdom.”⁷

In the same copy of “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 was so powerfully wrought upon that she fell into a trance and remained so for about an hour.”

In this 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.⁸

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 Elder 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,” but 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 not have to either drop the argument or preach a created Christ.” Now is not the 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, i.e., 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

7 December 1885, pages 82. Zion’s Advocate.

8 Zion’s Advocate. December, 1885, page 94.

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 viii, 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 Ketocan (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 there 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 nor 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 their declaration 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." Colossians iii, 9. This, however, does not come under that head; but in James iii. 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 I was well acquainted with the late Elder 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 Thos. P. Dudley 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 deduction 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 or 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 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 foundation be destroyed, what can the righteous do.” Psalm xi, 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 widespread 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 no 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 Li, 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 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 Indian, 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 Mt. 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 Associations 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 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 2 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 the 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 1887⁹ 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 2 John 10. 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.¹⁰

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 the 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 door 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;

9 Defence of Providence church by Elder J. G. Jackson – page 17.

10 Ibid page 1-8.

and in 1888, they were again present backed up 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 (a pamphlet) "An Expose of Cane Run and Sulphur Fork churches, and the so-called Mt. Pleasant Association," 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 Mt. Pleasant Association was the body received into correspondence of the Eastern Associations complained of in the letter of the Occuquan Church to the Corresponding Meeting in 1889.

But having noticed the transgression (2 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, was a sinner; the next question covered 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 preceeds a birth; and the absolute order is that the seed should be in itself, i. e., in the life producing it; and after "his kind," Genesis i, 11, 12. Again if the sinner is born of the Spirit he becomes spirit; John iii, 6, and the Saviour says "a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." Luke xxiv, 39.

But Durand in his 2 paragraph, 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 as 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.”¹¹

The 3 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 Thos 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 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 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 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 ** 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, January 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

11 Clark’s Exposure of Heresies. page 46.

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 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 iii, 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.” Matthew xii. 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 sure 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 September 1888, the 5th Item in Saturday’s proceedings reads;

5. 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 Wm. J. Purington, Benton Jenkins, and Elijah Lee. Durand was not appointed, but lo 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; Ezekial Lynn; J. M. Barbee, Sr.; J. W. Chapman; L. A. Lynn.

OCCOQUAN; Elder W. M. Smoot; Orvis Maxfield; Enoch Grimes; C. S. Stone; James Pusey; 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 an 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; Wm. 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, falsehood, 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 corresponding 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 manifest 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 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 morning’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 church 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 them 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 the 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 move of this resolution was pleased to term it an amendment to the original motion, and we were informed that it could be considered 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 considered 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 whatever 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 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 Quantico 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 order 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 Friday morning which I did at the proper time in the proceedings of the meeting. I copy from the Manifesto page 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 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 what he chose without regard to any particular subject, and the whole proceedings would 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

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 the 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 following is the proceedings of that Council.

(The council referred to above will be found in Appendix A.)

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 Association 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 either 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 ix, 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 the 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.¹²

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

12 Circular & Cor. Letter Published in the Signs, June 11 1890.

spirit born of the Spirit” (John iii, 6,) is concerned that spirit is already alive unto God, as possessing the life of God of which he is born. John i, 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 quickening. He also charges us with deny “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 any thing 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 1 Timothy vi, 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, 1 Corinthians xv, 53; also if he already has immortality this is the culmination of all that the heavenly birth embodies.

At the time of the division 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 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 preaches for us now. We will have our next meeting 1st Sunday in August. Come down and see us. 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 into the house of God in company." Psalms lv, 12, 13, 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 for the same cause with the Juniata Association. Both of these Associations were located near the Juniata, and were in position to be well acquainted with the 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 Co., Va., was in affiliation with the Clark party, co-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 defence 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 defence stated that it was the same as the plea of the prisoner brought to the bar for stealing a horse, whose defence 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 say:

We have very limited acquaintance personally with the Baptist composing the Mount Pleasant Association. The pastor of some of her churches and faithful and faithful ministers of our long acquaintance inform us that the charge that that 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;

“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 1870. 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 doctrine 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 any one to show wherein we or our ministry have departed one iota from one

point of doctrine or order held by us * * and our messengers to our correspondents; and 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 iii, 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.”¹³ Again we quote “If there are any that object to this, they must be, 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 in 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 ye are Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.” Galatians iii, 29. But we must give another quotation;

Nowhere according to our understanding does the word “elect” refer to the 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 Scriptures says he has not,

¹³ The parenthesis in these quotations are ours to show clearly the idea of the Circular.

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 of John iii, 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 was advanced by John Clark in his so-called "Exposure of Heresies," page 40. He says:

The people of God were in Christ before the world was, and they are in him in time by faith – becomes 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 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 unit 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 natural 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 (Galatians v, 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 mean "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.

