

Fermanagh Times, April 1907

Newspaper Articles

Fermanagh Times – April 1907

Revised Jan. 6, 2007

Newspaper Articles for Fermanagh Times for April, 1907

About

The Church Without a Name, The Truth, Two By Twos, *Two by Twos*

THE FERMANAGH TIMES

Newspaper Formerly Serving County Fermanagh, Northern IRELAND

April 04, 1907

April 11, 1907

April 18, 1907

April 25, 1907

NOTE: This newspaper is no longer being published.

April 4, 1907, p. 6

CORRESPONDENCE

We in no way identify ourselves with the sentiments expressed by our various correspondents

**The Pilgrims at Ballycassidy
The Question of Infant Baptism**

TO THE EDITOR OF THE FERMANAGH TIMES

Sir–

I am pleased to see Mr. John West in print again, and, no doubt, he is pleased himself. But the excellent man has adduced no evidence in support of his assumption that the great French reformer, Johannes Calvinus, rejected infant baptism and its accompaniment, regeneration. So the assumption, like the story of the runaway cleric, must go to the category of old wives fables. In Calvin's "Confession of Faith," vol ii, p 134, he says, "I detest the ravings of the Anabaptists," and page 154. "Wherefore, we reprobate all fanatics who will not allow little children to be baptized."

In my letter of March 21st I quoted Calvin's "Office for the Baptism of Infants"—his positive teaching on the subject. And now it will, I hope, be instructive to the readers of this paper to learn more about the subject at issue, and to this end I beg to quote the real Calvin again–

**"CALVIN'S CATECHISM OF THE CHURCH OF GENEVA"
OF THE SACRAMENTS.
Vol ii, pp 34-39**

Master–If it be true that the Sacraments were instituted by God to be helps to our necessity, it is not arrogance for any one to hold that he can dispense with them as unnecessary?

Scholar–It certainly is; and hence, if any one of his own accord abstains from the use of them, as if he had no need of them, he condemns Christ, spurns His grace, and quenches the Spirit.

M–How many are the Sacraments of the Christian Church?

S–There are only two, whose use is common among all believers.

M–What are they?

S–Baptism and the Holy Supper.

M–What likeness or difference is there between them?

S–Baptism is a kind of entrance into the Church for we have in it a testimony, that we, who are otherwise strangers and aliens, are received into the family of God, so as to be counted as His household. On the other hand, the Supper attests that God exhibits himself to us by nourishing our souls.

M—What is the meaning of Baptism?

S—It consists of two parts. For, first, forgiveness of sins; and secondly, spiritual regeneration, is figured by it. (Eph v, 36; Rom vi, 4)

M—What resemblance has water with these things so as to represent them?

S—Forgiveness of sins is a kind of washing by which our souls are cleansed from their defilements, just as bodily stains are washed away by water.

M—What do you say of regeneration?

S—Since the mortification of our nature is its beginning, and our becoming new creatures its end, a figure of death is set before us when the water is poured on the head, and the figure of a new life when instead of remaining immersed under water we only enter it for a moment, as a kind of grave out of which we instantly emerge.

M—Do you think that the water is a washing of the soul?

S—By no means: for it were impious to snatch away this honour from the blood of Christ, which was shed in order to wipe away all our stains and render us pure and unpolluted in the sight of God. (I Peter i, 19; I John i, 7). And we receive the fruit of the cleansing when the Holy spirit sprinkles our consciences with that sacred blood. Of this we have a seal in the sacrament.

M—But do you attribute nothing more to the water than that it is a figure of ablution?

S—I understand it to be a figure, but still so that the reality is annexed to it, for God does not disappoint us when he promises us His gifts. Accordingly, it is certain that with both pardon of sins and newness of life are offered to us in baptism, and received by us.

M—Whence is Regeneration derived?

S—From the Death and Resurrection of Christ taken together. His death hath this efficacy that by means of it our old man is crucified and the vigorosity of our nature in a manner buried, so as no more to be in vigour in us. Our reformation to a new life, so as to obey the righteousness of God is the result of the resurrection.

M—How are these blessings bestowed upon us by Baptism?

S—If we do not render the promises there offered unfruitful, by rejecting them, we are clothed with Christ and presented with his spirit.

M—If these things are requisite to the legitimate use of Baptism, how comes it that we baptize infants?

S—It is not necessary that faith and repentance should always precede baptism. They are only required from those whose age makes them capable of both. It will be sufficient then, if after infants have grown up they exhibit the power of their baptism.

M—Can you demonstrate by reason that there is nothing absurd in this?

S—Yes; if it be conceded to me that our Lord initiated nothing at variance with reason. For while Moses and all the prophets teach that circumcision was a sign of repentance, and even as Paul declares the sacrament of faith, we see that infants were not excluded from it—Deut xxx, 6; Jer iv, 4; Rom. iv. 11.

M—But are they now admitted to baptism for the same reason that was valid in circumcision?

S—The very same; seeing that the promises which God anciently gave to the people of Israel are now published through the whole world.

M—On what terms then are children to be baptized.

S—To attest that they are heirs of the blessing promised to the seed of believers, and enable them to receive and produce the fruit of their baptism, on acknowledging the reality after they have grown up.

M—Does the administration both of baptism and the Supper belong indiscriminately to all?

S—By no means. It is confined to those to whom the office of teaching has been committed.

M—But ought pastors, to whom the dispensing of it (the Supper) has been committed, to admit to all indiscriminately without selection?

S—In regard to baptism, as it is now bestowed only on infants, there is no room for discrimination, but in the Supper the minister ought to take heed not to give it to any one who is clearly unworthy of receiving it.

It will thus be seen that when Mr. West invoked the aid of Calvin to support the rejection of infants from the Kingdom of Heaven on earth, the visible Church of Christ with its privileges and blessings, he made a false move.

—I am, sir, A CHURCHMAN

P S—To church folk and non-church folk who desire to see this whole subject treated on Bible lines dealing with the modern objections of Anabaptists, Quakers, etc., the handiest book is "Sadler's Second Adam and the New Birth." London Bell, York Street, Convent Garden, price about half-a-crown.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE FERMANAGH TIMES

Sir—

In reply to Mr. Cooney, Scrutator, and Mr. West—all three may be taken together—I wish to remind them that they have not brought forward one shred of evidence, either for dipping or against infant baptism. They are now reduced to their last line of defence, namely, to prove infants incapable of receiving a blessing.

Not having graduated at the Crocknacrieve seminary I am unable to follow Mr. West in his line of abuse and vituperation which seems to be the whole stock in trade of his theology. His treatment of the sacred scene on the day of Pentecost is worthy of a

Voltaire. He has not even attempted to clear himself of the three charges I brought against him and proved to the hilt viz, false statements, inaccuracies and inconsistencies.

