WRITINGS OF G C BREWER

by G.C. Brewer

A collection of theological writings, sermons, and essays by G.C. Brewer, compiled for study and devotional reading.

85 Chapters

Table of Contents

1. 00A.01 Christ Crucifed
2. 00A.03 INTRODUCTION
3. 00A.04 CHAPTER I.—Evolution
4. 00A.05 CHAPTER II.—Christ the Gift of God’s Love
5. 00A.06 CHAPTER III.—Christ in Prophecy.
6. 00A.07 CHAPTER IV.—Christ the Man of Sorrows
7. 00A.08 CHAPTER V.—Christ the Friend of Sinners
8. 00A.09 CHAPTER VI.—Christ Our Mediator
9. 00A.10 CHAPTER VII.—Christ the Christian’s High Priest
10. 00A.11 CHAPTER VIII.—Christ’s Blood: How It Saves Us
11. 00A.12 CHAPTER IX.—Christ on Trial or What Shall I Do With Jesus?
12. 00A.13 CHAPTER X.—Christ the Christian’s Creed
13. 00A.14 CHAPTER XI.—Christ Saves the Believer, Or What Does It Mean to Believ...
14. 00A.15 CHAPTER XII.—Christ’s Bride—The Church
15. 00A.16 CHAPTER XIII.—The Gospel Paul Preached
16. 00A.17 CHAPTER XIV.—The Immovable Kingdom
17. 00A.18 CHAPTER XV.—Where Are the Dead?
18. 00A.19 CHAPTER XVI.—Heaven:What Will It Be to Be There?
19. 00A.20 CHAPTER XVII.—In Memoriam
20. 00B.02 Contending for the Faith
21. 00B.05 Prayer
22. 00B.06 Preface
23. 00B.08 Chapter I -- Contending For The Faith
24. 00B.09 Chapter 2--"Where Art Thou?"
25. 00B.10 Chapter 3--Men Ought Always To Pray--No. 1
26. 00B.11 Chapter 4--Men Ought Always To Pray--No. 2
27. 00B.12 Chapter 5--Men Ought Always To Pray--No. 3
28. 00B.13 Chapter 6--Men Ought Always To Pray--No. 4
29. 00B.14 Chapter 7--Men Ought Always To Pray-- No. 5
30. 00B.15 Chapter 8--Marriage and Divorce
31. 00B.16 Chapter 9--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No. ...
32. 00B.17 Chapter 10--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No....
33. 00B.18 Chapter 11--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No....
34. 00B.19 Chapter 12--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No....
35. 00B.20 Chapter 13--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No....
36. 00B.21 Chapter 14--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No....
37. 00B.22 Chapter 15--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No....
38. 00B.23 Chapter 16--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No....
39. 00B.24 Chapter 17--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No....

40. 00B.25 Chapter 18--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No....
41. 00B.26 Chapter 19--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No....
42. 00B.27 Chapter 20--Review of a Baptist Exegete
43. 00B.28 Chapter 21. Denominational Baptism--No. 1
44. 00B.29 Chapter 22. Denominational Baptism--No. 2
45. 00B.30 Chapter 23. Denomnational Baptism—No. 3
46. 00B.31 Chapter 24. Denominational Baptism—No. 4
47. 00B.32 Chapter 25. Denominational Baptism—No. 5
48. 00B.33 Chapter 26. The Baptist Arrow and the Bible Arrow
49. 00B.34 Chapter 27. Premillenialism
50. 00B.35 Chapter 28. About Organizations--Christian Colleges, Orphan--Homes, ...
51. 00B.36 Chapter 29. Some Controversies of Christ
52. 00B.37 Chapter 30. Fugitive Pieces
53. 00B.38 Chapter 31. The Bible An Authority On In Catholic Hands
54. 00B.39 Chapter 32. The Lord's Supper
55. 00B.40 Chapter 33. The Lord's Day
56. 00B.41 Chapter 34. Why Go To Worship Every Lord's Day?
57. 00B.42 Chapter 35. Why I Don't Go To Church
58. 00B.43 Chapter 36. Is There An Eternal Hell?
59. 00B.44 Chapter 37. Desultory Descanting
60. 01.00. CUSTOMS and CHRISTIANITY
61. 01.01. Introduction to the Topic
62. 01.02. The Attitude of Approach
63. 01.03. Human Customs and Divine Law
64. 01.04. What Say the Scriptures About Custom and Dress?
65. 01.05. What Say the Scriptures About Bobbed Hair?
66. 01.06. Comment on 1Co_11:3-16
67. 01.07. Further Examination of the Topic of Head-Coverings
68. 01.08. The Conclusion
69. 02.00.1. THE MODEL CHURCH
70. 02.00.2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.
71. 02.00.3. INTRODUCTION.
72. 02.00.4. AUTHOR'S PREFACE.
73. 02.01. CHAPTER 01 - What Constitutes A Congregation.
74. 02.02. CHAPTER 02 - The Qualifications of an Elder.
75. 02.03. CHAPTER 03 - The Duties of the Elders.
76. 02.04. CHAPTER 04 - The Relation of the Overseen to the Overseer.
77. 02.05. CHAPTER 05 - How Elders Are Made.
78. 02.06. CHAPTER 06 - How Elders Are Unmade.
79. 02.07. CHAPTER 07 - The Diaconate.
80. 02.08. CHAPTER 08 - Dealing with the Disorderly.
81. 02.09. CHAPTER 09 - Figuring on the Finances.

82. 02.10. CHAPTER 10 - Church Music
83. 02.11. CHAPTER 11 - A Model Church
84. 02.12. CHAPTER 12 - Prayer-Meeting Topics.
85. S. Pamphlet On Premillenialism

00A.01 Christ Crucifed

Christ Crucified A BOOK OF SERMONS

TOGETHER WITH A Lecture on Evolution Delivered in the First Baptist Church Auditorium, Fort Worth, Texas, September 18th—

October 2nd, 1927 BY

G. C. BREWER Author of “James Warden,” “The Immortality of the Soul,”

“The Model Church,” “Is the Church of Christ a Denomination?” etc., etc.

CHRISTIAN LEADER CORPORATION CINCINNATI, OHIO

Copyright By

G. C. BREWER

1928

00A.03 INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

While I was in a meeting at Bartlett, Texas, in July of 1927, some brethren in Fort Worth called me by long distance telephone and told me that I had been selected to do the preaching in a cooperative effort of the fourteen churches of Christ in Fort Worth. This preaching was to be done in the First Baptist Church auditorium, which, they claim, has a seating capacity of between six and seven thousand. At the time these brethren called me I had no open time. I had a schedule of meetings that ran up to Christmas, but I told the Fort Worth brethren that I would accept their invitation, provided I could get some church to release me from an engagement. This required a rearranging of my program and called for a good deal of writing, telegraphing and telephoning. Even then I was not very agreeably released from any place. But the day came and in the goodness of God I was there, ready to do the preaching. The meeting began on Sunday afternoon, September 18th, and closed Sunday night, October 2nd. We had two services each day, which made thirty sermons in all.

Brother John Dickey was our song leader in this meeting and he did his work well.

Before the meeting began Brother Dickey had asked me to allow the sermons to be taken down as I delivered them in order that they might be put into book form. I agreed to this with the understanding that 1 would have no responsibility in the matter—no burden, financial or other kind—except to preach the sermons.

Brother Dickey assumed full responsibility, therefore, and undertook the task of publishing the book. He employed an expert stenographer, a Mr. Everidge, to take down the night sermons and the two Sunday afternoon speeches, the first of which was the lecture on Evolution. Mr. Everidge failed to get this lecture because I talked too rapidly, but he said he had the other sermons in fairly good order and that with a little correcting and filling in by me they would be ready for the book.

However, he waited forty days after the meeting closed, putting Brother Dickey off with one excuse and another, before he began transcribing his notes. Then late in November he turned three very incomplete transcripts over to Brother Dickey who mailed them to me at Detroit, Michigan. But before I had time to do any work on these transcripts Brother Dickey wired me that Mr. Everidge had died suddenly. As many orders for the book of sermons had already been placed, it seemed necessary that the book be brought out. No one could be found who could read Mr. Ever- idge's notes, and there was nothing for me to do but write the sermons in long hand—I can not use a typewriter. I got home from Detroit about the middle of December, but as I had been out in the field the entire year, I felt that I owed it to my wife and daughter to spend the holidays with them without working. Hence I did not begin writing these sermons till in January, 1928.

While writing them I have held meetings at Tipton and Frederick, Okla.; at Sinton, Texas, and at Memphis and Martin, Tenn. I have preached twice each day in the week and three times on Sundays, and I have gone out each day for meals and I have done the many other things that go

with evangelistic work. In addition to these duties I have, during this time, prepared for and held a debate with Judge Ben B. Lindsey on the “Companionate Marriage” issue.

If, therefore, these sermons do not come up to the reader’s expectation I hope he will let these circumstances plead forbearance and liberality in forming his opinion.

If the original plan had not failed there would be eighteen sermons in the book, and five chapters that are now in it would not be there. These five chapters are:

“Christ, the Man of Sorrows”; “Christ, the Christian’s Creed”; “Christ on Trial” and “Where are the Dead?” These sermons were not preached in the Fort Worth meeting. Then, of course, the chapter on “In Memoriam” was added after our first plan failed. The reasons for this chapter are given in the chapter. The six sermons that I preached in the meeting that are not in this book are: “The New Birth”, “A Heart the Cord Opened’”, “Pentecost”, “The Advantage of Being in Christ” and two Sunday afternoon addresses on (1) “The Shepherd Psalm" and (2) “All Things Work Together for Good for Those Who Love the Lord”. The reasons for leaving these sermons out of the book and putting the others in are: 1. I wanted to complete the series on “Christ”. 2. Every book of sermons now on the market contains a discourse on “The New Birth”, on “A Heart the Lord Opened”, (the conversion of Lydia), and on “Pentecost”. The other three are hard to write. 3. The chapter on “Christ, the Christian’s Creed” and “In Memoriam”, were already written. This shorter route was made necessary because I was so busy and because people who had ordered the book were impatient and were constantly inquiring about it.

I claim nothing new or original for these sermons. They tell the old, old story in as simple a may as I could put it. “Christ Crucified” is always my theme and I am determined never to preach anything else.

I desire to thank all the brethren of Fort Worth for their splendid fellowship and co-operation during the meeting. I thank, also, every one who has in any way assisted me in bringing out this book. I am indebted to many. May our great Jehovah, whose I am and whom I serve and by whose goodness and mercy I have ever been able to accomplish anything, take this book and sanctify it to the good of all who read it and to the glory of Christ, the crucified, now risen and glorified Lord, is my humble prayer.

G. C. BREWER;

Martin, Tennessee, April 10, 1928.

00A.04 CHAPTER I.—Evolution

CHAPTER I. EVOLUTION [Delivered in First Baptist Church, Fort Worth, Texas] Sunday Afternoon, September 18, 1927

Mr. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I am highly sensible of the honor done me in being invited to do the preaching in this cooperative meeting, to be held by the churches of Christ of this city. I thank my good friend and brother, C. M. Stubblefield, for his words of introduction; and I am humbly thankful to our heavenly Father for the blessings of this hour, especially for this privilege of speaking to this very large audience of respectful and intelligent men and women. The subject that has been announced for this, the initial address of this series, is “Evolution.” This is, therefore, to be a lecture, but every other address will be a gospel sermon. The question of evolution is such a broad question that naturally you are wondering what part of it is to be discussed in this address. For that reason I shall adopt the policy of the old Negro preacher and give you an outline of the address in the beginning. The old Negro said: “I a’ways ’vides mah suhmons into three pahtes. Fust, I tells ’em whut I’s gwine ter tell ’em; den I tells ’em; den I tells ’em whut I done tole ’em.”

Likewise I shall now tell you what I am going to tell you, and then I shall tell you. Here is the outline:

I. The issued cleared.

II. Present Day Conditions in Reference to the Teaching of Evolution.

III. Does the Theory of Evolution Conflict with Christianity ?

IV. Is the Theory of Evolution True? Has It Been Proved?

1. What Say the Scientists?

2. The Proofs Examined.

V. The Failure of Evolution to Show (1) the Origin of Matter.

(2) the Origin of the Earth, (3) the Origin of Life, (4) the Origin of Species and, (5) the Method of Development. Of course each point of this outline will have to be very briefly handled since the outline covers almost the entire field. But I shall at least say something on each point and I beg you to hear me patiently.

I. CLEARING THE ISSUE. When any man speaks against the theory of organic evolution in our day he is, by all evolutionists, and by many other people who are under the influence of evolutionary propaganda, thought to be against science and scientists. In fact, such a man will be unhesitatingy stigmatized by newspaper reporters and even editors, and by some teachers, also by some preachers, as a reactionary who is fighting science and progress and enlightenment. And some of these will be kind enough to call him an ignoramus and other equally complimentary names. Our children are told in -the schools that no educated person today opposes the theory of

evolution, etc.

Now, in the very outset let me assure you, tny friends, that I am not opposed to science, and 1 do not fight our scientists. Science has done marvelous things for the world and I believe it is destined to do yet greater things. It would be impossible for me to tell you in one address of the many blessings that we, today, enjoy as a result of the untiring efforts of scientists. Many of them have sacrificed their own lives in order to give us the knowledge that we now have and the benefits that we now enjoy. My own life has been saved by science at least once—perhaps many times—and I would be a veritable ingrate to fight, either science or scientists. I take off my hat to the real scientists, and I pray God to give us more of them. I do not therefore oppose the teaching of science in our schools.

But, friends, the theory of evolution is not science, and in opposing it we do not have to give up any practical benefit thai science has ever brought to the world.

Two or three years ago, when the Dayton (Term.) trial had set the whole world to talking evolution, there appeared an editorial in a great daily newspaper under the caption: “Trying to Turn the Clock Back.” This editor said that those of us who oppose the theory of evolution are trying to turn the clock of progress backward. He said we wanted to stop.the efforts of scientists to bless the world with their researches into the secrets of nature and the laws of life. He said we are trying to deprive the world of the benefits that science has brought to it and to take it back to Medievalism. When I read that editorial I wrote a letter to the editor and told him that I had been opposing the theory of organic evolution, but I had not been conscious that in doing so I had tried to turn the clock back; thatl I did not want to deprive the world of any blessing that science has brought to us, nor did I wish to hinder scientists in their investigations and researches. I then asked him to please name at least a few of the practical benefits that science has given us that we will have to abandon if we should all repudiate the theory of evolution. I watched the paper carefully for an answer to my request. Each day articles appeared in that paper favoring evolution and bitterly denouncing and ridiculing those who oppose it. But no reference to my letter appeared. After about ten days I wrote to the editor again and reminded him of my request and then repeated the request by asking him to name one practical benefit that science has given us that I can not appropriate and enjoy as much while opposing the theory of evolution as he can while believing and preaching it. I told him if he did not have the time and the inclination to answer my request to please to publish it and allow some of his contributors to answer it. But that letter never saw the light and no reference was ever made to the request in that paper. Since that time I have presented that same request as a challenge to evolutionists, but no one has yet told me what practical benefit of any science—medicine, surgery, agriculture, animal breeding or any other branch of scientific study—we must give up if we oppose the theory of evolution. It is very true that we might have to give up some of the explanations that scientists make of existing phenomena, but such explanations are only given as possible explanations and they ’have nothing to do with practical benefits. The theory of evolution is not science; it is only a theory and wholly speculative, purely academic, and scientists themselves are at war among themselves on many points in the theory. Be it understood, therefore, that we who oppose the theory of organic evolution do not oppose science or the teaching of science in our schools.

II. PRESENT DAY CONDITIONS IN REFERENCE TO THE TEACHING OF EVOLUTION. The majority of real sincere scientists of our day may hold to some theory, or to some part of the theory of evolution. But these scientists are not propagandists and we have little to fear from them on this question. But there is a noisy group of scientists, whose sincerity, at least on some points, it is hard to credit, and a still larger group of propagandists who are not scientists, who are in our day making a desperate effort to popularize evolution. They employ every means that they can command to create a sentiment in favor of the theory and to turn public opinion against any man who does not unqualifiedly accept the theory. Evolution has become a dogma and organizations are formed for the purpose of upholding and preaching this dogma. It is no longer simply a theory which men are studying—a working hypothesis on which scientists are basing their researches—but it is with many a closed question. It is a pet dogma and its devotees hold to it with as much intolerance and dogmatism as any religious fanatic ever manifested. In the introduction to his book, "The Case Against Evolution," Dr. George Barry O'Toole, a scholar and a scientist, says: "In the present work, we shall endeavor to show that Evolution has long since degenerated into a dogma, which is believed in 'spite of the facts, and not on account of them." This is a strong indictment, but all those who have observed the spirit of many present day evolutionists will agree with the statement.

Evolution is taught in practically all our schools and colleges, in some schools with more zeal and enthusiasm than others, of course. It is taught as a fact—not as a theory—and our children are told that nobody questions evolution except ignoramuses. It is taught in the lowest 'grades. I hold here in my hand a text-book which was an adopted text-book in the State schools of Kentucky a few years ago—may be yet—and has no doubt been used in many other States. This book was used in the second grade, and the Teacher's Manual recommended that it be read to the children in the first grade. The name of this book is, "Home Geography." The author is Harold W. Fairbanks, Ph.D., and it is published by the Educational Publishing Co. On page 142, under the heading, Something About Birds," we have this:

If birds could talk what stories we might hear. We might learn of a time, ever so long ago, when their grandfathers were not birds at all. Then they could not fly, for they had neither wings nor feathers. These grandfathers of our birds had four legs, a long tail and jaws with teeth. After a time feathers grew upon their bodies and their front legs became changed for flying. These were strange looking creatures. There are none living like them now. If birds could talk, and if they were not any more truthful than men are, they would make images of their four-legged grandfathers and set them up in museums, and cause their pictures to be put in text books.

I hold here another text book which is used in our high schools. The name of this book is "American Social Problems." It is published by The MacMillan Company and it has two authors. They are Henry Reed Burch,. Ph.D., and S. Howard Patterson, A.M. I have examined this book and aside from what it says on evolution I pronounce it a splendid book. I can not see just what business evolution has in a book on the "American Social Problems '' but it is here all right—with a vengeance. It is called "A Great Discovery"—that is the name of the chapter in which it is treated, and the first sentence of the chapter says: "The discovery of the theory of evolution in the last century by Charles Darwin was almost as epoch making as the discovery of America by Columbus."

Then between pages 16 and 17 we have the picture of what evolutionists call the Neanderthal Man—an intermediate being between man and ape. Under this picture the authors tell us that this is “An artist’s conception of the Neanderthal Mjan.” They also tell us that it is in the book by “Courtesy of the American Museum of Natural History.”

Yes, in that part of the American Museum of Natural History, in New York, called “The Hall of the Age of Man,” there are five glass cases in which are kept the “reconstructed” forms of the so-called intermediate animals—ape-men. Skeletons of these ape-men have not been found, these forms are imaginary, or hypothetical. They are, in truth, only “an artist’s conception” of what evolutionists tell us must have once existed—but of such existence they have no proof. A few facts about these reconstructed forms will be interesting here. Let us take this Neanderthal Man first. Was the skeleton of such a man found? No. In August, 1856, some laborers digging in a small cave at the entrance of the Neanderthal gorge, Westphalia, Germany, threw out some pieces of a skull bone. The scientists learned about these bones and became interested in finding out to what race of men or what apes or what ape-men these bones belonged, Further search was made in that cave and oilier bones—human bones—were found. A controversy arose immediately among the scientists about this skull. They used the lines of the fragments found to form or reconstruct the complete skull and then measured its internal capacity. Now the capacity of the human skull is between 1400 and 1500 cubic centimeters, while the ape’s skull capacity stops at 600 c.c. Of course the evolutionists wanted to make this Neanderthal skull capacity as low as they could in order to tell the world they had found the “missing link.” So the first measurement told them that the capacity was 1033 c. c. But even Professor Huxley had to correct that, and he estimated the capacity at 1230 c. c. Others estimated it at a higher figure than that. There was never any agreement among scientists as to the proper place to assign these skull fragments. On the contrary, twelve distinct and different opinions among the most eminent scientists have been held in reference to this skull. Yet we have the reconstructed form of the man in our great museum and full page pictures of the complete form of this imaginary man in our text-books for our children to look at as they read the history of the “Neanderthal race”—a face that never existed! A race named for a valley in Germany where some bone fragments were found! The history of some of those other restored or recon-structed forms is even more disgraceful than that of the Neanderthal Man. (Scientists call this gentleman Homo- Neanderthalensis for short.) Take the Piltdown Man or the Dawn Man for example. Time will not allow me to give you the full story of that renowned gentleman’s career, but here are a few facts. About the year 1909, Mr. Charles Dawson, while walking along a farm road close to Piltdown Common, Sussex, England, noticed that the road had been mended with some peculiar brown flints not usual in that district,” He made inquiry and learned that these flints had been dug from a sand bed On that farm. He visited the sand bed and asked the lalxmers if they had found any bones or other fossils. They had not. He urged them to preserve anything they might find in the future. Upon one of his later visits to this sand bed a laborer banded Mr. Dawson a small piece of human skull bone. This started the excitement and laborers were employed to dig and search until every particle of gravel in the pit was sifted. As a result of this search three other bone fragments were found, consisting of another small piece of skull bone, a part of a jaw bone and one canine tooth.

Mr. Dawson brought these bones to the attention of other scientists and they proceeded at once to “reconstruct" the Piltdown Man, who was supposed to have grown these bones some 300.000

years ago. Of course he must have a scientific name and they called him Eoanthropus, from the two Greek words, Bo-dawn and anihopos—man—hence Dawn Man. And they named the species “Dawsoniin honor of Mr. Dawson. Thus our scientists had a new genus and species started out with the command to be fruitful and replenish the earth with “monkey-men” evolutionists. —But Mr. Dawn Man, like many other "down and outers,” found it not so easy to “come back” as it at first appeared. He had “Dawned” auspiciously, but there were thick clouds rising. In August, 1913, the British Association for the Advancement of Science discussed these Piltdown fragments. Then Sir Authur Kieth demonstrated that the Piltdown skull had a brain capacity of 1500 c, c., instead of 1070 c. c., which Mr. Piltdown’s friends had at first allowed him. This proved that the skull was a modern or fully developed human skull, and not a pre-human or ape-man skull, as the inventors of Mr. Piltdown had declared. Then quite a controversy was carried on for several years among the scientists in reference to the status of our dear Mr. Eoanthropus. And on examination some scientists showed that the canine tooth had by the “reconstructors” been put into the right side of the lower jaw, whereas it belonged in the left side of the upper jaw. Of course any scientists should have known better than to make that mistake, but their zeal to make the beloved Mr. Dawn Man look the part they had assigned him caused them to put this tooth into the protruding under jaw, just with the right angle to make it ape-like. But their embarrassment did not step with that humiliating exposure. A further examination by honest scientists revealed the fact that the jaw and the skull did not belong to the same individual, or even to individuals of the same genera. The skutt was that of a human being and the jaw was that of an ape. As late as 1916 Dr. George Grant MacCurdy, head of the Archaeological Department of Yale University, said:

Regarding the Piltdown specimens, we have at last reached a position that is tenable. The cranium is human, as was recognized by all in the beginning. On the other hand, the mandible and the canine tooth are those of a fossil chimpanzee. This means that in place of Eoanthropus Bawsoni (the Piltdown missing link) we have two individuals belonging to different genera.” (Science, Feb. 18, 1916.) The other “reconstructed” forms that scientists present to us in the museums and by pictures in our books are no more real and have no more authenticated existence than the disreputable Mr. Piltdown. Time will not permit me to tell you the story of the Java Man, which scientists call Pithecanthropus erectus. His existence is no better established than that of Eoanthropus. Concerning his bones the scientists have never agreed, and he today has rio standing among honest scientists. Then there is another “missing link” or pre-human ancestor known by the long name of Propliothecus Haeckeli. But this gentleman is such a patent fraud that even Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborne speaks of him as “hypothetical.”

These facts that I am here giving you can easily be tested. The controversy concerning the bone fragments can still be read in the publications in which they appeared years ago. They are preserved in our libraries. But in spite of the fact that these so-called missing links never existed, except in the imagination of the artists and over-anxious evolutionists, our text-books still carry pictures of them and our teachers tell our children about these ape-men. But the fact is the teachers often do not know themselves that these ape-men are fabrications. They have read about them, have seen their pictures and perhaps they have been to New York and have seen the “reconstructed” forms in nice glass cases in the Hall of the Age of Man of the Museum of Natural History. And many a poor little teacher is afraid to question these things lest he be called uneducated. Hence he has fallen a victim to these shameful deceptions. But I have said that there

is an organized effort to spread evolution propaganda today. I will tell you about some of these organizations, "j/ In 1925 there was formed in San Francisco what is known as the Science League of America.-^ Mr. Maynard Shipley was elected president of this organization and in his inaugural address he said that the purpose of the League was to “Keep evolution in the schools and to keep Genesis out.” Evolution is already in ffie~schoCls and Genesis is~already out and the Science League means to keep it just that way. This League grew rapidly and soon it had organizations in many States and representatives in a number of State universities. And this League was not slow to employ the most effective means for spreading evolution doctrine. I have here a circular put out by the Science League of America announcing a moving picture which preaches evolution. Hear what it says:

Must Repeat! Sensational Five-Reel Film on Evolution—The Tree of Life. A. death blow to Medievalism. The most amazing and convincing moving picture ever made, showing graphically the birth of worlds and the evolution of man frim simpic single cells. Auspices of the Science League of America.

Now, there you are! A picture showing the birth of worlds and the evolution of man from a little one cell microscopic life! Scientists know nothing of the origin of the earth. They have some theories. But behold here is a picture of how it was done! And no scientist —not even a wild-eyed evolutionist—will attempt to tell you how evolution has progressed from earliest times down to the present. They know that there are things they can’t account for—chasms they can not bridge— but here is a picture that purports to show the whole process at work—from a thing without organs up to man with his highly perfect organism. When the uninformed people sit and look at that picture they will of course think that scientists have found all this out—have proved it. They do not know that this thing is pure fiction. That it was drawn from the overwrought imagination of “monkey-men” evolutionists. When they see that it is put out by the Science League they think that means scientists. They don’t know it means an organization of propagandists.

There is an organization which holds a charter in New York State known as the Four A Society—The American Association for the Advancement of Atheism. This association can be complimented for one thing. It does not hide its purpose. It means to advance atheism --hence to overthrow faith in God and Christ and the Bible. In fact it boldly declares that it means to direct its fight against the church and the clergy. It, too, has grown rapidly, and now has many sub-organizations among college students of our country. But you ask what that organization has to do with evolution. Just this, it uses evolution as a pry pole with which to overthrow faith. And so anxious are they to prove evolution that they are, through their Mr. English of Detroit, endeavoring to raise one hundred thousand dollars to be Used in an effort to cross breed man with apes. They report that the Soviet government of Russia has already appropriated thousands of dollars to be used in this effort. These atheists know what many preachers do not realize—viz.—that if evolution is established Christianity is overthrown and God knocked out of existence. Like the people Paul speaks of in Romans (Romans 1:21-28), they refuse to have God in their knowledge and they must therefore account for the phenomena around us by a Godless process—evolution. But this brings us to the question—

III. DOES EVOLUTION CONFLICT WITH CHRISTIANITY ?

We have many people who say that evolution does not in any way interfere with our faith in God, Christ and the Bible. Even many preachers make this claim, and they get very much excited when some of us point out the conflict. The trouble with these preachers is that they think that the theory of evolution is established and completely demonstrated and they must therefore make Christianity harmonize with it or else 'jgive up Christianity. And down in their sub-consciousness somewhere they have the lurking suspicion that evolution has already ruined a great many things that our fathers believed—things taught in the Bible—but they console themselves with the assurance that at least the moral principles—the ethical ideals of Christianity still remain and therefore they profess to be Christians and evolutionists, too. But such people are neither good Christians nor good evolutionists and they must continually soft-pedal certain points in both systems. But as for me. I am going to accept the truth whenever I can learn it, regardless of what ft costs, and if evolution conflicts with Christianity then one of them must be false, and if evolution is proved to be true, then it is Christianity that is false and for my part it must go. Let us be honest enough with ourselves therefore to consider the question, Does evolution conflict with Christianity? In answering this question it is necessary to know what we mean by "evolution." What is evolution? We will let the scientists define this term for us or tell us what they mean to include in the theory of evolution. First, I wish to read to you Herbert Spencer's famous definition. Now you want to know what evolution is, here he tells you. You get this and tomorrow if somebody asks you what evolution is you tell them this:

Evolution is an integration of matter and a con-comitant dissipation of motion during which the matter passes from an indefinite incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation.

Tell 'em that! (Laughter.)

Now, fearing that you might forget some of those long words I have here a paraphase of that definition— the same thing exactly in simpler terms. Get this:

Evolution is a change from a no-howish, untalk- aboutable, nll-slikeness to a some-howish and in general talk aboutable not-all-alikeness by a continuous something elsefication and stick togethera tion. That is evolution! You may laugh at that if you please, but that is just as clear an explanation as any scientist can give of the transforming steps; or the change from the structureless cell to the perfect organisms of today. But other definitions will give us a better answer to the question we are discussing. Joseph LeConte, who was an authority on evolution, and a great apalogist for it, defines it as follows:

Evolution is (1) a continuous progressive change, (2) according to certain laws. (3) by means of resident forces.

Edward Drinker Cope, the American anatomist and paleontologist, in his "Introduction to the Primary Factors of Organic Evolution," says: The doctrine of evolution may be defined as the teaching which holds that creation has been and is accomplished by the agency of the energies which are intrinsic in the evolving matter, and without the interference of agencies that are external to it. It holds this to be true of combinations and forms of inorganic nature, and those of organic nature as well. . . . The science of evolution is the science of creation.

Ernest Haeckel says: Evolution is the non-miraculous origin of the universe.

H. W. Conn says: The essential idea which underlies the whole theory is that species have had a natural, rather than a super-natural, origin. In the debate at San Francisco between Mr. Maynard Shipley, President of the Science League of America, and Mr. Francis D. Nichol, Editor of the "Signs of the Times" Mr. Shipley affirmed, “That the earth and all life upon it are the result of evolution.” The “learned Genevan professor,” and ardent evolutionist, Carl Vogt, says “evolution turns the Creator out of doors.” From these definitions of the doctrine we must all see that Vogt is right. If creation has been accomplished by forces that reside in the evolving matter, and without the aid of any force, power or energy external to it— of course that excludes God. Evolution attempts to account for the earth and all the life upon it by a process of naturalism. It denies the touch of a divine hand, denies super-naturalism, at any point in the process. Truly this “turns the Creator out of doors” and if evolutionists do not deny the existence of the Infinite God, they leave Him no room to interfere or function in the affairs of the universe. They render Him both helpless and useless. But evolutionists, who are consistent and logical, know that the doctrine makes the existence of a personal God useless and hence they do not believe in Him. Professor George M. Royce, of Harvard University, defines God as “the spirit animating nature, the universal force which takes the myriad forms, heat, light, gravitation, electricity and the like.” (As quoted by Dr. Ni’chol in San Francisco Debates.) Le Conte avowed:

There has gradually grown up, without our confessing it, a kind of scientific polytheism—one great Jehovah, perhaps, but with many agents or subgods, each independent, efficient, and doing all the real wo-k in his own domain. The names of these, our gods, are gravity, light, heat, electricity, magnetism, chemical affinity, etc., and we are practically saying; “These oe your gods, O Israel, which brought you out of the land of Egyptian darkness and ignorance. These he the only gads ye need fear, and serve, and study the ways of.”—“Evolution and its Relation to Religious Thought,” p. 298 Joseph A. Leighton, professor of philosophy in the Ohio State University, has recently written: From the scientific standpoint, God is a superfluous hypothesis which explains nothing, and only constitutes a bar to scientific inquiry.—“Religion and the Mind of To-day,” p. 198.