<p>No organization except his church has ever received such authority. Baptism can be administered only by the ministry held in fellowship of this church. * * An error here must ever stand as in the glare of eternal noon, never to be condoned.</p> <p>Circular of 1884</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Corresponding Letter of 1890.</p>
---	--

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 lest us compare the doctrine;

Again:

<p>Christ is declared as the elect of God. Circular of 1853</p>	<p>Nowhere does the word elect refer to a spiritual man distinct from a body of flesh. Circular of 1890</p>
---	---

Again:

<p>It is written; "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same." Hebrews ii, 14. Circular of 1853</p>	<p>One inquires, Is it the Adamic man that becomes the child of God? Yes. Circular of 1891</p>
--	--

Again:

<p>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</p>	<p>We can hardly believe that the apostle meant that the spiritual man is the child of God. Circular of 1890.</p>
--	---

In closing reference to this subject I will state that these same preachers who at the Corresponding 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; i.e., 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 hold 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." Ephesians i, 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 Time: 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 Ebenezer Association. While I learn that the Ketockton did not take the same action that the Ebenezer did, with reference to re-establishing friendly relations between those who have been so long separated and alienated, I am glad to know that they feel the say way. * * Our fathers may have held different sentiments, so much so, that they could not walk together. They were men, weak and despondent, 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 sight. The reader will notice the expression; "Our fathers may have held different sentiments." Of course he no reference to the fathers on Dalton's side, for all knew that Dalton and his compeer 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 this 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 differences 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 that 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 put 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 same 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 doctrine; 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 1855, 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 overseas 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 gave my reasons for such refusal withdrew and left the grove where the Association was in session returning to my own people. Ruth i, 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 April 1889, just preceeding 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 those 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 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., locating 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 ministrations 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 the 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.

Whatever 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 preceeding 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 ii, 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 the 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 viii, 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 same "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 to this sentiment. The Anti-means doctrine opposing this is the testimony: "The gospel of the kingdom of God," Mark i, 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 we presume presented as the 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 ix, 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 vi, 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 to 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 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 houses. Any character of religious effort that labors to work upon the natural 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," Genesis xxi, 12; "Now we brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise." Galatians iv, 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.” 1 Corinthians ii, 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?” Galatians iii, 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.” Nehemiah xiii, 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 (Zephaniah iii, 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 the 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 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 the 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. We copy in parallel columns to show the similarity. Like Durand, Clark puts the birth before the life, as though the birth produces the life, instead of life producing the birth.

(1)	(2)
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.	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.

On page 61 to which we request the reader to refer, 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.

We have shown also on page 64, 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 that 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 Delaware River Circular of 1891.

(1)	(2)
The identical man that was born is born again * * the members which were servants unto iniquity are now servants of righteousness.	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)	(2)
The warfare is between that part of man regenerated, and that part left in its natural state.	The child of God has two natures one earthly, the other spiritual, and these are antagonistic 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 Circular of 1891.

(1)	(2)
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.	No man in (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 Va., Corresponding Meeting 1891.

(1)	(2)
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.	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 “Exposures,” to state that “some 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:” i.e., 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) here is from “Exposure” page 38: (2) from the Corresponding Letter of the Baltimore Association of 1890.

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

The parenthesis in these quotations are ours as showing what the writer meant from his connections.

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 Ketocton 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 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 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 preceeded us, and shown how fully it compares with what we are holding to-day: 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 any thing, 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 2d 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 (Ephesians i, 1,) spoken of in this letter are "quickened together with together with Christ:" the Vulgate translation reads, "quickened us together in Christ:" while the revised translation 1880 recognizes the corrections of the term "In Christ." I would like to know how we could be "quickened 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 acknowledge 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, Elder 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 Gilbert 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 to 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 page 16 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 arrangements 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. On page 16 I made 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 defence. 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 defence 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, and Elder Rittenhouse and Grafton, and most all the brethren in the South and North that in time all these differences might be healed.

Elder Chick relates several instances to illustrate his views that these two wings (Durand and 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 McInturf (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 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 essential to the doctrine of salvation by grace.

We quote extensively from Chick; he was truly with Durand a representative man in the 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 was 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, Pennsylvania, 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 in it. I learn he is going with brother Biggs to Canada. * * You may tell George that the question will be brought up for a I do not propose to have him or any body 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; Thos. 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 ix, 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 live 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 come out from that Meeting, organizing the Annual Meeting. This statement of Durand is on 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 it at almost every turn in this contest. Our quotations from Clark’s so-called “Exposure of Heresies” especially on pages 21 & 22, 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 in this connection against our brethren. Accusations were made against Thos. 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 is 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 have the truth of doctrine and order they begin to lie.

It is written in Revelation ii, 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 1 John iv, 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 way 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.” 1 John iv, 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 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. On page 16 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 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 Thos. 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 honour 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 not in the open. Dalton who was not 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 Corresponding Meeting and the Ebenezer and Ketchikan 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 doctrine 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 Unlimited¹⁴ Predestinationism 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:

¹⁴ He means here Absolute Predestination.