His whole letter is written on the principle when you have no case abuse the other side. His ignorance throughout is apparent, merely a garbage of verbosity. What has "Funds," "Hockey," &c, to do with the subject? Has he got baptismal regeneration on the brain, or is it the stinging of conscience for neglected duties?

Having now made good my two propositions, namely, dipping cannot be proved from Scripture, and infant baptism is in accordance with the teaching of Christ and His Apostles, also the practice of the early Christian Church, I will, with your permission, proceed, in a further issue to discuss believer's baptism.

Thanking you, Mr. Editor, for your courtesy,

AMICUS VERITATIS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE FERMANAGH TIMES

Dear Sir—

Corragarry writes in your issue of last week asking has John West renounced all that he hath? This is a question that John himself is most capable of answering. Had Corragarry asked me—the writer of the letter, had I fulfilled the conditions of discipleship as a preacher it would have been more to the point. The word translated "renounce" means to separate oneself from. So those who are not willing to let go claim to all they have and use it as the Lord's stewards cannot become his disciples. Paul taught those who were rich who got into fellowship with him as Christs destitute sent one, to be not highminded nor to trust in the uncertainty of riches, but in the living God; to be willing to communicate, ready to distribute, etc. I Tim vi, 17. This willingness to communicate and readiness to distribute is a mark of a rich man who has become a disciple. One proof J. West has given of discipleship is his willingness to receive sick and destitute people who are in genuine need to his house, some of whom owe their lives to Christ's loving care through him.

Those who were poor got into fellowship with Christ's destitute sent ones (and there is no other fellowship and no other sent ones). Paul exhorted to be content with food and covering—the word in the Greek implies a house, etc, viz—needful covering, adding that they who desire to be rich fall into temptation, and a snare and many foolish and hurtful lusts which drown men in destruction and perdition, etc. The man of God was to be free from the love of money.

I do not despise the education that fits a man to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow, and am glad I received such, but I do despise the theological training that enables men to so juggle with the Scriptures as to make profit out of what Jesus said should be freely given. Paul never profited by his theological training, but had to re-read and reinterpret the scriptures when he became one of Christ's destitute sent ones.

Corragarry's sneer at what he calls the farce of Cooneyism is misleading, for I do not follow the leading of my Cooney nature, but instead follow Jesus. John West should not follow Cooney except as Cooney follows Christ.

A woman though not permitted to speak her own words in the church was encouraged to prophecy, viz—to let God speak through her with her head covered, I Cor. xi 4-5. So as not to be masculine, Philip's 4 daughters were women that God spoke through. At the day of Pentecost the Lord spake through Peter and other men, also through women—Acts 2, 17,18.

Corragarry's other points are but the straining of the gnat, while he swallows the camel of clericalism.

—Yours faithfully, **E. COONEY.**

DEAR MR. EDITOR—

Will some of your correspondents give a little more light on Bible teaching with reference, 1st, to Baptism—(not from tradition) with chapter and verse without twisting God's word, so that we ordinary people can understand.

Is Baptism any use to a person before they are regenerate? Does regeneration precede Baptism or follow after?

2nd—Does God send forth preachers today, according to the pattern described in Matthew 10, or where in the Bible is their authority for any other pattern.

3rd—We read in Ephesians iv chap. 8 14 God's gift to the Church—where is such a Church to be found manifesting these gifts, and if not when were these gifts withdrawn and by what authority? Is it true that in the early Church none had authority to form a Church but apostles and prophets.

4th—What is a Bishop or elder according to New Testament teaching? Who were they appointed by? How did they earn a living? See I Peter v, 2. Not for filthy lucre, and again in the 3rd verse—not as lords over God's heritage—but as in samples.

5th—Where is the authority in God's word for titles beginning with "Revd," "Very Revd," "Right Revd," to the very highest, what ever that may be—do they get more like God's pattern as they get up higher, and are these titles of God or man?

Now I know there are hundreds of men and women would be glad to have these things explained from the Bible, as we are bewildered by so much writing—that only darkness counsel, and if you believe what you write don't be ashamed to put your own name to it.

—Yours, WILLIAM CALDWELL

April 11, 1907, p. 7

CORRESPONDENCE*We in no way identify ourselves with the sentiments expressed by our various correspondents***The Pilgrims at Ballycassidy
The Question of Infant Baptism****TO THE EDITOR OF THE FERMANAGH TIMES
REPLY TO MR. CALDWELL**

Sir—

Being one of your correspondents, I venture to give Mr. Caldwell the following Scriptural replies to his letter of last week:—

(1)—Baptism was practised by John the Baptist when he was preparing the way for Jesus.—Matt iii, 3. His baptism was preceded by repentance,—Matt iii, 6, 8, 9. Jesus submitted Himself to this baptism, John would have hindered Him saying—I have need to be baptized of Thee. Jesus said, suffer it now, for thus it cometh us to fulfil all righteousness, &c. Jesus suffereth him,—Matt iii, 15; Luke iii, 31.

Jesus commanded His disciples to baptize believers or disciples—Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them, &c.—Matt xxviii, 19; Mark xvi, 15. He and His disciples baptized more disciples than John.—John iv, 1.

His followers proceeded to carry out this command, baptizing believers only, as the following examples prove:—Peter at Pentecost—Repent ye and be baptized every one of you—Acts ii, 38. When they believed Philip preaching good tidings &c, they were baptized, both men and women,—Acts viii, 12. The Eunuch,—Acts viii, 36-38. Paul,—Acts ix, 35. Cornelius and those with him,—Acts x, 47, 48. Lydia,—Acts xvi, 15. The Philipian Jailor,—Acts xvi, 33. The Corinthians, —Acts 18, 8. The Ephesians,—Acts xix, 5, &c, &c. In every case recorded for our guidance in the New Testament belief preceded baptism. There is no authority or example in God's Word for the baptism of unbelievers or infants.

2nd question—Does God send forth preachers today according to the pattern described in Matt x? Certainly, and in no other way. The commands there given were confirmed by the risen Saviour—Go and make disciples, &c. TEACHING THEM TO OBSERVE ALL THINGS WHATSOEVER I HAVE COMMANDED YOU, and lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.—Matt xxviii, 20. Jesus walked this way Himself. “He made himself of no reputation, and took upon Himself the form of a servant,”—Phil ii, 7. “The Son of Man had not where to lay His head.”—Matt viii, 20. He commanded His disciples to become homeless like Himself. “Sell what you have and give alms.”—Luke xii, 33 in order that they might be dependent upon God for all their needs—and that they would seek first “the Kingdom of God and His righteousness then all things would be added unto them.”—Luke xii, 29-31.

After His resurrection Jesus said — “As the Father hath sent Me into the world, even so send I you into the world.”—John xx, 21.