Here is a rather lengthy but very frank and pointed statement on this issue from Winterton C. Curtis, Ph.D., of the University of Missouri:

During the three centuries involved, man’s picture of himself changed from that of a being, recently created and awaiting the day of judgment in the not distant future, to that of a being originating as a part of organic nature and set in a universe without beginning and without end. The byproduct of this intellectual revolution was an emancipation of the human spirit from the bonds of authority. Authority indeed remains, but it is no longer the authority of book or priest, however potent such authority may still appear to be. In its place stands the authority of nature; and so great has been the emancipation we have, as yet, recognized but an insignificant measure of the changes in human thinking which must follow. . . . In theology, the evolutionary doctrine is carrying us from the concept of a single religion, revealed to man by agents duly inspired, to the concept of a multitude of religions of various worthiness, but all the outgrowth of yearnings which originated with human intelligence. In other words, religion, of whatever sort, is a product of organic evolution, just as human intelligence is a product of evolution. When religion is so regarded, we need not condone the shortcomings of our fathers, nor strive for Metaphysical explanations of sin an death, of sorrow and pain; since these are but the present outcome of our origin from the brute. We know in part whence we come, if not whither we are going, and it is enough if we may, by our own efforts,

some-what improve the material and spiritual state of ourselve3 and our children. . . .Old beliefs often persist apparently in full vigor, until the collapse is at hand; but when beliefs begin to excite ridicule, their course is nearly run. The history of scientific progress has been marked by spiritual emancipations. To-day the process still goes on, for supernaturalism is not yet fully vanquished, but lingers on as a miasma of society. Science and Human Affairs, pp. 309-312. Harcourt, Brace Co., 1922. But as a final statement on this point I want you to hear what Dr. William E. Ritter has to say. As I am quoting' him after Dr. Nichal in the San Francisco debate, I shall let Dr. Nichal introduce the quotation and tell when and where it was uttered. Remember, however, that Dr. Nichal was in debate with the president of the "Science League." His opponent did not deny or question any of his quotations. Hear this:

Even more sweeping and more to the point here tonight is a statement made by one of the men responsible for the "Science League of America," Professor Wm. E. Ritter, of the University of California. From this platform, at a rally meeting of the "Science League" recently, he declared that any future evolutionary progress of mankind in philosophy, morality, or religion, is possible "only on the basis of a knowledge of, and confidence in, the naturae that will not have room for one jot or tittle of belief in the supernatural."

Now if the teachers in our schools and universities can so completely destroy the faith of the students in the supernatural that there will not be one jot or tittle left, how can even a modernist preacher claim that these students are still Christians? What sort of Christianity is it that this kind of teaching does not conflict with and destroy ? But to show you that evolutionists make no effort to deny or disguise the fact that their doctrine is destruc tive of Christianity, look at this: I hold here the latest book that has been published on Darwin. This book is written by Gamaliel Bradford^ and published by Houghton Mifflin Company," off the press last~year. The name of the book is "Darwin," and you see here a large picture of that gentleman on the paper cover of wrapper. See here in the upper right hand corner this statement in quotation marks:

"He made hell a laughing stock and heaven a dream."

According to this statement Darwinism destroys all. hope of a future life. It makes hell an invention of the heathen and heaven the dream of a poet or a religious fanatic.

Then at the bottom of this wrapper we have these words: "The life story of a gentle, tolerant, and lovable f man who overturned the world of thought, shifted (the whole attitude of science, and upheaved the very foundations of religion and morality." I do not know whether the author or the publisher is responsible for these words on this cover. Nor do I mean to question what is said about Darwin as a man. It is the effect that his doctrine had upon the world that we are interested in. If he "upheaved the foundations of religion and morality", how say some that it does not conflict with Christianity? Christianity had been here for 1,800 years when Darwin gave us his theory, but this book says Darwin upheaved its foundations. And note h says he upheaved the foundations of morality also. When we consider the woeful breakdown in morals since the theory of evolution began to be taught to every school child in the land, we can well believe this statement. Leopold said that the crime of kidnapping and killing Bobby Franks for the purpose of studying the sex reaction in death was no worse than that committed when an entomologist impales a beetle on a pin. Why should it be considered any worse if man is only an evolved beetle? And man has become what he is on the principle of the survival of the fittest or the rise of the strong on the

Weakness of the weak—by his ability to out-kill his fellow- brutes. That is the theory! No wonder it upheaved the foundation of morality. Who that believes that would “resist not him that is evil” or love his enemy and pray , for those who persecute him, or weep with those who weep?

Oh, I know Henry Drummond tried to inject an element of altruism into this bloody-might-makes-right theory, but Sir J. Arthur Thompson says the fact remains that man has gone upstairs on the bones of weaker beings.

Yes, the fruits of the theory prove conclusively that it upheaved the very foundations of morality.

Bearing on this question of morality, here is a very frank admission by one of the most distinguished and most ardent evolutionists of our time. Professor Henry Fairfield Osborne, in his “Impressions of Great Naturalists”, says: I do not see that Darwin’s supreme service to his fellow-men was his demonstration of evolution. Man could have lived on quite as happily, and perhaps more morally, under the old notion that he was specially made in the image of his Maker. (Quoted and criticised by J. Arthur Thompson on page 196 of “The Gospel of Evolution.”) But some of these evolution-believing preachers are goiug to tell you that these men that I have quoted are all atheistic evolutionists and that they (the preachers) are theistic evolutionists. They will wisely explain that theistic evolutionists believe in God and that God created everything, but that He did it by law—natural law—hence by the process of evolution. And with an arrogant tilt of their heads they imply that theirs is a very superior, learned and modern attitude.

Oh, yes, I know that claim and I once thought I was a theistic evolutionist. I didn’t know anything about theism or evolution, either (however, I knew as much as the college students and most of the teachers of today know. They have not investigated any more than I had),, but I thought evolution was true and I knew I believed in God and I heard somebody say that one who held that attitude was a theistic evolutionist, and I said, “that settles it. I am one of the big ones.” But you have noticed, my friends, that the question I am discussing is, Does evolution conflict with Christianity? Now, there is a big difference in a theist and a Christian. John Fiske was a theist and an evolutionist, but he was not a Christian. All Jews are theists, but they are not Christians. It is conceivable that a man can be a theist and an evolutionist, hence a theistic evolutioist— Darwin was that—but how can a man be a Christian— a believer in Christ as the Redeemer of the world—and be an evolutionist? How can he believe in the virgin birth, the vicarious atonement and the resurrection from the dead and other miracles when evolution denies miracles? Furthermore, evolution teaches that man has developed from a tiny cell up through fish, amphibian, reptile, bird and mammal stages. And then after he reached the mammal stage he went up gradually, step by step, until he reached his present condition. A continuous, upward climbing. Hence there was no “fall”, according to the theory. No ruin.

Now Christianity is a remedial system. A remedy pre-supposes a ruin. If there was no fall, no ruin, then there is no room for a Redeemer. Then Christ was not the gift of God’s love to save a perishing world! The world was not perishing, but evolving, climbing higher and higher, from ape to man and from man to super-man, and from super-man to demi-god and up and up and up!

Christ Himself was the product of evolution and the Son of a monkey!!!

Now what will you say about your preacher who believes in evolution? But that is not all yet: How can an evolutionist believe in the immortality of the soul? If man has a soul, where did he get it and

when? Do apes also have souls? At what point in man's evolution did he get his soul? How did he get it? Was it evolved by natural processes and was it once in rudimentary form? Hence did half men—Pithecanthropus and others—have half souls? If you say God gave man his soul full blown by miracle, then how can you claim to be an evolutionist? Why deny any miracle? If you say man has no soul, how can you claim to be a Christian ? The truth is, a consistent evolutionist does not believe that man is immortal. Some of them believe that the race will become immortal. In his lecture on "The Destiny of Man Viewed in the Light of His Origin", John Fiske said that considering the fact that man has come from nothing to his present condition we may well believe that he will yet attain immortality. But this does not promise you or me, as individuals, anything. It does not promise the generations that are dead anything. Even if man does continue to evolve until he outwits death and lives on forever, we are only a strata in that upward march, and future generations will go upstairs on our bones. If we have been created and developed by evolution, we can not claim exemption from the law of dissolution. Death awaits us and the grave is our goal. Those who have fallen asleep have perished, our hope is in vain and our testimony is false and Christians are of all men the worst deluded—IF, if the theory is true.

IV. But—Has the Theory of Evolution been Established? Is Evolution True ? Whatever is true will stand, whether we believe it or deny it. If evolution is actually true and all the forces of nature are right now busily engaged in the process, then nothing we can do or say will have any effect upon it. But if Christianity is true, then all the evolutionists, infidels, atheists, and demons can not destroy it, but they can destroy the faith of many and cause them to be lost. There can be no sensible reason for holding to anything that is false, and especially none for fighting for it; being false, it will fail some day in spite of all you can do and then your time and labor is lost. Bet us be honest therefore in answering this question:

What say the scientists? No reliable scientist will say that evolution has been proved. There are some teachers of science who will say it, and there are some men of science who have so far lost the scientific spirit as to become propagandists for the theory instead of searchers after truth. These will loudly proclaim that it is a closed issue—no longer debateable—yet they are constantly debating among themselves on practically every point in the theory. No two of them agree. But the real scientists—men who have not only the knowledge, but the spirit of scientists—will all tell you that evolution is only a theory. They believe it perhaps and they can cite things in nature that lead them to the belief, but they will tell you that there are many things demanded by or involved in the theory that they can not explain; that there are insuperable difficulties. They will also tell you that the whole world of science has changed its views on many points of the theory in the last thirty or forty years.

Let us hear what some of these scientists say. In 1925 Dr. L. T\ Moore, of jthe University of Cincinnati, delivered a series of lectures on evolution at Princeton University These lectures are published in a book called "The Dogma of Evolution". On page 160 of that book we have this frank statement: The more one studies paleontology, the more certain one becomes that evolution is based on faith alone; exactly the same sort of faith which it is necessary to have when one encounters the great mysteries of religion. Our faith in the idea of evolution depends on our reluctance to accept the antagonistic doctrine of special creation.

There we have it from an honest scientist. One of the very strongest “proofs” that evolutionists can adduce is based on paleontology, but Dr. Moore says that it only convinces one who studies it that evolution is based on faith alone —not on facts. And the strength of a man’s faith in the doctrine will be determined by his attitude toward the Bible—the Bible account of creation, says Dr. Moore. Therefore the best and strongest evolutionist is the atheist! Your own observation will confirm that. Ernest Haeckel was a blatant atheist and he went so far with his application of Darwin’s ideas that Darwin wrote him, “Your boldness makes me tremble.” (Quoted by Gamaliel Bradford in this book—“Darwin”.) But hear other scientists. Lord Kelvin said:

I marvel at the undue haste with which teachers in our universities and preachers in our pulpits are restating truth in the terms of evolution while evolution itself remains an unproved hypothesis in the laboratories of science.

Hear Dr. Thomas Hunt Morgan, of Columbia University :

Within the period of human history we do not know of a single instance of the transformation of one species into another one. .. It may be claimed that the theory of descent is lacking, therefore, in the most essential feature that it needs to place the theory on a scientific basis. This must be admitted.—“Evolution and Adaptation,” p. 43. The theory proved? Why, it is not on a sound scientific basis—lacks the most essential feature of being scientific. Yet they tell our children that nobody but an ignoramus doubts it!!

Dr. Ethridge, of the British Museum, said: In all this great Museum there is not a particle of evidence of the transmutation of species. Nine-tenths of the talk of evolutionists is sheer non-sense, not founded on observation and wholly unsupported by facts. This museum is full of proof of the utter falsity of their views. (Quoted by practically all the anti-evolution writers.) As a final quotation on this point I want you to hear this from Dr. Millkain This speech was delivered in Los Angeles in August, 1923. it was reported by Associated Press under a date-line of Aug. 7. I give it to you in the reporter’s own words—let him tell you about Dr. Millikan, whom he was addressing and what he said. Hear it:

Scientific dogmatism, as well as the religious brand, was denounced by Dr. Robert A. Millikan, Noble prize winner and internationally famous, in an address before the American Chemical Society here last night.

Dr. Millikan, who himself opened a new era in scientific investigation with his exploration of the atom, told his audience of prominent chemists that the development of the last quarter century of all the physical sciences should teach men of learning to be “more modest and thoughtful.”

“We must learn to get away from our assertiveness and dogmatism, whether scientific or theological,” he said. “I see over assertiveness from scientists in connection with such things as the late evolution trial ana I see on the other side assertiveness on subjects about which I know nobody knows anything.

“The pathetic thing is that we have scientists who are trying to prove evolution, which no scientist can ever prove. Now, i don’t, want you to forget that either. On the other side, I am not. I am only asking for more caution. “We must not bite off more than we can chew. We must not take a few facts and then draw conclusions. This applies both to the theologian and the scientist. Both should

learn the lesson of modesty." The title of Dr. Millikan's address was "What's It All About?" That was taken from the Nashville Banner and that is the complete report of his speech—that is all that was given in that paper. I doubt if papers ouside of Tennessee published that much of the Associated Press dispatch. Dr. Millikan is a famous scientist and he was addressing a society of scientists, but he said evolution is not proved and can never be proved and that does not suit the news-papers. That isn't ''News". But I will not say that other papers didn't give prominence to this speech. I didn't see it in any of them.

Dr. Millikan says it is pathetic that any scientist will try to prove evolution: that no scientist can ever prove it. That, is strong enough for any of us. Why will not teachers and students and the public in general listen to what these real scientists say instead of accepting without a qualm or a question the false claims of pseudo-scientists?

After such statements from scientists it seems unnecessary to examine any of the arguments that evolutionists rely upon to prove the theory—the very effort being pathetic—but we will see what they are, anyway.

2. The arguments examined. The proofs of evolution may be grouped under these five heads:

1. Comparative Anatomy.

2. Paleontalogy.

3. Embryology.

4. Vestigial Organs.

5. Experiments of Breeders.

COMPARATIVE ANATOMY. Comparative anatomy, of course, deals with the resemblances between the human form and the form of lower animals. Scientists tell us that many structures are on exactly :he same pattern. They say that the flipper of a whale, the wing of a bird, the leg of a cat and the arm of a man are homologous —not as seen outwardly, but found to be so by dissection. From this they conclude that we all evolved from a common ancestor. But why can not we just as logically conclude that we were all created by One Common Creator? Especially since evolutionists can't explain our differences which are certainly greater than our similarities. The difference is so great that no anatomist would mistake a single bone in an ape's frame for a human bone.

PALEONTOLOGY. Paleontology is the science of fossil remains of ancient living things. When we talked about Pitheconthropus and Eoanthropus, and other fictitious gentlemen, we saw what evolutionists have to offer in this line. You remember, too, that Dr. Moore said the more we study paleontology the more we see that there is no proof in it for evolution. It has been claimed by some evolutionists that the fossils are found in regular sequence in the geological strata. This was called the "theory of conformation and succession," or "the onion skin theory"; but it is now known to be false. Of course paleontologists do find the fossils of animals that are now extinct—none like them existing now—but there is no evidence that they evolved into something else. But this so-called Tree of Life is cut off high above the ground. The very lowest forms of life ever found were fully developed animals with perfect organs that functioned. There are no remains of animals with half

formed organs—nothing between the one cell animal and the animal with a perfect structure or organism.

EMBRYOLOGY. Evolutionists tell us that the embryo passes through all the stages in its development that the human race has passed through in coming up from the primordial protoplasmic cell to the present state. This is known as the recapitulation theory. They claim that in some stages the embryo resembles a fish, has gills, and then later it resembles an ape, etc. This doctrine was given prominence by Ernest Haeckel, and all evolutionists who make this argument have been influenced by him. He called this the primary biogenetic principle. But he practiced fraud in order to work out his twenty- four different successive changes. He “schematized” his plates in putting out his pictures. He put parts of a monkey embryo with a human embryo. His frauds were exposed by his associate scientists in his own laboratories. He admitted this trickery. But still evolutionists use his books! The theory of recapitulation is now repudiated by the best scientists. Dr. William E. Bateson says it has disappointed them and they can not rely upon it. Even the atheist, Carl Vogt, said: It has been laid down as a fundamental law of biogenesis that the development of the individual and the development of the race must exactly correspond.....This law, which I long held as well founded, is absolutely and radically false. Attentive study of embryology shows us, in fact, the embryos have their own conditions suitable to themselves, very different from those of adults.— (Quoted on page 194), “The Old Riddle and the Newest Answer.”

“Absolutely and radically false!” That is strong enough for any of us, and that is not from a preacher, but from a scientist, a very ardent evolutionist and an atheist. With that we may dismiss embryology. When you hear men making arguments on that you may know they have been influenced by Haeckel’s frauds.

VESTIGIAL ORGANS. Evolutionists tell us that we have ii* our bodies vestiges of organs that we once used in a former stage of our existence, but which now are useless—only vestiges and on the way to be eliminated. I think they say we have about 188 such organs. The vermiform appendix is the remains of a stomach that we used when we were wood eating animals. The tonsils are the remains of gills, the pineal gland an eye, the coccyx a tail, etc. They say you have behind your ears and attached to the ears, muscles which are dormant now, but which you used to wiggle your ears when you were a mule.

If you will notice the hair on a man’s arm you will see that the hair on the upper arm slopes from the shoulder toward the elbow, and that on the lower arm slopes from the wrist toward the elbow. Do you know what caused that? Evolutionists can explain it. They sav that when we were in the ape stage of our develop- gpftt sitting on th£ limb of a tree in the rain, we clasped our hands upon our heads to protect ourselves from the hard rain. *he water, of course, xan down the forearm and off at the elbow. Likewise it ran down from the shoulder and off at the elbow. That started the hair to growing toward the elbow on both sections of the arm. (Laughter.) Don’t laugh at that, my friends, that is science (?) ! That is one of the proofs of man’s monkey origin. An evolutionist told me not long ago that no intelligent evolutionist ever made that argument. Well, I got that from Henry Drummond’s book, “The Ascent of Man,” and from the chapter called, “The Scaffolding Left in the Body.” I call Henry Drummond an intelligent man. The only evidence against him is that he was an evolutionist. As to these so-called vestigial organs: Do you know that evolutionists once

claimed that the thyroid glands were vestigial? You have right up in the top of your head a little gland that is called the pineal gland. Evolutionists say this is the remains of an eye, now useless, and might as well be cut out. But the scientists have now discovered that it is vital to growth and development. They could cut it out of a child's head and the child would live, but it would be a dwarf—its mind would not clevelope. Now suppose some evolutionist had cut out your pineal gland! Some of them must have had theirs extracted in infancy. (Laughter.)

Furthermore, we know that the male of the genus homo—even Homo sapiens—has vestiges of the mammary glands. At what stage of his evolution did man suckle the young? May be you think these proofs (?) conclusive. If so, we say, "If Baal be God, serve Baal."

EXPERIMENTS OF BREEDERS. Evolutionists tell us that the fact that breeders can by carefully selecting the type of animal desired and by breeding for that type, finally produce it, proves the theory of natural selection, which is the foundation of. evolution. That breeders can do that, we all admit. Thus they produce beef cattle and milk cattle; the race horse and the draft horse. But this is artificial selection. This selecting is done by man and he carefully chooses the animals he mates and keeps them fenced away from others. If these animals were left to their own choice, would they thus mate and keep the breeds distinct? That is what natural selection requires. But while man may do wonders in developing certain characteristics by selective breeding, he can never breed a cow into a horse, or a sheep into a hog. He can not change the species or produce a new one. Yet evolution says that natural selection produced all the millions of species. That animals unaided so mated as to produce new types! Do you think artificial selection proves natural selection?

V. The failure of evolution to account for (1) the origin of matter, (2) the origin of the earth, (3) the origin of life, (4) the origin of species, and (5) the development of the organs of the body.

(1) Evolution does not tell us where matter originated. Cosmic evolution attempts to tell us that the earth was formed by a collection of particles of existing matter, or by the transfer of stellar substances from one place to another, according to the laws of physics. But it does not tell where this existing matter—these stellar substances, come from. It assumes the existence of matter before it can start.

(2) As to how the earth came into existence there is no agreement among scientists. The solar system is here with all its glories and wonders. The philosopher,. Kant, said that the two great wonders of human experience are "the starry heavens above and the moral law within," and he speculated about both these wonders. But in 1796 Laplace published certain tentative suggestions which became widely known as the Nebular Hypothesis. According to J. Arthur Thompson, "He did not himself take it too seriously, for he speaks of his suggestions as 'Conjectures which I present with all the distrust which everything which is not the result of observation or calculation ought to inspire.'" The gist of this theory was that the solar system arose by a rotational break-up of a great nebula. But now scientists have what they call The Tidal Theory. This holds That a tide or a commotion was caused on the sun by a passing star and the planets were thrown off from the sun during this commotion. Then there is another theory, different from these. Dr. D. H. Jeans, in his article on "Cosmogony" in Encyclopedia Britannica, says that the time has pot yet come when we can draw definite conclusion in Cosmogony. We do not know where or how the earth originated according to science. (But we Christians, can understand by faith that the worlds were formed by

the word of God. (Hebrews 11:1-4.)

(3) The Origin of Life. After assuming the existence of matter and asserting that this matter in some unknown way got together and formed the earth, evolu- itonists can not tell how life came up on the earth. They all have to admit this. J. Arthur Thompson says: Therefore it follows that at some uncertain, but inconceivable distant date, living creatures appeared upon the earth. No one knows how, but it is interesting to consider possibilities.....Science must often say “Ignoramus”: Science should be slow to say “Ignorabimus.”—(Gospel of Evolution, page 45.)

Then to keep from saying ignorahimus—we will continue to be ignorant—he speculates on possibilities. And his possibilities leave out the Creator. Special creation is not among possibilities with evolutionists. They claim that the blind forces of nature operating upon inorganic matter turned it into organic and then turned the organic unto vital or living. If the blind forces of nature did this once they have never done it again, hence it was a miracle. The forces of nature are destructive. They will turn organic matter into inorganic, but not the reverse. Here stands a fine young man with a perfect physique. Shoot a few thousand volts of electricity through him and he is dead. Here lies a perfect body; the organs are all there intact—a wonderful machine already created. Now leave it untouched and let the forces of nature operate. Will these forces that once formed a body out of inorganic matter and then put life into it now put life back into this organism that already exists? No, they will not, but they will begin at once to disintegrate and destroy that body—to turn it into inorganic matter. Do you believe that these forces ever did reverse themselves—that natural law turned unnatural for once and performed a special act of special creation? Why not rather believe that Jehovah did the creating and then set these natural laws to work?

(4) The Origin of Species. We have on earth today something like three million distinct species of animal life. Evolution claims that all species came from a common ancestor and evolved according to natural law into these different branches. Yet natural law makes it impossible to cross or blend these spedes and keep up the result. Nature will stop the process with the first hybrid —the mule is an example. He is a cross between the horse and the ass—related species belonging to the same genera—but he is sterile. He will not reproduce himself. There is no way known to scientists to start a new species. How then did the existing species grow from one into another? From the original one into the millions, as evolution demands? Evolutionists can never answer this. We have already quoted Dr. Thomas Hunt Morgan and Dr. William Ethridge on this point. They say there is no evidence that one species ever changed into another one. Even Darwin himself, after trying to tell us about the origin of species, said If we descend to details we can not prove that a single species has changed. In Dr. Vernon Kellogg’s “Darwinism of Today,” p. 18, we find these words: Speaking by and large we only tell the general truth when we declare that no indubitable cases of species—forming or transforming, that is of descent, have been observed; and that no recognized cases of natural selection really selecting have been observed.

Then, after discussing some few freaks or exceptions which radicals cite as cases, and showing that they do not prove the point, he says: For my part it seems better to go back to the old and safe ignoramus standpoint.— (Quoted in God or Gorilla, p. 2.) Yes, “it is better to be safe than sorry.”

Evolution can never even claim to be science till it can show the transmutation of species. It is only philosophical speculation.

(5) Evolution can not tell how the organs of the body developed. They tell us that the organs change from one form into another—the gills into lungs for instance—by modification to meet conditions—existing organs gradually changing. But they can not tell how the original organs developed. We naturally wonder how our distant ancestors pro-created before the organs of pro-creation developed or while they were in rudi-mentary and non-usable form! Also, what environment brought out these organs? If pro-creation was carried on without them what was the need for them? These may be ignoramus questions, but if we wait for evolutionists to answer them we would as well say ignorabimus, right now.

Scientists have now repudiated the doctrine that held that acquired characters are transmitted to the offspring; and that leaves them absolutely without any explanation as to how the organs of the body developed. Also without any explanation as to the method or causes of evolution. They used to teach, following I.amarck, that the organs began in the smallest way in one generation, because of some use to which these symptoms of an organ —these potential organs then existing only the prophecy of a pigment—were put. Hence these rudiments of organs were passed on to the next generation and were used by it and therefore developed a little further, but still very imperfect and rudimetary, they descended to the next generation to be used and further developed. Thus after some millions of generations an organ—say a leg or an arm or an eye—was perfected. Each generation inheriting the little growth and dexterity acquired by the preceding generation. But now scientists know that what one generation acquires can not be passed on to the next.

Dr. Winterton C. Curtis says (Science and Human Affairs, p. 170): Of late years the failure to obtain conclusive evidence for the inheritance of characters acquired by the individual has told heavily against the theory. [Lamarckian Theory—Brewer.] It would seem that if such inheritance occurs we should by now have secured experimental proof. Convincing proofs have not been forthcoming. The majority of biologists, therefore, regard the Lamarckian Theory as distinctly not proved. Many go so far as to believe there is small chance of its ever being proved.

Therefore this gradual development is not accounted for—could not have taken place unless one generaticn could inherit the advantage gained by the preceding one. Then complete perfection must have been attained in one generation. But if attained or acquired it could not have been transmitted to the next generation. How then did a one-cell, organless, structureless animal develop into an animal with perfect organs? How did t develop into millions of different animals with divergent organs, many and multiplex?

Verily this theory that is put forth as’an explanation of the whole riddle of the universe has some enigmas of its own!

If one species will not pass from one into another one, then these species must always have been distinct and did not emerge from a common ancestor and change gradually from one to another until millions of species— unrelated and uncrossable--were produced. If they did not do this then they started separate and distinct, and evolution is not true. The Bible teaches that they were created separate, and each divinely ordained to bring forth after its kind. That law still prevails and all that scientists have learned confirms and establishes it.

If acquired characters are not transmitted to offspring then one generation could not profit by any development attained by a preceding generation; therefore man could not have gradually

developed through a long series of evolving generations, but must have sprung fully developed into existence. The Bible teaches that he was made by an intelligent Creator in that Creator's image. Evolution denies this, but can not even begin to tell how man came. It offers only a fabric of wild and untenable speculations. Are you willing to give up God, Christ and the Bible; your refuge in the pavilion of prayer and your hope of heaven to follow this "will o' the wisp" through the slime and ooze of pre-historic darkness, only to pitch headlong at last over a precipice into oblivion ?

Choose you this day whom you will serve. But as for me and my house, we will serve God. I thank you,

(Applause.)

LITERATURE I am more or less indebted to all the following books for the arguments, pro and con, of this lecture: FOR EVOLUTION "Origin of Species," by Charles Darwin.

"The Descent of Man," by Charles Darwin.

"The Voyage of the Beagle," by Charles Darwin.

"Science in Human Affairs," by W. C. Curtis.

"Evolution of Today," by H. W. Conn.

"The Primary Factors of Evolution," by E. D. Cope.

"Men of the Old Stone Age," by H. F. Osborne.

"The Earth Speaks to Bryan," by H. F. Osobrne.

"The Ascent of Man," by Henry Drummond.

"Science Remaking the World," by Caldwell and Slos- son.

"From the Unconscious to the Conscious," by Gustave Geley.

"Landmarks in the Struggle Between Science and Religion," by J. Y. Simpson.

"Evolution and Creation," by Sir Oliver Lodge.

"The Mind in the Making," by J. H. Robinson.

"Science and Religion," by J. Arthur Thompson.

"The Gospel of Evolution," by J. Arthur Thompson.

"The Outline of Science," Edited by J. Arthur Thompson.

"Darwin," by Gamaliel Bradford.

"Nineteenth Century Evolution and After," by Marshall Dawson.

(This author tries to harmonize the Bible and Evolution. He emasculates both, but does some fine moralizing.) AGAINST EVOLUTION "Pro Fide," by Charles Harris.

"Organic Evolution Considered," by Alfred Fairhurst.

“Theistic Evolution,” by Alfred Fairhurst.

“The Problem of Human Life Here and Hereafter,” by A. Wilford Hall.

“Debates on Evolution,” Baker-Nichol Shipley.

“The Phantom of Organic Evolution,” by George Mc- Cready Price.

“The Predicament of Evolution,” by George McCready Price.

“I. E. D.,” by George McCready Price.

“The Case Against Evolution,” by George Barry O’Toole.

“God—or Gorilla,” by A. W. McCann.

“Evolution at the Bar,” by Philip Mauro.

“The Divine Demonstration,” by H. W. Everest.

“The Bible Versus Theories of Evolution,” Edited by E. A. Elam.

“Evolution and the Supernatural,” by H. W. Griffith Thomas.

“Beyond the Natural Order,” by Nolan Rice Best.

00A.05 CHAPTER II.—Christ the Gift of God's Love

CHAPTER II.

CHRIST, THE GIFT OF GOD'S LOVE The subject for our sermon tonight nas been announced as "Christ, The Gift of God's Love." Of course any one of you could now name the text. The text for this sermon is perhaps the besit known passage in all the Bible. It has been called the "Golden Text" of the Bible. It is one passage that the people remember—remember the wording and also the reference. When you say John three sixteen everybody knows what that verse is. When you say "God so loved the world," everybody says John three sixteen.

Many years ago I was walking through a cinder- paved side street of the industrial district of the City of Chattanooga, Tennessee, having been sent by the church to carry relief in the name of the Lord to a suffering family, when I was arrested by the voice of a singer in a smoky hut beside the way. That voice would have told any Southern ear that the singer was a Negress, but the voice was mellow and full of melody-—there was a soul in the song. Perhaps the music was not classic, but the song was a spiritual and the refrain ran like this:

Jesus loves me, How do I know it?

John three sixteen Will show it. As I went on my way I repeated over and over again, John three sixteen, and I thought of the comfort and joy that that passage has brought to the millions of earth's toilers. Here it has gone into the hut of poverty and caused a poor slave girl to sing, as she toils, with a note divine. But in order to fully appreciate the text we must read also the context. It is a gem in rare setting. Let us read now John 3:14-17. And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilder derness. even so must the Son of Man be lifted up; that whosoever believest may in him have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he grave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God sent not his Son into the world to judge the world; but that the world should be saved through him.

There may be other passages in the Bible that are more beautiful than this from a standpoint of rhetoric— passages more poetic and ornate—hut there is no passage more sublime in its import. No passage could possibly be more comprehensive. The whole gospel story is told in these few words. In fact in is all included in one word and that a word of one syllable. A word spelled with four letters—I-o-v-e. God loved the world. God so loved the world—loved the world to the extent that he gave his Son—his only begotten Son—to redeem the world. What was wrong with the world that God had to pay such a price for its redemption? It was perishing —and in order that it might not perish God gave his Son that whosoever"—not that the whole world, unconditionally, might be saved—"believeth on him should not perish." In this text then we see on the one side, God, a loving God, a giving God; and on the other side a world, a perishing world, a receiving world.