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 page 97; “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 without their rants, 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 evidence 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 *very, Eligo*;¹⁵ *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 we expect here-after 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 any thing pertaining to gospel doctrine and order: “comparing spiritual things with spiritual.” In Isaiah xlii, 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 what 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, Behold, I lay in Sion, a chief corner stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded.” 1 Peter ii, 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.” Hebrews ii, 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

¹⁵ Ainsworth Latin Dictionary, page 185

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 1 Corinthians ii, 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 farther where this choice is. In Ephesians i, 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 of 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 Ephesians i, 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 1 Thessalonians i, 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)¹⁶ in Christ Jesus," declares "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular," 1 Corinthians xii, 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." 1 Corinthians xii, 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 (Ephesians i, 22, 23;) not as a seed substance (Galatians iii, 16;) not as "the first-born among many brethren," (Romans viii, 29;) all of the brotherhood being born of the same parentage (God,) John i, 13. They entirely ignore the absolutely important testimony in Romans v, 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 iii, 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 September 25, 1742. On page 29th of this Confession we have reference to "Those whom God hath accepted in the Beloved:" and on page 45, "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 these vital points to more fully develop and bring out the testimony in the travel of our churches.

The late Elder Gilbert Beebe in the Prospectus of the Signs of the Times, as published in the first Volume, declares 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,

16 I have placed in parentheses expressions that show my understanding of the testimony quoted.

1845, he describes the church as in Bible testimony, “Descending from God out of heaven adorned as a bride for her husband;”¹⁷ so say we; so says the Scripture: “a chosen generation, a royal priesthood.”

¹⁷ 2d Volume Editorial page 530.

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,” Romans vi, 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 ii, 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 to bondage.” Here is the 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 (1 John v, 20;) Spirit (John iv, 24;) and man (1 Timothy ii, 5;) both Spirit and flesh for God is a Spirit: John iv, 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, Romans viii, 2; Romans viii, 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.” Ephesians iv, 22, 24.

In 1 John iv, 2, we have similar and corroborative testimony to that recorded in Hebrews ii, 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 vii, 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.” Matthew i, 21. It appears from Ruth iv, 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 Hebrew ii, 14, does not say “that the children were,” but that “the children are” &c. this corresponds to Revelation xx, 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: (Revelation xx, 2;) the body (Colossians i, 18;) these are the “his people.” Matthew i, 21, that he come to save. They are “his people,” because they were given unto him, John

xvii, 24, not merely “in covenant relation” as Means Baptist hold, but by actual “choice in him,” as we have already shown; these are the character 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,” 2 John v, 18, because they come from a sinless head; but these people in their mortal relationship in Adam can do no otherwise but sin, Romans vii, 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,” 1 John iv, 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 vi, 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,” 1 John iii, 5: tempted in all points like unto his people, “yet without sin,” Hebrews iv, 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,” Galatians iv, 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, Hebrews ii, 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 x. 18.

The inquiring reader will take notice to the fact that this vital oneness between the head and body; upon which the debt was paid as held against the church in 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; i. e., 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 seraphs sung all hell’s defeat.
This sacred bond shall never break,
Though earth should to her center 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.” 1 Corinthians xv, 3: Romans v, 6: they died in him as surely as they were raised up together with him 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,” Romans viii, 34. “For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead.” 2 Corinthians v, 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.” 1 Peter i, 3. “And he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first born from the dead.” Colossians i, 18. This does not mean simply the resurrection from the dead, but the Regeneration; the begetting again of the generation of Jesus Christ from the under the law and under its curse into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. The reader will turn to 1 Peter i, 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.” Psalms Cxxxix, 15. As stated on page 100 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.” Galatians iii, 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 of Solomon vi. 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.” Hebrews x, 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.” 1 Corinthians vi, 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.” 2 Corinthians v, 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. 1 Thessalonians v, 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 preceeding chapter (xv,) that the death of Christ, the head, could have no possible effect upon any especial 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 i, 13: these children of God partake of flesh and blood, thus the head becomes involved, and "likewise took part of the same," Hebrews ii, 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 life time subject to bondage," Hebrews ii, 15. The head (Christ) because of this vital relationship to his body, had a legal right to bear their griefs, and carry their sorrows, Isaiah liii, 4: "who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree." 1 Peter ii, 24; the same relationship that laid the sins upon the head, caused the deliverance of the body, as its head was "brought again 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." Romans v, 11. The reader will notice that those who have thus received the atonement are the "beloved of God," Romans i, 7: "the elect of God, holy and beloved," Colossians iii, 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, i. e., 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." 1 Corinthians xv, 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 chose 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 this 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.” Exodus xxviii, 1. “And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.” Hebrews v, 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, to day have I begotten thee.” Hebrews v. 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, Counsellor, the Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.” Isaiah ix, 6. Luke testifies to this typical Israel, “For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.” Luke ii, 11. The LORD declares in Psalms ii, 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 viii, 22. Come now to the substance of those prophecies; Christ Jesus. We find in Hebrews ii, 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 fullness of him that filleth all in all.” Ephesians i, 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 xvi. Can there be any thing 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. Galatians iii. 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, ourself 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, (Isaiah ix, 19,) however, explained how this was to be accomplished; a birth with 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 that the