All the new testament preachers—were after this pattern—Paul was a hungry, thirsty, half-clad preacher without certain dwelling place,—I Cor. iv, 11-13. There is no authority for any other pattern—Jesus said—“all that ever came superior to him were thieves and robbers”,—John x, 8. There has always been false apostles, and preachers who go after their own way who disregard and do not believe in God's plan — as the following scriptures prove—“Many will say to me that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name and by thy name cast out devils, etc. Then will I profess unto them I never knew you”.—Matt vii, 22, also Chapter xxv, 41. “They preach another Jesus”, —II Cor. xi, 4. “They mind earthly things”—such as politics, bazaars, soirees, sports, picnics, concerts, etc, etc. Paul said—“I tell you even weeping they are the enemies of the Cross of Christ” whose end is perdition.—Phil. iii, 18-19. “They love to walk in long Robes”,—Luke xx, 46. “They sit in Moses's Seat and love salutations in the market places and to be called Rabbi. They shut the Kingdom of Heaven against men. They enter not themselves nor suffer others to enter.” Matt xxiii, describes them; also compare Luke xi, 37-54.

Question 3—Eph iv, 8-14. God's gifts to His Church are not withdrawn. There are Apostles, Prophets, etc. today, who have formed Churches after the New Testament pattern. 18 such Churches have been formed in County Fermanagh from which over 40 apostolic preachers have gone forth during recent years. There are upwards of 400 “sent ones” at present in all parts of the English speaking world forming Churches and preaching and living like Jesus in accordance with Matt x and the other Gospels; who have dared to shake off the last shreds of clerical and traditional teaching and have proved to the world that there is a living God who can and will provide for his servants same in the 20th century as the first—without collecting card, quarterly ticket, 20th century fund or charity sermon. The ministry of these brave men and women have been sealed and blessed by God in every land and clime they have reached.

It's true that none but apostles and prophets have authority to form a Church in any age.

Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day and forever.—Heb xiii, 8

4th Question—A bishop or overseer or elder was left by the apostles in charge of the little flock. He earned his own living. He was a man that ruled his own house so well that he might know how to care the Church of God—I Tim iii, 4, 5. The husband of one wife, given to hospitality, apt to teach, no lover of money—I Tim iii, 3—he was not to act for filthy lucre, nor as lords over God's heritage, and was to be an example to the flock—I Peter v, 2 3 4. They were appointed at the instigation of the apostles.

Just the very opposite to what the worldly church calls a bishop today.

5th Question—There is no authority in the Word of God for men to be called rev, very rev, or right rev. Jesus forbade His disciples to use such things. “Be not ye called Rabbi”—Matt XXii. 8. “Call no man father”—Matt xxiii, 9. All such titles make men more UNLIKE God’s pattern as found in Jesus. Jesus always humbled himself—became poorer and poorer—more hated and despised. So did all His true followers. Therefore, the greater the title, the more unlike Jesus.

Let us see where these titles come from. God has graciously given us an account of Babylon the Great—(said to be Papal Home)—what He thinks of her, and who she is—Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep these things that are written therein; for the time is at hand.—Rev 11, 3. This great Babylon described in Rev xvii as the great harlot presuming to be the bride of Christ (the true church) and is not.—Full of names of blasphemy—Rev xvii 3, i.e. taking titles that belong to God. Holy and Reverend is God’s name.—Ps cxi. The great harlot has daughters. She is described as the mother of harlots.—Rev xvii 5. We find by analogy Ezek xvi 44—As is the mother, so is her daughter, look at the family likeness; both take these blasphemous titles, both commit fornication with the world—its rulers and chief men. What is spiritual adultery?

We have it clear in James iv, 4—Ye adulteresses know you not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God, whosoever will be a friend of the world is an enemy of God. Such friendship then is spiritual adultery. How many of the sects are clear of this? Is not all the desire and strife today for popular preachers and preaching? All such churches and preachers are the enemy of God. Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you, for so did their fathers of the false prophets—Luke vi, 26. Paul says—Study to show thyself approved unto God—II Tim ii, 15. And again, if I yet pleased men I should not be the servant of Christ—Gal 1:10. But great Babylon will come in remembrance before God. All nations have drunk of the wine of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her—Rev xviii, 3. By her sorceries were all nations deceived—Rev xviii, 23. This great Harlot did corrupt the earth with her fornication—xix, 2. Some of God’s people are in her, but they are in an unscriptural place. “Come out of her my people and be not partakers of her sins that ye receive not of her plagues”—Rev xviii, 4. Only those whose names are not written in the Book of Life can be deceived by her and have fellowship with her and her daughters—Rev xvii, 8.

What will the end be? The world will turn against her, for God hath put it in their hearts to fulfil His will—Rev xvii, 17.

Therefore, God has nothing to do with her sorcery—titles or degrees—which make for place popularity and worldly favour, and engender in man the climb up spirit, typical of the goat nature in them—Matt xxv, 32. God’s sheep feed in the valleys beside the still waters and are satisfied.

—Your obedient servant, **JOHN WEST.**

TO THE EDITOR OF THE FERMANAGH TIMES

Sir—

“Whosoever he be of you that renounces not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple”—Luke xiv, 33, R.V. So wrote Mr. Cooney. Why then does Mr. Cooney object to the Crocknacrieve great gun of Cooneyism being tested by this standard. It was Mr. West—not Mr. Cooney—I asked to answer, and I again repeat the question. Does Mr. West hold a position in which he has to “blaspheme,” and has he renounced “all that he hath?” Why does Mr. Cooney now lower the standard of discipleship and try to cover his retreat by lauding Mr. West for being kind to the poor. I would now ask Mr. Cooney does feeding and caring for the poor by members of the Shankhill Road Mission, the Grosvenor Hall Mission, or the Salvation Army mark them also as disciples. If not, why not? It is possible to shout as loud as Mr. West, and bestow his goods to feed the poor as Mr. Cooney, and still be but sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal—I Cor xiii, 1-3. There are few who have had a better opportunity of observing than I, and I say deliberately that, with the majority of them, this “renouncing all” is mere cant and humbug. They still hold their well paid situations, their farms, their horses and traps, their cattle, &c, &c, same as when they belonged to other denominations. No wonder I say Cooneyism is a farce!

Next Mr. Cooney says—“Those who were poor got into fellowship with Christ’s destitute sent ones (and there is no other fellowship, and no other sent ones).” Mark well the last words. I now refer Mr. Cooney to Acts viii, 27 28, and ask was the Eunuch a poor man, or did he get into fellowship with Philip. Neither he or Philip were ashamed to drive in a chariot. As to the “sent ones,” Jesus Himself, and this is a later command than Matt x, tells them to “take purse and scrip”—Luke xxii, 36 and Paul says he took “wages”—II Cor xi, 6. This is a sample of Mr. Cooney’s truth.