Satan has made man believe that God hates man and wants to damn him. In fact, sinful man sees God as a monster who lurks behind the shadows and looks out upon man like a beast of prey and

longs for an opportunity to pounce upon him and rend him limb from limb. Or to seize man by the neck and sling him off into an eternal hell and then forever gloat like a fiend over man's miseries. A more distorted view of God than that would not be possible. And Satan never perpetrated a greater deception on the human family than when he succeeded in painting that picture of God on the hearts of men. The Bible pictures God to us as a kind, compassionate, loving Father, who is not willing that any should perish, but who desires that all should come to repentance. In order to induce men to come to repentance he has manifested his love to men. The Old Testament is full of assurances to man that God loves him and wants to save him from sin and its consequent suffering. He appeared to Moses thus: And Jehovah passed by before him, and proclaimed, Jehovah, Jehovah, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abundant in lovingkindness and truth; keeping loving kindness for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin; and that will by no means clear the guilty.(Exodus 34:6-7.) And David said:

He made known his ways unto Moses. His doings unto the children of Israel.

Jehovah is merciful and gracious.

Slow to anger, and abundant in lovingkindness.

He will not always chide;

Neither will he keep his anger for ever.

He hath not dealt with us after our sins, Nor rewarded us after our iniquities. For as the heavens are high above the earth, So great is his lovingkindness toward them that fear him. As far as the east is from the west, So fir hath he removed our transgressions from us.

Like as a father pitieth his children, So Jehovah pitieth them that fear him. For he knoweth our frame;

He remembereth that we are dust.

(Psalms 103:7-14.)

Again: For thou Lord, art good, and ready to forgive. And abundant in lovingkindness unto all them that call upon thee. (Psalms 86:5.) And again:

O Israel, hope in Jehovah; For with Jehovah there is lovingkindness, And with him is plenteous redemption.

(Psalms 130:1-8; Psalms 7:1-17) But it is in the New Testament that God's redeeming love is fully revealed. It is there that we have the concrete example of his love. It is there that the Gift of His Love is Given. And we can not over-emphasize his love. We need to tell of it more in our preaching. We need to stress it—to make it the central point around which all other points revolve. The doctrine of God's redeeming grace and infinite love is the basic truth upon which all other doctrine must rest. All other doctrine without this fundamental and vital truth is but chaff. And to preach doctrine to men without basing it upon this primal principle is to feed the hungry souls of men upon husks. And if men should be convinced of the truth of your doctrine and led to espouse it without being moved by the love of God, they would not be converted to Christ; they would not be Christians. They would be ranting dogmatists, bitter partisans, zealous propagandists, ready to

contend for their doctrine, to quibble over a trifle and two-fold more the children of hell than the preacher who preached “the truth” but left out the one essential element of the gospel that makes it gospel. A preacher once preached two or three sermons on the love of God and of his gracious provisions for man’s salvation when a brother approached him and asked: “When are you going ito begin to preach the gospel?”

He meant, of course, when was the preacher going to preach on the things man must do to be saved—faith, repentance and baptism. He wanted the preacher to prove that he—the brother—was right in his claims, and that his neighbors were all wrong. Simply a partisan desire to establish his creed. May the Lord have mercy on such brethren.

Paul declares that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation. (Romans 1:16.) The Greek word for power in that passage is dunhnis. The word from which we get dynamic, dynamo, dynamite, etc. The gospel is the power—the dynamite of God unto salvation. It is that which moves men. It is the mighty magnet that draws men to Christ. Will a credal statement draw men unto God? Will the preaching of duties move men? Will the preaching of laws or commandments as the arbitrary enactments of a tyrannical Master make men love God? No, neither will it make men love each other. But are not commandments and laws included in the gospel? Does not the gospel have conditions with which men must comply in order to be saved ? Yes, but this obedience must come as a result of hearing and believing the sweet old story of Jesus and his love. The word gospel means ‘‘good news” or “glad tidings.” In what does the good news consist? Is it not, beloved, in the fact that man was lost, perishing, without God and without hope, and that God saw him “plunged in deep distress” and loved him to the extent that he sent Jesus to the earth and to the cross to redeem man? That is the gospel—the power that attracts men. Jesus said: And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself. But this he said signifying by what manner of death he should die.

Therefore we must preach Christ lifted up on the cross—dying, the innocent for the guilty—dying that we might live—if we would preach the gospel. The Apostle Paul said: Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance an longsuffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? And the Apostle John said:

Herein was the love of God manifested in us, that God hath sent his only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.....We love, because he first loved us.(1 John 4:9-10; 1 John 4:19.)

You have seen a little blade of grass crushed down beneath the rubbish or debris of a fallen building, and you noticed that it was pale, colorless and feeble. But if you watch that little blade you will see it creep along on the ground for some inches until it reaches a crevice and then it will lift its head from the ground, turn upward and creep out through that crevice. Then once outside it takes on life and color—it becomes verdant and vigorous. What was it that caused that grass blade to creep toward that crevice? What enabled it to lift itself up from the ground and come out through that small opening? Of course you will say it was the light. The sun ray attracted that little grass blade and drew it through the crevice. Responding to the kiss of the genial sun ray it lifted itself up from the earth, came out in the open and took on life and color and beauty.

Just so does God draw the sinner unto himself. When the souls of men are crushed down beneath the weight of sin and the fear of death and the genial ray of the Sun of Righteousness falls in tender kisses upon them they leap up in response and are filled with the health and life divine. In order to make men love him God manifested his love toward men. That is the gospel—the power of God to move men. But when we speak of the love of God, how shall we adequately declare it? By what shall we illustrate it, or to what shall we compare it? We may think of the love of Damon and Pythias—the man who gave his life for his friend. But Christ gave 'his life for his enemies. We may think of mother love—and surely there is no tie, no sentiment known to man that is sweeter than mother love. Nothing among the experiences of men has the appeal to the nobler side of man's nature than stories of mother love have. We like to think of the swan mother that plucks the feathers from her own breast to line the nest for her young. We like to think of the eagle mother that builds her nest aloft in the crags of the mountain peaks, and when the forest fires begin to sweep up the side of the mountain -and the smoke forming garlands of purple in the golden sunlight announces that danger is near, she soars away and franticly endeavors to induce her young ones to follow her. But when the young can not follow and when smoke has enveloped the nest and the greedy blazes are leaping nearer, the mother comes hack and, spreads her wings over her nest and burns to death with her birdlings. But mother love reaches its climax in the human mother's bosom. We have heard often of the toil and sorrow, the sacrifice and suffering that the mothers of men must endure for their young. They frequently give their lives that a new life may exist. But where they give only of their strength for the new being they care for that being through the helpless days of babyhood and they follow him on through the ungrateful days of youth and often they follow him through crime and shame to a disgraceful death. Still loving him, owning him and desiring to shield and protect and to suffer for him. All of us can recall stories of such mother love— all of us are the beneficiaries of such self-denial, of such sacrifice and suffering. But could we concentrate all mother love into one mammoth mother love it would not be comparable to the infinite love of our heavenly Father. Isaiah says, speaking for God: Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, these may forget, yet I will not forget thee. Where then shall we find an illustration of God's love? How shall we express it? Poets have sung of the Father's love and goodness, but when we analyze their poetry we find that they have simply said they were unable to tell of this wonderful love. They have not expressed it; Lhey have just expressed their inability to express it. Whittier said:

Yet, in the maddening maze of things, And tossed by storm and flood, To one fixed stake my spirit clings:

I know that God is good! And so beside the Silent Sea I wait with muffled oar; No harm from Him can come to me On ocean or on shore.

I know not where his islands lift Their fronded palms in air;

I only know I can not drift Beyond his love and care.

Some other poet has said: Could I with ink the ocean fill— Were the earth of parchment made, And every blade of grass a quill And every man a scribe by trade, To write the love of God above Would drain the ocean dry, And the scroll would not contain the whole, Though it stretch from sky to sky. The only way we can find God's love adequately expressed is to lake God's own

expression of it. There are two things at least that man can not measure or fix with metes and bounds. These are God's love and man's sin. But we get an idea of both when we see what God did to save man from sin. We can not know the demerit of one sin and who shall presume to say what is the just desert of a life of sin. If sin was not terrible, and its consequences beyond all reckoning, God would not have paid the price he did pay to save man from sin, the gospel would not be good news and Christ as a gift from God to die for men would be an absurdity. Yea, it would be a crime. The gospel is painted on a black background—-a background of despair—and unless that background is seen the gospel loses its beauty and meaning. When we see man lost and ruined, hopeless and helpless, groping in darkness and groveling in iniquity; held in the slimy coils of the serpent of sin, and utterly unable to extricate himself, then are we able to appreciate the divine interposition. In all matters pertaining to the spirit or the spirit world man was but— A babe crying in the night, A babe crying for the light And with no language but a cry.

God heard man's wailing cry and resolved to redeem him. But as God looked out over his vast dominions to select a sacrifice for man's sin, where did he find one that was sufficient? Not all the lambs that had died upon Israel's altars—not all the bleeding sacrifices that had been offered upon the hills of Zion—could expiate one sin or save one sinner! Not all the wealth of all the world could purchase the salvation of one soul. Then what sacrifice was made? God robbed heaven of its richest jewel. He plucked the fairest flower that blossomed in the paradise of God. He sent Jesus, his well beloved Son--the darling of his bosom—from the land of light and life and love to the world of darkness and death and hate to be born of a woman, to live in the flesh and to die on the cross. He was born in poverty, lived in suffering and died in shame, all for us!

We do not see the full test and strength of God's love until we come to the dark hour of the cross. The night that Jesus was betrayed we follow him from the upper room^ across the brook Kidron and unto the garden of Gethsemane. The shadow of the cross was upon him and his soul was exceeding sorrowful, even unto death. He knew his hour had come and that soon the mob would be coming out to take him and lift him up on the cross in a horrible death. His spirit was willing but the flesh was weak. It felt the agony that awaited it and was almost ready to succumb beneath its burden. Jesus stationed his disciples as sentinels on the way. Eight were left in one place and a little further on the three faithful and trusted companions of the Savior were set to watch for the coming mob. With these two companies of men on guard duty the Savior went on to where he was alone and threw himself upon the ground and prayed earnestly to the Father that he might, if possible, be spared this ordeal—that the cup might be re-moved. But always said "not my will but thy will be done." Then he arose and went back to, his three disciples, nervous and agitated, and found them sleeping. He was no doubt sorely distressed and disappointed to find even Peter sleeping. He rebuked them and commanded them to watch. He then ran back to his place of prayer and falling upon his face in the dust of the earth he again prayed, "My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt."

Three times Jesus prayed this prayer and his agony was so great that not only the sweat poured from his face, but the blood exuded through the skin and dripped to the ground. Why did not God hear that cry of his Son and remove the cup?

I once had a discussion with a man who said that all men will be saved. He said God would nqt allow men to suffer after death. He became excited over the thought of hell and challenged me to

say if any earthly father would for any conceivable crime permit his child to suffer such punishment. In answer to this challenge I drew before that audience the picture we have before us hereof Christ in Gethsemane and asked my opponent if any earthly father could have refused to come to his child in such a situation. I said: “Suppose we see a great general standing here erect and in uniform, with the insignia of his rank upon his shoulders. His little child is playing at his feet. Back of him and stretching away to the right and the left are great columns of his soldiers—thousands of men armed and standing at attention, ready ’to move at the word from the general. And we see a fiend sieze this child with the purpose of rending it limb from limb. We see the little child as it looks to its father with trembling lips and tearful eyes and appeals for help. We see the ’little white, dimpled outstretched arms appealing to the father. But the father does not move. He does not utter a word. He witnesses the murder of his child, he hears its death cry, he sees its body dismembered and mangled and never moves. Could any human being do it?

Then what shall we say for God? Why did he not hear the bitter death cries of his Son—His Holy Child Jesus? Has his heart petrified into stone or ossified into bone ?

Ah, no, God heard that cry and his heart was moved. If I may be permitted to describe God with the parts and emotions of a human being—if you will pardon the anthropomorphisms—I will give you the picture of this part of the scene. That wailing cry from Gethsemane went up to heaven and the angels ceased their singing and stood at attention I see them looking to the Father and expecting his command. I see the Father seated on the throne of the universe and surrounded by angels and archangels. He hears the cry and looks down upon the prostrate form of his Holy Child in the dust of his foot stool. I see the great Father’s bosom as it begins to rise and fall with emotion. I see the great chin quivering and the tears as they begin to course down the cheek. Surely the Father will remove that cup! He looks again and sees that infuriated and senseless mob creeping stealthily up the hill like a hungry beast, stalking its prey. That cry of anguish again pierces the heavens and the angels weep. Will the Father now save the Son? The Father looks again and there arises before him another scene. He looks down over the ages and sees the teeming and toiling millions of men as they stagger across the stage of life neath their burdens of sin. He hears them crying for mercy. He sees them standing by the open tomb with broken and bleeding hearts, yearn ing for light. He saw me and he saw you with our eyes swollen with weeping and souls stained with • sin. He saw us all traveling toward the brink of eternal woe, and he loved us, blessed be his name; he loved us so that he redeemed us. I see him dispatch an angel to the earth with this message:

“My Son, it is not possible. If you do not drink this cup then all my poor children of earth are lost forever.” Then the angel ministered unto him, gave ’him strength and removed his fear. “He was heard in that he feared” (Hebrews 5:7-9).

Then the Son arose and went back to his disciples, no longer nervous and agitated, but calm and resigned. He did not rebuke his disciples now, but told them to sleep on and take their rest, But immediately he saw the mob coming and he said: “Arise, let us be going: behold, he is at hand that betrayeth me.”

Jesus met the mob fearlessly and meekly surrendered to them without resistance, fully knowing what awaited him, but resigned to drink the cup to its bitterest dregs. They dragged him through the streets of Jerusalem in the night hours and brought him before Annas and then before

Caiaphas. At early dawn they brought him before the Sanhedrin. There they falsely accused him and bribed witnesses to swear against him. But even then they could find nothing on which they could convict him, until they forced him to say that he was the Son of God, and then they sentenced him to death for blasphemy.

They rushed away to the Roman governor to get him to sign the death warrant. Pilate tried Christ and found him innocent, hut fearing to release him, he sent him to Herod. Herod mocked him and sent him back to Pilate. Pilate finally yielded to the clamor for his blood and delivered him up to be crucified.

They nailed him to the cross and there he hung by the bruised and bleeding tendons of the quivering flesh, dying for you and me. The sun was veiled in darkness and the earth, shrouded in gloom, quaked and trembled upon her axis. Finally Jesus chied with a loud voice and 'bowed his weary head upon his guiless bosom and gave the spirit into the hands of the Father. By the grace of God he tasted death for every man. (Hebrews 2:9.) But they took his body from the cross limp and lifeless and laid it in the rock-hewn sepulchre of Joseph of Arimathea, where he slumbered in the solemn silence of death for three days, hut early upon the first day of the week, as the sun was breaking over the horizon, the Sun of Righteousness burst through the gloom of the grave and came forth with healing in his beams to flood and fill the earth with light divine. He had abolished death and dispelled the shadows that surround the tomb and given us a view of the "land of pure delight" over beyond death's turbid floods.

He was now prepared to be the Savior of men and he sent salvation unto every creature in all the earth upon simple and easy terms. My friend, if you have never accepted this salvation thus provided for you upon the terms on which our Savior offered it to you, you are still lost and perishing —exposed to eternal danger. If the whole world was perishing without Christ, then those of the world who are still without Christ are, of course, still perishing. If you could 'be saved without him, then Christ died in vain—and surely God should have removed the cup. The choice is now yours. Will you be one of the whosoever will or one of the whosoever will not come unto the Cord ? Have you no place in your heart's affection for a Savior like this? Can you look with indifference on the suffering Son of God, as he hangs bleeding and dying on the cross for you? God loves you. Jesus died for you. Angels are concerned for you. Can you, the one most interested, be indifferent and unconcerned? The sun refused to shine upon the crucifixion of Jesus, can you look upon it without a blush? The earth trembled when the Savior died, and can you contemplate it without a tremor? The solid rocks were shivered, can your heart remain unbroken?

See from His head. His hands. His feet, Sorrow and love flow mingled down; Did e'er such love and sorrow meet, Or thorns compose so rich a crown? Were the whole realm of nature mine, That were a present far too small;

Love so amazing, so divine, Demands my soul, my life, my all.

Amen and Amen.

00A.06 CHAPTER III.—Christ in Prophecy.

CHAPTER III CHRIST IN PROPHECY As a Scripture reading for the sermon tonight you will please give heed to John 5:30-47. I shall read all the remaining part of the chapter. (Speaker reads from memory.)

I can of myself do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is righteous; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true. It is another that beareth witness of me; and I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true. Ye have sent unto John, and he hath borne witness unto the truth. But the witness which I receive is not from man: howbeit I say these things, that ye may be saved. He was the lamp that burneth and shineth; and ye were willing to rejoice of a season in his light. But the witness which I have is greater than that of John; for the works which the Father hath given me to accomplish, the very works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me. And the Father that sent me, he hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his form. And ye have not his word abiding in you: for whom he sent, him ye believe not. Ye search the scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me; am. ye will not come to me, that ye may have life. I receive not glory from men. But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in yourselves. I am come in my Father’s name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive. How can ye believe, who receive glory one of another, and the glory that cometh from ;he only God ye seek not? Think not that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, on whom ye have set your hope. For if ye believed Moses, ye would believe me; for be wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words? This is- the language of our Lord addressed to the unbelieving Jews. He here presents four witnesses upon whose testimony he rests his claim to be divine. He did not ask them to accept his own testimony or to believe his claim upon his unsupported word. There was plenty of evidence if they would but consider it. The four witnesses that he here introduces are (1) John the Baptist (2) the works which he (Jesus) did, (3) the Father and (4) the Scriptures. It would be very interesting, as well as profitable to hear the testimony of all of these witnesses tonight, but our time will permit us to hear only one witness testify on this occasion. And I have chosen the fourth. Let us examine this witness.

TUB SCRIP TURPS. This means, of course, the Old Testament Scriptures. The New Testament had not then been written—not a word of it. These Scriptures were what are sometimes called the Jewish Scriptures, though these Scriptures are for all men indirectly which will be. shown by the lessons of this sermon. But they were Scriptures that these Jews searched and in which they thought they had eternal life; Scriptures, some of which had been written by Moses, the head of the Jewish church and the Mediator of their covenant. “If you had believed Moses, you would believe me:; for Moses wrote of me,” said Jesus. All the Old Testament Scriptures bore witness of Christ, and Christ repeatedly and boldly made this claim and declared that he would fulfill “all that was written in the law of Moses, in the prophets and in the psalms” concerning him. You remember the many passages, no doubt, in which this claim is made in such language as: “It is

written of the Son of Man that he must suffer many things." "The Son of Man goeth as it is written of him." "All things written by the prophets concerning the Son of Man shall be accomplished." "Then said he unto them, O, fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself."

Consider now how wonderful and how daring this claim is. The Jews knew that their Scriptures promised them a Messiah and they well knew from what tribe he was to descend. They knew that the time and the place of his birth were foretold. They knew what his character was to be and that he was to be a king and reign in righteousness. They could have known at least something of the nature of his kingdom and that the Gentiles were to be embraced in it, had they not been blinded by a false interpretation of their prophecies. They read and searched these Scriptures, copied them, quoted them, argued about them and earnestly hoped to attain unto the promise made of God unto their fathers. They were looking for their Messiah and each succeeding generation for centuries had hope that he would appear in its day. They were ready to examine the claims of any contender and to measure him by their Scriptures and to challenge each other to search and see if a prophet was to come out of Galilee, And Jesus boldly claimed to fulfill all the requirements of all these Scriptures and they were not able to refute his claim! They exhausted their resources and all the devices that their wicked scheming could conjure in an effort to get an accusation against Christ, but not once did they point out a prediction of their Scriptures that he did not fulfil. Had they done this they would have proved him an impostor and his claims would have been so ingloriously defeated that they would have been laughed out of the minds of men before that generation had gone from the earth. Why did they not do this? Is it necessary to say that the only reason they did not was because they could not? The apostles made this same claim for Christ even after his crucifixion and resurrection. They fearlessly accused the Jews of fulfilling their Scriptures in killing Christ. They charged upon these rulers and doctors of the law that they had crucified their long looked for Messiah—the one who was promised and described in their prophecies. They "powerfully confuted the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ." They always took their texts in the Old Testament Scriptures and then added their own personal testimony to the fact that these Scriptures had been fulfilled before their eyes—the eyes of all that generation of Jews. Peter quoted David and Joel on the day of Pentecost. Philip took a text in Isaiah and began "at the same Scripture and preached unto him Jesus." Paul went into the synagogue and "reasoned with them from the Scriptures, opening and alleging that it behooved the Christ to suffer, and to rise agaiii from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom, said he, I proclaim unto you, is the Christ."

These Jews knew their Scriptures, and if Jesus were not the Christ it certainly should have been easy for them to answer the apostles. One prophecy concerning the Christ that was not fulfilled in Jesus would have been sufficient. That would have overwhelmed the apostles in disaster. But no such Scripture was ever adduced jind the learned Jews for two thousand years have had ,to suffer the embarrassment of facing the charge that they rejected the testimony of their own Scriptures and killed their Messiah—the world's Redeemer. The only rational conclusion from all this is that in Jesus all the predictions and promises of the Scriptures found accurate fulfillment. His claim in this respect must be true. But if this claim is admitted then we are also forced to the conclusion that

Jesus was divine. No mere human being could search out all the prophecies concerning Christ and then so shape his own life as to fulfill them. Many pf these prophecies were concerning the birth and death of Christ and over neither of those events did he exercise any control. An impostor could not have made his birth, life and death match these Scriptures so accurately .that no detail could be pointed to as missing or out of place. That would have been impossible, as all must admit. Therefore Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah of Jewish hope, the Son of God and the Savior of the world.

Why do not the atheists, the infidels and the skeptics of our day consider the arguments made on the prophecies in favor of the divinity of Christ? Why do they not point to some prediction that was not fulfilled? Why do the college students and the younger atheists who imagine that they have superior intellects, who boast of using their reasoning powers and laugh at the gullibility of Christians, not turn their reasoning faculties to work on this argument and expose its fallacy? The fact is that these young upstarts do not know that such an argument exists! They never heard of a prophecy and its fulfillment. As between Christianity and atheism they never heard but one side and they don't even know the strength and weakness of that side. If they will study the evidence in favor of the existence of God, of the divinity of Christ and the inspiration of the Bible, they will find that it is far more rational to believe than not to believe. It is far easier to believe that Christ is the Son of God than to believe that a peasant of Galilee could have done and said the things that Jesus did and said: could have influenced the whole world for two thousand years, as Jesus has. In order that we may see the meaning and strength .of the argument from the Scriptures referred to in the ,text, let us notice now a few prophecies and their fulfillment. This is a great field of study and in this sermon I can do but little more than show you its beauties and possibilities. You may continue the study indefinitely.

1. First, you remember that Jesus said that Moses wrote of him. What did Moses say concerning Christ? Here is one statement:

Jehovah thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken; according to all that thou desirest of Jehovah thy God in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of Jehovah my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not. And Jehovah said unto me, They have well said that which they have spoken. I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee; and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. (Deuteronomy 18:15-18.)

Peter applies this prophecy to Christ in Acts 3:22-24. If Jesus was not like unto Moses the Jews could have pointed out the difference—if the difference was such as to vitiate the claim. But that is not the only way in which Moses wrote Of Christ. The whole law of Moses was temporary and symbolic. It contained many types of Christ. He was fore-shadowed in the sacrifices of the law. Paul said, "For the law having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of things" could never make the comers thereto perfect. "For it was impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin." Their sins were remembered again every year. But he declares that when sins are removed by the blood of Christ they are remembered no more forever. Therefore the "good things" to come were the blessings of salvation in Christ Again in Colossians 2:16 he says;

Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast day or a new moon or a sabbath day: which are a shadow of the things to come; but the body is Christ's. A shadow passed down over the generations and told of an approaching substance or body. That body was Christ. The ceremonies and sacrifices of the law of Moses constituted that shadow.

2. But to descend to details let us notice that the Scriptures had foretold the tribe out of which the Messiah should come. In Genesis 49:10 we read: The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, Nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, Until Shiloh come; And unto him shall the obedience of the peoples be. This is understood to mean that the Messiah—Shiloh, one sent—would come before Judah ceased to be a distinct and ruling tribe. The "scepter" was the standard of the tribe of Judah and a symbol of the tribe itself. It is well known that Judah was the only tribe remaining in the days of Christ, as is indicated from the name Jew (from Judah), and there was still a Jewish high-priest. Thirty-five years after the death of Christ both disappeared in the destruction of Jerusalem. This promise that Christ should come out of Judah ,was repeated in the promise to David, for David was pf the tribe of Judah. It is well known that Christ was ,to be of the seed of David, but one prophecy to that effect will not be out of place here. Jeremiah 23:5-6, Says:

Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his name whereby he shall be called : Jehovah our righteousness.

Mary the mother of Jesus, was of the tribe of Judah, and of the seed of David, as was also Joseph, as may be seen from the genealogy as given in Matthew and Luke. And Paul said, "For it is evident that our Lord hath Sprung out of Judah" (Hebrews 7:14).

3. The place of the Messiah's nativity was definitely foretold by the prophet Micah. In Micah 5:2 of his prophecy we read: But thou, Bethlehem Ephrathah, which art little to be among the thousands of Judah, out of thee shall one come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth are from of old, from everlasting. The Jews understood this to apply to their Messiah and not to some mere human ruler, for when Christ was born Herod called unto him the chief priests and scribes and inquired of them where the Christ was to be born. And they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judaea: for thus it is written through the prophet, And thou Bethlehem, land of Judah, Art in no wise least among the princes of Judah: For out of thee shall come forth a governor, Who shall be shepherd of my people Israel. (Matthew 2:5-6.) The prophecy of Micah was written something like five hundred years before the advent of our Savior, but the prophet, looking down the vista of the years, named the place where he was to be born. And let us consider J:ow remarkable was the fulfillment of this prediction. Mary the mother of Jesus lived in Nazareth of Galilee and not in Bethlehem. Nazareth was about a hundred miles from Bethlehem, Then how did it happen that Mary was so far away from home when her babe was born? You all know, of course, that this was brought about by a decree issued by the Roman emperor—the ruler of the world—that all the world should be taxed or enrolled. This required each subject of the decree to ,go to his native city to enroll. Joseph was of the city of Bethlehem, and he went there to enroll himself and Mary. But why did he bring Mary with him? Surely that was not necessary. Surely she could have been .excused under the circumstances, especially as Joseph could enroll for her. (Men were the heads of the house in those days.) The ways of travel then were very .crude and

the journey was a long one over a rugged country and beset with dangers from wild beasts and from robbers. Can you imagine why an expectant mother would undertake such a journey, especially right at the time she was expecting tire birth of her babe ? The answer is, Jehovah was guiding in this affair. His prophet had foretold the place where the babe was to be born and the power that enabled him to know that had now caused the emperor to issue a decree and was moving in all the circumstances to bring about that which had been before revealed. But unless Mary knew and understood that her babe was now .to be born just at this time, in fulfillment of prophecy (which she evidently did not), how do you suppose she was induced to make the trip? Did she go on that journey for the express purpose that her child should be born ir Bethlehem? I hardly think go. There is some evidence that she did not expect the .child just at this time. When the babe was born they wrapped him in swaddling cloth. Swaddling cloth, according to the meaning of the Hebrew word, was cloth unrolled from the bolt—bands of cloth. There was no garment made; no preparation for the child. But Jehovah knew and guided the young mother to the right place.

Then when the wicked Herod sought to kill the child, Joseph, being warned of God. fled into Egypt. There he remained until after Herod's death and then Jehovah called him out of Egypt and thus another prophecy was fulfilled. Hosea 11:1 says, "Out of Egypt have I called my son."

Now that Joseph was told that it was safe to do so, he returned to his home in Nazareth and there Jesus grew up. For that reason he was called a Nazarene, and MatLhew tells us that that was in fulfillment of another prophecy. (Matthew 2:23.) This prophecy is .probably found in Isaiah 11:1, but our English versions do not show it.

Because Jesus was called a Nazarene the Jews assumed that he was born in Nazareth. Things of such a vital nature must never be settled upon assumption. That is what prejudice will do. Prejudice means to .pre-judge, to judge before you hear or before you investigate. In the seventh chapter of John, when the Jewish rulers were denouncing Christ and abusing the officers for not arresting him, Nicodemus, a member of the Sanhedrin, dared to say: "Doth our law judge a man, except it first hear from himself and know what he doeth?" But they silenced him with the scornful and sarcastic reply: "Art thou also of Galilee? Search and see that out of Galilee ariseth no prophet." But had they themselves been honest enough to search and see, by investigating the life of the man whom they were seeking to kill, they would have found that he was born in Bethlehem, and that he was called a Nazarene even in fulfillment of their Scriptures.

4. The trials and death of Christ had been minutely foretold by the prophets. They had said that in his .trials he would suffer great abuse. "I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting" (Isaiah 50:6). That this was literally fulfilled the following passages show:

Then released he Barabbas unto them; and when ne had scourt/ed Jesus, he delivered him to be crucified. (Matthew 27:26.)

Then did they spit in his face and buffeted him: and others smote him with the palms of their hands, saying, Prophesy unto us, thou Christ, Who smote thee? (Matthew 26:67.) And some began to spit on him, and to cover his face, and to buffet him, and to say to him, Prophesy! and the servants did strike him with the palms of their hands. (Mark 14:65.) That the Messiah was to die a

violent death is clearly indicated in these passages: “He shall be cut off out of the land of the living” (Isaiah 53:8). “And after three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself” (Daniel 9:26). These quotations do not, however, show the manner of death that he should die, but that will be seen in another prophecy soon to be introduced.

Psalms 22:1-31 gives a complete picture of Christ’s death on the cross. It opens with the words, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me,” and then in the sixteenth verse it says, “They pierced my hands and my feet.” This refers to the nails that were driven through the hands and the feet of our Savior when they crucified him. This prophecy becomes one of the most remarkable of all when we consider that this manner of putting men to death had not been heard of when this Psalm was written. At least it was not known among the Jews. Their manner of inflicting capital punishment was by stoning- Had they put Jesus to death by their own hands they would have stoned him. Romans inflicted capital punishment upon a citizen by beheading him. Decapitation was their well known method. But they used the cross, which was the most barbarous and horrible death ever devised, for slaves and subjects who were not citizens. Jesus was condemned by the Jews and sentenced to death. How then did it happen that they did not execute him by stoning? Here again we see the hand of providence guiding in the affairs of men and bringing about the fulfillment of his word. The Romans had taken away from the Jews the privilege of inflicting capital punishment without the sanction of the Roman authorities and that meant that the Romans would attend to the matter themselves. But how did it happen that these Jews, who were entirely the cause of Christ’s death, did not override this Roman law and execute Christ as they did Stephen, and as they would have killed Paul had not the Roman officer interfered? (Acts 7:1-60, also Acts 21:1-40) The only answer is that God was guiding. His prophet had said they would “pierce his hands and his feet,” and that meant crucifixion. Jesus had himself indicated that he would die on the cross—be lifted up. “And as Moses ’lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up.” “And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself. But this he said, signifying by what manner of death he should die” (John 12:32-33.) In Psalms 22:1-31 we find another prediction that was fulfilled in Christ’s death. Psalms 22:18 says: “They part my garments among them, and upon my vesture do they cast lots.” This was literally fulfilled as John tells us in these words: The soldiers therefore, when they had crucified Jesus, took his garments and made four parts, to every soldier a part; and also the coat: now the coat was without seam, woven from the top throughout. They said therefore one to another, Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be: that the scripture might be fulfilled, which saith, They parted my garments among them, And upon my vesture did hey cast lots. These things therefore the soldiers did. (John 19:23-25.) Another prophecy concerning the death of Christ is found in Psalms 69:21, which reads:

Reproach hath broken my heart; and I am full of heaviness: And I looked for some to take pity, but there was none;

\nd for comforters, but I found none.