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 on pages 98-99; and in chapter xvi, page 111; each is, and both are spoken of as a key to the gospel system; and as much 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; i.e., 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 Jeremiah xxiii, 6, referring to Christ we are told; "And this is the name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." In chapter xxxiii, 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 to-day 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 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.” Romans iv, 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;” Romans vi, 9; “I am he that liveth, and was dead: and behold, I am alive forevermore:” Revelation i, 18: thus he brought his people: who died in his death; and came up with and in him: “quickened together with Christ” (Ephesians ii, 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 xxii, 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 that we have by the grace of God, attained had we remained together; the division opened the way for further advancement; Life Insurance: Prohibition: Labor Unionism: Woman Suffrage with all the unrighteousness bred in these cess-pools 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, 1 Timothy i, 19, 20; 2 Timothy ii, 17; 2 Timothy iv, 14; 3 John 9. We are told in Isaiah ix, 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." Matthew v, 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." Matthew vii, 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 offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them." Romans xvi, 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." Psalms lv, 15. In fact, subjects of grace are found sometimes in 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 received not of her plagues." Revelation xviii, 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 breadth from what he feels called upon to contend for, for fear of some unpleasant consequences."¹⁸

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

While apparently a large majority of 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, (1 Corinthians iii, 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

18 Reminiscences of the Baptist of Virginia, Page 37.

upon my invitation the late Elder R. M. Thomas of Missouri visited the Corresponding Meeting during this contest, his preaching was well received; even Elder Wm. 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 xxxii, 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 on page 122 we quote 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 to reclaim them from their errors in his own good time and way. At the same time we would warn such of the chastising rod with 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."¹⁹

The term Christian used here evidently meant subject of grace; the term Christian (Acts xi, 28,) 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 antichristians, 1 John ii, 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 on pages 49, 56, 73: 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, see pages 91, 92: 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 (see page 92) the Delaware River opened correspondence with the 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 Cor. Meeting had ever held; yea, more, what had ever been held by such men as Trott: Gilbert

¹⁹ Reminiscences of the Baptist of Virginia, Page 22.

Beebe: Leachman: Dudley: Johnson: Paman and others. Shades of the departed fathers, what irony! confusion worse confounded!

As stated in preceeding paragraphs I had intimate acquaintance with the ministers on both sides of the 1886-89 contest; and 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,” 1 John ii, 18, 19. ‘Tis 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, (Romans x, 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 men 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 xv, 16, 17, “Better is little with the fear of the LORD, then 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 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 am of Christ;” 1 Corinthians xi, 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 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.”

Psalms Cxliv, 1, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.

I indeed might we conclude here, but let us lay under this forcible testimony the broad foundation recorded in Isaiah vii, 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.”

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 so elected in Christ 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.

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 the work.

First and foremost in these articles for preservation readily stands the Circular on the Christian Warfare by the late Elder Thomas P. Dudley regard as by far one of the clearest articles every 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 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.”²⁰ 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.

20 Biography of Elder Dudley, Page 88

APPENDIX A

CIRCULAR LETTER ON THE CHRISTIAN WARFARE

By Thomas P. Dudley, 1846

To the Churches composing the Licking Association of Particular Baptists, their Messengers, wish grace, mercy and peace be 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, than 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 while 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.” (Deuteronomy 32:4) Now we ask if indeed, in regeneration, the man (natural carnal 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.” (Romans 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.” (Colossians 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 man is the new man, or that the new man 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 nowhere in the Scripture represented as Re-formation, 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 off-spring with them.” (Isa. 65:18,19,23).

None, we presume, will deny, that the last quotation has exclusive reference to Galatians 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 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.” (Isa. 43:1,5,6,7) “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.” (Jere. 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.” (Psa. 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.” (Genesis 2:7) “Male 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, 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 Scripture; “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 mayst 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 the man. 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.” (Genesis 2:15-18;22-24)

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 a “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 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 (not, was to become) 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.” (Psa 51:5)

“The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies.” (Psa. 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 preceeding facts 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 Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening Spirit. Howbeit that was not first which was 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 doeth 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 “quickenings” were created in and simultaneously WITH the “last Adam” – Christ – 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 quickenings necessarily descend from the last Adam: that the seed of the “first man 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 earthy 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 the earth; of the last Adam, are born for heaven. Those of the “first” are born of corruptible seed: 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 “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 ALL the chosen seed.

But as the transgression of the “first Adam” did not disqualify his whole 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 see 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 producing 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.” (Romans 8:7,8,9)

“All men hath 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 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 yet be developed, were once inclosed 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, 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 Bible that the Husband 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.” “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 worlds 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.” (Psalms 139:15,16)

“For we are members of His body, OF HIS FLESH, and of HIS BONES.” (Ephesians 5:30)

Creation was instantaneous. – Formation is progressive. Though we are 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.” (Gen. 5:1)

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 (church), 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 the 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.” (Isa. 63:6,7).

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, earthy; 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.” (Colossians 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 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 life time 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 pleasures of the Lord shall prosper in His hands.” (Isa. 53:10) “Now is My soul troubled.” “My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death.” “Who His own self bear our sins in His own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were 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 “begat 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.” (Isa. 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 distinct natures – human and divine? 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 being; the second, an incorporeal being. The first, an earthly being; 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.” (Matthew 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 man,” 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 therefore proven that “their mind and conscience is defiled.”

But we are asked, When, and how, are the “old man” 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 until 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 Lamb’s 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.” (S.S. 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 over matter.” Have they forgotten that it requires both to constitute an intelligent responsible being? We have shown that “even the mind and conscience is defiled;” that “the carnal mind is enmity against God.” (Rom. 8:7,8) 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 can not 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.

APPENDIX B

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.