Mr. Cooney’s next statement was “that Paul’s education by the theological professor, Gamaliel, made him an opponent of the destitute ministry of Jesus.” I asked for a single proof that this theological education hindered Paul after his conversion, but Mr. Cooney is dumb. He seems to forget that multitudes of the uneducated were opponents also. But as today one R. J. Campbell makes more impression (whether for good or evil) than all the uneducated Cooneyites put together, so in those days educated Paul made more impression (whether for good or evil) than a multitude of the uneducated.

Education does not of itself lift a man into the Kingdom of Heaven, but it is false to infer that God is better pleased with foolishness and ignorance than with wisdom and knowledge.

That one verse I quoted from Proverbs, which, according to his own reasoning, proved Mr. Cooney to be a fool has had such good effect. I would now advise him to study the first nine chapters of that Book. They, I think, would so change his attitude—judging from the effect of one verse—that I should not be surprised if, in his next letter, he recommended a theological training for all. But I fear Mr. West would not agree to this. He cannot, and therefore does not, quote Greek, and that makes all the difference.

I am inclined to again write “farce” when Mr. Cooney talks about being “glad he received an education that fits him to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow.” Let me inform readers he earns it—not by the sweat of his brow—but by preaching as do others, whom he

would consign to perdition for so doing.

Then he says "I do not follow my Cooney nature, but instead follow Jesus." Very nice! but false, nevertheless, for there is no record that Jesus authorized "women tramp preachers," "instrumental music," "and unscriptural Go-Preacher's Hymn Book," "zinc churches," and a host of other things. Nor does he follow the apostles, for they ordained Deacons and Elders in all the Churches—Acts xiv, 23.

Mr. Cooney's argument RE "women tramp preachers" is even more foolish than I expected from him. Does he claim they can prophesy? I understood Dr Dowls was the last of the prophets, and Mrs. Eddy, the last of the prophetess's. Perhaps I am wrong and a new lot have sprung up. I am open to conviction if Mr. Cooney gives chap and verse Paul distinctly, and repeatedly, forbids such and I cannot believe Paul contradicted himself till Mr. Cooney gives an instance of any woman having addressed an audience on two or more occasions.

Perhaps I have swallowed "the camel of clericalism," but it is a clericalism commanded in the New Testament, the clericalism of Acts vi, 6; Acts xiv, 23; Titus i, 5, &c. That I hope is not a serious crime. But does Mr. Cooney fulfil these commands? Does he ordain Deans and Elders in the Churches as did the Apostles. No! like the Pharisees of old he would rather be disputing over some hair-splitting point about Baptism or College education while the weightier matters of the Gospel are neglected by him.

I challenge Mr. Cooney to say in face of these and many other passages, if he is living according to the plan laid down in the New Testament.

Now I come to the "gnat," and I think it must be larger than the "camel" from the way Mr. Cooney evades it. He tells us he is living the New Testament "to the letter." I test him by the New Testament, and I leave it to the judgment of readers whether that is "straining at a gnat."

Mr. Cooney gives us his commission Matt ix, 1 to 10. The tenth verse commands "not to take two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves," but such is the inconsistency of Cooneyism, most of them have two coats.

Mr. Cooney wears shoes, and instead of staves they are well provided with bicycles.

Mr. Cooney has not denied my statements, and I again ask him for chap. and verse authorizing "Women tramp Preachers," "The Go-Preachers Hymn Book," "Instrumental music," zinc Churches, etc.

Until such time as Mr. West and Mr. Cooney answer these questions, Cooneyism is proved to be a "farce," and Cooneyites an ignorant, inconsistent sect, which it is a duty to expose.

Mr. Cooney and Mr. West denounce all others if they do not give definite commands from Scripture sanctioning their actions. I only test them by the standard they themselves have laid down, and which at the street corners they claim to fulfil. I have charged Cooneyism with gross inconsistency. Let its leader take my charges and questions one by one and answer them, or let Cooneyites for ever after hold their peace. Quibbling does not suit a Gospel preacher. Let there be no more nonsense about straining at gnats, but let us have straight answers to straight questions, and if I have charged Cooneyism falsely I will be the first to admit it.

Thank you in anticipation for the insertion of this long letter.

—I am, Mr. Editor, CORRAGARRY. 8th April, 1907.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE FERMANAGH TIMES

DEAR SIR—

The appointment of sponsors is a most important item in the baptismal controversy, and if we can ascertain the time when they were first introduced we will be able to approximate the date when infants were first admitted to the rite of baptism.

No one can claim that sponsors had any place in New Testament times, or even in the apostolic age; they were not needed in the baptism of adults who could speak for themselves; they were only required in the case of infants, who could not be admitted to the rite without making the necessary profession of repentance and faith, and their appointment is strong circumstantial evidence that up to that time baptism had only been administered to adults.

Now, it is a grave mistake to suppose that the sponsors undertake to repent and believe for the infant—they simply lend a voice to the infant—the necessary questions are addressed to the infant through the sponsors, and the answers are assumed to come from the infant; one of the questions would decide this there were any doubt on the matter, namely, "Wilt thou be baptized in this faith?" the answer being—"That is my desire."

The only responsibility which sponsors undertake is to see that the infant be brought up as a Christian. Now sponsors are not mentioned until the close of the second, or beginning of the third century, and infant baptism is not mentioned by any writer or by any of the early fathers until the second century. Infant baptism and sponsorship may be considered, therefore, as coeval, one being the necessary complement of the other.

Irenaeus is the first of the early fathers who mentions infant baptism, but it had not met with general approval in his day, for Tertullian, who came after him in the last years of the century, stoutly opposes it.

It would appear from his argument that the advocates for infant baptism had quoted our Lord's words, Matt xix, 14—"Suffer the little children to come unto me," &c, for he says—"Let them (the infants) come while they are growing up, let them come while they are learning, while they are being taught to what they are coming, but let them be made Christians when they are able to know Christ."

He goes on to say on the same subject—"What hurries the age of innocence to the forgiveness of sins? Let them first learn to feel their need of salvation, so it may appear that we have given to those that wanted."

Tertullian makes further objection to infant baptism in regard to the Sponsors, who he alleged, might be prevented from fulfilling their obligations either by their own death, or by the untoward conduct of the child.

The causes which led to the adoption of infant baptism were first of all the doctrine of original sin which was believed to expose all of Adam's race from the moment of their birth to God's wrath and everlasting damnation.

In the next place was the theory first introduced by the Western Churches that baptism only could wash away the effects of that natural depravity.

Consequently it was deemed necessary to bring infants within the arch of salvation, as Cyprian who lived in the third century, said—"We must do everything that lies in our power that no soul may be lost." It was not, however, until the fifth century that the practice of infant baptism, became the general usage of the Churches.