They gave me also gall for my food; And in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink. The fulfillment of that prediction is told by John in this language:

After this Jesus, knowing that all things are now finished, that the scriptures might be accomplished, 3aith, I thirst. There was set there a vessel full of vinegar: so they put a sponge full

of the vinegar upon hyssop, and brought it to his mouth. When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished, and he bowed his head, and gave up his spirit. (John 19:18-20.)

There is one other prophecy that we must not fail to study tonight in connection with our Lord's death. We have seen enough already to convince any unprejudiced mind, it would seem, that these things did not just happen. They were not mere accidents or fortuitous coincidences. Divine wisdom is displayed in all these things. But the one other prophecy that I wish to bring to your attention before we close tonight is found in Isaiah 53:9. It says: And they made his grave with the wicked, and with a rich man in his death; although he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth. The statement that he was to be in the hands of a rich man in his death challenges our attention. That he was numbered with transgressors and was with the wicked in his death is not new to anybody. That fact is so well known that it is not necessary to cite the passages that prove it. Everybody knows that Christ died as a criminal, the just for the unjust—taking our sins upon him—and that he was crucified between two robbers, though everybody may not know that that also was foretold by the prophets. But unless it has been called to your attent'on. many of you may have overlooked this remarkable statement, that he would be with the rich in his death. This strikes us as peculiar because we know that Christ was a pauper all his life and his friends were the common people—the poor people and often publicans and sinners. He was born of pauper parents. We know this not only from the fact that he was born in a stable and cradled in a manger, but we see it in the fact that Mary brought the pauper's offering when she came to offer for her cleansing. (See Luke 2:22-24; Leviticus 12:8; Leviticus 5:11.) That Christ was homeless and penniless we know. When one man suggested that he would like to join his company and go about with them, Jesus said, "The foxes have dens and the birds have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head." And when he wanted to pay his temple tax he had to direct Peter to get the money miraculously from the mouth of a fish. How strange that he who was so poor, and whose disciples are from the poorest classes, is to be among the rich in his death. But the prophet said that such would be the case. Did it come to pass? When Christ was on trial no rich man was there to employ counsel or to use his influence in behalf of Jesus. Even his disciples had deserted him and he stands friendless and forsaken between a cowardly governor and a mob of purblind sectarian ecclesiastics and blood thirsty hypocrites. When at last he dies upon the cross between thieves none but a few weeping women are near to sympathize. He is dead now'and no rich man has appeared to defend him or to die with him. What shall we say of that prophecy? Did this one fail? Oh, no. The interpretation thereof is accurate and the fulfillment thereof is sure. Let Matthew tell us how this was fulfilled, although he does not refer to the fact that it was a matter pf prophecy—just tells what occurred as a matter of history. Hear him: And when even was come, there came a rich man from Arimathea, named Joseph, who also himself was Jesus' disciple: this man went to Pilate, and asked for the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded it to be given up. And Joseph took the body, and wrapped it in a clean linen cloth, and laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock; and he rolled a great stone to the door of the tomb, and departed. (Matthew 27:57-60.)

John tells us that Nicodemus joined Joseph in the burial and that he brought a hundred pounds of ointment made of a mixture of myrrh and aloes and they anointed the body of Jesus and wrapped it in linen cloths and buried it in the rock hewn tomb in which no corpse had ever been laid. Thus our Lord was given an expensive burial by the hands of two rich men—members of the Sanhedrin

or Jewish supreme court, though they had not been present at the trial of Christ, it seems. My friends, can you follow out this line of study and not be convinced that the men who wrote those prophecies were inspired? How could they have known that these things that were centuries in the future as they ,wrote would occur? And how could a mere man have made the events of his life accord so perfectly with these predictions? What say you of Jesus? Was he not unique, different, therefore divine? If not, how do you account for him? If he was divine what will you do with him? To reject him would be to reject the divine One, the messenger from heaven, the Gift of God's love, and therefore to judge yourself unworthy of eternal life, If God has gone to that extreme limit to save you and then you refuse to accept the escape thus provided, what do you think ought to become of you? These are solemn questions, beloved, and this is your hour; others may or may not have heard the gospel, and they may or may not have heard the testimony in favor of the Lord's divinity, but you have heard it tonight. The evidence is before you and you are forced to render a verdict. You must say that he was divine or he was not. If he was divine, then your soul is lost without him—else there was no need for his journey from heaven to earth; no need for his sacrificial death. What is your decision? Will you accept the salvation brought to you by this suffering (Savior or will you refuse it and go out into the darkless of the boundless beyond without one ray of light or hope?

O, come unto the Lord tonight, give him your life, You must believe, the evidence is too strong to be rejected, Then believe upon him with all your heart, repent of all your sins and having thus died to sin be buried with your Lord in baptism, according to his blessed word, and arise to walk in newness of life. Thus one life is ended in a death and a burial and another life is begun by a resurrection. These are the terms of the gospel; these are the conditions upon which he promises to save you. He is lovingly, tenderly calling you now and we pray that you may come to him right now.

00A.07 CHAPTER IV.—Christ the Man of Sorrows

CHAPTER IV CHRIST, THE MAN OF SORROWS Our Scripture reading for the sermon tonight is Isaiah 53:1-6.

"Who hath believed our message and to whom hath the arm of Jehovah been revealed? For he grew up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. He was despised, and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and as one from whom men hide their face he was despised; and we esteemed him not. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon dm; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and Jehovah hath laid on him the iniquity of us all."

“He was despised, and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief.”

We have all often heard Christ spoken of as a man of sorrows, but some people do not seem to know where he is so designated in the Bible. I once knew a man who read the entire New Testament through looking for that expression, and when he didn’t find it he took delight in calling people down for using it, telling them that it is not in the Bible. But even if it were not in the Bible and our using it would cause many people to read the New Testament through, we ought all to begin using it every time we speak of our Lord.

Isaiah is called the gospel prophet or the Messianic prophet, because he foretold so many things about Christ. We have the example of an inspired man in applying this 53rd chapter to Christ. "Philip opened his mouth, and beginning from this Scripture preached unto him Jesus” (Acts 8:35). There can be no doubt, therefore, about Christ being here called the man of sorrows.

We are studying Christ each night in the first part of these meetings because he is the only Savior of the world and our efforts here are for the salvation of men. We have no desire to perpetuate a part}’, defend a doctrine or extend the interests of a denomination. We are “determined to know nothing save Christ and him crucified”.

Personally, I believe that Christ is not only the Savior of our souls, but I believe that he is the panacea for all earth’s ills. I believe that he is the ideal of the ages; the goal which men are trying to attain; the “holy grail” for which they are seeking. I think all honest scientists, philosophers, legislators and educators are seeking to better the conditions of the earth, to amelioriate human suffering and to bring more joy, happiness and good will to men. But the very things they are seeking to bring about—many of them without Christ—can be found only in Christ. Hence if the scales could only fall from the eyes of men and they could recognize Christ for what he is—and for what he is worth to the world, I believe all men would fall at his feet and crown him Lord of all. This having been said, somebody is perhaps ready to say: “Do you think a man of sorrows is the ideal of the world? Do you think men want to fall at the feet of a sighing, sorrowful, weeping man? That

is not man's nature; we want a strong, fearless, indomitable, iron man for our ideal. We are hero worshipers. The whole race is. Men will not follow a tearful sentimentalist. This age has no time at all for 'sob stuff'. Give us life; give us action; give us daring and adventure."

We might appropriately reply with the text, "despised and rejected of men," but for the fact that we have said that, he is the ideal of all men. We can not deny the claim that men are all hero worshipers. That we are all fascinated and even captivated by men of strength and courage: men who fear nothing but will dare anything. That is why Hannibal and Caesar hold such a large place in the history of ancient nations. That is why Napoleon's page in the world's history is so luminous and his name is embalmed in the hearts of the French people. And in our own nation who does not thrill with pride at the mention of such dauntless men as Washington and Jackson and Lee and Grant and Nelson and Forrest and hundreds of others whose names adorn the pages of our history, and whose memory will be preserved by the statues and monuments that stand in our capitol city and in our national cemeteries? And perhaps no man of modern times has had a larger place in the hearts of our people than Theodore Roosevelt. He was a great man in many respects, but who doubts that his dashing, daring, adventurous spirit is what appealed to the fancy and challenged the admiration of the populace:'

We have had one President whose whole claim upon the hearts of his countrymen was his heroism. He was not a great statesman —he w'as no scholar at all, and he was not a military genius like Napoleon. But he was a dare devil. He fought whenever there was an opportunity to fight without waiting for orders from his superiors. Andrew Jackson, known as "Old Plickory," the seventh President, won fame as a fighter in both public and private battles. His duel with Mr. Charles Dickinson took the prize before a certain New York Athletic Association as the bravest deed ever done on American soil

Jackson and Dickinson both lived at Nashville, Term., but their duel was to be fought at Harrison Mills, Logan County, Kentucky. Mr. Dickinson and his friends preceded Jackson in the journey to the place appointed. Enroule Dickinson entertained his- friends by performing special feats with his pistol, which were told to Jackson as he came along the way. At a certain toll gate one of the Dickinson company put a fifty cent piece upon the gate or pole. Dickinson stepped off thirty steps and shot the coin off the gate. His friend replaced it and he shot it off again. Again he replaced it only to see it drop off at the report of the pistol, Dickinson handed this disfigured coin to the gate-keeper and told him to give it to Mr. Jackson with his compliments. He thought he would give Jaclfton an ague. The gate-keeper gave the coin to Mr. Jackson and told him how Mr. Dickinson had hit it three times out of three shots. Jackson thanked him and put the battered coin into his pocket. When the time came for the duel Mr. Jackson proposed that they shoot alternately and he gave Dickinson the first shot! Stood up before a man—just twenty-four steps away—who could hit a fifty cent piece three times out of three shots and let him shoot at him ! Dickinson hit him, but Jackson did not fall. Instead he took deliberate aim and shot Dickinson, fatally. That deed won a prize for its bravery —the bravest ever done in America. The world loves to hear tales of bravery . There can be no successful denial made of that. And it is equally true that the world wants things that are light and cheerful and amusing, instead of things that are serious and solemn and pathetic. Men want music and laughter instead of sobbing and groans. But after making these admissions I still affirm that Christ, the Man of Sorrows, is the ideal of the ages. That he meets a universal yearning of the human soul.

Mrs. Ella Wheeler Wilcox—who was at this time Miss Ella Wheeler—was once riding upon a train in which there was a woman weeping She was dressed in full mourning and she attracted the attention of all the other passengers by her inconsolable grief; by her outbursts of crying, Ella Wheeler observed that the passengers, after finding they could do nothing for the woman, avoided her and soon no one was sitting near her. After a while some one in the end of the coach furthest from the weeping woman began telling something that provoked laughter and all the passengers strained their ears to hear. And it was not long until they had all gathered around the man who was dispensing laughter. This caused Ella Wheeler to write:

Laugh and the world laughs with you;

Weep and you weep alone. For the sad old earth Must borrow its mirth;

It has troubles enough of its own. That is the explanation; that is the philosophy of the whole situation. The world is so burdened with grief and sorrow that it seeks to borrow all the mirth it can. Every man would like to lay at least a part of his burden off on some one else. We all like to tell our troubles and we expect sympathy from our friends. But we don't enjoy hearing tales of woe from the other man. We avoid people who are gloomy and pessimistic. But we will seek the company of a man who can make us laugh and who can give us strength and courage by his optimism and buoyant philosophy. A fun-maker can lead men as the Pied Piper of Hamelin led the children The ancient kings always had jesters in their courts. And our humorists, such as Will Rogers, can gain admission where scholars, educators and preachers could not go. And some of them have incomes greater than that of the President. In view of these facts how can we expect the world to fall at the feet of a man of sorrows? Because Christ is not one who dispenses sorrow, but one who dispels it He never sympathized with himself and he had no tear for his own grief. He said to the tender hearted sympathetic women who followed him as he bore the cruel cross—the instrument of torture—"Weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children, for that which is coming upon you." He always thought of others. "He bore our griefs and carried our sorrows" He is the man of sorrows because he is the one upon whom the sorrow and suffering and sin of the whole world is cast. He is our universal burden bearer. Is there not a universal demand for such a Helper and Friend? Have we not seen already that men in trouble seek sympathy and look to their friends for help? O, yes, we ail admire heroism and we honor Caesar and Napoleon and "Old Hickory" Jackson, but what man would go to a Napoleon for sympathy when his baby is a corpse or his wife is ill? What man would call a Caesar, or a Jackson to his bedside to pray with him when the icy hand of death is on his throat? Whom do men call at such times? Ah, they call the preacher and they want the most humble, pious and Sympathetic preacher they can find. In life they may have admired the fighting preacher, the fiery petrel, but in the hour of sorrow and at the approach of death they want the godly man with tender heart and kind words. The world is weighted down with woe and the voice of the whole suffering human family is crying for a burden bearer and a comforter. From the time when, as children, we ran to mother to kiss away the hurt, until death claims us, we are looking for some one to relieve our heart pangs and soothe our sorrows. Often in times of deep distress we go to our dearest friend on earth and unbosom ourselves and find comfort in his sympathy. But however true, faithful and sympathetic that friend may be, and however heavily we may lean upon him, we sometimes have stings that he can not take away and hurts that he can not heal. There are times when all that earth friends can do avails but little.

Then it is that the human heart protests against the cruelties and tragedies of life and cries out to the Great Unknown and longs for light and relief that this earth can not give. Even the heathen know this longing and this need of the heart, and their desire for this tells them that there is a Power Somewhere that can help them and that there is a life that is Higher and Happier and Holier.

Now in Christ this life is revealed, this ideal is realized. In Christ we find light to dispel the darkness. He is the light of the world. In him is the light of life. He reveals the Father and the Father's mercy and love. He bears all our burdens and heals our hearts. How tender are the words of promise:

Cast thy burden upon the Lord and he will sustain thee. He will never suffer the righteous to be moved. (Psalms 55:22.) Casting all your care upon him; for he careth for you. (1 Peter 5:7.) Be anxious for nothing; but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God, (Php 4:6.) But seek ye first his kingdom and his righteousness and all these things (all creature comforts) shall be added unto you. (Matthew 6:33.) If ye abide in me and my words abide in you, ask whatsoever ye will and it shall be done unto you. (John 15:7.) And ye are complete in him. (Colossians 2:10.) Let not your hearts be troubled: believe in God, believe also in me. (John 14:1.) And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. (Matthew 28:20.)

Christ is our "all in all". In him our weary souls find rest. In him we find a balm for all our ills. He is our refuge and strength. He is our Shadow from the heat and our Rock n the time of storm.

He searches our hearts and knows all our woes. He has been tempted in all "points like as we are" and understands every point of attack. He has run the entire gamut of the human soul and touched every chord that vibrates there. He knows every sigh that heaves our bosoms and understands every emotion that shakes our frames. He knows the bitter, briny Lear and the groan that is too deep for utterance. He knows it all. A good many years ago I preached one night in the Masonic Temple at Chattanooga, Tenn. (We worshiped in that hall regularly then), on a subject similar to this. In the sermon I had made the statement that Christ understands all our emotions, knows all our sorrows, has experienced all our temptations and is therefore able to succor us in every time of need. I had noticed a strange man sitting back near the door. He seemed to be listening to me, but still he had a pre-occupied look and a rather grim expression on his face. When the service was over I was at the door shaking hands with the people and he came up to me and took hold of my hand with a firm grasp. He looked me in the eyes with a straight, sincere gaze and said:

"Young man, that was a wonderful sermon you preached tonight, if it were only true."

I said: "Sir, the things I told tonight are indeed wonderful and the wonderful thing about them is that they are true."

He said: "Do you believe that?"

I assured him that I did. Still holding my hand tightly he said: "I can't believe it. Jesus Christ doesn't know anything about my sorrow and my temptation."

I said: "The trouble is you do not know Christ and you are not willing to let him help you. If you do not believe, you can't expect to enjoy the blessings."

He replied: “How can I believe,” and then quickly, “I’d like to talk with you. When can I see you ?”

I told him I was ready to talk with him right then and led him apart into a private room. I asked him to sit down and as I was tired, having preached three times that day, I sat down in one of the chairs that were in the room. He did not sit down, but continued to pace to and fro before me. He turned abruptly upon me and said: “And you -believe that Jesus Christ knows my heart, understands my situation and can help me?” I reaffirmed my belief of that truth. He shook his head and continue to walk the floor.

I arose and put my hand upon his shoulder and said: “My brother, there seems to be something troubling you, can you tell me what it is? I shall be glad to help you if there is anything I can do.”

Then he told me his story. He had loved and married a girl who was all the world to him. A baby girt had come to bless his home and his happiness was unalloyed. Then came the Serpent into his Eden. His wife bad eloped with another man and had carried his baby with her. He was then searching for her. And he swore with the vilest oaths that he would murder her and her seducer if he could find them.

He concluded by saying: “Jesus never had any such experience as that! He doesn’t know what I suffer and how I am tempted.” At once my mind began to turn that problem over. I could have replied that Christ knows our hearts by divine power, but for the fact that I had preached that he had lived among men and therefore knew our sorrows. That he was tempted in all points in which we are tempted. I began to think of many experiences that come to men through which our Lord did not pass while here on earth: the death of a babe; a wrecked home, the ruin of a son or a daughter; the loss of bodily strength and many other things. For a minute I was puzzled and then the answer came like a flash.

I said: “My brother, let me tell you that Christ our Lord does know your feelings and your great trial and he alone can bear you up and heal your heart. It is true that Christ never had this identical experience while living among men, but we do not have to have the same experience to know the same emotion. To illustrate: You have laughed and I have laughed. You laughed at one thing and I at something else, but we both know laughter. You have wept and I have wept. One thing caused you to - weep and another caused me to weep, but we both know what it means to weep. We have both been angry Our anger was not provoked by the same experience, but we both know anger.

“Here is a musical instrument. It has all the notes or tones in music and every tone has been made on it: Every chord has vibrated, but we know every piece of music that was ever composed has not been played on this instrument. Many compositions have never been rendered on this keyboard, but every tone that is in them has sounded here."

“Now the human heart is a harp of a thousand strings. It has chords like a musical instrument and Christ our Lord has touched each chord. He knows every emotion."

“He knows sorrow; his soul was once ‘exceeding sorrowful even unto death’. He knows what it means to be betrayed. One of his trusted friends, one who was admitted to the inner circle and knew his plans and hopes and his places of prayer and private resort, betrayed him, sold him for the price of a slave and led the mob to the place of his private devotions and identified him with a kiss! A kiss, the token of affection, prostituted to a signal for murder!"

Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, Who did eat my bread, Hath lifted up hi? heel against me. (Psalms 41:9.)

“He knew what it was to be misunderstood and to have his words misconstrued and perverted. He knew what it was to be falsely accused and to have his claims mocked, ridiculed and blasphemed.

“Oh, yes, brother, he knows it all. If some thorns are found in your path remember he bore them on his brow. He can turn your night into day and bring joy out of your great sorrow if you will submit to him and wait upon the Lord. If you do not ruin things by hate and malice and murder. If you will give your bruised heart to him who never broke a bruised reed or quenched the flickering flax—if you will bow to him in chastened resignation, do his will and ‘wait, meekly wait and murmur not’, you will soon know the peace that passeth understanding.”

I didn’t get the man to surrender to the extent that he obeyed the gospel, but through the help of God I sent him on his way with a different idea of Christ and with kinder feelings in his soul. He promised to give up his murderous search. My friends, I have related this experience in order to impress upon you the truth that Christ knows your hearts and can help you in any time of need. You, too, might some time get the idea that because Christ did not pass through some special experience while here in his earthly sojourn that he could not sympathize with you in such a trial. But he can, as we have seen, and that is the excuse now for the story just told.

Christ is a wonderful friend if we will only recognize our own weakness, dependence and utter helplessness and say, “The will of the Lord be done” and then stop worrying and fearing and foreboding and scheming. VVe have not learned the lesson of the grass of the field, the lilies and the .sparrows. We claim to be trusting the Lord, but we carry our own burdens—often useless burdens.

There is a story of an Irish peddler who was going down a dusty road on a hot summer day with a very heavy pack upon his back. A man in a light spring wagon overtook him and seeing that he was under a great burden and seemed tired, he asked the peddler to get in and ride. The peddler accepted the kind invitation and climbed into the back part of the wagon. The man drove on for a mile or two and then looked back and saw Pat down on his knees sweating under his burden which was still on his back.

“Why don’t you take your pack off and rest as you ride,” asked the man.

Said Pat: “Faith, and I didn’t know that you meant to haul me and me pack, too.”

Most of us are just that foolish in the matter of allowing the Lord to “bear our griefs and carry our sorrows.”

Many things in the life of our Lord showed His tenderness and sympathy, but the story of His weeping with the heart-broken sisters who had lost a brother is to me the most touching.

Lazarus and his two sisters, Martha and Mary, lived at Bethany. Jesus was often in this home. He seemed to make it his home when He was in that region. He taught at Jerusalem during the day and spent the night at Bethany with these friends. The Book expressly says that Jesus loved Mary and Martha and Lazarus.

Jesus had left Judea, because the Jews were planning to kill him, and had gone up into Galilee. And Lazarus became very ill after the Lord's departure. Death seemed near and the sisters sent at once and called for Jesus, believing that he could save their brother. "Lord, he whom thou lovest is sick," was their message. But the Lord purposely delayed to go. He remained where he was for two days. Then Jesus knew that Lazarus was dead and he announced to his disciples that he was going to Bethany to awake Lazarus. The disciples felt rather that he was going to his own death, but resolved to go with him. When they had reached the vicinity they learned that Lazarus had been in the tomb four days. No doubt everybody was ready to tell Jesus of the death of his friend and of the sorrow of the sisters. Many Jews had come out from Jerusalem to console the sisters and I have no doubt that their sympathy was genuine. Our hearts always go out to our fellow men when we see them in great sorrow, and unless we have passed through such a sadness ourselves, we do not know how much the sympathy of friends means. Just to know that they think of us and that they weep with us is worth worlds. Their words do not count for much, for words are very feeble and empty things in the presence of death: at the time of a loss irreparable. But just the presence of a friend, just the touch of a hand, or the sight of a tear means much. We all recognize our helplessness at such a time and we all feel a sense of equality in suffering—we know we are heirs to the same sorrow and it helps us all to weep together.

It seems that the people not only talked to Jesus about the death, but the news of his arrival spread and some one told Martha that he was coming. She arose and left Mary weeping and went out to meet the Lord. Her words of greeting were: "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." That is an expression of faith. She believed the Lord could have healed her brother, but there seems to be a note of disappointment also. She had sent for the Lord and he had not come. O, don't you know she and Mary had counted the hours and looked anxiously for him and hoped to the last that he would yet reach there in time? But, no, the hours grew darker, the patient grew weaker and at last death came and hope was gone.

Perhaps you, too, have passed through a similar experience. You prayed earnestly and you /expected each moment to see a change come. You repeated the Lord's promise and you claimed them and watched for the fulfillment. But you were disappointed. The thing you prayed for was not granted and you may have felt hurt and found it hard to be resigned.

Martha and Mary seemed to feel that way, too, and had they known that the Lord had purposely stayed away, what would have been their feeling? But the Lord had a wise and benevolent purpose in this delay. He knew he would take away the sting, he would turn their mourning into laughter, and would demonstrate a power that would produce faith and save souls. Just so it is in your case or mine. The Lord knows best and he will do what is right, whether we see it or not. After a while when the mists have cleared away and the clouds are gone, we shall see his wise purpose, and, like Mary and Martha, we shall know both his sympathy and his power.

Jesus assured Martha at once that his arrival was not too late, that Lazarus would rise again. But Martha didn't understand him. After talking with her for a few moments, Jesus called for Mary.

Ah, I can hear him say: "Where is Mary, Martha? May I not see her now?" He knew Mary was brokenhearted. He knew she was somewhere sobbing out her grief and he wanted to console her.

All gospel preachers have gone to homes where death had come and seeing some members of the bereaved family they inquire for the others. They want to see them all.

“Where is Mary ?” Martha went into the room where Mary sat weeping and whispered to her: “The Master has come, and he calleth for thee.” He has come at last, Mary, and he wants to see you.

Mary arose and went out quickly and the friends who were there trying to console her supposed she was going to the grave to weep there.

How natural! How often we go again and again to the spot where, we had laid the body of a loved one! We decorate the grave and raise monuments and do all we can to hide the ugliness of death and to relieve our hearts of the sorrow. But Mary came to Jesus and fell down at his feet convulsed with grief and wailed: “Lord, if thou hadst been here my brother had not died.” She used the same words Martha had used, showing they had talked it over and had waited together for the Lord to come.

Jesus did not try to reason with Mary as he had with Martha—Martha the practical. Mary was broken up. No words would mean anything to her. See her there at the feet of Jesus, shaken by her grief, convulsed and sobbing! Her grief was so great and so touching that the Jews wept as they stood by and beheld her.

Jesus saw all this helpless weeping. He saw this broken, sobbing woman at his feet, he said no word to her, but the record says; “Jesus wept!”

Ah, what a scene! The Maker of worlds and the Lord of all life, weeps! You have heard it flippantly said that “Jesus wept” is the shortest verse in the Bible. And you have heard men say the only scripture they can quote is, "Jesus wept.*’ But, my friends, such people can not quote that at all. They do not see the meaning of those words. They have not touched the hem of the garment. Why did the Apostle John put that information in two words? Why did he not say, “Just at this juncture it was observed that Jesus himself was shedding tears?” Or, “The disciples noticed that Jesus was weeping also?” How insipid! There is no effort to explain, to elaborate or to garnish this fact. The abrupt statement shows the wonder with which this struck the apostles. They knew he had come to raise Lazarus. The Jews thought he wept because he had lost a friend, but that was not it. The disciples knew better than that. Why should he, the Master of death, weep? He will make everything right in a few minutes. Mary will soon be shouting, then why is he weeping?

There is only one answer, my friends, and that is sympathy! Pure human sympathy! He felt Mary’s grief, his heart was touched by her weeping and he wept with her! How sublimely sweet and touching is that picture!

Then the Lord said: “Where have you laid him?” And Martha said: “Lord, come and see.” She no doubt thought they would go to the grave and stand there and all weep together. She would tell the Lord all about his sickness and how she and Mary had anxiously looked and hoped for the Lord to come. She would tell of Lazarus’ last words. And she would tell of the funeral and how good the friends had all been. They would talk it all over and let their tears flow unrestrained. The Lord would hear the story sympathetically and they would all find relief in weeping. But there was a great surprise awaiting Martha! She believed in Christ and loved him, but she did not know his power or understand his purpose. But you know the story. The cave was opened and Lazarus was

restored to life and given back to his astonished sisters. In this story we have a marvelous demonstration of divine power and human sympathy. Here we see Jesus bearing the sorrow of others and then removing it entirely. But the fact that he meant to take away the sorrow did not keep him from sharing the viewpoint of the grief- stricken sisters and entering into their sorrow. He wept with them and then dried their tears! And the sweetest thought of all, for us, is, that he is the same today. He does this for us. now if we are his friends. What a wonderful Saviour is Jesus! What a Friend we have in him! He bears our griefs and carries our sorrows and takes away our sins. “Him who knew no sin, was made to be sin for us; that we might.be made the righteousness of God in him” (2 Corinthians 5:21). Do you know Jesus? Have you given your life in service to him in order that you may claim him as your Friend? He said: “Ye are my friends, if ye do the things which I command you” (John 15:14). And, “If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love” (John 15:10). “If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him” (John 14:23). Do you want all these great blessings? Do you want God and Christ in your life to order your steps and to uphold you? Then you must obey the Lord and be guided by his Holy Word. You must not ignore his will and rebel against his authority and refuse to obey his commands. You must not make void his commands by heeding the creeds and traditions of men. All spiritual blessings are in Christ. They are not in some human organization or society or club or denomination.

We are not asking you tonight to join some religious order or denomination or to put yourself under the control of some council, conference, synod or some other body" of ecclesiastical officials, No. We are telling you of a friend divine, who can save your soul and make you unspeakably happy forever and ever. We want you to come into him. How do you get into him? You must believe upon him with all your heart; you must sincerely repent of all your sins—abhor them—-turn from them. Having thus died to sin, you must then be buried with the Lord in baptism according to his Word, and then come forth to walk in newness of life. “If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature ; old things are passed away, and all things are become new” (2 Corinthians 5:17).

“For we are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus: For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ” (Galatians 3:26-27). Will you enter in while yet there is room? When as of old in her sadness, Mary sat weeping alone.

Softly the voice of her sister Whispered the Master has come.

So, in the depth of thy sorrow, Gall tho’ its fountain may be, List, for there cometh a whisper, Jesus is calling for thee.

0, when thy pleasures are dewing, Fading thy hope and thy trust, When cf the dearest earth’s treasures, Dust shall return unto dust.

Then, tho’ the world may invite thee, Vain will its offering be, List, for there cometh a whisper* Jesus is calling for thee.

Down by the shore of death’s river, Sometime thy footsteps shall stray, Where waits an angel to bear thee Over to infinite day.

What then tho’ dark be his shadow, If when his coming thou see, Cometh there softly a whisper, Jesus is calling for thee.

00A.08 CHAPTER V.—Christ the Friend of Sinners

CHAPTER V CHRIST THE FRIEND OF SINNERS Our theme tonight is, “Christ, The Friend of Sinners”, and the text is found in 1 Timothy 1:15-17:

Faithful is the saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief: howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me as chief might Jesus Christ show forth all his longsuffering, for an ensample of them that should thereafter believe on him unto eternal life. Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only God, be honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen. This is the language of Paul and he here calls himself the chief of sinners, and says that in saving him the Ford Jesus Christ demonstrated the fact that he can save any one. Paul reckoned himself the chief of sinners and since he had obtained mercy no one else need despair. That is the way he felt about it and that is why he lifted his grateful praises to the God who had saved him. His appreciation of the Ford’s mercy would not have been so great if his sense of guilt had not been so keen.

Paul was never a wicked man in the sense of being immoral. He was never a reprobate. He had been a religious man all his life—zealously endeavoring to serve Odd, but he had persecuted the Church of God and made havoc of it. But he was honest in his madness against the disciples. He thought they were heretics, perverters of the law of Moses and transgressors of the principles of the decalogue, and he felt that it was his duty to exterminate the new heresy. But when he learned that he was in rebellion to God he at once changed his whole course and called upon the Ford for mercy, and when he was told upon what conditions he could obtain mercy and pardon lie, without hesitation, complied with the conditions and rejoiced in the full forgiveness of all his sins. And so may all sinners be saved through the rich provisions of tine Gospel of Christ, who is not only the friend of sinners, but also the Savior of sinners.

Although we have taken Paul’s language as a text for this sermon we shall not confine our study to this text, for we find in the life of Jesus many demonstrations of the fact that he was a friend of sinners; that he had compassion on them and was anxious to help and to save them. But as we begin to speak of Christ as the friend of sinners we must he careful to make you understand that Christ is not a friend of sin. He never endorses the sinner’s wrong doing. He never connives at sin and there can be no terms of peace and amity between Christ and the sinner so long as the sinner is defiant and reliellious and persists in his sins. In order to obtain mercy and to enjoy the friendship of Christ the sinner must be sick of sin and anxious to have relief from its guilt and pollution.

Jesus is ihe friend of sinners and he is ready to save the most depraved man upon the earth tonight, but he can not, consistent with his will—consistent with his plan, save any sinner so long as that sinner loves his sins and desires to remain in them.