In 1 Timothy v, 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 P. 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:

“Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of the flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same.”

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 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 angles, 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) crowned with glory and honor, that he, by the grace of God, (not by suffering) should (in the future) taste death for every man. So that when arminians attempt to quote this text, “He tasted (in the past) 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 tally destroy it so far as his brethren are concerned; and the brotherhood consists of, Both he that sanctifieth (setter 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 verse next 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, can not 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 fibres 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 i, 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 iii, 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, therefore, that they are the children of God. Let us next go to 1 Peter i, 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 beside me.” – Hos. xiii, 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 ii, 19-21. John saw his children, “The Holy City, new Jerusalem, (‘in like manner’) coming down from God out of heaven.” &c. – Rev. xxi. 1. 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 1 Cor. iii, 16, and vi, 19. Moreover, which is not of the world, “in like manner,” his children are not of the world. – John xv, 19, and xvii, 15. 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, 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 to 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 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 and blood and 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 his 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.

APPENDIX C

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 iii, 3: 1 Peter i, 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 pre-supposed 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.²¹

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

Notice, Clark here says, "Now to be a man i.e., 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 1 Corinthians xv, 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 1 Timothy ii, 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 iii, 3, in the original Greek, and under the Greek word, its English meaning:

<i>Apekrithe</i>	<i>Jesous</i>	<i>kai</i>	<i>eipen</i>	<i>auto</i>	<i>Amen,</i>	<i>Ame</i>
Answered	Jesus	and	said	to him;	Amen,	Am
<i>lego</i>	<i>soi</i>	<i>ean</i>	<i>me</i>	<i>tis</i>	<i>gennethei</i>	<i>anohen</i>
I say	to you	if	not	any one	be born	from above
<i>on</i>	<i>dunatai</i>	<i>idein</i>	<i>ten</i>	<i>basileian</i>	<i>tou</i>	<i>Theou</i>
no	will he be able to	to see	the	Kingdom	of the	God

21 CLARK's EXPOSURES. Page 44.

The strict interpretation of the text reads, "Answered Jesus, and said to him; 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 interpretation of this text connection with the contests of former and recent years, often hinges upon the translation of the Greek word *anōthen*. 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 what 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,²² hence liable to be led 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." Galatians v, 17. There could be no such a thing as one 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 the 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 *anōthen* (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 at the one man born twice. The second testimony examined at the University is contained in 1 Peter i, 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 the God." The word above to our understanding destroys much of the force of the arguments based upon the erroneous translation of the Greek word "*anōthen*." 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

22 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 the different Protestant orders.

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 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 comprehend heavenly or spiritual 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. i. e., 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, “Anothen,” 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 iii, 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 vii, 22, the “inward man,” and in Ephesians iv, 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 him “who only hath immortality.” 1 Timothy vi, 16: “And of Zion it shall be said, This and that man was born in her.” Psalms Lxxxviii, 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,” (Romans i, 20,) through what 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,” Genesis i, 11; and again producing or developing “after his kind.” Verse 12th.

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 Revelation iv, 6-9; and in Revelation xvii, 1-4: whereas in the first instance the rendering should be “living creatures,” as rendered from the Hebrew in Ezekiel i, 5, so it seems clear a mistake has been made, as previously stated, in translating the Greek word *anothen*, 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, *anōthen*, as a secondary meaning, coming from *ano*, which sometimes means "spreading all over a space throughout." It would seem that the lover of the Armenian 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, *anōthen*, 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. Genesis i, 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." Colossians ii, 7, 8.

Our readers will notice that there is not a worldly religious order any where 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." Ephesians iv, 20, 21.

APPENDIX D

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.”

SAMUEL TROTT.

“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.

“1 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 of figure of Christ points directly to this life union.

“So long as I have known much of the Baptist I have known those who believed that the new birth was a being born of a distinct life of which Christ is the head.”

“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 1 John v, 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 give 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.

APPENDIX E

ORGANIZATON OF THE VIRGINIA ANNUAL MEETING

Oak Grove, Va.,
August 19, 1889.

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 out 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 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; the Revelation that he has been pleased to make of himself as Father, Word, and Holy Ghost, and “these three are one.” 1 John v. 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 the final Judgment. In a declaration of our order we affirm out 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 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.

APPENDIX F

WAS THE CONTEST WORTH WHILE?

Forty years have passed since the active opening of the contest traced through the pages of 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, (Romans xiv, 10; 2 Corinthians v, 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.

I requite from page 121 the testimony recorded in Romans xvi, 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," Hebrews x, 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 to-day. Examine the testimony that we have produced; yea, more go to the writings of those who have succeeded in the footsteps of the Chick and Durand following: read their published statements, and there will be found the same statements, an election in Adam; i, e, sinners of Adam's race; the identical idea put forth by Nicodemus, "the same man (sinner) that was born of the flesh is now horn 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 same only and so on down the list.

We are admonished; "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him." Colossians ii, 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 v, 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," Proverbs viii, 23. In the previous Verse he says: "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way." And in John i, 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 i, 3, reads in the margin "All things were made through him;" and in Colossians i, i6, the testimony covering the same ground informs us, "In him were all things created * * through him and unto 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." Colossians i, 26.