But it must be borne in mind that infant baptism as practised in those times, was not infant baptism pure and simple, as practised by noncon-formists. It was the baptism of infants as adults, repentance and faith were required as the only conditions upon which infants could be introduced to the Church. We have yet to consider when subsequently to those times, the baptism of infants as such was introduced.

It is rather remarkable that as early as the third century the controversy which is going on around us as to the relative value of sprinkling, and immersion was hotly waged. Even in controversy, "there is nothing new under the sun."

Immersion in baptism was then the rule, but exception was made in case of sick persons, who could not possibly endure the ordeal. (We have yet to learn what the present advocates for immersion would do in such cases) and many superstitious persons clinging to the outward form imagined that baptism by sprinkling was not valid. Cyprian strongly protested against this delusion, and very properly stated, that "in the sacraments of salvation, the divine thing, tho' outwardly abridged when necessity compels bestows all that it implies on the faithful."

OBSERVER.

April 18, 1907
CORRESPONDENCE

We in no way identify ourselves with the sentiments expressed by our various correspondents

The Pilgrims at Ballycassidy
The Question of Infant Baptism

TO THE EDITOR OF THE FERMANAGH TIMES

Sir—

Mr. John West, after the manner of distinguished prelates, published his Easter pastoral in last week's issue of this journal, and though he seems generally to despise the good breeding and cultivation usually found among church folk everywhere. Yet, for himself, he appears anxious to stand on the same pedestal with the great men of history.

In a previous Lenten pastoral, March 14th, addressed to the faithful everywhere who acknowledge his mission and jurisdiction, he assumed that the great German reformer, Doctor Martin Luther, is on his side regarding his anabaptist notions. As people say in a homely way, "What put this into his head?" is a problem best known to himself.

But Luther, "though being dead yet speaketh" in his works, and I hope people who are seeking information will not object to hear the real Luther on the question of Infant Baptism and the accompaniment, Spiritual Regeneration.

Luther—"Folly of supposing baptismal grace contrary to Salvation by Faith."

But in reference to what our wiseacres, that is these new spiritualists are each superciliously feigning, viz that it is faith by itself which saves, but that works and external rites are of no force or efficacy to the attainment of salvation. I answer that assuredly in ourselves no other thing works out or accomplishes our salvation than faith, on which matter I shall by and by speak more fully.

But those blind leaders of the blind are determined not to see that faith must have something which it may believe, i.e. on which it may lean, and by the support of which it may stand. So in the present case faith fastens on the water and believes that it is a baptism in which is unmingled happiness and life, not by virtue of the water, as has been sufficiently enforced, but on this account, that baptism is joined to God's word and confirmed by His decree, and ennobled by (the invocation of) His name.

Now, when I believe this, what else do I believe in but in God, even in Him who laid up and implanted His own word in baptism, and places before our eyes outward things in which we are enabled to perceive a store of things of such surpassing value. Opera, Wit, vol v, p 637.

Again from "Luther's commentary on Joel," Moreover, when we speak of the word of the Gospel we also include the Sacraments for they have the promise of the Holy Ghost annexed as well as remission of sins. Thus Peter, when asked what was to be done replies—"Repent and let each be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, etc." And Christ says—"Unless a man be born again by water

and the spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." This view is manifest that the Holy Spirit wills, by means of baptism, to exert His influence with efficacy on the mind.

So, St. Peter also says— "And ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

And this too is the cause why we bring infants also to baptism following the example of the Apostles and the Primitive Church. For because it is certain that the Holy Spirit wills to be efficacious through the water of baptism, we determine that the action of the Holy Ghost is in the same point of view, unimpeded by the want of consciousness (Anais Thesia) of infants as we adults do not render the work of the Holy Spirit more perfect by our strength and senses. Opera, vol iv, p 672. Ed Jense, 1558 A D, Joel ii, 28.

Now, Luther, of all men, could not be accused of any Roman tendency, but he fearlessly gave his ideas of Bible Truth on Infant Baptism, and here they are, so that he who runs may read. Mr. John West, I fear, will have to excommunicate the great German reformer whose name still lives as unsound in the faith.

By this time Calvins works will be ordered to the flames, and the name inserted in the Westonian INDEX EXPURGATORICS. CHURCHMAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE FERMANAGH TIMES

Dear Sir—

Corragarry charges me with lowering the standard when in my last I explained the meaning of the words of Jesus to the multitudes, "whosoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath he cannot be my disciple." The application of those words to one who does not go forth and preach, but wishes to be a disciple as a saint at home is—Let go claim to your faculties, members and possessions, from henceforth you and all you possess are Christ's. Become His steward and spend your life, which is His, and your substance, which is His, for Him to whom they belong.

The application is different in the case of one who goes forth to preach, for such it means—Sell that ye have and give alms (Luke xii, 33). Go forth on the lines described in Luke x. To interpret Luke xiv, 33 as above is not lowering the standard, but rightly dividing the word of truth; there are other conditions to be fulfilled before discipleship can begin, these are mentioned by Jesus, Luke xiv, 26 to 33. In my previous letter there was a word missed which gave Corragarry a wrong impression of my meaning. What I did write was "Those who were poor AND got into fellowship with Christ's destitute sent ones, Paul exhorted to be content with food and covering, whilst those who were rich were to be willing to communicate, ready to distribute, &c." (I Tim vi, 6 to 11 and 17 to 19). The omission of the "and" led to his mistake as to my meaning.

Corragarry will persist in calling me a Cooneyite, although I asserted in my last that I was not a follower of my Cooney nature derived from Adam, coming to me through my natural parents. I was regenerated some years ago, and received the nature of the second Adam; this made me a disciple of Christ's. So Corragarry will please note that I am not a Cooneyite, but a Christian. Those in fellowship with me as fellow-workers and saints are not Cooneyites, but Christians. When Corragarry says I have proved myself to be a fool, and that he looks on my religion as a farce, what is it after all but history repeating itself. When Paul had been out preaching for some time as Christ's destitute sent one he writes to the Corinthians, I Cor iv, 10, 13—"We are fools for Christ's sake; we are made as the filth verse: of the world, and are the offscouring of all things unto this day." Paul did not consider himself a fool for suffering the loss of all things and counting them but dung that he might go forth and preach in Christ's way, but this did not hinder him from being looked on as a fool by those who believed in the comfortable clergy way of that day. Certainly to all who believe that the comfortable clergy way is the way of God I appear as a fool and am willing to appear so that in me Christ may be magnified.

When I wrote of the education I had received as having fitted me to earn my bread, etc. I alluded to my life up to 34 when I ceased to follow my earthly calling and went forth to preach. I do not now earn my bread by the sweat of my brow, but I seek first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all those things are added.—Luke xii, 22 and 33. Jesus ceased working with his hands when he was 30 and when he went forth to preach lived of the alms of saints till he was put to death by those who hated his way when about 33—See Luke viii, 1 to 3; Luke x, 38.