Now, there were sinners in the days of Christ’s earthly sojourn, and the sinners who found in Jesus a kind, tender and sympathetic friend were those humble sinners—those outcasts who

realized that they were lost and undone; whereas the Pharisees and Scribes, who were sinners, too, the very worst of sinners, were denounced by Jesus in the most scathing and merciless terms that were ever used by any inspired speaker or writer. And yet even these people could have found a friend in Jesus had they realized their need of his pardoning love, but they felt that they were righteous and holy and the true guardians of heaven's laws. Instead of feeling their need of Christ they felt that he needed them. They were sinners, but they were religious sinners—the worst sort of sinner that any man can be. They represented organized religion in their day. They paid tithes, and fasted, and prayed standing in the street corners; they were very punctilious about observing the traditions, or of living true to the creed of their party, and they were so busy enforcing it upon others, and so blinded by their sectarian zeal and they felt so satisfied and "loyal" in their mad heresy-hunting that they never thought of measuring their own lives by the character of God as revealed in their Scriptures. They were loyal to a theory and thought they were faithful to God. How sad is such a condition! They were sinners, sadly in need of salvation, but they didn't know it. Jesus told them of their hypocrisy and showed them that they were sure for hell, but they did not believe him; it only angered them and made them hate the Lord. They were selfsatisfied, self-sufficient, self-righteous, self-saving sinners who felt no need of a divine Savior.

If we were called upon to name tonight the one thing that the present day world needs more than anything else, we should say, a sense of sin. The reason that people do not come to the Lord is because that they do not feel that they are sinners and therefore they do not believe that they need the Lord. When we present to the people of today the story of the cross it becomes a stumbling block to them, because it is not complimentary to men. It does not compliment man to say that he had gone down into the depths of depravity to the extent that God had to send Jesus Christ from the heavenly world to save him; that Jesus must shed his innocent blood upon the cruel cross for man's redemption. As we told you last Sunday night, the whole gospel picture —a picture of God's infinite love- -is painted on a background of despair. For if the world bad not been lost we would not have needed redemption. But the world was lost and it needed a redeemer. The world is lost— it still needs a redeemer, but the redeemer is here if the world will only recognize him and come down at the foot of the cross and depend upon the merit of its atoning blood for salvation, Hence, we repeat, the world needs a sense of sin. We must know that we are sinners all; we must feel the burden of sin; we must know that we are heavily involved and we have nothing wherewith to pay; that we are hopelessly insolvent—completely bankrupt. Then will we come unto him who is able to pay the debt and who offers to do so freely? That is the attitude into which we must come before we are ready to receive the gospel. The reason we are not better and more grateful Christians is that we have not felt that we were lost sinners and have therefore been snatched as brands from the burning.

We have simply inherited our religion and many of us have no personal convictions. We have not known the guilt of our own sins and sought and found relief in the glorious gospel. Many of the churches today gain more by generation than they do by regeneration. So many people are born to their belief. Like Rachel, they have stolen their father's gods and are carrying them as luggage through life. It is no wonder that they are only nominal Christians. No wonder such people do not feel grateful to God and do not rejoice in the privilege of serving him. No wonder they do what little they do with an irksome sense of duty and then limit those duties to a certain set number of commands or to a few specific, acts, like going to church for one hour on the Lord's day. When we

are made to realize that we are lost, hopeless and helpless, and Jesus has fled to our relief and that in him alone do we have hope, then will we come to him as we would rush out of a building that is burning and ready to fall in upon us. Can you imagine yourself having to be begged and coaxed to leave such a building ? Surely not, if you knew your danger. Nor will we have to beg you to come to Christ when you see that you are forever lost without him. A generation ago men were more sensible of their lost condition than we are today, hence the Christians of that day were more grateful, more zealous and more earnest than we are. Where, today, do you hear Christians singing as though they meant it—singing from their redeemed and grateful souls—such exultant hytnns as Amazing grace, how sweet the sound, That saved a wretch like me;

I once was lost, but now I'm found, Was blind but now I see? In order to appreciate the fact that we are saved we must know what it means to be lost. In order to know the joy of spiritual vision we must remember that once we were blind. Then would we serve God out of a sense of gratitude and not from a sense of duty or fear. It may be that service rendered from a motive of duty or fear is acceptable, but it is certainly not the highest order of service. The very highest order of service that we can render to our heavenly Father is a service of gratitude and love. That sort of service is not a burden, but a pleasure and those who are thus moved to serve God do not divide his commandments into essential and non-essential classes and make the essential class as small as possible. They do not keep books with God and claim his blessings as a reward for the works they have done. Who would think of a mother as she watches by the bedside of her sick babe, keeping her eyes upon the clock and counting the hours till she can go off duty? A hired nurse might do that, but a mother will not. She is serving from a sense of love and she forgets her own personal needs in her anxiety for her child and she continues through the weary, anxious hours of the days and the long, sleepless hours of the night until she is exhausted. The limit of her service is the limit of her ability. And that would be the limit of our service to God if we served him from a motive of love. Not only do we need a sense of sin today, but we actually need to learn that the gospel is meant for sinners; that Jesus is a Savior of sinners. The churches today do not want the outcast, for whom Jesus died, in their communion. They withhold the gospel from the abandoned sinners and many professed Christians would be scandalized if such a sinner were to enter the congregation and walk down to the front in response to the gospel invitation. Such church members are only seeking recruits to their congregation and are hot seeking the salvation of souls. They want members that will add wealth, influence and respectability to the church and there is more joy among such church members over one respectable (?) sinner who walks down the aisles, stiffnecked and unconverted, with a diamond in his shirt front, than over a hundred and ninety-nine real outcast sinners who are truly converted. And this attitude of church members not only causes the poor, humble, bankrupt sinner to hate and avoid the church, which should be the light of the world, the salt of the earth, but it also causes the rich, influential sinner to remain impenitent. It makes him think that his money and influence will commend him to God and gain his blessings just because it gains him favor with church members and causes them to fawn upon him.

It is not necessary to tell you that all this is entirely contrary to the gospel of our blessed Lord, who came to call—not the righteous but—sinners to repentance. Then we should not hold the gospel back from the plague spots of earth, from the segregated districts, from the vagabonds that tramp our railroads or the prisoners that people our penal institutions, Jesus loved them and died upon

the cross to. redeem them, and they can be transformed and made new creatures and prepared for heaven and immortal glory through the precious gospel which we have the privilege of preaching. In the life of Christ we have several stories which illustrate the fact that he was the friend of sinners. We will tell you these stories tonight to impress some of the points that have already been made, as well as to bring out some additional lessons. You are acquainted with these incidents in the gospels, but the more you think of them the more beautiful and tender they become. In John 8:1-59 we have the story of the woman who was taken in adultery and brought before the Lord. Now Moses had said that a person guilty of adultery should be put to death by stoning. He didn't say women—he said both men and women should be put to death when guilty of this sin. So the Pharisees had found a woman who was guilty and they brought her before the Lord. And why did they bring her before him? Was it because they hated the sin and wanted to see a wicked woman put away from among the people? No, no, that was not it. They brought her before the Lord because they wanted to get him into trouble. They thought that if he released the woman from this sentence of the law he would be guilty of setting at naught the law of Moses and they would have a charge against him upon which they could put him to death. On the other hand, if he sentenced her to death and commanded them to stone her, he would violate the Roman law, for the Roman government had taken away from the Jews the privilege of inflicting capital punishment. Hence you see these wicked, scheming Pharisees thought they would put our Lord in a dilemma and either way he should go would be fatal. The sinister motive of these Pharisees is further seen in the fact that they did not bring the guilty man along, too. They said the woman had been, taken in the very act of adultery. If that was true, then, of course, there was a man there. Why was he allowed to go free? He was just as guilty as she was and should have suffered the same penalty. But you see enforcing the law was not their purpose. You may have wondered where that man was; did you ever imagine that he was back there in that crowd with a rock in his hand ready to help stone the woman to death? Jesus did not, of course, condone this sin. He did not say that the woman was not guilty of a capital offense, but he knew that the sin in the hearts of those men was greater than the sin the woman had committed The fact is there is evidence to show that these men were not only sinners, but that they were guilty of the same sir,—and may be guilty with this very woman. They knew her and they were going to make her the victim in their wicked scheme to entrap the Lord.

Artists have painted pictures of this scene and they represent the woman as cowering, humiliated and disgraced, at the feet of her accusers. Perhaps the artists can see more in this than the rest of us can, but that is not the picture that suggests itself to us. We see the woman standing up, brazen, defiant and unrepentant, Why? Because she knew these men were as guilty as she was and therefore she did not feel ready to humble herself before them. She would the more probably defy them and challenge them to do their worst. After awhile, when she addressed the Lord she seems to be humble and respectful because she recognizes in him a man very different from the others. But these Pharisees presented her to the Lord and told him of her sin and reminded him of what Moses had said in the law and asked: "What then, sayest thou of her?"

Jesus stooped down and wrote upon the ground with his finger. We do not know what he wrote—nor do we know why he wrote. But when he arose he threw the responsibility right back upon them. "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her," said Jesus. And then he again stooped to write upon the ground; this time he probably did it in order to give them a

chance to find their sinless man or to get away without his watching them. When they understood what he said they began to leave one by one, beginning with the oldest and continuing down to the youngest. Sometimes you may have wondered why the oldest man slipped out first. Don't you suppose that when this challenge from the Lord was thrown at them that each knew he was a sinner, but he looked to some other in the crowd to meet the challenge and cast the first stone? In such a situation, naturally all eyes would turn upon the oldest man in the company expectantly. When he therefore saw himself expected to answer the inquiry' of their gaze, and his conscience told him he could not meet the demand, he sneaked out. All the others followed in rapid succession and soon Jesus was left alone with the woman. He said, "Woman where are they? did no man condemn thee?" She answered, "No man, Lord." "Neither do I condemn thee: go thy way; from henceforth sin no more."

Sometimes people seem to think that Christ here excused or palliated this sin. He did not. He merely released her from judicial sentence. They had made him the judge. They had called upon him to dispose of her case according to the law of Moses. But the law required the witnesses who testified against the guilty person to cast the first stone. No witness in this case was willing to declare himself worthy according to the Lord's demand. There was therefore nothing to do but to release the woman with the charge to sin no more.

What a just Judge we have here! Who shall lay anything to the charge of his elect when before him we stand at the last day?

There is another story in the life of our Lord that shows that he was a friend of sinners. It also shows the gratitude of a sinner whose load has been lifted. In Luke 7:1-50 we read the story of a Pharisee by the name of Simon, who invited Jesus to come into his home and eat with him. It seems strange that he would invite the Lord into his home as a guest and then not treat him with the courtesy due a guest, but that is exactly what he did. It was customary in that day and country for the host to meet his guest at the door with a kiss on the cheek. Then to bring a basin of water and wash the guest's feet and anoint his head with oil. Simon did none of these tilings for Jesus. He didn't even bring the water that Jesus might wash his own feet.

Why did he invite him at all? He had heard of Christ and he probably wanted to talk with him and decide whether or not he is a prophet and as great and good a man as some had reported him to be.

There is another story in literature that is very similar to this incident in the life of our Lord and with your pardon we will relate it just here for the sake of the similarity as well as for our interest in the story itself.

During the life of Bobbie Burns, the plowman poet of Scotland, a lord of that land—an aristocrat, a member of the nobility—who had been reading some of Burns' poetry, conceived the idea that it would be an interesting, not to say amusing, diversion to have this peasant poet to come into his home and read s^me of his poetry for the other guests. Accordingly this lord invited Burns to be a guest at a dinner that he was to give. But when the guests were invited to the table poor Burns was left to stand in the hall with the servants. While thus waiting with the servants Burns wrote a poem which he thought would be specially appropriate to read to the lord and his guests after dinner. That poem is now one of the most famous poems in all our literature You are acquainted

with it. It is entitled “A Man’s A Man for A’ That.” Do you remember the stanza that says Ye see you birdie, called a lord, Who struts, and stares, and all that;

Tho’ hundreds worship at hi word, He’s but a fool for all that?

Try to imagine how that lord felt when Burns pointed to him and read this. But to get back to Christ and the Pharisee: Christ was in Simon’s home by invitation and was reclining at the table when a woman who was a sinner—a known sinner, a scarlet woman—entered the room and bowed down at the feet of our Lord and began to kiss his feet. Her copious tears began to wet his feet, but she dried them with the hair of her head. She also broke an ala-baster box of ointment and anointed his feet.

Now, Simon, the Pharisee, sitting at the table decided that he had found out what he wanted,to know. He reasoned thus: “If this man were a prophet he would know that this woman is a sinner. If he doesn’t know it, he is not a prophet. If he does know it and still permitted her to touch him, he is not a righteous man. So which way we look at this doesn’t matter, it has ruined the claim that is made for him.” The Pharisees would not allow this sort of sinner to touch them. Four feet was the regulation distance for them to keep between them and such a sinner. But Jesus knew Simon’s thoughts and he said to him: “Simon, I have somewhat to say unto thee.’"

Simon said, “Teacher, say on.”

Then Jesus said, “A certain lender had two debtors: the one owed five hundred shillings, and the other fifty. When they had not wherewith to pay he forgave them both.” They were both utterly insolvent, completely bankrupt, and the lender forgave them both. “Which of them therefore will love him most?”

Simon answered, “He, I suppose”—and that expression, “I suppose” shows a sort of supercilious irony, as though Simon considered this a simple question—“to whom he forgave the most.”

Jesus said, “Thou hast rightly judged.” And now Jesus directs Simon’s attention to the woman; he is going to reveal two things to him. First, he is going to prove to Simon that he is a prophet, for he had read Simon’s thoughts and he did know that the woman was a sinner. Second, he is going to show Simon that he is above the smug self-righteousness of the Pharisees and their ceremonial regulations in that he is a friend of sinners, willing to show them kindness, mercy and forgiveness. Incidentally we have here also an illustration of the attitude of heart in the two classes of sinners which we mentioned a few moments ago. The woman who felt her guilt and was grateful for forgiveness, and the man who did not feel any guilt and did not desire any forgiveness, but rather felt himself superior to the Lord. And turning to the woman, he said unto Simon, Seest thou this woman? I entered into thy house, thou gavest me no water for my feet: but she hath wetted my feet with her tears, and wiped them with her hair. Thou gavest me no kiss: but she, since the time I came in, hath not ceased to kiss my feet. My head with oil thou didst not anoint: but she hath anointed my feet with ointment.

There is a keen contrast here between the customary basin of water which the courteous host would supply, and the woman’s tears: between the kiss of greeting on the cheek and the woman’s continuous kissing of the feet: between oil for the head and the woman’s ointment for the feet. And yet Simon had left off those trivial amenities, but the woman had gone to the extreme limit in her

expressions of gratitude and love.

Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little.

There is our point again: Realize the burden and extent of your guilt and then you will rejoice forever in the salvation which the Lord has provided for you.

There is another story that we must bring into this sermon tonight. It is perhaps the best known parable in all the Bible and yet the lesson that it teaches seems to be hard for the people to learn. The parable of the prodigal son illustrates at least two vital points. The first is the attitude that the sinner must have in coming to God, and the second is God's readiness to receive and forgive the sinner when he comes—the joy that is occasioned in heaven by the sinner's repentance. In Luke 15:1-32 we have three parables, and they were all uttered by our Lord in answer to a criticism from the scribes and Pharisees to the effect that "This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them". Answering this critisicm Jesus gave us the parables of the lost coin, of the lost lamb and of the lost boy. The conclusion from each parable is the same, but in the details of the parable of the prodigal boy we have a severe rebuke to these Pharisees and also some wonderful lessons.

Let us look at that story again. " A certain man had two sons, and one day the younger son said unto his father, Father give me that portion of the estate that falleth to me. And the father divided unto them his living." Not many days after this the younger son gathered all his part of the inheritance together—turned it all into money no doubt—and took his journey into a far country and there he began to spend his money with ruthless prodigality in riotous living. And before long his money was all gone, a famine had also struck that country and the thoughtless and improvident young man began to be in want. And he went and joined himself, or hired himself, to a citizen of that country and he sent him out to feed swine.

You must bear in mind, beloved, that Jesus was speaking to Jews and, of course, they thought of a Jewish household—a Jewish father and his two sons. Therefore when this boy went into a far country he went away from among the Jews to a Gentile country and now he is hired to a Gentile as a servant. That was reducing him to a pretty lowly condition in the mind of the Jews —that was humiliation enough. But Jesus did not stop with simply making him the servant of a Gentile, but he made his task that of feeding swine. The swine were unclean in the eyes of the Jews; they did not raise them or have any use for them. Surely this was a shamefully pathetic predicament into which this scion of Abraham had fallen. But our Lord did not leave him with even that description. He reduces him still further—he brings him to the extreme limit of want and of shame and disgrace. Even as a servant of a Gentile with the task of feeding swine the young man did not make a living. He ' id not have food to satisfy his hunger. He was perishing with hunger—mark that—and he actually de-sired to eat the shucks which the hogs themselves refused and trampled into the mud of the pig pen. When he reached this condition, he came to himself. He remembered who he was, what he had done and now he saw the result of his folly. His mind went back to his father's house and he no doubt wanted to return. But he reflected that he had already received his portion of the father's estate and wasted it. He had no further claim on his father's property, and he was not worthy to be called his son. What right had he to return home? Ah, he remembered that his father employed servants and his father's servants had plenty of food and clothing. They were well taken care of. His course was now clear, he would go home and become a servant in his father's house,

go home and ask his father for a job.

Now, may we be allowed to leave this story just long enough to moralize a little? Aside from the gospel story two lessons are suggested just at this point in the parable. One is suggested by the fact that the boy's thoughts went back to his old home. When our boys and girls go away from home today, if they leave with a mother's kiss warm upon their lips and a father's benediction fresh in their hearts, they are far better armed against temptation than the boy or the girl who has never known the sweetness of a happy home. And if they fall into sin and even go down to the brink of ruin, as long as there remains in the background of their minds the memory of a sacred home circle there is hope. There will come moments of rational reflection when they will think of that home with its family altar and its hallowed associations; they will remember the father's counsel and the mother's anxious warnings, and perhaps they will be saved through the memory of these early influences. But God pity the boys and girls whose homes have been wrecked by divorce, and whose mothers have been jazz- mad flappers or bridge playing society climbers, and whose fathers have been so busy making money they have had no time to make a home. Their lives have been spent swinging like a clock pendulum from the home to the office. Or if they have had leisure hours they with the Sundays have been spent on the golf links. God pity the children of such parents. The second lesson is suggested by the fact that the prodigal boy had reached the lowest possible depths before he came to himself. When people today get into a similar condition, and then repent, we have church members who are ready to say, "Yes, it is time to repent now. I don't have any confidence in him. Why didn't he repent before he was caught? Why didn't he repent before he had to?"

Beloved, you do not reason correctly, and you do not manifest a spirit of sympathy and forgiveness. Be careful that you do not act like the older son of the parable People sometimes have to hit the bottom before they come to themselves. The boy of the parable did not come to himself while he had money and clothing and friends. He had to be reduced to the direst straits before he was sensible of his sin. Remember this when you are inclined to be censorious and Pharisaical.

Before we tell the rest of the story of the lost boy as Jesus gave it to us, let us tell it as it did not happen. Let us suppose that when he came to himself he said: "If I haven't played the fool! Here I am a son of Abraham working for a Gentile—feeding swine! I was reared in a good home and I once had money and friends. Now look at me in rags and hunger, with my money wasted and my friends gone! Is there nothing better for me? Yes, by the blood of my fathers, by the power of my own will, by the cleverness of my own wits I will get out of this. I will leave this place and find some better employment and when I can buy some decent clothing I will move on into another community where my former life is not known, and there I will get into some office or bank and there I will live a respectable life and make friends and finally establish a home." Then just suppose that the young man did that. Suppose he carried out that plan, what would you say of him? Ah, says the average man, I would say that was a noble resolve and a wonderful achievement. It was bad to sin and waste his money, but was noble to reform his life and become an honest, upright man after all. Yes, but what about the dear old father? .The boy has corrected his mistakes so far as his own interest goes, but he has shown no regard for his father's aching heart. He has never gone home or written home to tell his father of his change of conduct.

We can see that old father at home yearning for his boy to come home. Daily he prays for God to guide him and send him home. We see him in the late afternoon walking on the lawn with his hands crossed behind him and his head bowed as he meditates. Now we see him as he places one hand up above his eyes to shade them from the lowering rays of setting sun, and looks longingly down the road in the hope that he may see his boy coming. We see him in the long winter evening as he sits before his fire and meditates in sorrow. He recalls the years when his two little boys stood by his knees and listened with wide-eyed wonder as he told them the stories of Hebrew history—the stories of Abraham and Moses, of Joshua and David. He remembers how his heart then beat high with hope that his boys would become great and good men. Then he recalls the changes that came as the boys grew up and how the younger—a restless and adventurous youth—had finally taken all his interests out of the old home and gone away. But he had continued to hope that the boy would tire of roaming and come back. He had thought he would learn his lesson and come home and settle down. But that ungrateful boy has not gone home. He is only interested in recovering his lost fortune and making a new record for himself, while the old father goes down to the grave disappointed and broken hearted.

What do you say now of that boy? In supposing that this boy treated his father thus, we have given you a description of the way many people treat God, our heavenly Father. They sin until they realize they have ruined their lives. They see they have lost the respect of men and the hope of success. Then they correct their lives; they reform and we say that is a noble thing to do. Yes, it is noble for a man to quit anything that is bad, but you may reform and not repent. A reformation may be brought about by self-interest, by a sorrow of the world, but repentance is toward God. (Acts 20:21.) All sin is against God and we must be moved by godly sorrow in our repentance—must be sorry we have offended God and grieved his great heart, and we must go back to him and ask for forgiveness—if our repentance is to bring salvation, (2 Corinthians 7:10.) But we told the story of the prodigal as it did not happen. We will now finish it as it did happen. This young man came to himself and remembered his father's house and he said, "I will arise and go to my father and say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight: I am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants."

Ah, that is the proper attitude of heart. There is your real penitent sinner. He didn't say, I would like to go home but I don't have decent clothing. I'm not good enough, so I'll just stay here and perish. No, he didn't say that. He didn't say, I want to go home and I know my father would welcome me, but I could not stand the scorn of my brother and the sneering laughter of the neighbors. No, he didn't say that. He saw his condition as it was and he knew that no one could say anything about him worse than he deserved. He was ready to take a lowly place.

He didn't say, I will arise and go to my father and say unto him, Father, I see now that I have been a fool. I should never have left home, but I did and I have wasted all my money; but father, I am through now. I've learned my lesson and I am ready to come back home and be your son again and inherit with my brother. Of course you are glad to see me, but, father, you will have to get me new clothes right away. You see these are in bad condition. And father, you will have to be pretty careful about referring to mv mistakes you know, for I'm sensitive on that point. Oh, no, he didn't say that either. No real penitent sinner will say any of these things. He will not hesitate to obey the gospel because he is not good enough. He will not fear what others may say or think. He will not claim anything because of his repentance and try to dictate to God or to God's people as to how

he is to he treated.

Now, having seen the son's attitude, let us see the father's attitude toward the son. The boy did arise and come home. And surely enough the father must have been out on the lawn looking for him, for when he was yet a great way off he saw him and ran to meet him. The boy began to make his confession and intended to ask for a servant's place, but he never did finish that speech. The father fell upon his neck and stopped his mouth with kisses. He shouted to a servant to bring the best robe and put it upon him; to put shoes upon his feet and a ring upon his hand. He commanded that the fatted calf be killed and a feast be made in honor of the son's return. This represents the manner in which God receives the penitent, home-coming prodigal and tells us of the joy that is in heaven when a sinner repents. Next, let us see how the older son behaved on this occasion. Who is this elder son? He represents these Pharisees to whom Jesus was talking.

Now, this son was in the field when his brother came home and the feast and the merry making were well under way when he came in. He saw that something unusual was happening and called a servant and inquired about it. When the servant told him of his brother's return and of the welcome the father was giving him, this older son was highly offended. He went off and sulked. He would not go into the house and the father had to come out and entreat him. Listen to that son as he talks to the father: "I have always been with you and I never transgressed a commandment of thine"—There is your true Pharisee. "And yet you never gave me a kid to make merry with my friends, but when this thy son"— notice that expression, "thy son"—"who has wasted thy substance with harlots is come you kill for him the fatted calf." . Now, listen to the father, he did not deny the son's claim for himself, nor did Jesus here deny the Pharisees' claim for themselves. He reasoned with them as though they were as righteous as they claimed to be. Said the father:

"My son, thou art ever with me, and all that is mine is thine, but it is meet that we should make merry and be glad: for this thy brother"—the father reminds him that this is still his brother, the son said "thy son," the father said "thy brother"—"was dead, and is alive again; and was lost and is found." This brings us to the close of our sermon. You have seen that Jesus was a friend of sinners and we can assure you that he is no less a friend of sinners tonight He is calling them now to come and find rest. He is rich in mercy and the terms of salvation are simple and easy—in reach of all. "Believe, obey, the work is done, Then why not tonight?"

00A.09 CHAPTER VI.—Christ Our Mediator

CHAPTER VI CHRIST OUR MEDIATOR

Again we must lift our grateful praises to our heavenly Father for the blessings of this, another service in this series. This splendid audience tonight encourages us to do our best in these efforts and I am sure that all who are participating share with me this feeling of appreciation of the interest manifested by your presence. The subject for the sermon tonight is, “Christ Our Mediator ” You see we are still studying Christ. Christ and him crucified is my theme always. The Scripture reading for this sermon is 1 Timothy 2:1-8. Hear it:

I exhort therefore, first of all, that supplications, prayers, intercessions, thanksgiving, be made for all men; for Icings and all that are in high place; that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and gravity. This is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior; who would have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, one mediator also between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all; the testimony to be borne in its own times; whereunto I was appointed a preacher and an apostle (I speak the truth, I lie not), a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth. (1 Timothy 2:1-8) A mediator is one who stands between somebody. Literally the word means some one who stands in the middle—equi-distant from two sides. In the fifth verse of the passage just read we learn that there is one God and one mediator between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus. Thus from this text we learn who the Mediator is—Christ—between whom he stands—God on the one side and man on the other—and that he is himself Man. We learn also that there is but one Mediator. One God and one Mediator. It would be just as unscriptural to try to have a plurality of mediators between God and men as it would Ire to try to have a plurality of Gods. There is one God and one humanity. For God had “made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth” (Acts 17:1-34; Acts 26:1-32). There is but owe approach for this one humanity unto the one God. Jesus said; “I am the way, and the truth and the life; no one cometh unto the Father, but by me” (John 14:6). Hence there is One God and One Humanity and One Mediator through whom the One Human race can approach the One God. The fact that there is but one Mediator is emphasized here because some one has sent me a marked copy of a paper in which I find an article that insists that the people who are strict and sincere Confudanists or Buddhists or Zoroastrians will be saved just the same as Christians, and that they should be considered equal with Christians now: therefore recognized and fellowshiped. If that tvere true we would have men coming unto God by others than Christ, and his Mediatorship would be useless. Those religions were here before Christ came to the earth. If there was salvation in them why did Christ die? There is but one way unto God, beloved. “And in none other is there salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved” (Acts 4:12). The Roman Catholic Church seems to have a number of mediators between God and men also. The Catholics recognize Christ, of course, but they put the Virgin Mary almost, if not quite, on an equality with Christ and pray to her. Then a little lower than the Virgin they have saints in great numbers. The Bible teaches that all Christians are saints, and in the New Testament the disciples

are called saints many times more than they are called Christians. But with the Catholics no one living in the flesh is a saint. A Christian must first die and go to purgatory, and after passing through purgatorial expurgations, he may then be “sainted” or canonized by the Church, according to Rome’s theology. When a soul is exalted to sainthood by the authority of the church, that soul may then act as an intercessor for living human beings, and good Catholics pray to these saints. They have in their church calendar what is known as “All Saints Day,” and upon that day the priest reads off the names of the saints and the people respond, “Oh, Saint So and So, pray for me.” Hospitals and schools are named for some saints, like Saint Paul’s at Dallas, and Saint Vincent’s at Sherman, and the saint for whom the institution is named is the patron saint of that institution and his image will be found somewhere in the building. But in addition to this great number of intercessors the Catholic has the whole church machinery between him and God. He depends upon the church for his salvation: from her he draws his instruction, his permission or license for any line of action, and his remission of sins. The priest must be seen and satisfied before a guilty man can be absolved.

All this, in spite of the fact that the Book of God plainly declares that there is One Mediator between God and man. As a reaction from these errors of the Church of Rome, some people have gone to the extreme of saying that the church means nothing—that one may be saved outside of the church as well as inside of it. But such people fail to distinguish between the church of Christ —a divine institution with a Divine and Infallible Head —Christ—and with divine laws—and human denomina-tions with man-made laws and fallible men as ruling officials. Certainly, no one needs to approach God through any human organization, or to place himself under the control of any human government, to be saved. God alone can save and he will save all who come unto him through Christ. But to become a Christian, or to come into Christ, is equal to becoming a member of the church of Christ, as we shall see in another sermon. One would as well try to distinguish between the sunshine and the sunlight as to try to separate Christ from the church, or to distinguish between the Christian religion and the Christian Church—they are all the same But the church is not a man-made or man-governed institu-tion, beloved. There is no salvation in any human organization, call it a church or what you please. As another reaction from this priestly usurpation and intermeddling, we sometimes hear the quibble that to teach that baptism as a condition of salvation is to put the preacher between the sinner and God, hence to vitiate Paul’s statement that there is One Mediator. But this is only a quibble and hardly deserves notice here. Baptism as a condition of salvation no more makes the preacher a mediator than faith as a condition of salvation does. For “How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?” (Romans 10:14). This clearly makes faith depend upon the preacher. “So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God” (Romans 10:17). Many other passages could be cited upon this point, but this is sufficient. The preacher who preaches the gospel which begets faith in the sinner’s heart and then upon his confession of that faith baptizes him into Christ, does not in any way or by any official authority or act absolve the sinner or propitiate God. There is no merit in the preacher— no reconciling value or commending grace or divine unction. -"What then is Apollos? and what is Paul? Ministers through whom ye believed: and each as the Lord gave him” (1 Corinthians 3:5).

“Was Paul crucified for you or were you baptized into the name of Paul?” (1 Corinthians 1:13). But with those points out of the way we are ready to consider other passages that speak of Christ as

our Mediator. In Hebrews 9:15, Paul says And for this cause he is the mediator of a new covenant, that a death having taken place for the re-demption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, they that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must of necessity be the death of him that made it. For a testament is of force where there hath been death: for it doth never avail while he that made it liveth. From this reference we learn two facts: First, Christ is the Mediator of the New Covenant or Testament, and second, he had to die—a death had to take place—before he could act in this capacity.

Then in Hebrews 12:18-26 we read: For ye are not come unto a mount that might be touched and that burned with fire, and unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which voice they that heard entreated that no word mere should be spoken unto them; for they could not endure that whieh was enjoined. If even a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned; and so fearful was the appearance, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake: but ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable hosts of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of a new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better than that of Abel. See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not when they refused him that warned them, on earth, much more shall no\ we escape who turn away from him that wameth from heaven: whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more will I make to tremble not the earth only, but also the heaven.

Here the apostle draws a contrast between that to which we are not come and that unto which we are come. That, to which he says we are not come, is clearly a description of the giving of the law at Mount Sinai. Moses was the mediator of that covenant or law. He went up into the mountain and received the law from God and brought it down to the people. He stood between God and the people. Paul says “the law was ordained by angels in the hands of a mediator” (Galatians 3:19). And Stephen said Moses “was in the church in the wilderness with the angel that spake to him in Mount Sinai” (Acts 7:38).