"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 liv, 13;) learn of the Father, John vi, 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 in chapter vi page 28. 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 and 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 obligations; 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 this 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 Romans vii, 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 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." 1 Corinthians xv, 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, 2 Samuel iv, 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." Galatians v, 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," Isaiah li, 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 we repeat 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 smouldering 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; contended 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,” Romans xi, 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,” Psalms cxxxix, 15, i.e., 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 iv, 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.

APPENDIX G

THE ATONEMENT

For by one offering he hath perfected them that are sanctified. Hebrews x, 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 imperilled the child after the birth as before. It is written that we are conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity, Psalms li, 5: and so far as our birth in nature is concerned, that we "are estranged from the womb" speaking lies. Psalms lviii, 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 come to inquire why this man could not lay off 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 (Leviticus xvi, 7-10) taken as the sin-offering of the congregations of Israel, one offered upon the holy altar or yet the "ram caught in a 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. 2 Timothy 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. Lxxxix 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 whom 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." Hebrews ii, 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 and blood) because of the eternal life oneness between him and them. Hebrew ii, 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 fullness 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. ii, 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. Hebrews x, 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." Hebrews ii, 13-16. This brings us to our text;

"Far 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." Hebrews vii, 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 their flesh (1. John iv, 4,) partakers of their nature: the law demands death as the wages of sin (Romans vi, 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.” 2 Corinthians v, 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 corners there-unto perfect,” Hebrews x, 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,” Leviticus xvi, 34, he bore an ephod upon each shoulder upon which was engraven in ouches of gold the names of the twelve tribes of Israel; also a breast-plate over his heart similarly engraven in gold (Exodus xxviii, 6-43;) thus typifying him who was to come (Hebrews ix, 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. Aarons offering failed to perfectly cancel but was simply a reminder of the transgressions of Israel, but the offering of Christ who his own sinless body received the stroke (Zechariah xiii,) 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,” Ephesians i, 4: “Sanctified in Christ Jesus,” 1 Corinthians i, 2; “For both he that santifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one,” Hebrews ii, 11: “That they all may he one; as thou, Father, art in me, and 1 in thee, that they also may be one in us:” John xvii, 21; “So we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another.” Romans xii, 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.” Ephesians v, 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," Hebrews ii, 16: was made "a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death," Hebrews ii, 9, that through death he might deliver "his people" (Matthew i, 21,) from the bondage of death. Christ was sanctified by the Father, "and sent into the world," John x, 36, evidently as "the first-born among many brethren," Romans ix, 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. Hebrews ii, 11. The elect were chosen (sanctified) 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." Romans v, 7-11.

The apostle uses the pronouns us, and we here referring to himself, and those at Rome, "beloved of God" (Romans i, 7,) assuredly confining his testimony to those who were loved in Christ "that the purpose of God according to election might stand." Romans ix, 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 (2 Corinthians v, 17;) of which creation Christ is the first-born (Colossians i, 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." Romans viii, 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." verse 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. Ephesians i, 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 xv, 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," 2 Timothy i, 10: and they in eternal, vital union or oneness with and in him are "made alive from the dead," Romans vi, 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." Colossians iii, 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 Romans vii, 22.) "Keep under my body, (the body of sin and

death referred to in Romans vii, 24,) and bring it in subjection (the power of its indwelling life accomplishes this, Philippians ii, 13,) lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a cast-away,” (like many others in this and in former days.) 1 Corinthians ix, 27.

These children in their Adamic relation have received “the adoption of sons,” Galatians iv, 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 1836-89, 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.” Galatians iv, 6. This spirit which is born of the Spirit is the same spirit that seals these children, Ephesians i, 13; 2 Corinthians i, 22: “unto the day of redemption,” (of the purchased possession,) Ephesians iv, 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, Psalms Cxxxiii, 3:) whether in the icebound 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.” Isaiah xliii, 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 them, he bottles all their tears and all their wanderings are in his book. Psalms Lvi, 8. They cannot wander beyond his sight; they cannot get from over his everlasting arms. They are borne in his chariot covered with purple, Song of Solomon iii, 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.

APPENDIX H

Next in this order comes The Regeneration. We insert an Editorial in 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, 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. (1 Corinthians xv, 44.)

REGENERATION (Editorial From *Sectarian*.)

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. Matthew xix, 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 xxiv, 39; but would become spirit, John iii, 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 said to follow Christ, “what should they have.” The Saviour’s answer they 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 xxxii, 1: Christ referring evidently to the gospel dispensation which he had come to establish: the bringing in of “a better hope,” Hebrews vii, 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 Psalms xxii, 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 Matthew i, 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 1 Peter i, 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 (Hebrews ii, 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,” Galatians iv, 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 iii, 5: “According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.” Titus iii, 5. Here are the same us spoken of and to, in previous testimony, for Paul writes “according to the faith of God’s elect.” Titus i, 1. This “washing of regeneration” evidently; refers to the washing “us (the same us) from our sins in his own blood,” Revelation i, 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 up, (the same us) and we shall live in his sight” Hosea vi, 2. “Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us (the same us) together with Christ.” Ephesians ii, 5.