Corragarry in seeking to prove that I do not follow Jesus and asserts that I do not ordain elders and deacons to the churches I plant; this is false. I have by God's help and grace planted over 20 churches since going forth and in each of the 20 there is an elder appointed by me who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow, and shepherds the flock for love. I also ordain deacons in every Church who do their work from the same motive as the New Testament deacons, viz, love to God and his saints to whom they minister.

When Corragarry asserts, moreover, that I get my bread in the same way as the clergy his statement is such a gross perversion of truth that it needs no denial in the press of my native town where my testimony is so well known.

Corragarry's remarks re prophesy are due to his not knowing the meaning of the word in its full sense. The Greek word prophetes means a proclaimer of a divine message one to whom—through whom God speaks (I quote from Ballingers Greek Lexicon). It does not necessarily mean foretelling future events, in fact New Testament prophecy was largely connected with past events—their relation to men for salvation and edification. When Peter and his fellow servants and the hand maidens prophesied at the day of

Pentecost there was no foretelling of future events, but God spoke through their lips the message that led to the Salvation of the 3,000 –See Acts ii, 14 to 18. This is the sort of prophesying that I, my fellow workers, both bond-servants and hand-maidens believe that God has sent us to do. This was the sort of prophesying that the woman at the well did when many of the Samaritans of that city believed on him for the saying of the woman, John iv, 39. This was also the sort of prophesying done by Philip's four daughters who were virgins and did prophesy, Acts xxi, 9.

When Corragarry speaks of the clericalism of Acts vi, 6, how unmeaning it is; I quote the verse "whom they set before the Apostles, and when they had prayed they laid their hands on them," there is not a scrap of clericalism in the verse; the destitute Apostles, who ordained the seven deacons were men living like their Master, homeless wandering lives, having gone out on the lines laid down by Jesus in Luke x. Such men and such [?–] are sent to plant churches and ordain elders deacons today as in the days of old for Jesus is the same yesterday, today and for ever. Corragarry tries to read that into the Presbyterian clergyman in Belfast, who used to be a carpenter, but has now ,18 per week for preaching in the name of Jesus, who was a carpenter, before he went out to preach, but who when he went out to preach, took upon himself the form of a bondsman, pp Phil ii, 7. This trying to read clericalism into Acts vi, 6, is surely nonsense.

The instrumental music question using hymns in addition to Psalms, wearing boots instead of sandals, riding a bicycle instead of using a staff, the saints having a zinc hall for central meetings, &c. are, but straining at gnats whilst Corragarry swallows, the camel of clericalism and its accompaniments.

Yours faithfully, **EDWARD COONEY**

TO THE EDITOR OF THE FERMANAGH TIMES

Sir–

There was a man of the Pharisees named Corragarry, and he was a "drummer," blind from his birth, who lived in Matt xxiii, the same took light for darkness and darkness for light; in proof of this, he could not see the difference between a scribe–(educated, proud, exalted, well clothed, well paid, well fed, with worldly honour, place, and power)–and a disciple of Jesus, who had sold all, given alms, and become poor, hungry, half-clad, homeless and hated, despised and destitute; nor the difference between a Pharisee, self-seeking and self-satisfied, and the self-denying, self-sacrificing saint, who renounces all he has and holds it as the Lord's steward.

In further proof of his blindness, and notwithstanding his chances of "Knowing" he is ignorant in the following:

- (1) Mr. West does not call any man Rev.
- (2) There are no musical instruments in any of the Churches.
- (3) No buildings other than the houses of saints are used as places for saints to worship.

Perhaps he does not know that for this purpose the early Christians met in the homes of saints up to about 200 A D. The bishop or overseer was generally a working man, in whose house the Church usually met. The Gospel was preached everywhere–in the open air, in the fisherman's boat, in prison, in the synagogues of Jesus' time –everywhere the opportunity offered–hence the tents and movable halls of to-day–but Corragarry is blind to this also. It is well here to note that the Jewish synagogue was an innovation brought from Babylon after the captivity, and was contrary to the Law of Moses, Ex xiii. Just as the present church building are opposed to apostolic practice, and came from Rome, with baby sprinkling, salaries, manses, ecclesiastical titles, position, and world power. The Jews were to worship towards the temple. After the death of Jesus God dwelleth not in the temples made with hands, but in bodies of men whose lives are lived after the pattern of Jesus. Stephen suffered martyrdom for preaching this truth. There has always been two ways of worshipping. The worship of the beast and his image, i.e. the mixed multitude in the Temple, made with hands–led by the titled hireling–as opposed to the assembly of Saints, i.e. those that are sanctified in Christ Jesus and worship in spirit and in truth–I Cor i, 1-7. The charity of I Cor 13 has no reference to Scribe and Pharisee worshippers, but to the true test of the love of God dwelling in His Saints and manifested towards one another. Re Woman ministry–women were created as help-meets for man in Adam, so in Christ they have always a place, but subordinate in the Churches and in Apostolic Ministry–Rom 16. In conclusion, God's thoughts and God's way may seem foolish to Corragarry as it did to the Angel, who, not only refused to humble himself, but sought the exalted way and was cast out of Heaven in consequence. I fear for Corragarry, he has evidently partaken of the tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil and gone in the way of Cain, who hated his brother because he has done well, as said. When Blind Bartimaeus got his eyes opened he followed Jesus in the way.

Yours faithfully, J. H. F.

April 25, 1907

CORRESPONDENCE

We in no way identify ourselves with the sentiments expressed by our various correspondents

**The Pilgrims at Ballycassidy
The Question of Infant Baptism**

TO THE EDITOR OF THE FERMANAGH TIMES

DEAR SIR—

It occurred to me to write further this week on the subject that is at present interesting so many of your readers, viz, what constitutes becoming a disciple of Christ. In some of the passages where the word disciple occurs it means only those who have gone forth to preach, for example, Luke 9 and 1 John 4 and 2, John 21 and 1. In the case of these it means a liberal scattering of all as they go forth to preach. In others it includes all followers of Jesus who fulfil the conditions of Luke xiv, 26 to 33. In verse 26 the hating of father, mother, wife, children, brethren, sister, and one's own life necessary before one becomes a disciple, is a strong way of expressing the contrast between natural love in its highest form and the love for Christ which begins to be manifest in the man or woman who becomes a disciple of Jesus. In verse 27 the taking up the cross and coming after Jesus is the joyful acceptance of the same hatred and spleen that was manifested towards Christ which culminated in the crucifixion, and which becomes the experience of the disciple or one that comes after Jesus. Jesus explains in verse 28 and 29 why it is necessary to face this before starting, because the opposition of the flesh, Devil, and world will be so keen in the case of one who comes after Jesus that before starting to build the tower to which discipleship is likened, the disciple had better count the cost lest he be not able to finish by being willing to put on the topstone of the tower on in suffering death for Jesus sake if needs be. Verse 26 represents the opposition of the flesh, verse 27, the Devil: verse 29, the world. Verse 26 speaks of the opposition of the flesh coming because of the path of loss which every true disciple must walk in. In Matt x, 36, Jesus says—"A man's loss shall be those of his own household" as he starts out to follow Him who abused Himself for the sake of others. The desire that our natural friends have to see us prosper in this world is the very reason they oppose as they see us start out on the path which brought Jesus and many of the early saints and apostles loss and suffering unto death, and brought all who lived Godly in Christ Jesus persecution.—II Tim ii, 12.