Therefore Moses was the mediator into whose hands the angel in Mount Sinai committed the law—the Old Covenant. Paul says we are not come to that. But we are come unto “Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better than that of Abel. See that ye refuse not him that speaketh [vis., Christ). For if they escaped not when they refused him that warned them on earth [vis., Moses], much more shall not we escape who turn away from him who warnelh from heaven”—vis., Christ.

Christ is the Mediator of the new covenant and Moses was the mediator of the old. We are now under Christ and the new covenant and not under Moses and the Old Covenant. We are not come unto Mount Sinai, but we are come unto Mount Zion—unto Jerusalem. God spoke to the Israelites through Moses, but “God who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son” (Hebrews 1:1). Christ is a manifestation of the Father’s love and mercy and in him the Father’s will concerning us is revealed. He is our only and all-sufficient Savior, Header and Law-giver. We do not go back to Moses or to the old covenant—Old Testament—to learn how to become and be Christians. We learn that from Christ and the New Covenant. But this lesson on the two covenants is only

incidental to our chief purpose tonight which is a study of Christ our Mediator.

We have learned that a mediator is one who stands between persons or nations, etc. But there is another idea involved in the meaning of this word. It means one who stands between persons who are estranged from each other with a view to reconciling them. One who stands between persons who have had a misunderstanding or a difficulty. There would be no need for a mediator between boon companions. Between persons who are friends and between whom there are bonds of peace and good will.

Then, since Christ is the Mediator between God and men, this question arises, Were God and men estranged from each other? Was there a misunderstanding between them? Were they not on terms of peace and amity? That man was estranged from God and needed to be reconciled to God and to be washed from his sins and thus fitted for God's society is the teaching of the entire Bible. Man sinned against God, disobeyed him and hearkened unto the voice of Satan and thereby transferred his allegiance from God to Satan. That brought the curse—brought ruin upon the earth. Christianity came in as a remedy for this ruin. Christianity is a remedial system. Man was lost and Christ came to save him.

"For God commanded his own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. . . . For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by his life" (Romans 5:8; Romans 5:10). Not only were men sinners and enemies against God, but Paul says they hated God and shut him out of their knowledge. (Romans 1:28-30.) Men then were exactly like unbelieving men now. They did then and they do now, try to explain the whole universe by a system of naturalism that leaves out all supernaturalism—knowing God they glorify him not as God, but turn him out of his creation—even now.

Yes, men are estranged from God, and where can there be found a mediator who can effect a reconciliation ?

Since a mediator serves as a peace-maker between persons estranged, of course he must be a disinterested, dispassionate, unbiased person. If we were going to select a man to serve as a peace-maker between two men in a church or in a town, we would get an unbiased man. One who was a friend to both sides and who could appreciate the viewpoint and feelings of each. In our civil courts when we go to select a jury to try a man for a crime, we want men who are unbiased and fair. One of the questions that the court will ask a prospective juror is, Are you related to the defendant? If he says he is, he is excused. He is not eligible for jury service in that case. Another question is, Have you formed or expressed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendant? Again if he answers in the affirmative he is considered ineligible and excused. There is no principle that is better established or better understood than that a mediator or peace-maker must be disinterested, and unbiased.

Then, where can such a mediator be found to act between God and men? Where is there a person who can understand the holy, infinite God and his attitude toward men and toward sin and at the same time understand poor, ignorant, weak, sinful and short-sighted man and his sufferings and trials? Who could devise terms of reconciliation that would meet God's approval and man's possibilities? Do you not see that such a person would have to be both God and man? He would

indeed have to be Immanuel—God with us. The Son of God by, or according, to the Spirit of Holiness, and the Son of Man after, or according to, the flesh. This is exactly what Jesus was, according to the scriptures. He made that claim for himself and others made it for him. And the place he came to fill—the work he was to do—demanded that of him, as we have seen. But we have today a class of religious teachers—'who think they are Christians—known as Modernists. These Modernists are men who try to modify, interpret and "modernize" Christianity to fit the demands of infidelity and materialistic philosophy. They do not, therefore, believe that Jesus was born of a virgin, that his death was vicarious, or that he was raised from the dead. They do not believe that he was Immanuel, God with us. Or that he was "the Christ, the Son of the living God."

Surely, you can see, my friends, that such men not only disbelieve the plain statements of the New Testament and deny the claims made by Christ and for which he died, but they also disqualify Christ as a Mediator and ruin the most beautiful and appealing feature of the whole gospel picture—God in love sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, that for sin he might atone. But the fact is, beloved, that these men do not believe in the reality of sin; do not believe in the fall; do not believe that man and God were or are estranged and need to be reconciled. Is this not a horribly mutilated, emasculated and devitalized Christianity? This Modernism? But the Book of God continues to teach that there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus. "Himself man"—that is the way the apostle tells us that our Mediator is qualified to represent us and to sympathize with us in our weaknesses and temptations, Christ lived in heaven, with God and with him created all things. He shared the Father's glory before the worlds were made. He, therefore, knew God and understood his love for poor fallen man. He knew his attitude toward sin and exactly what it would take to bring man into favor with God and prepare man to dwell in God's presence forever. Hence he was qualified to represent God on the earth and to reveal him to men.

Then Christ came to the earth; was made flesh, was born of a woman, and lived among men as a man, with all the emotions, impulses and propensities of a man. He knew the touch of temptation and the power of sin; he knew the sordidness and perversity of men; he knew the weaknesses and infirmities of the flesh; he knew the sorrow and suffering of human experience, and finally he knew the terrors and pangs of death. Then raised, triumphant, he was qualified to go back to heaven and to repre-sent men before the Throne of the universe. Indeed, he sat down with the Father upon his throne. What should a Christian fear, when the Power and Ruler upon the Throne of Eternity—the Throne of the universe, high up on the burning rim of glory—is his Friend and Mediator, Representative and Redeemer? Should this not assure our hearts in the midst of an orgy of unbelief, materialism and immorality? The point is already clear, I am sure, but there is an incident in the history of England that will illustrate our point beautifully and will so fasten it on the minds of all of us that we will never forget it:

We have all heard of the Prince of Wales, of course. The present Prince of Wales is a very popular young man. Fie has been to our country several times and he has created several new styles in men's dress, etc. Now, who is this Prince of Wales? (Old gentleman near the front: "Why, he is the son of the King of England") (Brewer — That is correct, thank you.) Everybody knows that he is the son of the King and Queen of England- He is an heir to the throne of Great Britain and if he lives he will be the next to occupy the throne—he will be the next king. But how does it happen that the heir to the throne of all the British dominions is called the Prince of Wales?

Wales is only a small part—a small province or principality in the empire of Great Britain. It is only one of many dependencies. How does it happen, then, that the Prince, is of or from or at least named for that part of the country over which he is to reign?

Here is the explanation: England has often had difficulty in keeping all her dominions satisfied and harmonious. Some of those under her suzerainity have been constantly clamoring for something—Ireland, for example., Back in the thirteenth century when King Edward of England made Wales a principality of Great Britain—• having suppressed the independence of the Welsh people —the people of that little country were disappointed and dissatisfied. They felt that they would not receive proper consideration from the government; that they would not be properly represented at the throne. In order to pla-cate these people King Edward had his wife, Queen Eleanor, who was expecting an heir, to leave the palace and the throne of England and to journey down into Wales that the prince might be bom there. .Accordingly Prince Edward was born in the newly-built castle of Carnarvon and presented by his royal father to the Welsh people as the Prince of Wales. Then these people could rejoice in the fact that the heir to the throne—and later the king on the throne—was a native of their country—- hence one of their citizens and brethren.

Just so, in order to placate and reconcile men of earth, God caused his Son to leave heaven and the throne of Light unapproachable, to journey down into the earth and to be born of a woman, born under the law, and then presented him to the people of earth as a Prince and a Savior. And now we can rejoice in the overwhelming thought that the King on the throne of the universe is a native of earth—one of our citizens and our brethren! “Himself man, Christ Jesus!”

“Thanks be to God, for his unspeakable Gift.”

We see from the facts already presented that Christ was not ready to fill the office of Mediator until he had completed his earthly sojourn. He could not present man as a fit subject for the company of God or the society of heaven until he had provided a means for man’s purification from sin. He could not know the extent of man’s suffering until he had suffered to the extreme limit. He could not deliver man from the bondage of fear and from the shadow of the tomb until he had abolished death. To illustrate: If you wanted to practice medicine you would have to go to a medical college and finish a course of study and then you would have to stand an examination and procure a license to practice medicine. Or if you wanted to practice law you would have to attend a law school and finish a prescribed course of study and then stand an examination and be admitted to the bar—or be given license to practice in the courts. Likewise if you wanted to bje a captain in the United States Army you would have to take a course in military training and then receive a commission from the government.

Now, Christ wanted to be our Mediator, our High Priest, and the Captain of our salvation. In order to fill this office he had first to go to school—I speak it reverently, and to complete a course and then stand an examination and receive authority and license. He went to school in the flesh; took a thirty-three-year course in human suffering. He stood the examination in Geth- semane, and his trials in Jerusalem and in his death on the cross and his burial in the tomb. Then when he was raised triumphant he said: “All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth”—and then he sent the disciples out with the message of salvation.

Bearing upon the point of Christ's being made perfect through suffering, hear these scriptures: But we behold him who hath been made a little lower than the angels, even Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, that by the grace of God he should taste of death for every man. For it became him, for whom are all things, and through whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the author of their salvation perfect through sufferings," (Hebrews 2:9-10.)

Again: Who in the days of his flesh, having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and having been heard for his godly fear, though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation: named of God a high priest after the order of Melehizedek. (Hebrews 5:7-10.) And again:

Now when they had passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessaioniea, where was a synagogue of the Jews: and Paul, as his custom was, went in unto them, and for three sabbath days reasoned with them from the scriptures, opening and alleging that it behooved the Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom, said he I proclaim unto you, is the Christ. (Acts 17:1-3.) And again: And he said unto them, O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory? (Luke 24:25.) And one other:

Then opened he their mind, that they might understand the scriptures; and he said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem. Ye are witnesses of these things. And behold, I send forth the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high. (Luke 24:45-49.)

These citations certainly make plain the fact that Christ had first to Suffer, Die and Rise from the Dead before he became the Author of our salvation: before he was made perfect and before he could enter into his glory. And you will remember that we quoted to you in the first part of this sermon what Paul said about a covenant being of no effect until after the death of him that made it (Hebrews 9:15-17). That Christ died for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant and then became the Mediator of the new or second covenant.

How foolish it would be, then, in the light of these plain statements of God's Word, for us to go back of the cross—back of the death of Christ to find the terms or conditions of salvation: back to the thief on the cross to find an example of salvation under the new covenant when the thief died under the old covenant.

Christ said he must first suffer, die and be raised from the dead and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem. As a thing can not begin before its beginning, we know salvation did not begin to be preached in Christ's name until after his death and resurrection. Then it was to begin in Jerusalem and the disciples were to wait in Jerusalem until they were clothed with power from on high—or until the promise of the Father came upon them (Luke 24:45-49; Acts 11:4). This power—this promise--the Holy Spirit—came upon these witnesses on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:1-47). That day they preached

Christ crucified, raised from the dead by the power of God, ascended into heaven and made Lord and Christ; there to appear before the face of God for us (Hebrews 9:24), hence to act as our Mediator. Being thus exalted, he had received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit and had sent him upon the apostles according to his promise. That day Christ began to reign, and that day salvation began to be offered in his name; repentance and remission of sins began to be preached in his name. When men who were pricked in their hearts or convicted of sin, and cried out to Peter and the rest of the apostles, “Brethren, what shall we do? And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.” There is repentance and remission of sins proclaimed on that memorable day in the name of Christ because of the fact, and by virtue of the fact, that he was now exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour. That he had now become the perfected Mediator. The one and only Mediator between God and men. Through him we all now have our access unto God. The vilest sinner may come unto God by him and be saved. All his sins will be removed and his soul will be washed and made whiter than the snow. He will be made complete in him and presented unto the Father as one purchased and prepared for glory. He is bringing many sons unto glory, will you be among that number? O, why not come unto him and be saved tonight? Are not the terms plain and simple, and is not the arrangement—the divine provision—marvelous and appealing? Is not the reward sufficient? Eternal life? Life in a sinless summer land where the flowers never fade and where death never comes. Where no heart ever aches or bleeds or breaks. Do you wish to go there? Christ is the way. May God help you to start tonight...

What do you hope, dear brother, To gain by a further delay?

There’s no one to save you but Jesus, There’s no other way but his way.

00A.10 CHAPTER VII.—Christ the Christian's High Priest

CHAPTER VII CHRIST THE CHRISTIAN'S HIGH PRIEST The sermon tonight is to be a study of Christ as our High Priest and while many texts shall be used the most appropriate text, in the usual sense, is Hebrews 3:1.

Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling1, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, even Jesus. That text requires us to do exactly what we are now endeavoring to do in this service—consider our High Priest.

There seems to be an idea in the minds of men generally that Christ once did something for us. Everybody seems to think that Christ once did something for the world: that he once made a great effort to save then.

Now, I would like to get that idea out of your minds tonight and in its place put a much better and more comforting view.

Christ is now doing something for men. He is now engaged in our behalf and in the interest of our souls. He has never ceased his efforts to save men. The office that he now fills exists for man's benefit, and the business that now occupies his time is connected with man's salvation. "Wherefore he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them'' (Hebrews 7:25).

It is because "he hath his priesthood unchangeable" and that "he ever liveth to make intercession for them," that he is able to save men to the uttermost. I used to think that this passage meant that Christ is able to save the most depraved sinner—that "save to the uttermost" meant that he could reach down to the lowest depths of depravity and save the most abandoned wretch. But that is not the thought in this passage. It is true that Christ can and will save all who come unto him. "Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out" is a statement from out Cord himself. But the passage now under consideration is made clear by the context. He is able to save to the uttermost—down to the last limit of life, down past the last temptation, down through the last trying experience—because he ever lives, never sleeps, never takes a vacation, never grows weary, is never out of patience with us, never moody, but is ever constant and always faithfully interceding for those who come unto God by him. In order that we may the more thoroughly consider our High Priest, let us first learn what a priest is. What is a priest? Could you answer that question right on the moment? Well, here is an easier one, What is a prophet? O, you say, everybody knows what a prophet is. He is a seer, a diviner, one who foretells things. Yes, that is what we understand by the word prophet, but that is not ifs primary meaning. That is not its scriptural meaning. If you will learn the meaning of prophet and then take just the opposite idea you will have a priest. Here is: A prophet is one who speaks to the people for God—hence in the New Testament, an inspired teacher. A priest is one who speaks to God for the people. They pass each other in their duties—going in opposite directions. In all ages God has had men through whom he sent his messages to the people; and in all ages men have had their priests who ministered about sacred

things and prayed to God for the people. In some instances one man combined both—a man was both prophet and priest. This was perhaps always true in the Patriarchial age. The Bible dispensations or ages are three in number, and each age has had its own peculiar priesthood or priestly system. In fact, these ages are named for and divided according to their priestly ministry. The first age extended from Adam to Moses and is called the Patriarchial Age or Age of Family Worship. The second age extended from Moses to Christ and is called, variously, the Jewish Age, the Mosaic Dispensation or the Age of National Worship. The third age extends from Christ to the end of time, and is known as the Christian Dispensation or Age, or the Age of Individual Worship—-or of Universal Worship: Every man under his own vine or his own fig tree.

Now, the word "Patriarch" means father or "High father". Under that dispensation the father was the head of the house and he acted as priest for the entire family. He offered the sacrifices for the whole house, consisting of children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, etc. He also conferred blessings upon them. You remember reading of Abraham. Isaac and Jacob doing these priestly functions.

Then under Moses God had a special nation of people called out from among other peoples and hedged in by a "wall of partition" consisting of laws and ordinances. This nation consisted of twelve tribes and one of these tribes was chosen to be a priestly tribe: to offer sacrifices and prayers for the other eleven tribes. Many of those laws and ordinances were given especially to these Levitical priests and were to be enforced by them. These priests were divided into different "courses" or orders with special duties for each course. Then there was the high priest with functions all his own. They could have only one high priest at a time. In order to get a general view of the service of this Levitical priesthood, let us get a picture in our minds of the tabernacle with its divisions and ministry, for Paul declares that that tabernacle and its service was a "copy", "pattern", "shadow" or type of our priesthood and service un<|er Christ. (Hebrews, eighth and ninth chapters.)

First, here was the court-—an enclosure—into which all the people could enter. Inside this court stood the brazen altar on which all animal sacrifices were offered. Then standing just in front of the tabernacle was the brazen laver at which the priests always bathed themselves before they could enter the holy place, or sanctuary.

Second, there was the Tabernacle proper, or Tent of Meeting, or Tent of Testimony, which stood near the center of the court measuring from north and south sides, (The court was 150 feet east and west and 75 feet north and south, with the entrance at the eastern end) and about thirty feet from the back, or western, wall of the court. This tabernacle had two divisions or rooms which were separated from each other by a heavy curtain suspended from the roof. The first apartment of this tabernacle was thirty feet by 15 feet in dimensions. In this room were three pieces of furniture on the south side stood the seven golden candlesticks, on the north side was the table of showbread, and in the center and just before the curtain, or veil, stood the altar of incense. Into this apartment, which was called the holy place, the priests went daily and offered sacrifice of incense. The people could not enter into this holy place—only the priests. The second room or apartment was four-square—fifteen feet in length, breadth and height. In it was the ark of the covenant and the mercy seat. Here is where God's glory was seen and where the High Priest met him. Here the holy Shechinah—or the Divine Presence dwelt. No one could enter into this apartment, which was called the Holy of Holies, but the High Priest and he was not allowed to go in there but one time in

the year. Now, the temple at Jerusalem was built on this same pattern and had these same divisions and exactly the same service. So, this same priestly ministry continued up till Christ came and set up a new order.

Then, see these priests going daily into the sanctuary with their incense. See the fumes of this sacrifice going over and around the veil into the Holy of Holies and'* tip to the Mercy Seat. But now the day of atonement has dawned and this is the day that the high priest goes into the Holy of Holies to offer for the sins of the people. Let us observe him especially, for he is the type of the High Priest of our confession. First, we notice that he puts on a special dress for ,the occasion. We will study only one or two parts of this paraphernalia. He has on a Mitre or bonnet which has a gold plate at the forehead with these words inscribed thereon: "Holiness unto the Lord." He has on a breast-plate which has twelve precious stones set in it, in rows of four. On each stone is engraved the name of one of the tribes. Thus the twelve stones carry the names of the tw-elve tribes and the high priest bears them above his heart as he go'es in to represent them before the Lord.

Now, as the high priest is robed and ready to go in beyond the veil, let us observe especially that he is taking a vessel of blood from the brazen altar—the blood of a lamb. Now he goes through the holy place and passes behind the veil and goes before the Mercy Seat bearing the names of the tribes and offering the blood for his own sins and for the sins of the people. God recognizes this offering and the sins of the people are remitted temporarily—are laid over for one year.

Now this court, this holy place and this Holy of Holies represented something. They were copies of the true "tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man." The court represented the World where all the tribes of earth are—the brazen altar represented the cross where the Lamb was slain for our sins. The Holy Place represented the church where God's priests now minister and from whose altars the sacrifices of praise arise unto the Mercy Seat beyond the skies. The Holy of Holies represented heaven itself, which lies four-square, fifteen hundred miles each way, and where God is and whither our High Priest has entered.

You will now listen carefully as I quote you a few passages of scripture in proof of these statements, and which will further show us the great provision and sublime ministry of our High Priest.

Since then the children are sharers in flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner partook of the same; that through death he might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage, For verily not to angels doth he give help, but he giveth help to the seed of Abraham. Wherefore it behooved him in all things te be made like unto his brethren, that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted. (Hebrews 2:14-18.)

Again:

Having then a great high priest, who hath passed Through the heaven3, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession. For we have not a high priest that can not be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are yet without sin. Let us therefore draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy, and may

find grace to help us in time of need. (Hebrews 4:14-16.) And again For when God made promise to Abraham, since he could swear by none greater, he sware iy himself. saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee. And thus, having patiently endured, he obtained the promise. For men swear bj the greater: and in every dispute of theirs the oath is final for confirmation. Wherein God, being minded to show more abundantly unto the heirs of the promise the immutability of his counsel, interposed with an oath; that by two immutable things, in which it is impossible for God to lie, we may have a strong encouragement, who have fled for refuge to lay held of the hope set before us: which we have as an anchor of the soul, a hope both sure and stedfast and entering into that which is within the veil; whither as a fore-runner Jesus entered for us, having become a high priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek. And hear this also : And they indeed have been made priests many in number, because that by death they are hindered from continuing: but he, because he abideth for ever, hath his priesthood unchangeable. Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that drew near unto God through him,, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. For such a high priest became us, holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher th«r> the- heavens; who needeth not daily, like those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people: for this he did once for all, when he offered up himself. For the law appointeth men high priests, having infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was after the law, appointeth a Son, perfected for evermore. (Hebrews 7:23-28.) Now notice this especially: But Christ having come a high priest of the good things to come, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands that is to say, not of this creation, nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption. For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling them that have been defiled, sanctify unto the cleanness >f the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? (Hebrews 9:11-15.)

Once more:

Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter the holy place by the blood of Jesus, by the way which lie dedicated for us, a new and living way, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having a great priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience: and haying our body washed with pure water, let us hold fast the confession of our hope that it waver no (Hebrews 10:19-22)

You have noticed that all these quotations are from the book of Hebrews, the reason is obvious. These Hebrew Christians were thoroughly acquainted with the Hevitical priesthood and the temple service, and Paul was showing them that the priesthood had changed. But from the references quoted we have learned

(1) that Christ has been tempted in all points like as we are and that he is therefore able to be touched with the feeling of infirmities, (2) that he calls us brethren, (3) that he has gone within or beyond the veil, (4) that he has opened up a new and living way through the veil for us, (5) that he took his own blood into this Holy of Holies and (6) that he is a High Priest, only, over the house of God.

You remember that the record tells us that when Christ died on the cross the veil of the temple was torn from top to bottom. Tom into two. That was the veil that separated the holy place from the most holy place and beyond which no one could go except the high priest- The tearing of this veil signified the fact that Christ through his death had opened the way into the presence of God for all men. That through him we may all come at last into that holy place and see the face of the Father. This, together with the statements that Christ has gone within the veil and into the holy place of the greater and more perfect tabernacle, proves conclusively that heaven is the antitype of that second division of the tabernacle—the Holy of Holies. This being established with the fact that Christ has gone into that most holy place as our High Priest, we are left now to consider briefly the antitype of the first division or holy place and the priests that now minister in it. This must have some attention before we “consider our High Priest” further. That this holy place or first division of the tabernacle represented or typified the church is clear from Paul’s teaching in the eighth and ninth chapters of Hebrews. Peter, also, tells us that we, Christians, as living stones are built up a spiritual house. (1 Peter 2:5.) The temple and tabernacle, both, were in the Old Tes-tament called the house of God. But those were material houses, and the house or temple of God in this age is spiritual and God dwells in it through the spirit. Paul says Christ is Lord over his house “whose house are we” —Christians. (Hebrews 3:3.) And even Gentile Christians are now of the “household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone; in whom the whole building fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord; ’in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God through the spirit” (Ephesians 2:19-22). Then Paul declares that the “house of God is the church of the living God” (1 Timothy 3:15). That settles at. The house over which Christ is Lord and over which he is High Priest and which enjoys the blessings of his help and intercessions is the church of the living God. You must therefore be in that house, that church, before you can claim Christ as your High Priest and before you can draw nigh unto God through him. God’s house, household or family is composed of God’s children or Christians and when you become a Christian or a child of God you then become a member of God’s family or church. And you do not need to join anything or to be “received into any communion.” When you obey the gospel that makes you a child of God, a Christian, and that is all anybody needs to be.

Christ has made every Christian a priest. His church or kingdom is a kingdom of priests. There is no such thing as a sacerdotal order or hierarchy in the Christian religion, but there is a universal priesthood. The teaching of the New Testament is very plain on this point.

Permit me to quote a few passages that teach this: John to the seven churches that are in Asia:

Grace to you and peace, from him who is and who was and who is to come; and from the seven Spirits that are before his throne; and from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, the firstborn of the dead, and the ruler of the king’s of the earth. Unto him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood; and he made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto his God and Father; to him be the glory and the dominion for ever and ever. Amen. (Revelation 1:4-7.) As certainly as he loosed us from our sins by his blood, just that certainly he also “made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto his God and Father.” But hear this also: And when he had taken the book, the four living creatures and the four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having each one a harp, and golden bowls full of incense, which are the prayers . the saints. And they sing a new song, saying Worthy art thou to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for tnou wast slain, and

didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation, and madest them to be unto our God a kingdom and priests; and they reign upon the earth. (Revelation 5:8-10.)

Here we have the same statement repeated—that he made the blood purchased host to be a kingdom and priests on the earth. Did you also notice that this reference says that the “golden bowls full of incense which are the prayers of the saints”—Christians? Remember that, for we shall need it later.

Peter also testifies on the point we are considering Hear him :

Ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. (1 Peter 2:5.) And again : But ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God’s own possession, that ye may show forth the excellencies of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light: who in time past were no people, but now are the people of God: who had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy. (1 Peter 2:9-10.)

These references put beyond question the fact that we all, who are Christians, are a holy priesthood and a royal—kingly—priesthood. Even Gentile Christians who were once no people—not recognized in God’s economy—• are now exalted to be priests unto God. Every man, every woman, every hoy and every girl, who becomes a Christian, becomes at the same time a priest in God’s house. When the priests under the Levitical order went into the sanctuary to minister about sacred things they had first to bathe themselves in the brazen laver that stood at the door of the tabernacle. Likewise we pass through the “washing of regeneration” (Titus 3:5), have our “bodies washed with pure water and our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience” when we are baptized into Christ (Romans 6:3-6; Galatians 3:26-27), baptized into his body (1 Corinthians 12:13), which is his church (Colossians 1:18-24; Ephesians 1:22-23), which is the house of the living God (1 Timothy 3:15).

Then in the house or sanctuary of Jehovah we as priests minister about sacred things. We offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Christ.

What! says some one, are women and girls exalted to the priesthood? Are they priestesses? Yes, indeed, there are no male and female distinctions recognized in the provisions of the gospel.

But, says an objector, that would mean that women should baptize people and administer the Lord’s Supper and do everything that any other Christian or priest is permitted to do. Yes, every general command and every privilege that is given to Christians includes all Christians—women and girls as well as men, but such general commands must be understood in the light of the limitations or restrictions that are put upon women, of course. These restrictions are not as narrow, however, as many people imagine. But would it not look strange to see one of these little boys or girls who are Christians and therefore priests, bringing a lamb or a calf here and killing it and offering it as a sacrifice?

Yes, that would look very strange even if a man were offering the sacrifice. Then how do these little Christians or priests minister about sacred things? Why they offer sacrifices, but our sacrifices are spiritual—not material. What is a spiritual sacrifice? I imagine these boys are asking that

question. Let's let Paul tell us about our sacrifice. Hear him:

"Through him, then"—through Christ our High Priest —-"let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God." Ah, there we have it, a sacrifice of praise. What sort of praise? That which is pecked out of a piano, or beat out of a drum, or blown out of a horn, or sawed out of a fiddle? (Laughter from boys.) No, no: He tells us about this sacrifice of praise. We will quote the whole verse now:

Through him then let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to his name. (Hebrews 13:15.) The fruit of our lips—that is it. When we praise God in song and prayer we are offering up a sacrifice of praise—a spiritual sacrifice. These boys and girls have been functioning as priests here tonight. They have joined with us all as we praised God with the sweet sentiments of sacred song. When the priests of the Old Testament went into the holy place and offered incense upon the altar the smoke of that incense went beyond the veil into the Holy of Holies and enveloped the Mercy Seat. Likewise we come into the presence of God with golden bowls full of incense which are the prayers of the saints. Our prayers go up before God as incense and the lifting up of our hands as the evening sacrifice. But of course our songs and prayers must be sincere and heart-felt. The lips are only expressing the music of the soul—the melody of the heart. All this must be done with reverence and awe. With the fact that all Christians are priests—that the kingdom is composed of priests—made so clear in the Scriptures is it not strange that there is so much error on this point in the world? Nearly all the religious world thinks that a priest is a person who has some sort of divine imprimatur. One who has "official powers''—who is exalted above ordinary children of God and through whom God confers blessings on men. A priestly benediction is something divine and holy in the eyes of men. This idea is not confined to the Catholics. Protestants are, as a rule, still under that papal or priestly delusion. They call their preachers Reverends and Divines and even these denominational preachers themselves imagine that they have exalted powers and privileges in the kingdom of God. According to the doctrine of these denominations a band of God's children could not get together and partake of the Lord's Supper in memory of him unless there was some ordained minister there to give them the "sacrament"!

Brother George A. Klingman, who is in our audience tonight, and who has just returned from a trip abroad during which he attended the religious unity conference which was recently held at Lausanne, Switzerland, told me today that when Peter Ainslee suggested in that conference that an unpriestly ministry—the Bible doctrine of equality among Christians—would be a step toward unity it threw consternation among those "Divines".

Ah, beloved, there is no such thing as "officialism" in the church of God. There is no such thing as a "high churchman" and a "low churchman", and a down-in-the- "cellar-churchman". There are no aristocrats and plutocrats and proletariats in the economy of grace, but we are all one in Christ Jesus. Do you know that the very first step in the great apostasy which culminated in the Roman Catholic heir- arc by was a distinction between a presbyter or elder and a bishop? Giving one man undue prominence. The word priest is a derivative from, or a modification of, the word presbyter and in John's day we read of a man who loved the pre-eminence (3 John 1:9) and Paul told the presbyters of Ephesus that after he departed men from among them —among these presbyters—would arise speaking perverse things and draw away disciples after them. (Acts 20:30.) That was certainly prophetic, for that is where the apostasy began—among the elders.

They must have thought there ought to be a priestly ministry.

Wherever we have elders of simple churches of Christ who arrogate to themselves “official” prerogatives and refuse to consult the wishes of the church and to take the whole church into all important business matters and give all a voice in the matter of disbursing the congregations’ money, right there you have an unscriptural condition. You have a miniature apostasy—an embryo pop- ism. Do you not all know that the scriptures forbid any such “bossism” in the church of God? Hear these passages : And there arose also a contention among them, which of them was accounted to be greatest. And he said unto them, The kings of the Gentiles have lordship over them; and they that have authority over them are called Benefactors. But ye shall not be so: but he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. For which is greater, he that sitteth it meat, or he that serveth? is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am in the midst of you as he that serveth. (Luke 22:24-27.) “With you it shall not be so!” No lordship over you. But again: But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your teacher, ind all ye are brethren. And call no man your father on the earth: for one is your Father, even he who is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your master, even the Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled: and whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted. (Matthew 3:8-12.) “All ye are brethren”—no over-lords among you. But another passage: But I call God for a witness upon my soul, that to spare you I forbare to come unto Corinth. Not that we have lordship over your faith, but are helpers of your joy: for in faith ye stand fast. (2 Corinthians 1:24.) Even an apostle didn’t claim lordship over their faith. Are you acquainted with Diolrephes? Hear about him:

I wrote somewhat unto the church: but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the preeminence among them, receiveth us not. Therefore, if I come, I will bring to remembrance his works which he doeth, prating against us with wicked words: and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and them that would he forbiddeth and casteth them out of the church. Beloved, imitate not that which is evil, but that which is good. (3 John 1:9-11.)

Lord, deliver us from such men and help us to be humble and brotherly in our relationships in thy kingdom. Now, all this study of Christians as priests is not a complete digression from our subject which is Christ our High Priest, because this is the Christian priesthood or the system of priests that Christ inaugurated. But if we have learned these lessons and if we have been impressed with the sublime privileges that are given unto us as priests in the house of God over which Christ reigns as High Priest, we may now turn back to “consider the apostle and High Priest of our confession."’