Mark you “quickened together with Christ:” i.e., 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.” Romans xii, 4, 5. “Christ is the head of the Church; and he is the Saviour of the body.” Ephesians v, 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 (1 Corinthians xv, 44, 47, 48, 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,” Genesis v, 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 viii, 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,” Psalms ii, 7; and the many brethren (Romans viii, 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.” Proverbs viii, 23.

The generation of Christ as traced in Matthew 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.” Isaiah viii, 18.

These are the children; this is the generation Inspiration informs us (Hebrews ii, 13, 14,) that partake of flesh and blood, and were in bondage under the law of sin and death (Galatians iv, 3, 4, 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.” 1 Peter i, 3.

And this Regeneration abolished death in their behalf; and “brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.” 2 Timothy i, 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.) Revelation xii, 1.

The typical testimony of this doctrine is found first in the tabernacle service in the wilderness in layer (wash-basin) mentioned in Exodus xxx, 18, 19, 20, put between “the tabernacle of the congregation and the altar;” in which the priests were to “wash their hands and feet thereat.”

“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 hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins.” Hebrews, 3, Leviticus ix, 7; and in all these offerings there was but the remembrance of sin; but the offering of Christ; 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: 2 Chronicles iv, 2-6. This sea like the Layer 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 earth and time. Mark xvi, 15.

As the priest before engaging in the tabernacle or temple worship washed in the layer 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 xix, 34,) that flowed from the side of Jesus.

“This is the fountain filled with blood,
Drawn from Emanuel’s veins;
And sinners plunged beneath this flood,
Lose all their guilty stains.”

The service of the legal dispensation was administered by blood and water Hebrews ix, 19, and Christ came by water and blood, 1 John v, 6. In this last testimony the water is placed first as typifying we presume his (water) baptism unto death Luke xii, 50, and the blood his crucifixion but in the crucifixion the blood is named first, John xix, 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 (Matthew 1, 21,) from their sins. Especially was this typified in the atonement offered once a year under the Aaronical priesthood (Hebrews ix, 7,) offered

with the shedding of blood, and the priest was required to wash himself before and after this offering Leviticus xvi, 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,” Hebrews ix, 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.” Revelation vii, 14. “And the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.” 1 John i, 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 (Ephesians i, 22:) as the seed, substance of the development of this holy generation (Galatians iii, 16; Malachi ii, 15; Psalms Cxxxix, 14-16) thus begotten in him (Isaiah Lxvi, 8,) developing the generation of Jesus Christ, Matthew i, 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 (the church) in this development stands in the place of his people; lays down his (Adamic) life (John x, 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 x, 18,) and take it up again; as born from the dead (Colossians i, 18: 1 Corinthians xv, 20;) (begotten again, 1 Peter i, 3,) he forever cancels by paying in full the debt against them, covering their sins (Psalms xxxii, 1; Romans iv, 7,) as it is written; “Thou hast forgiven the iniquity of thy people, thou has covered all their sins.” Selah. Psalms lxxxv, 2.

Now seated “in the throne of his glory,” “as judge of all,” (Hebrews xii, 23,) “he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out,” (John x, 3.) as before him are gathered all nations, and he separates them “as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats.” Matthew xxv, 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.”

“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 xvii, 14, 24.

APPENDIX I

We have now traced the elect through Christ the seed substance (Psalms Cxxxix, 16; Galatians iii, 16;) born of God, the Father (John i, 13; 1 Thessalonians i, 1;) partakers of, but not made up out of flesh and blood (Hebrews ii, 14; 1 John iv, 2;) brought up from under the law and from under its curse Matthew xix, 28: 1. Peter m, 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.” 1 Corinthians xv, 12, 20, 57.

We must bear in mind, however, that any discussion of the “Resurrection of the dead,” Philippians iii, 11, must witness that “It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body,” I Corinthians xv, 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.” 1 Thessalonians iv, 18.

APPENDIX J

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 shewing the origin of her enemies; (Revelation xii, 3;) the various branches of anti-christ.

THE GOSPEL CHURCH.

“Which is in God the Father, and in the Lord Jesus Christ.” 1 Thessalonians i, 1.
“Upon this Rock I will build my church: and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”
Matthew xvi, 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 circumstances give colour to the date. A. D., 33.

Christ was crucified at the Passover, Exodus xii, 3-12; Luke xxii, 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 xxii, 17-29,) 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 fiftieth day after the resurrection, it was a harvest season, when the “first fruits” of their harvest were brought to the LORD. Deuteronomy xvi, 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 ii, 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. Genesis vii, 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 it gave them utterance.” Acts ii, 1, 2, 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”, Revelation xxi, 2; the other “coming up out of the earth;” (Revelation xiii, 11:) out of the “multitudes, and nations, and tongues of earth,” Revelation xiii, 1, 2; xvii, 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” (the gospel;) “the great red dragon” appears for her persecution. Revelation xii, 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 apostle’s doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.” Acts ii, 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; 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 counterfit 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, saving, that bonds and afflictions abide me. * * And now behold, I know that ye all, * * 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 xx, 20, 22, 23, 25, 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 xx, 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 he 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, Waldences, &c.

But in a straight line we trace the church of to-day 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 xiv, 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 to-day 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 were the Episcopal persecutors of Jeremiah Moore. Hence we cannot trace the church through any such character of descent.