Verse 27 speaks of the opposition of the Devil through religious people who profess to be saved and are certain they are going to Heaven in many cases, but their hatred towards preachers who sell all and give alms and go after Jesus as His sent ones, like Him not having where to lay their head, proclaim them to belong to the same class as those to whom Jesus said, "Ye search the Scriptures for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me." These also search the Scriptures and declare that in them they have eternal life, but the New Testament Scriptures which they search tell of no other sort of preachers recognized by God, but those who went forth destitute, providing neither gold or silver, nor brass in their girdles, nor wallet of bread for their journey, and not having extra clothing other than a poor slave man would possess varying, of course, according to climate, these preachers of whom the New Testament Scriptures testify religious people will not have. When men quibble about shoes in this climate instead of the sandals which were worn in the east it means they are driven into a corner with reference to a bicycle. I may say that some time ago I saw it was better to give the one I had away, and now I get the use of a saints on the same terms as Jesus got the use of the colt.—Mark xi, 2 to 6. Verse xxiii in Luke xiv implies that if one does not from their heart renounce all that he hath, that in the great war with the world the loss sustained through being in fellowship with preachers who like their master are despised and rejected of men will lead him to call an ambassage and desire conditions of peace with the world rather than go through as a disciple even though it means the loss of all. A man who has renounced all is willing to literally lose all if such be the result of loyally following Jesus.

Lazurus, Martha and Mary, are 3 types of disciples. Each having fulfilled the conditions mentioned in Luke xiv, 26 to 33. Lazurus renounced all the he had and henceforward the home at Bethany, and all Lazarus had was Christ's, this did not mean that he sold all and scattered it, but rather that used the home for Jesus and his destitute sent ones, and all he had to provide food, etc. for them and himself, also Martha and Mary; Martha cooperated as housekeeper for Jesus and his destitute sent ones, also for Lazarus and Mary, whilst Mary chose the better part, sat at the feet of Jesus and drank in the living water intending to go forth and pour it out as a preacher. She broke the alabaster box of ointment on the feet of Jesus, valued for about ,10, supposed to be her dowry money, and was probably one of the handmaidens spoken of as preaching with Peter and the other apostles on the day of Pentecost.—Acts ii, 17 and 18. Lazarus, Martha, and Mary, were all disciples who renounced all to follow Jesus, Mary being the only one who scattered all and went forth as one of Christ's destitute preachers.

See Luke x, 38 to 42; Luke 12 and 33; Matt xix, 27 to 29, the last two are specially for preachers, forsake in Matt 19 and 29 being a different and stronger word than Luke 14 and 33 and meaning to leave as if one was in the grave dying. To sum up. All preachers are disciples, but all disciples are not preachers. When Jesus was the carpenter at Nazareth, he had renounced all that he had, but did not scatter all and give alms until he went forth to preach. In Mark vi, 3, we read that when Jesus went to his own country, they said, "Is not this the carpenter?" Now as a carpenter he must have had a home where to lay his head, tools to operate with, timber to operate on. He had renounced all in the sense that all should, who do not go forth to preach, and was using life and substance for God and the world God in Him loved.

When He went out to preach He did that which He taught all preachers to do. Sold all He had and gave alms being no longer, Jesus the carpenter, but Jesus the preacher, then he had no place and lay his head. Thus when He says to all—If any man will come after me, let him deny himself meaning abjure himself, efface himself, cease to live for self, take up the cross which is the consequence of so doing and follow me, he means. Either as Jesus, the carpenter, in the way, Lazarus, Martha, Lydia and Jason did, Luke 10, 38; Acts 16, 14 and 15; Acts 17, 6 and 7, or Jesus, the preacher same as Paul and others did, and as I by God's grace have done.

-Yours faithfully, **EDWARD COONEY****DEAR MR. EDITOR—**

Will some of your correspondents give a little more light on Bible teaching with reference, 1st, to Baptism—(not from tradition) with chapter and verse without twisting God's word, so that we ordinary people can understand.

Is Baptism any use to a person before they are regenerate? Does regeneration precede Baptism or follow after?

2nd—Does God send forth preachers today, according to the pattern described in Matthew 10, or where in the Bible is their authority for any other pattern.

3rd—We read in Ephesians iv chap. 8, 14 God's gift to the Church—where is such a Church to be found manifesting these gifts, and if not when were these gifts withdrawn and by what authority? Is it true that in the early Church none had authority to form a Church but apostles and prophets.

4th—What is a Bishop or elder according to New Testament teaching? Who were they appointed by? How did they earn a living? See I Peter v, 3. Not for filthy lucre, and again in the 3rd verse—not as lords over God's heritage—but as in samples.

5th—Where is the authority in God's word for titles beginning with "Revd," "Very Revd," "Right Revd," to the very highest, what ever that may be—do they get more like God's pattern as they get up higher, and are these titles of God or man?

Now I know there are hundreds of men and women would be glad to have these things explained from the Bible, as we are bewildered by so much writing—that only darkness counsel, and if you believe what you write don't be ashamed to put your own name to it.

-Yours, WILLIAM CALDWELL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE FERMANAGH TIMES

Sir—

Mr. West has got every opportunity of proving his claim to be a disciple. He has not done so, therefore, I conclude, that Mr. West while shouting his loudest about "renouncing all" is still sticking like a leach to a well paid situation, although part of the work he says is blasphemy. If there was one sin Jesus hated more than another it was hypocrisy. What right then has such a hypocrite to claim that he is living the "Jesus way" or lecture others on how they should live. An unregenerate son of his unregenerate forefather Ananias he claims to have "renounced all," and yet he has kept back part, if not all. Mr. West's position is no uncommon one amongst his sect. Jesus gave a true description of them, when he said: "Ye are like unto whited sepulchres which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy. 23rd Matt 27 and 28.