We learned that Christ has been tempted as we are tempted and that he is able to succor us in every hour of need; we learned also that he has gone within the veil— before the face of God—with his own blood and that he calls us brethren. As the high priest of Israel bore on his bosom the names of the twelve tribes and represented them in the presence of God, so our High Priest bears upon his heart the names of all his disciples and enter- cedes for them. If he calls us brethren in the plural of course he calls us brother in the singular. How enkindling is the thought that the Lord of glory—the Ruler of the universe-—

He “Who sees with equal eye, as God of all, A hero perish, or a sparrow fall, Atoms or systems into ruin hurled, And now a bubble burst, and now a world”

— should know us as individuals and speak of us as Bro. Brewer, Brother Dickey, Brother Rose, Brother Campbell and Brother You and You.

O, yes, he knows us and understands all of our temptations and he is therefore able to help us in every time of need. This is no new thought. Some of the hymns that we sing every time we meet for worship tell of these blessings, but, O, my brethren, do we fully grasp the thought and realize what it means? A wonderful Savior is Jesus my Lord, A wonderful Savior to me:

He hideth my soul in the cleft of the rock, Where rivers of pleasure I see.

He hideth my soul in the cleft of the rock, That shadows a dry, thirsty land, He hideth my life in the depths of his love, And covers me there with his hand. A wonderful Savior is Jesus my Lord, He taketh my burden away;

He holdeth me up, and I shall not be moved, He giveth me strength as my day.

Yes, he gives us strength as our day—or as our needs require. And there come times when we can not express our own feelings. We know not how to pray as we ought. There are times when some tragedy comes into our lives with such, abrupt and shocking force it paralyzes our souls. All life and color has gone out of the earth. The skies are brass above us and the earth is iron beneath us. Our tear ducts are dried up and we can not weep. We are struck dumb and we can not pray. Not many months ago I was called to conduct a funeral service over one little white casket which contained a few charred bones of four little children—all of the same family—brothers and sisters—who had burned to death in their bedroom. The father and mother sat there before me with dry eyes and a vacant stare—faces blank. They could not weep; they could not pray. That is the condition I am talking about. But in a time like that our Savior's grace is sufficient for us. The groan ings we can not utter are borne by the Spirit which dwells in Christians up to the Savior and he intercedes for us. He helps us, sustains us, and heals our bruised, broken hearts. He is able to save to the uttermost—he will go with us all the way and he never goes off duty. There is no need for anybody to be lost when the pro-visions are so patent, so rich and so abundant. Just lay your hand in his and he will lead you on and finally lead you gently home. Are you in the house of God? If not, you can not claim the benefits of Christ's High Priesthood. Will you not tonight come to the Savior? Just as you are, pleading no worth, no merit of your own, but pleading only the merits of Christ's atonement, come to him. Come in simple, trusting, obedient faith and be saved.

While heaven waits, while mercy lingers and while we pray, will you come? Our blessed Lord refuses none, Who would to him their souls unite;

Believe1 obey, the work is done, Then why not tonight?

* * * *

FOOT NOTE.—In the above sermon Romans 8:26 is alluded to. This passage says that the Spirit helps our infirmities and intercedes for us with groanings that can not be uttered. But in the true sense there is only one intercessor for man and that is Christ (1 Timothy 2:5). An intercessor is one who offers his own life or some merit of his own in behalf of those for whom he intercedes. The word that is translated intercessions in Romans 8:26-27 should be translated "offers complaints unto God with groanings unutterable." That the Spirit expresses the grief, the sorrows, the complaints which we can not ourselves utter, seems to be the thought. The word for

intercessions is elsewhere translated “complaineth”. Romans 8:34 says it is Christ who maketh intercessions for us.

00A.11 CHAPTER VIII.—Christ's Blood: How It Saves Us

CHAPTER VIII CHRIST'S BLOOD AND HOW IT SAVES US The sermon tonight is to deal with the question oi vicarious atonement. Of course you understand that vicarious means one suffering for another—the innocent for the guilty. This doctrine has been scoffed at by unbelievers and it is today rejected by some religious teachers—the modernists for example.

They reject the idea for two reasons. First, they have such a high estimate of themselves and they glory so much in man's worth and powers and achievements, that they will not admit that man was in such a sinful and lost condition as to require this supreme sacrifice. Second, and this idea is based on the first, they do not see why an infinite God could not have redeemed men in some other way—some way that was less expensive and less horrible They say it is unjust for an innocent man to suffer for the guilty. Like the Jews of old, Christ is a stumbling block to them for the reason they do not want to admit their need of divine grace. They want to establish their own righteousness and will not submit to the righteousness of God. And then again they are like the ancient Greeks in that Christ to them is foolishness. They seek after wisdom. They want to attribute all man's success and moral achievements to his own sapience and sagacity. They want man to work out his own salvation independent of God. The)' think that man's philosophy, scientific researches and mechanical inventions will finally rid the earth of sin and suffering and death. Hence they even now deny the existence of sin, and they try to ignore and laugh at old age; they are constantly experimenting with monkey glands in an effort to turn old men into young—and they have assumed to rob death of its terrors, they treat it as a trifle and it is decidedly bad taste to weep or mourn for the death of a loved one in this age.

Nevertheless the earth is still freighted with suffering and sorrow; crime having advanced a pace under this philosophy, is holding high carnival in the land and death continues to billow the earth with the graves of our fellow beings. But these fanatical pseudo-philosophers, these psycho-science-inongers refuse to face the facts, and if a man— a boy, the product of their teaching—commits a crime so atrocious that it outrages the earth they will rush across the country in great numbers to testify—'give expert testimony—to the idea that he is insane and not responsible. There is no sin—no one is responsible, in their theory. But all of us who are yet rational enough to reason, know that sin, suffering and death are here, and that all of man's science and philosophy have not removed these things from the earth. If we admit this, surely we are ready to seek a remedy—to welcome a. relief. This relief and this remedy can come only through divine grace—through the Gospel of Christ. The Bible abundantly teaches that man is lost and that the Son of God came to seek and to save; that the blood was shed for our remission and that the cross is the emblem of our salvation. That we "must needs go home by the way of the cross." That the blood-sprinkled way is the only way. You will now please permit me to quote a few passages from God's holy word to illustrate this thought. Most of you are familiar with these texts, but they are the words of life and you like for them to be sung over and over again to you. In the midst of the religious and intellectual confusion and false philosophy of our day this blessed Bible doctrine comes like a gentle shower upon the parched earth. But hear the Scriptures. The prophet

Zechariah foresaw man’s redemption through the “fountain filled” with blood and sung of it in these words: In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness. (Zechariah 13:1-9)

Isaiah also caught the vision of one coming up with “dyed garments from Bozrah” and sang of the mighty to save Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, marching in the greatness of his strength?

I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save. Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the winevat? I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the peoples there was no man with me. (Isaiah 63:1-3.) And of course we all remember what he says in the fifty-third chapter:

But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned everyone tn his own way; and Jehovah laid upon him the iniquity of us all. The wicked Caiaphas unwittingly prophecied that Christ would die for others: But a certain one of them, Caiaphas, being high priest that year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, nor do ye take account that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. Now this he said not of himself: tout toeing high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus shiuld die for the nation; and not for the nation only, but that he might also gather together into one the children of God that are scattered abroad. (John 11:49-52.) Our Lord himself not only taught that his blood was shed for human redemption, but he also erected a monument to perpetuate that doctrine: he instituted a memorial feast. How can modernists celebrate the Lord’s supper? Whether they call it “eucharist,” sacrament” or something else, it has one meaning. Hear this:

"And as they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed, and brake it; and he gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood and the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins." (Matthew 26:28.) The following passages from Paul will leave no doubt as to what he taught. We give them one after the other without comment. Notice the emphasis upon the blood and the cross.

Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit ath made you bishops, to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood. (Acts 20:28.) But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe; for there is no distinction; for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the showing, I say, of his righteousness at this present season: that he might himself be just, and the justified of him that hath faith in Jesus. (Romans 3:21-26.) To the praise of the glory of his grace, which he freely bestowed on us in the Beloved: in whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace. (Ephesians 1:6-7.)

Wherefore remember, that once ye, the Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called Circumcision, in the flesh, made by hands; that ye were at that time separate from Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of the promise, having no hope and without God in the world. But now in Christ Jesus ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ. (Ephesians 2:11-13.)

"For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in him should all the fulness dwell" and through him to reconcile all things unto himself, having made peace through the blood of his cross; through him, I say, whether things upon the earth, ot things in the heavens. And you, being in time past alienated and enemies in your mind in your evil works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and without blemish and unreprovable before him. (Colossians 1:19-22.)

John tells us that the blood not only cleanses sinners when they obey the gospel, but he shows us also that it constantly, continuously, keeps Christians—those who walk in the light—free from sin. Constantly cleanses them. Hear John: And this is the message which we have heard from him and announce unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with him and walk in the darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: but if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin. If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us. (1 John 1:5-9.)

Peter many times emphasized this doctrine and chimed in with the whole chorus of inspired men on the sublime theme of Christ Crucified. Let us hear Peter: And if ye call on him as Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to each man’s work, pass the time of your sojourning in fear: knowing that ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things, with silver or gold, from your vain manner of life handed down from your fathers; but with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood o: Christ: who was foreknown indeed before the foundation of the world, but was manifested at the end of the times for your sake. (1 Peter 1:17-20.) The seven thunders of the apocalypse also added testi mony to this doctrine in many places. When John saw the redeemed host in white garments he reports this conversation concerning them: And one of the elders answered, saying unto me, These that are arrayed in the white robes, who are they, and whence came they? And I say unto him, My lord, thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they that come out of the great tribulation, and they washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. (Revelation 7:13-15.) But the teaching of Paul in Hebrews (Hebrews 9:1-28 and Hebrews 10:1-39, which passages were cited last night when we studied the priesthood), is as clear and strong as language, logic and analogy can make it. He says that Christ offered himself for our sins, purchased eternal redemption with his blood and then with the merit of that shed blood went into the Holy of Holies to appear before the face of God for us. That the Israelites were cleansed from ceremonial defilement by the blood of calves and goats, but that our consciences—our souls— are cleansed from actual sin by the blood of Christ: That the old covenant, the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry were sanctified by blood and that likewise the new covenant and all that appertains to the service of God under it are blood-purchased and blood-sanctified. And he concludes by saying, “Without the shedding of

blood there is no remission" (Hebrews 9:22).

This, of course, settles the question with all who accept the Bible as a standard. That book being true, you can not be saved without the blood. And yet we find many men who claim to believe the Bible and who will agree with us theoretically that nothing can take away our sins but the blood of Jesus and who will turn right around and contend for a principle or an idea that is inimical to the doctrine of the blood atonement. And not only that, but they live in harmony with that false idea. They claim to believe in the efficacy of Christ's atonement—of his blood—and yet by their conduct they count it an unholy thing. They neglect and refuse to have it applied to their souls and trust something else for salvation. Men, how in the light of all those plain, pointed, unmistakable statements of God's word which you have heard tonight, and many others like them, can you trust anything to save you but the blood of Jesus? How.can you afford to remain out from under the blood? To remain out of the covenant, out of the blood-bought church? Many of you are doing it. For example, you speak to a man about obeying the gospel—about becoming a Christian—and he will begin to make one excuse or another, and in the final analysis all the excuses amount to the same thing, which is: "I don't think it is necessary for me to obey the gospel—I think I'll be saved anyway." And that is tantamount to saying:

"So far as I am concerned there was no need for Jesus to die. I can be saved without him. I don't need his blood to cleanse me. So far as my salvation is concerned, his blood is a useless thing." That is just what you say, men, every time you try to offer any reason for not surrendering Jp Christ and allowing him to take away your sins. Sometimes a man will say, "O, I'm just as good as many church members. There are so many hypocrites in the church. I will just risk .my chance out of the fold—out of Christ."

Yes, there are hypocrites in the church. We can not deny that charge, however embarrassing it may be. But that will not give you any advanage. That will not be any plea for your redemption. If every professed Christian on earth tonight were a hypocrite—which is not true, of course—that would not save you. You can not be saved on other men's demerits. To plead the hypocrisy of church members is to sentence Christ to a useless death because his friends have betrayed him. Even the Pharisees were too logical, if not too fair, to send Christ to the cross because of the treachery and hypocrisy of Judas Iscariot. And even if you are as good as the best church member you can not be saved out of Christ. Church members will not be saved on their own goodness. They do not expect that, or they would not be in Christ. They expect to be found in him not having a righteousness of their own, even that which is by the law, that is, a righteousness attained by complying with legal requirements or by measuring up to a perfect standard, "but that which is through faith in Christ Jesus, the righteousness which is from God through faith" (Php 3:9).

Sometimes we find men who are depending on their own morality—their own worth and merit for salvation. O, what a delusion ! There were good men in that sense, my friends, before Jesus came to the earth to die for us. They had good laws, too; a high moral code. A law that was given by Jehovah and was ordained to life— intended to give life. (Romans 7:10.) This law was holy, and the commandment holy and righteous and good, but men were carnal, sold under sin, and this law proved to be to death because it exacted more of men than they could do. And by the works of the law no flesh is justified. Then by what sort of law or system of laws are you going to be saved, today?

Men sometimes depend on :heir fraternal orders or benevolent societies—their lodges—to save them. They say, ‘If I live up to the demands of my lodge, I’ll be saved. Our requirements are high. They will surely make a good man out of any one.”

Well, now let us grant that all you say for your lodge is true. Let us grant that it has good laws and that it will make men good, honest, true and charitable. But do you not see that after all, that is only another way of saying that you are good enough to be saved without* the blood and righteousness of Christ? That you are going to be saved through a man-made system? Through a legal process of a cultural program? Do you think your lodge has better laws—a higher moral code than that even by God on the two tables of stone? Is it not a fact that all that is good in any lodge is based on these principles or precepts found in the Book of God? Yet men could not be saved by those laws. They tried it for about two thousand years and then Christ had to leave heaven and come to this earth and die on the cross to redeem a ruined and recreant race.

Even some of the heathen nations had moral requirements as stringent and as salutary as any lodge or society of men has ever had. But these did not avail. If they did, then why did Christ have to die?

Paul says, ‘“For if there had been a law given which could make alive, verily righteousness would have been of the law” (Galatians 3:21). But was such a law ever given? No, indeed. Hear him again “For if righteousness is through the law, then Christ died for nought” (Galatians 2:21).

There you are, my friends. Righteousness is not by the law—is not by any law of works, either human or divine—and no law can make alive, or save. Our righteousness—that is, the righteousness that commends us to God, that saves—is from Christ. The song of every real Christian—every one who knows the Bible—is:

My hope is built on nothing less Than Jesus’ blood and righteousness;

I dare not trust the sweetest frame But wholly lean on Jesus’ name. On Christ the Solid Rock, I stand, All other ground is sinking sand.

Nothing in the Bible is more clearly stated than this, beloved. Hear these passages: But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets: even the righteousness of God through faith in Christ Jesus unto all them that believe. (Romans 3:21-22.) But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who was made unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification, and redemption: that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord. (1 Corinthians 1:30-31.)

Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf; that we /night become the righteousness of God in him. (2 Corinthians 5:21.)

Yea verily, and I count all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I suffered the loss of all things and do count them but refuse, that I ma- gain Christ and be found in him, not having a righteousness of mine own, even that whici is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is from God by faith. (Php 3:8-9.)

Only through the righteousness of our Reedemer shall we see the face of God. You can not possibly be saved on your own efforts without the healing balm of the cross, You can not be saved

by a legal system You can not reach heaven by your own moral achievements. You are leaning on a broken reed, my friends. You are building on the moving sands of a treacherous and unsafe foundation. You would just as well to try to climb a moonbeam to heaven as to try to pass through those gates of pearl on your own good works. There is nothing that can save you but the blood of Jesus.

Yet men of today are depending on everyth'ng except the blood. Statesmen are depending on moral legislation to save the people. Educators are depending on education and scientists are depending on scientific researches and discoveries. Philosophers are depending upon the potency of their philosophical speculations. All these things may be good in their own places; they may bring benefits into our earth life, but they only embellish and build up the outer man and leave the heart untouched and unsaved.

Wisdom could not save Solomon from idolatry and polygamy. Philosophy could not save Bacon from bribery. Poetry could not save Byron from immorality. Education could not save Leopold and Loeb from crimes of the most shocking, brutal and atrocious nature.

Ah, yes, they had education, art, philosophy and science before Jesus came to save a ruined world. The philosophy of Socrates, Seneca, Pythagoras, Plato, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius has never been excelled except by the principles of the gospel. Yet the conditions of society at the time these men lived have been depicted in as dark colors by Seneca and other non-Christian writers as it is by Paul. Licentiousness and cruelty ruled the age and ruined their nations.

Art attained such a height in Athens that it is said the birds of the heavens pecked at the grapes which Appelles painted on the canvas. But art and philosophy could not save Athens from eternal ruin. In our own times, my friends, we have witnessed the utter failure of education, science and philosophy as a means of saving the world from war, butchery and brutality. No nation known to history has ever attained the height in science and education that Germany had reached prior to the most senseless and worst war that ever disgraced the history of man. But German "Kultur" could not take the brute out of the war lord's heart; and the spirit of terrorism and might-makes-right plunged an unsuspecting world into the vortex of a German made hell.

O, how we should all labor and pray to bring the nations under the blood-stained banner of the Prince of Peace and induce them to crown him Lord of lords and Ruler of the kings of earth. And then we would have peace on earth and good will among men. The principles of his religion will transform the lives of men and fill their hearts with forbearance, forgiveness, altruism and the peaceable fruits of righteousness. They will make all men brothers and fill the earth with love, peace and joy. But nothing else will do this. "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." But we have already seen that according to the Sc. ip- tures there is no salvation without the blood. "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission." No soul can be saved except through the merit of Calvary's Cross. No soul that lived before Christ and no soul that lives after Christ has ever been saved or can ever be saved except by the blood of the crucified One. As the beams of the cross pointed in opposite directions, so did the significance of the atonement extend in both directions—both backward and forward. The blood rolled back to the crumbling walls of Eden ruined, and rolled down the future to the walls of eternity and embraced in its crimson tide all the suffering souls of sinful men. For "Christ did by the grace of God taste of death for every man" (Hebrews 2:9).

But, you ask, how were the people who lived before Christ came saved by his blood.

They were saved by his blood in exactly the same way that we are saved by it now. That is, the principle is the same.

They were saved through faith in his blood. From the time that Abel offered his excellent sacrifice by faith, in the early dawn of time, when the mists of the morning of creation still hung across the horizon, down to the hour when Jesus poured out his blood on Calvary's hill—every lamb that died on the altars of earth was a picture of the Lamb of God that was to die to take our sins away. Peter says Christ was slain from the foundation of the world. How ? In the purpose of God and in type when Abel's lamb was slain. That is why God required an animal sacrifice—a dying lamb. Abel offered his sacrifice by faith, and faith cometh by hearing the word of God. Therefore God had commanded this kind of offering. Otherwise it could not have been by faith. His faith was in God and whether he understood the typical feature of his sacrifice or not, God did, and it was a part of a far-reaching, eternal plan.

Paul declares that those sacrifices under the law were shadows of good things to come. (Hebrews 10:1-4.) And then he tells us that the body which cast this shadow is Christ. (Colossians 2:16.) Therefore those Israelites who offered those lambs in accord with God's instructions did so by faith and received the blessing and at the same time they pictured the death of Christ in their dying lambs. But what blessing did they receive from these offerings? Paul declares that the blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin, but that their sins were remembered again every year. Ah, that is it, they were remembered again at the end of the year, but they were not remembered for a year. Their day of atonement came annually. Upon that day their sins fell upon them again, but the High Priest went into the Holy of Holies that day and offered blood for them and they were put forward for a year. This they did year by year continually until death claimed them. Then the next generation went on with the same services and ceremonies. But those who died in faith, hence in obedience to God, had their sins moved forward, but not forgiven. Then Christ came and took them all away, blotted them out forever for those who had died in faith.

Let me illustrate this. Suppose I wanted to borrow some money. I go to the bank and borrow a thousand dollars on my note, unsecured and no interest paid in advance. (Now, no banker would do business this way, but God did.) The note falls due in one year and I can not pay it; can not even pay the interest. The banker lets me add the interest and renew the note. At the expiration of another year I again add the accrued interest and renew the note. At the end of another year I repeat the process, and so on year after year until the interest has grown to a greater amount than the principal. Then at last I die. The note was not due at my death, but it soon matured and I left nothing to even apply on that debt. Now, who will pay that debt? Who will take up that note? Why, you say, that banker ought to pay it. He owes it to his stockholders. He is responsible for that money. Exactly so, my friends.

Now, that is what God did for the people who lived before Christ died. He passed over their sins year by year on the condition that they offer the sacrifices he commanded. Then when they died God assumed the responsibility and set forth Christ to be a propitiation— that means satisfaction-:-for the sins that he had in his forbearance passed over aforetime. That is exactly what Paul says in Romans 3:23-25, which has already been quoted in full once in this sermon. But if you will now read it again you will see that thought clearly presented. In Hebrews 9:15 the same

thought is expressed “And for this cause he is the mediator of a new covenant, that a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant they that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance.” That is the way those people who lived before Christ were saved. They were saved by the blood of Christ. Through faith in the blood. They manifested that faith by doing exactly what God commanded them to do. And in that obedience there was the picture, the type of Christ dying for the sins of the world. But now, suppose some ancient Israelite had grown wise and philosopical above what was written and had said: “I am not going to offer any lamb. I don’t want that High Priest to take any blood into that tent for me.

I believe in God. I am going to trust God for my salvation. My faith in God is just so strong that I am going to rely upon him to save me apart from any ordinance, or ceremony or external obedience. I have faith—I have faith in God. That sacrifice can’t save anybody and to offer it would be to trust in the blood of a sheep. It would be sheep salvation. Excuse me.”

Now, I ask you, beloved, which man has faith in God, the one who takes him at his word, accepts his provisions, and obeys his commands, or the one, who rejects his arrangements, refuses to hear his word and rebels at his command? Which do you say?

Ah, sure, you will answer the one who humbly submits and obeys his commands. But was there any cleansing efficacy in the blood of those lambs? None whatever. It was impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins. Those sacrifices made nothing perfect.

Then why were they offered? Because God commanded them—they were pictures of his plan. They symbolized Christ. Through them the obedient Israelite reached the blood of Christ. To put it tersely, God commanded, their faith acted, and the blood saved. Now, upon this side of the cross we are also saved through faith in his blood. They looked forward to the cross for salvation. We look backward to the cross. How do we reach the blood? By faith. What sort of faith? The faith that takes God at his word, obeys his commands and trusts his promises.

Again God has commanded, our faith acts, and the blood saves. But what commands does our faith obey before we reach the blood?

Paul says that Christ is the author of eternal salvation to all those who obey him. (Hebrews 5:9.) After he was raised from the dead and had all power in heaven and on earth he said to his apostles:

Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. (Mark 16:15-16.) Then the first time they ever preached this gospel and when men asked what to do, what were they told? Here it is:

Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. (Acts 2:38.) Believe, repent and be baptized. Those are the conditions plainly stated.

But, says one, I can not be baptized for the remission of sins. That would be water salvation.

No, it is not. It is salvation through the blood and you reach that blood by faith. But you know it is not faith that rejects God’s commands. Hear Paul:

Know ye not, that so many of as as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should wall in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection. (Romans 6:3-6.)

There we have a likeness of his death again. As the obedience of the Israelite pictured the death of Christ, then future, so the obedience of the man coming unto God now commemorates, symbolizes and pictures the death of Christ, now past. Yea, there is also now the picture of his burial and resurrection.

We die to sin in the likeness of his death, we are buried in baptism in the likeness of his burial and raised in the likeness of his resurrection. The complete likeness of that transaction by which alone we are saved. That is the way we reach the blood.

Thus God has made the death of his Son to stand in the center of the ages as our dying Lamb and Savior, And he so arranged his plan that all who came to him for mercy and salvation before the death of Christ did that in obedience to him which was a symbol and prophecy of that dying Savior. And now his commands on this side of the cross require those who come to him for mercy to do that which symbolizes and commemorates that dying, buried, and risen Savior. That is the center and soul of all divine service. It is that which gives point and meaning to any law, doctrine, creed or command. That has been the theme of all inspired men. It was the refrain of the prophets' song and the high- ringing, resounding note of the angels' chorus. It is the hope of earth and the joy of heaven.

If I could represent this idea geographically, I would erect in the center of the earth, on a mountain that would lift its head above the stars, and upon the topmost peak. I would set the rugged old cross, and on top of that cross I would set a beacon light of greater glory than the rising sun and cause it to shoot its radiant shafts to the remotest bounds of illimitable space, so that all creatures in the entire universe could see that human redemption by means of the cross is the acme of earth's hope. My friends, this is the whole substance of the Christian religion. This was the gospel preached by the apostles. This was the doctrine that produced the martyrs and this was the hope that sustained them when they felt the flames. This was the faith of our fathers and this is the faith that will give you the victory over doubt and fear and sin and death and hell. What shall we do about it? Are we going to give it up?

O, I wish here and now, once again to confess this as my faith, to pledge my all and plight my life for this faith. Will you join me, brethren, in this pledge and express it often in that grand old hymn?

Faith of our fathers living still, In spite of dungeon, fire and sword;

O, how our hearts beat high with joy, When e'er we hear that glorious word.

Faith of our fathers, holy faith!

We will be true to thee till death. Our fathers, chained in prisons dark, Were still in heart and conscience free;

How sweet would be their children's fate If they, like them, could die for thee!

Faith of our fathers! we will love Both friend and foe in all our strife; And preach thee too, as love knows how, By kindly words and virtuous life.

Faith of our fathers, holy faith!

We will be true to thee till death. But before we close tonight we are going to call upon those in this audience who are not in Christ to come to him now. Have you been to Jesus for his cleansing power? Have you been taken captive by this glorious gospel and given your life to the Lord? If not, why do you delay? What do you hope for? You arc lost without Christ and if you die in your sins he has declared that where he is you can not come. Then why not be-come a Christian now?

We are not asking you to join “our church,” or to join any denomination; to subscribe to any human creed or to put yourself under the direction and control of any ecclesiastic council, conference, synod, association or any other sort of “church officials”—no, nothing of that kind. We are not here for that purpose.

We only ask you to come to Christ; to enthrone him in your heart as Lord of your life; to become a Christian by obedience to his will—as that has been dearly pointed out in this sermon. There is only one plea you need to make and that is that his blood was shed for you. Come relying upon that alone. Just as you are—waiting for nothing. Come saying:

Just as I am! without one plea, But that thy blood was shed for me, And that thou bid’st me come to thee, O, Lamb of God, I come! I come!’

Just as I am! and waiting not To rid my soul of one dark blot; To thee, whose blood can cleanse each spot, O, Lamb of God, I come! I come! That is the idea, dear friends, you will never be any better than you are right now until you come to Christ, for no spot can be taken away from your soul until his blood washes you whiter than the snow. Now while we sing will you come? Bro. Rose will stand here at this aisle. Bro. Stubblefield will stand here on the left. Come and give these brethren your hand in token of the fact that you give God your heart—obey his truth and be saved. Right now, please sing. In the Cross of Christ I glory, Tow’ring o’er the wrecks of time;

All the light of sacred story Gathers round its head sublime.

00A.12 CHAPTER IX.—Christ on Trial or What Shall I Do With Jesus?

CHAPTER IX CHRIST ON TRIAL, OR WHAT SHALL I DO WITH JESUS WHO IS CALLED THE CHRIST? The question for our sermon tonight is Pilate's question: But the governor answered and said unto them, Which of the two will ye that I release unto you? And they said, Barabbas. Pilate saith unto them, What then shall I do unto Jesus who is called Christ? They all say, Let him be crucified. And he said, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out exceedingly, saying, Let him be crucified. (Matthew 27:21-23.)

Sometimes when we consider the situation in which Pilate was placed in the trials of Jesus we are almost inclined to sympathize with him, for it is evident that he made an honest effort to release Christ. But again we have only contempt for him when we realize that he could have released him and if necessary he could have called out the Roman Army to disperse that mob and protect an innocent man. The Roman Captain was right there in the castle and as he later protected Paul he could have saved Christ. It is the duty of an officer to protect the innocent as well as to punish the guilty—to see that justice is meted out. But Pilate was swayed by the voice of the people. Like many another politician he was willing to vote for what popular sentiment called for, whether it was right or not. He would sacrifice an innocent man for political reasons.

But, as we have stated, Pilate did attempt to release Jesus and this question came as an effort and after the failure of one effort to let him go. When we see Pilate's position just as he cried out, "What then shall I do with Jesus who is called Christ?" we will see that this came almost as a wail from the distressed governor when he was defeated in this effort. In order properly to appreciate this question we must understand the situation and in order to do that we must study the entire proceedings. Ret us, therefore, follow Christ through all the trials up to Pilate's question and then see Pilate follow the advice of those who answered the question. The facts that shall be given in this sermon are found in the accounts given by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. We have to take all that they all give in order to get it complete. Then we can not tell accurately in just what order these things occurred. Of course we know that these things all did take place, but j ust what happened first and what second, etc., it is a little difficult to tell— that is in reference to some of these things. For example, from the reading of some of the accounts without the others it would seem that the Jews themselves first suggested that Pilate release Barabbas and crucify Christ. But from a study of all the reports it seems clear that this was Pilate's idea. This was a ruse to get rid of Jesus. Pilate remembered his custom of releasing a prisoner unto the Jews at this season and he suggested that he would release either Barabbas or Jesus. He shut them up to these two in the decision. He forced them to choose between these two. He evidently thought that if he selected the worst criminal then in the prisons of his province—and there could hardly have been a worse one— and forced the Jews to choose between him and Christ they would surely have more fairness, justice and honor than to cry for the freedom of a murderer and send an innocent man to the cross. But Pilate was mistaken. He didn't know the strength and fury of religious prejudice, rivalry and jealousy.

You remember, of course, the scene in the garden when Judas led the mob that came out to apprehend our Lord. This was some time in the night and presumably in the early part of the night, at least before midnight. Christ met this mob and surrendered to them and forbade his disciples to fight in his behalf. When his disciples saw him bound and led away they scattered and only two of them seemed to follow him on to the trials. These were Peter and John—and Peter followed a long way behind—and when he reached the high priest's house the gate had been closed and it was only through John's influence that it was opened for Peter; and then Peter denied his Lord. But as he repented we will draw the mantle of charity and forgiveness over that sad scene. The soldiers (for the mob was composed of soldiers, officers, and servants of the priests) first took Christ before Annas who was the father-in-law of Caiaphas the high priest and who was looked upon as the real power behind the throne. Annas asked Jesus about his teaching and about his disciples. Jesus replied that he had taught publicly in the synagogues and in the temple and that he had taught nothing in private, Annas could therefore find out what he had taught by asking those who had heard him. At this reply one of those who held Jesus struck him in the face and rebuked him. Jesus told him that he was on trial and if his reply had been evil to turn it into an accusation—to bear witness against him. If he had not spoken evil then why should he be rebuked and smitten? This is the only time in all his trials that Jesus seemed to resent or even to reply to any charge they brought against him. It may be that this man who struck Jesus did not do it because he thought the answer was curt and disrespectful, but because he thought it was untrue. He may have been made to believe that Jesus was an evil-doer and that he had been secretly stirring up a rebellion against the constituted authorities. Jesus, under that view, therefore meant to correct him by challenging him to become a witness against him if he knew his answer had been false. Many a man would have to take back what he has said if he were called upon to be a witness or to sustain it in court. At any rate, Jesus did speak out against the injustice of this treatment.