APPENDIX K

But let us now pass from CHRIST to Antichrist; from the Gospel church to her adversaries,

CHRIST and Antichrist.

“Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is Christ.” 1 John ii, 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.” 1 John iv, 3.

“Even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time.” 1 John ii, 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 he round about him. Jerusalem is as a menstrous woman among them.” Lamentations i, 17.

Under this head we call attention to the various groups of antichristian orders Springing from the two beasts mentioned in Revelation xiii.

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.” Revelation xii, 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.” Revelation xiii, 1; xvii, 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 (Psalms Lx, 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 their 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 to day, 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, (Revelation xii, 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 arid jangles yet it drifted along its destined course filling its allotted days (Revelation xiii, 5,) when it gave way to its successor the Protestant beast (Revelation xiii, 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 November 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" (Revelation xiii, 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 thy 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, i. e., a unison 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 affect this Protestant movement.

Our readers will notice that the Gospel Church had no connection whatever with this 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.” Revelation xvii, 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 November 3, 1534, confirmed, making Henry viii, “supreme head of the church of England.”

Thus began the church of England also called 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 marriage. Henry then marries a German Duchess, Anne of Cleves, but in a short while tired of her, he divorced her, the English Parliament readily granting this order of divorce.

In the space of about two weeks Henry married his fifth wife, but soon found it convenient to get rid of her. She was condemned and met the same fate of 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 iv, 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 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 anti-christ; 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 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's 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 pure in religion; and of course they consider 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 and 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 relation-sonship 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 there 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 xiii, 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 Baptist.

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 to-day 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.” Matthew vii, 16.

We desire to emphasize the clear distinction between the Gospel church as in her heavenly origin she is “coming sown from God out of heaven,” “the holy city” as separate and apart from all the systems and isms of earth, Revelation xxi, 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 Samuel xxviii, 13: and to which the apostle alludes in the testimony: “There be gods many,” 1 Corinthians viii, 5 gods in olden days hewn out of wood, but in after days hewn out of the depraved minds and imagination 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 the lead in a movement to override all human rights by imposing the most cruel and brutal laws in an effort to enforce an unenforcible 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 endeavor 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 line speeches lead astray the unwary. They come with a lie in their mouth (2 Thessalonians ii, 11; Revelation xxii, 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. 2 Thessalonians ii, 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 ii, 1.

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 represent 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 Russelites 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 Russelites. It is written: “Every house is builded by some man” and the foundation of this Russelites 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 Russelites 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; viz, 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,

On page 216 we refer to antichrist; we requote the testimony from I John iv, 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 Russelites 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 (Matthew xvi, 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,” 1 Thessalonians v, 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 hare done, and are doing.

Miller like Russell printed several periodicals circulating his views, sent missionaries like these “I. B. S.” broadcasting his 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 Russelites 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 Timothy iii, 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 and blood (Hebrews ii, 14,) as we have several times allude I to in this work.

The Russelites 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 Russelites 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.” Hebrews ix, 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 i, 11.

But these Russelites have discovered a “mare’s nest,” which has made them “wise in their own eyes” (Isaiah v, 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 folk!

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.” Matthew vii, 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.” Matthew xxiii, 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 hark 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.” Psalms cxxxix, 19, 20, 21, 22.

The Saviour declares “He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.” Matthew xii, 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.” Matthew vi, 24.

APPENDIX L

Ana-Baptist.

We desire to make further brief reference to this “sect every where spoken against.” Those who under this name passed through the every 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 xxiii, 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 baptised in other orders, to be baptised, they were called Ana-Baptist, or Rebaptisers.

As noticed in our reference to this subject on page 214 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 and 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,” Revelation xvii, 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 ii, 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 (Revelation xii, 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 iv, 1.

APPENDIX M

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, viz; 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 xiii, 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 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 (Habakkuk i, 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" (Proverbs vii, 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." Revelation xvii 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.” Psalms cxxxix, 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.” Romans xi, 33.

Ridpath another Protestant historian in volume v, page 133 of his history says of what was called this “Protestant: Reformation.”

“The new churches which the Reformers 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 a 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 premissis which had not belonged to Rome for centuries. So when Protestantism come 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 (Genesis iii, 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; He was subject from his childhood to 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 lime had gotten a large foot hold in Europe. Mohammed 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, which showed it 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.

The Mohammedan 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.

APPENDIX N

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 commitment 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 February 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 Edinburg 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 Baptist. He died August 14, 1828.

Elder J. F. Johnson was born in Culpepper County, Virginia, November 7, 1800. He removed to Indiana in early life; and was baptized there in June 1830. He was ordained to the work of the ministry and became one of the ablest expounders of gospel truth in a cluster of preachers among the ablest men of his or any other age.

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 January 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 (Died 1884.)

Elder Dudley passed through some severe scenes in the war of 1812, with England, he was taken a prisoner and experienced peculiar 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 at the age of 92 years old.)

ELDER SAMUEL TROTT was born in 1784, and died in Fairfax County, Virginia, October 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 treasure. 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 Vol. X, numbers 4 and 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 61, 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 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 consequence to either friend or foe, the faithful minister has no right to consider them, or to swerve one hair's breadth 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" part 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.