No wonder Mr. West ostrich-like buries his head in the Crocknacrieve sand when he is tested by the standard Mr. Cooney laid down in his first letter. I need not emphasize this point further. Readers, I am sure, have already taken sufficient note of Mr. West's inconsistency.

In reply to Mr. Cooney let me say at once his explanations and evasions are useless to me. Unlike him I have to earn my bread by the sweat of my brow and have not time for answering meaningless letters. I have answered all his arguments, he has not answered mine, nor refuted any of my charges. I have put question after question to him, but have not got one straight reply. With him it is the same old parrot cry without any proof. If I am straining at a gnat why not answer my questions and expose the gnat. His explanation RE the "destitute sent ones" gives the passage a different meaning, but even yet is hard to wring from him the truth that it was possible for a rich man to get into fellowship with the disciples. Perhaps he is still doubtful of the Eunuch, because of his chariot, &c.

I must persist in giving Mr. Cooney, his proper title till such time as he proves his consistency. I again repeat he is not following Jesus, and gave a list of reasons in my last letter. When Mr. Cooney proves that Jesus sent out "Women tramp preachers, &c." then I will discontinue calling him Cooneyite.

Then we come to the education question. I have never yet got the proof of how, or where, it hindered Paul. He slips over the question as quietly as he can, but as in the case of the Eunuch, his explanation is in reality an admission that I was right. Speaking of his own education he says he "only alluded to his life up to 34." If he does not at once say what he means how am I to read his thoughts. There are more of his passages than this one require an explanation of the same sort. Let me now ask—Is that education which enables him to translate Greek and quote Bullinger—although received before his conversion—is that education any hinderance to him now, or does it tend to make him sinful? If so why does he still practice this sinful habit?

It is no perversion of the truth to say Mr. Cooney earns his bread by preaching. He admits he does not earn it with his hands. Why then this quibbling about "alms." The Salvation Army, in fact all other denominations can put forward as truthfully the same pleas.

I don't want Bullinger's opinion of the office of a prophet. Will Mr. Cooney please give it in plain English from the Bible. Cooneyites used to boast that they put the Bible before "man made wisdom." So do I, so let me hear no more of Bullinger. Mr. Cooney charged me with having swallowed clericalism. I distinctly state I swallowed no clericalism, but that of Acts vi, 6 and Acts xiv, 23. He says now—"There is not a scrap of clericalism in these passages." I agree, but why then in face of his own statement does he wind up his letter with the same charge. Like all his other arguments there is nothing in it. He also says "he ordains deacons." How? Does he ordain them according to scriptural warrant by the laying on of hands? But elders—not deacons,—are the really spiritual church officers, yet he has not a word about them. Has Mr. Cooney scripturally ordained elders and deacons in all the churches? He will require to supplement his evasive reply with something stronger.

If Mr. Cooney can change the staff of Matt x, into a bicycle, by what authority does he denounce others because he thinks they do the same? "Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then thou shalt see clearly to cast out the mote of thy brothers eye," Matt vii, 5.

The whole system of Cooneyism depends on two things, viz—(1). The commission of Matt x, (2) and their consistent life according to that standard. I have already proved beyond the shadow of doubt that Cooneyites are not living according to this standard and never can. The 1st verse of this commission tells us Jesus gave them power to cast out unclean spirits and heal all manner of diseases. Has Mr. Cooney that power? This in itself is enough to exclude him from any part of this commission, without adding anything about bicycles and the other inconsistencies.

I will now prove that Mr. Cooney's whole plan is built upon the sand, and not upon either Matt x or Luke x, for both these commissions have been fulfilled as any Bible student can see by reading Luke ix, 10 and Luke x, 17. In the commission in Matt x, we know the Apostles had power to cast out devils, to heal all diseases, and in the 5th verse they were commanded not to go not into the way of the Gentiles. How anybody endowed with a grain of reason or common sense can twist this commission to suit Cooneyism is hard to understand. But the proof that this commission has passed away after fulfillment is found in Luke 22, 36. No wonder Mr. Cooney fears this commission, for it sounds the death-knell of Cooneyism. He never mentions it, although it is part of Christ's last commission, and given at the same time and to the same apostles as the commission of Matt 28—Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them etc. The commission of Matt 10 fits no Gentile preacher; that of Luke 22:36 fits almost—if not all—Gospel preachers; it is Christ's last commission, and therefore never annulled; it is worldwide, therefore as yet unfulfilled.

What next, Mr. Cooney, please?

In conclusion, just a word for J H F. His letter neither requires nor deserves more.

(1). Mr. West has not yet denied that he holds a paid situation in which he must address men as Rev.

(2). I stated I have attended "Go Preachers" meetings where instrumental music was used. My word is at least as good as J H F's.

(3). The zinc churches at Ballinamallard and elsewhere are not used by "the saints as homes."

The remainder of his letter is abuse—not argument—and therefore not worthy of notice, but, perhaps, this will let him see I do "know" what I am talking about, but few will say the same of him.

—Faithfully yours, CORRAGARRY. 21st April, 1907

TO THE EDITOR OF THE FERMANAGH TIMES

Dear Sir—

Corragarry asks for chap and verse authorizing tramp women preachers. St Luke i, 39, he can read there who went in haste to the hill country to TELL the glad tidings the Angel Gabriel had made known to her; and we can all picture the house it was with those two women filled with the Holy Ghost, in a loud voice telling the wonderful things which were made known to them of the Lord.

St. John iv—Christ talks with a woman of Samaria and gives her the command, Go, call thy husband and come hither. She had to acknowledge her secret sin before going and be taught who to worship and how, and her faith in Christ to come. He reveals himself unto her. His heart is full of joy; no thoughts of the world. She left her waterpot and went her way into the city to tell the men and invite them to come to Christ. The result of her preaching follows.

The four gospels give an account of our Lord's resurrection, and in each it is the women who are authorized by the angels—Go tell His disciples He is risen. Our Lord also sends them on the same glorious mission. I shall only quote one it is so beautiful to us all—St. John xx, part of the 16th and 17th verses—Jesus saith unto her, Mary, touch me not, but go to my brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, unto my God and your God.

The women were last at the cross and first at the grave. Our Lord Jesus Christ said there is neither male nor female in heaven, and I believe the same while doing His work on earth it is heaven. The angels had their message and passed it on.

—Yours ISHI

TO THE EDITOR OF THE FERMANAGH TIMES

15th April, 1907.

Sir—On looking over my letter in your last issue I find the following error:

"Paul says he took wages, II Cor xi, 6." This should be II Cor xi, 8.

"Mr. Cooney gives as his commission Matt ix, 1 to 10." This should be Matt x. 1 to 10.

"Does he ordain Deans and Elders" should be "Does he ordain Deacons and Elders."

Thanking you in anticipation for inserting this correction.

CORRAGARRY.

Go to: May, 1907 of this series in Fermanagh Times