After the experience before Annas Jesus was next taken before Caiaphas, the same night. The details of his trial before Caiaphas are not given, but it was here that Peter's test came and here he fell. Malchus, whose ear Peter had deftly amputated with his sword, was a servant of Caiaphas and he probably was present at this time, but he was no doubt engrossed with the trial and was not interested in Peter.

It was unlawful to hold court at night, but Jesus was being questioned and tried informally while they were waiting for the dawn when they could assemble the Sanhedrin. It was perhaps during these night trials that those witnesses were secured and bribed and prepared to testify against him. And old Caiaphas, who was the high priest and therefore the head, the chairman or the chief man of the Sanhedrin—which was their supreme court— was active in preparing this case. Instead of acting in a manner becoming his position—instead of acting as a calm, dignified, dispassionate jurist, he is acting the part of a prosecuting attorney and preparing to convict Christ in the court of which he was the head. When the day came, as early as they could, they called together the council or the Sanhedrin. It may be that some of the members of this body were not as unfair as Caiaphas and this he realized, hence he was anxious to get testimony that would convince them and secure their verdict against Christ. Joseph of Arimathaea and Nico- demus were both members of this court and once before Nicodetnus had dared to speak a word in behalf of a fair trial for Jesus, and had received a sarcastic ultimatum from some of the others, perhaps from Caiaphas. Caiaphas had, on a former occasion, told these members of the Sanhedrin that

they were blind and didn't know anything at all if they did not see that it was expedient to put Jesus to death. Nicodemus and Joseph were evidently not present at this trial, for the writers tell us that the verdict was unanimous and Luke states that Joseph did not consent to their counsel and deed.

Before this Sanhedrin all the evidence that the scheming Caiaphas and his official helpers had worked up was submitted. The witnesses that they had bribed came and swore the falsehoods that they were taught to swear. But the testimony was conflicting and even Caiaphas could see that the case was not made out. He was not willing to call for a verdict on the charges they had made.

Then as a final effort he put Christ on oath and said, "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou art the Christ, the Son of God." Christ had to answer this, for the law of Moses required a man to answer when he was adjured or he would have to take the death penalty. Jesus complied with the law and answered. He told them plainly that he was the Son of God.

Then old Caiaphas tore his priestly robe in great astonishment and outraged piety and exclaimed:

"He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard the blasphemy; what think ye?" This was a shout of triumph from old Caiaphas. He knew he had the most conservative member of that court convinced now. "Behold, you have heard the blasphemy!" It is no longer hearsay. It is not a false charge. He said he was the Son of God, "you heard him!" Then they all rose up and tore their garments and said he is worthy of death. That was the verdict.

Now, blasphemy was a capital offense under the law and if Christ had not been the Son of God their verdict was perfectly legal and correct. But Christ was the Son of God and he had offered proof in abundance. But who ever now says that Christ was not the Son of God must agree in this verdict and he therefore declares that Christ deserved death and that his crucifixion was just.

Some Modernists claim that Christ did not himself claim to be the Son of God. They say his apostles and early disciples made this claim for him after he was gone. But you see, my friends, that Jesus did make this claim on oath and was put to death on the charge of blasphemy. He died for saying he was the Son of God.

Having now condemned him, they began to mock Jesus and to spit in his face. They blind-folded him and then struck him and told him to prophesy or to tell by divine knowledge who it was that struck him. This was in ridicule of his claim to be divine. This was before the religious court and it was his religious claim that was here mocked. It is hard to believe that these priests themselves did these things, but there is no doubt that they approved and perhaps directed the soldiers and servants in this cruel and blasphemous mockery. Their next step is to secure,the authority.of the Roman courts to put him to death. They had sentenced him, but they were not allowed to execute him. Roman law had taken that privilege away from them. So the whole company arose and went to Pilate, the Roman governor of Judea, to get him to sign the death warrant,

They first attempted to get Pilate to sign the warrant on their sentence without examining Christ himself. Pilate asked what crime he was charged with and they said, "If he had not been an evil doer we would not have brought him to you." Pilate told them to take him and judge him themselves according to their law. This was Pilate's first effort to get rid of Jesus. He seemed to

see from the first that Jesus was not a criminal. If he had been, these Jews would have specified the crime of which he was guilty. He saw at once that it was a religious issue and that these priests were very biased and bitter. But when Pilate told them to take him and judge him they reminded him that it was unlawful for them to put anyone to death. And death was what they were demanding for this man.

Then Pilate called upon them again to specify the charge against him. They then said that he had been stirring up the people and telling them that it was unlawful to pay tribute to Caesar and proclaiming himself as Christ a king. This charge was wholly untrue, but they knew Pilate would not consider the thing for which they had sentenced Christ. Blasphemy was no violation of Roman law. But of course treason was; that was a capital crime and as it was well known that the Jews were looking for a king to come and deliver them from Roman power, they thought Pilate would believe this charge and sentence the prisoner forthwith. But Pilate asked Jesus if he was the king of the Jews, if that was his claim. Jesus said, “Do you say that of yourself or did others tell you that concerning me?” Pilate said, “Am I a Jew? Why, your own nation delivered you unto me.” Which was of course an admission that the Jews had made the accusation. Then Jesus told him that his kingdom is not of this world. If it were his servants would fight, but it is not of this world, therefore his servants do not fight: Could not then and can not now. “Put up thy sword” is the command of Jesus.

Pilate said, You are a king then, are you?

Jesus admitted that he was.

Pilate went out to the Jews—who would not enter into the Gentile hall, for that would defile them!—and told them that he found no fault in Christ. Pilate did not understand the nature of the kingdom that Christ was to rule over, but he saw that it was not a rival kingdom to the Roman empire, He acquits Christ of that charge at once. He told the Jews that he would therefore release Christ. Their charge was not sustained. This is Christ’s first acquittal. But they cried out with great vehemence and told Pilate that if he released Christ he was not Caesar’s friend, for Christ had stirred up the people against Caesar all the way from Galilee down to Jerusalem.

Now, when Pilate heard this, it gave him an idea. Perhaps Jesus is from Galilee, if he is, then he belongs to Herod’s jurisdiction and Pilate would be rid of him. On investigation he found that Jesus was indeed from Galilee. He then sent him to Herod, who was in Jerusalem for the feast. Pilate no doubt thought that he was now relieved of any further responsibility in reference to Jesus. He had examined him and found him innocent, but he didn’t have the courage to release him. So he sent him to Herod.

Herod had been hearing of Christ and his miracles and for a long time he had wished to see him. He was therefore glad of this opportunity of examining Christ. He thought that Christ would display his powers and perform some tricks for his amusement. But he was very much mistaken. He asked many questions, but Jesus did not give him any answer at all. He did not one time open his mouth while he was before Herod. He would talk to Pilate. He would not make any reply to the accusations they brought against him, but he talked to Pilate. But not once did he speak to Herod. The Jews had followed him and they vehemently accused him before Herod. No doubt they made the charge that he proclaimed himself a king and rival of Caesar. For it was before Herod that this

claim was first mocked. They clothed Christ in the garments of a king and put a reed in his hand to represent a scepter and put a crown of thorns upon his head. Then they bowed down before him in mock obeisance and said, “Hail! King of the Jews!” Old Herod himself forgot his dignity and joined in this mockery. He came off of his official seat and bowed down before Christ in mock honor.

After they had amused themselves in this way until they were satisfied Herod sent Jesus back to Pilate, still wearing the robes of mockery and the crown of thorns. Herod, no doubt, communicated with Pilate, for they became friends because of this incident. For a long time they had been enemies. There had been no diplomatic relations between them, but this trial brought them together. But Herod did not send back any charge against Christ. On the contrary, he evidently told Pilate that he found no fault in him, for Pilate reported to the Jews that Herod had not found Christ guilty of any wrong-doing. The only thing in the whole situation that looks the least favorable to Herod is the fact that he did not sentence Christ to death, for it had been known that Herod wanted to put him out of the way. It is probable that Herod now looked upon his claim as a huge joke when he saw him under arrest. But it is more probable that he sent Jesus back uncondemtied as a compliment to Pilate. He was pleased that Pilate had shared this tun with him and he would now send the prisoner back to Pilate for sentence. He would defer to Pilate’s judgment. We can hardly think that Herod, the murderer of John the Baptist and the general reprobate that he was, could have had any scruples against sending Christ to the cross. It must have been a diplomatic reason that caused him to send Jesus back to Pilate. But this matter was not a joke with Pilate. He knew that Jesus was an innocent man and he didn’t want to be guilty of his blood. Therefore when he found that he had Christ back on his hands he came before the Jews again and announced that they had brought Jesus to him for sentence, but that he had carefully examined him and found him not guilty. There was no fault in him. He had sent him to Herod and Herod had found no crime in him. Or at least Herod had found nothing worthy of death in him. Pilate said he would therefore scourge Jesus and release him.

Since he had boldly pronounced Jesus not guilty, there was no reason why he should scourge him. If he was innocent of any wrong doing, and Pilate said he was, then why scourge him? But Pilate made that concession to the Jews. He thought they ought to be satisfied with that. But they were not. There arose a tremendous cry of protest at the suggestion of releasing him.

They shouted “Away with him, crucify him! Crucify him!”

Pilate said, “Why? What evil hath he done?” But they only repeated their savage yelling for his blood.

Pilate was troubled. He didn’t want to offend these Jews who were his constituents, and yet he didn’t want to put this innoceut man to death. And to add to his fears his wife sent him word to have nothing to do with that innocent man. He had been in her dreams and she was also troubled about him. Then it was that Pilate fell upon this scheme in his effort to release our Lord.

He remembered that it was customary to release a prisoner to the jews at this feast. It seems that it was the custom to let them choose the one to be released. That he released whomsoever they chose. But this time Pilate confines their choice to two men. Of course we know they had other prisoners, for two others were crucified at this time. Pilate thought he would bring the Jews to their

senses by this marked contrast. He therefore presented Barabbas and forced them to choose between him and Jesus.

Look, who comes through the crowd there? Two soldiers are bringing a prisoner bound in chains. See the people fall back and make way for them. He is now before the governor, and we can get a good view of him. He is not humiliated because of his situation. Neither is he scared and suppliant. He is bold and defiant. He is the leader of a band of brigands or bandits who had been robbing and murdering men. They were not simply outlaws, but they were rebels against the government. They were a sort of political rebels or revolutionists. Hence Barabbas was guilty of at least two capital crimes, sedition and murder. Now, if it is Caesar's government that these Jews are jealous for—if they are anxious to put down a rival leader, here is one.

There he stands, guilty and defiant. Challenging the law to do its worst.

There also stands the Christ, meek, humble, innocent but unresisting. He bears the marks of the night of trials and abuse. He has the thorns upon his brow and perhaps there are the streaks of blood down his face. There are two men bound. Now, Pilate reminds the Jews of his custom and tells them that he will release one of these two, which shall it be? The priests at once cried for Barabbas and began to urge all the people to call for Barabbas. And soon the shout became loud and clamorous, "Barabbas, Barabbas!"

Then Pilate, utterly defeated and disappointed and distressed, cried out: "What then shall I do with Jesus who is called Christ ?"

They all shout back, "Let him be crucified."

Then Pilate gave order to release Barabbas.

Look! See Barabbas smiling. That grim, defiant look is gone and a look of pleasing surprise has spread over his face. See the soldier unlock the chains and hear them clank as they drop off. See Barabbas make a broad bow to the governor and turn and bow profusely to the people! See him spring quickly into the crowd and see him receive the congratulations of his friends! He hears Pilate's anxious question and he throws one glance at Jesus, who is going to the cross in his stead. There the innocent man is being sent to the cross, while he, the man under the legal sentence, justly condemned, is permitted to go scot free!

What a true picture of the world's redemption! When I see Barabbas unshackled and set free, I say, there I go! That represents me. I was a sinner condemned, with no excuse to plead, hopeless, and Jesus took my place and died for me! He went to the cross and I go free.

Pilate gave commandment to scourge Jesus. It was the custom to scourge a prisoner before crucifying him. They scourged with thongs and we are told that the scourging was so severe that the poor victims some l imes died under it. The idea of humane treatment for prisoners was not then in the earth. Punishment was entirely vindictive and was not simply for the protection of society. They inflicted punishment with a relish. They enjoyed seeing the victim suffer. That feeling that now makes bull fights and prize fights popular was then more prominent and pronounced in the human heart, because we have since then had two thousand years of the civilizing and refining influence of the Christian religion.

Evolutionists claim that that feeling is a hang-over from our brute ancestry and that we are evolving—that evolution has lead us away from that barbarous cruelty. But we claim that that feeling is an evidence of our fall, our sin, our depravity. That it was a downward slide toward the brutes.

If it is evolution that is taking it out of us, why is it that the teaching and belief of evolution increases such cruelty today—and even licenses it? Why is it that our laws against prize fighting have broken down under the teaching of evolution ? Why are all such barbarous things that were outlawed by'our Puritan fathers and kept down under the influence of the Christian religion now coming back under the reign of evolutionary propaganda ? Who patronizes prize fights and bull fights? Christians or evolutionists ? But you will please pardon that digression. After Pilate had had Jesus scourged in preparation for the cross he made still another effort to release him. The soldiers were again mocking him and striking him in the face. They had put the crown of thorns upon his head again and had put the purple garment upon him. Pilate saw that Jesus was a pathetic figure and he led him out before the Jews with the thorns on his brow and the robes of mockery draped over his striped and beaten body. As he stood there before the mob Pilate pointed to him and said in the Latin tongue, Ecce Homo! Behold the man! Pilate thought his appearance was enough to soften their hearts and cause them to relent. But they shouted, "Crucify him, Crucify him!"

Pilate said, "I bring him out before you to let you know that I find no fault in him."

They cried, "Crucify him, crucify him!"

Pilate said, "Take him yourselves and crucify him; I find no fault in him." This stung the priests, for it was equal to saying, If you are going to crucify a man who is pronounced innocent by the court, why do you want a warrant from me? If you are going to override the verdict and mob the man, just go ahead. Why wait for legal sentence? If you want to lynch him simply from a sheer motive of blood lust, here he is!

They had to justify themselves now and they said: "We have a law and by that law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God." We are not lynching him. We tried him in our court and found him guilty of blasphemy.

They had made all kind of charges, but this is the first time they had mentioned the thing for which they had condemned him. All their charges before Pilate had been of a political nature in the hope that they would influence him. But at last in self defense they told of the crime for which they had sentenced him to death. He made himself the Son of God.

Pilate then asked Jesus if he was the Son of God. Jesus told him that he was. "Before Pontius Pilate witnessed the good confession" (1 Timothy 6:13). This scared Pilate worse than ever. He didn't know much about God, but he was not without superstition and he didn't want to crucify a God. He sought again to release him. But the Jews cried for his blood. They told Pilate if he released this man he was not Caesar's friend. They jumped back of the charge oh which they had condemned Christ—that did not weigh with Pilate. Instead it made him more anxious to release Jesus. The Jews, then, renewed their old charge that Christ was opposed to Caesar. This however did not effect Pilate. He had passed on that. It was not true. No charge they had made had had any effect on Pilate except the charge that he was the Son of God. That terrified him. But he saw

they were not going to allow him to release Jesus and he thought he would sentence him and at the same time be free from his blood.

He called for a basin of water and washed his hands of the blood. He said, “I am innocent of the blood of this righteous man: see ye to it.”

They said, “Let his blood be upon us and on our children.”

Then Pilate, thinking he was relieved of the blood, got sarcastic. He taunted the Jews. He sat down before them and had Jesus led out in their sight.

He said, “Behold, your King”!

They yelled, “We have no king but Caesar. Crucify him, crucify him!”

Pilate said, “Shall I crucify your King?”

After this scene Pilate wrote the warrant and the soldiers led Christ away to be crucified. He had suffered untold humiliation and torture, out the cross is yet ahead of him. The officers led Jesus to the place of crucifixion but the whole multitude followed.

John tells us that Jesus carried his own cross, but Matthew, Mark and Luke all say that they met Simon of Cyrene coming in from the country and that the soldiers forced him to go with them and carry the cross. Tradition says that Jesus was unable to carry the cross, that he fell under its weight. This tradition is very probably true. Since Simon was not with them when they started, for they met him after they were on their way, we know that Jesus carried the cross until they did meet Simon. We know that from John’s statement that he carried his cross. It was certainly not mercy or sympathy for Jesus on the part of these soldiers that caused them to relieve him of the load and place it upon a stranger. Therefore it must he true that Jesus could not get along under his cross.

There is no indication that Simon had had anything at all to do with the trials. He probably knew nothing at all about them. He was coming in from the country and he saw this mob coming and perhaps drew aside to wait for them to pass, and then, as the prisoners drew near bearing their crosses, one of them gives down under his burden and the soldiers seize Simon and force him to carry the cross. I have often thought that I should like to have been Simon: That I would have sprung to the relief of the Lord and raised that cross upon my shoulder and borne it after my Lord. Would you have been glad to do that, my friends? Well, are you bearing his cross now? Or are you ashamed of him? In this multitude that followed Christ there were some women weeping for him. I think that is a compliment to womanhood. It says these were women of Jerusalem. It doesn’t say that they were disciples. They were women of Jerusalem—hence they were, perhaps, wives and daughters and mothers of the men who were crucifying Christ. But they, like Pilate, were touched by his meekness, humility, innocence and pathetic appearance under this shamefully brutal treatment. They wept for him. Jesus turned and spoke to them. He told them to weep not for him but to weep for themselves and for their children, for that which was corning upon them. He referred to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans.

We will not go on with Christ to the cross tonight. We all know of that awful death and we will leave the story now as we have given a complete account of the trials and scourgings that preceded that death for our sins. It would be interesting to go on with the story and witness the scenes of the

cross, the railing of the mob, the cry of the thief, the seven utterances of our Lord, the quaking of the earth and finally the death and the burial and then the glorious resurrection. But we shall let a mention of those things suffice at this time. My friends, what will you do with Jesus who is called the Christ? What do you say of him? Was he an impostor and did he deserve this death? If not, was he simply a misunderstood and terribly abused man who suffered unjustly? Or was he truly the Son of God? I don't believe there is a man living who will say that he was justly sentenced and executed. That he deserved this treatment. But there are many who will say that he was a good man and a great moral leader and teacher, but they will not confess that he is the Son of God. But that, my friends, is an illogical position. He was either the Son of God or he was a deceiver. He claimed to be the Son of God and died for that claim. If the claim was false then he was not a good man. A good man could not make a false claim and deceive people. Furthermore, if he was not the Son of God, then he was indeed guilty of blasphemy and therefore worthy of death under the Mosaic law. What do you say, was he worthy of death or was he the Son of God? He is on trial before you tonight. Which way will you vote?

There were three men connected with the trials of Christ who represent three classes of people today. They were Simon who bore his cross, Peter who denied him, and Pilate who washed his hands of him. Which one will you imitate? Will you, like Peter, deny him? Will you, like Pilate, wash your hands of him? Will you attempt to waive the question and say, Oh, I'll let theologians settle that.

I don't know about these things, that isn't in my line.

I will not sentence him to death, but I will not release him. I will just wash my hands. But you know, beloved, that Pilate did sentence him. He was responsible for his death. He could not wash his hands free of his blood.

Neither can you. You can not waive this question and not be guilty of crucifying him. Jesus is the best known figure in all human history. Our era is dated from his birth. Now, he was the Son of God or he was not. If he was not the Son of God how can you account for his influence? If he was the Son of God then you are lost unlesr you confess him. What then will you do with Jesus? . He is on your hands tonight—you must answer one way or the other. What is your verdict? May God help us all to bear his cross after him. He is on trial in this age of the world—right now. Some are denying him, others are trying to wash their hands of him and others are bearing his cross. They are suffering the ridicule of an unbelieving world, but what is that? Think of what he endured for us. Behold, the man! What will you do with him? May the Lord help you right now to decide to acknowledge him as the Son of God and your Savior.

00A.13 CHAPTER X.—Christ the Christian's Creed

CHAPTER X CHRIST, THE CHRISTIAN'S CREED

Sometimes members of the church of Christ say: "We have no creed." That statement is incorrect. It is impossible for a religious body to exist without a creed. It is just as impossible as it would be for a political party to exist without a platform, or without some well-defined and clearly announced principles upon which the party stands and for the advocacy of which the party is organized. The church of Christ is not a party in the sense of being only a part of God's children—a few Christians banded together by certain rules that distinguish them from other Christians and also wearing a distinguishing name; for the church, being the "household of God" (Ephesians 2:19), contains all of God's children. It contains all Christians, regardless of color or race or social position, because the same thing that makes a man a Christian makes him a member of the church. Therefore, in becoming Christians, men become members of the church, which is the body of Christ. (Acts 2:38-41; Ephesians 1:18-23; Galatians 3:26-27; 1 Corinthians 12:13.) But because the church is not a "Christian denomination", or a denomination composed of Christians or those who profess to be Christians, is no reason that it is not a body or party with definite principles. The church is a party, established to oppose other parties, too. It is opposed to all evil, and is distinct from and opposed to all other religions or churches—non-Christian religions, such as Buddhism, Confucianism and Zoroastrianism. Has this church, then, no principles that distinguish it from nonChristian parties? Do its members have no rules of life that differentiate them from worldly people—non-church members? Is there no difference between the Christian and the atheist? The answer to this question is ready in the mind of every reader. The atheist is an unbeliever and the Christian is a believer. But a belief is a creed. Whatever, therefore, a Christian believes is his creed. When a man says that the church of Christ has no creed, he means that it has no human creed; that its members do not submit to any ecclesiastical laws made by fallible men, such as pope, priests' or bishops' conferences, to govern their consciences or to stultify their faith. The New Testament church, however, has a creed. We are ready now to inquire—What, then, is the creed of the church? In considering this question, let there be no misunderstanding as to what church we are talking about. We are not thinking of "our denomination" or of the "Campbeilite Church" or of a denomination known as the "church of Christ.". All denominations have their headquarters and their governing officials to whom we could easily appeal for information concerning their organization and rules of faith and practice. In fact, we could get their creed or a statement of their faith from their publishing houses. But we are not just now concerned about what any denomination believes. On the contrary, we are endeavoring to learn what was the creed of the New Testament church—what was the creed of the disciples of Christ in the days of Peter and Paul and Philip and Stephen Their creed should be our creed, and the creed of the church then should be the creed of the church now. The word "creed" is from the Latin verb credo, from which we also derive our words "credit", "creditable", "credible", "credence", etc. The verb credo means I believe. What, then, did Christ and the apostles require people to believe? Is there any stated requirements? Is there no example of a man's saying, "I believe —", in the New Testament?

We all remember that when Philip had preached “Jesus” unto the eunuch and the eunuch demanded baptism, Philip required him to believe first. He did not say what the eunuch must believe, but it was evident that Philip meant he must believe what he had heard—what Philip had preached unto him.

’Therefore the eunuch responded (quoting from the Latin version): “Credo Pilium Dei esse Jesum Christum." Or, from the English Bible: “I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God” (Acts 8:37). Upon this statement of his creed, or his “I believe”, Philip baptized him. On the day of Pentecost, Peter required the people to believe confidently, or to “know assuredly, that God hath made that same. Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ” (Acts 2:36). Paul required the jailer at Philippi to “believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shaft be saved” (Acts 16:31). And to the Romans Paul clearly stated what is to be believed: “That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved” (Romans 10:9). And to put the matter beyond all question, John said “And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book but these are written, that ye might believe (Believe what, John?) that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God: (with what result, John?) and that believing ye might have life through his name” (John 20:30-31). It is clearly settled by these passages that the creed of the New Testament church was: “I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.” Upon this confession of faith, without any further vows or promises, persons were baptized into Christ, or into the church. But it is sometimes said that this confession or creed is not sufficient; that those who desire to become Christians or to enter the church should be put under obligations and solemn vows to live righteous lives, to support the church, and to submit to the counsel of the brethren But those who raise this objection fail to see what the confession means. Of course, when a man desires to become a member of any denomination, it is but natural that the denomination should want him to be loyal to it, to support all its departments of work and to submit to its ruling authorities; for how else could the denomination exist? No doubt, then, our denominational friends are ready to ask: Does a man agree to submit to no authorities, to be governed by no laws, when he enters the church of Christ? Most certainly he agrees to submit to the authorities of the church. Then the question arises, What is the governing authority of the church of Christ? Christ is the Head of the church. (Ephesians 1:23; Ephesians 5:23; Colossians 1:18.) Therefore, to acknowledge Christ means to submit to the Head of the church, and then the acts of obedience by which a man enters into Christ, or into the church, which is his body, declare the man’s surrender and submission. When he is buried with Christ by baptism, he vows his allegiance to Christ; thereby is proclaimed his death to sin and his resurrection to righteousness. Such a person has died in the likeness of Christ’s death, has been buried with him, and has been raised in the likeness of his resurrection. As death has no more dominion over Christ, sin should have no more dominion over the Christjan. (Read Romans 6:1-23) Thus it is seen that the steps that put a man into Christ —into the church—constitute a very solemn and impressive dedication of the life of Christ. A person who is in this manner dedicated to Christ is, of course, under promise to follow in the footsteps of Christ, to obey all his commands. But in order to follow in the footsteps of Christ, he must be acquainted with Christ’s life, and this can be learned only from the Bible—the New Testament. To obey Christ’s commands, the Christian must know them. These, too, can be found only in the Bible. The conclusion, therefore, that the Bible becomes the Christian’s Law Book and Guide Book is inevitable. And it is ail-sufficient. The Bible was given for this very purpose, and is perfect for all

the needs of the man of God. (2 Timothy 3:16.) While Christ was here on earth .he spoke many things that were intended to govern the lives of his followers. These things were after his death confirmed unto us by those who heard him. (Hebrews 2:1-4.) For Christ had strictly commanded them to teach us to observe “all things whatsoever I have commanded you” (Matthew 28:19-20). But Christ could not make known his complete will while he was on earth, for his disciples were not capable of receiving it until the Holy Spirit came upon them. Jesus said: “I have yet many things to say, unto you, but ye can not bear them now. Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide ydu into all the truth” (John 16:12-13). Therefore, that portion of Christ’s will that was not made known by him while here on earth was afterwards declared unto the apostles by the Holy Spirit and through the apostles made known unto us. And Jesus said to his apostles: “He that heareth you heareth me; and he that rejecteth you rejecteth me; and he that rejecteth me rejecteth him that sent me” (Luke 10:16; Matthew 10:40; John 13:20). Nothing is clearer than this: In order to please Christ—to obey Christ—we must be governed by all that is taught by Christ and the apostles, hence by the New Testament. And all that is included in the creed.

Sometimes young members of the church are heard .to ask: “What does our church teach on this or that?” Or, “Does our church allow dancing?” Or, "What do we believe about divorce?” Such persons should know that the church of Christ has no laws that may be suspended, repealed, altered or amended according to popular demand or to satisfy the whims of its worldly- minded members. A young lady, on being asked to obey ,the gospel, replied: “No, I am going to join the Episcopal church, because they permit their members to dance.” Of course, when people are taught to “join the church of their choice”, they are going to “choose” the one that has the things, and practices the things, they prefer. If some church would make “free love” or promiscuous sex cohabitation one of its tenets, thousands of people would “choose” it. But, according to the Bible, we have no choice, except to obey Christ and be saved or to disobey him and be eternally lost. Instead of asking, “What does our church teach?” or, “What do we believe?” young people must be taught to ask: “What is the will of Christ, my Lord, the Head of the church, and to whom I gave my life, in reference to these things?” That simple question, without any answer at all, is sufficient to knock all ideas of dancing and other sinful practices out of the minds of really conscientious young Christians. But our denominational friend is ready to ask: “Why do you include these things in your creed and catechize young people when you take them into the church?” But what he does not understand is that Christ and the apostles made the terms of admission into the church of the Lord and we have nothing to do with it. We can ,not niake any other requirements for membership in his body. But those things are included in the creed, and we should always make that plain to persons who desire to obey the Lord. “Do you mean to say,” our objectors ask, “that the simple statement that ‘I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God’ embraces all these things? Why, everybody believes that.” We reply that the “good confession” (1 Timothy 6:12) includes all that we have mentioned and very much more. In fact, it is impossible for the finite mind to comprehend all that is included in that creed or confession of faith. If everybody believes that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, then everybody is born of God; for John says:

“Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God” (1 John 5:1). Such a person is born of God because to believe that, as we have shown herein, means to surrender to Christ and to (they his will. John knew that every one who sincerely believes this fact has submitted to the terms of pardon as they were tabulated by Christ (Mark 16:15-16; Acts 2:38), and has enthroned Christ

in his heart as Cord of his life. That is what it means to believe in Christ, and that is why this simple creed is sufficient. But in order to see something of what this confession includes, let us hear John again: “He that confesseth the Son hath the Father also” (1 John 2:23). And again: “Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God abideth in him, and he in God” (1 John 4:15). Bet the objector ponder that and tell us its full meaning if he can! But John says further: “And who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God” (1 John 5:5). In view of what thy pen of inspiration has here said about this simple yet wonderful confession, the following quotation from Alexander Campbell seems appropriate. Commenting upon Peter’s confession, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God”, Campbell said:

Here, then, is the whole mystery of the Christian institution—the full confession of the Christian faith. All that is peculiar to Christianity is found in these words; not merely in embryo, but in clearly expressed outline. A cordial belief and clear conception of these two facts will make any man a Christian. He may carry them out in their vast dimensions and glorious developments to all eternity. He may ponder upon them until his spirit is transformed into the image of God—until he shines in more than angelical brightness in all the purity and beauty of heavenly lcve. Man glorified in heaven, gifted with immortality and wrapt in the ecstasies of eternal blessedness, is but a mere result of a proper appreciation of and conformity to this confession.

00A.14 CHAPTER XI.—Christ Saves the Believer, Or What Does It Mean to Believe in Christ?

CHAPTER XI CHRIST SAVES THE BELIEVERS- OR WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO BELIEVE IN CHRIST?

Sir?, What must I do to be saved? And they said, Beiieve on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house. This language is found in Acts 16:30-31, and it expresses the subject for the sermon tonight. We may call this the text if you like, but we shall discuss several texts before we take this one up for special notice. But ,we may observe before we read other passages that this .text predicates salvation upon belief. Believe and be saved, is the plain teaching of this text. If we ask, What does it mean to believe on the Lord Jesus? the answer is: Itmeans salvation. This text states that.

What does it mean to believe, according to other texts? It means eternal life. Jesus said:

Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life. (John 5:24.) Again, It means to be born or begotten of God.

Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God. (1 John 5:1.) Also, It means that you shall have remissions of sins: To him bear all the prophets witness, that through his name every one that believeth on him shall receive remission of sins. (Acts 10:43.) And it means justification: Be it known unto you therefore, brethren, that through this man is proclaimed unfx you remission of sins: and by him every one that believeth is justified rom all things from which ye could net be justified by the law of Moses. (Acts 13:38-39.)

Thus we see that if we believe we shall be saved, we shall have eternal life, we shall be born of God, we shall have remission of sins and we shall be justified. All these terms mean the same thing, or refer to the same transaction, but these different ways of expressing the thought will certainly make us see that God promises to save a man on the condition that he believe. No one who believes the word of God can question that. The texts that have been cited prove the point, but it would be easy to quote a hundred passages that state the same great truth.

Now, with that point settled, our next duty is to ascertain what the word believe means. What does a man do when he believes?

Many people think that the word believe simply means to credit certain statements or to give mental assent to certain facts. They think that is all the word means in the texts we have quoted. Hence they teach that in complying with the requirements of these scriptures you only become convinced of or give assent to the fact that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and the Savior of men, and then you are saved. They claim that the whole process is mental or inward and that when you reach a certain state of mind or heart in reference to Jesus you will on that instant be saved—forgiven of all your sins and born of God, without any outward action or physical

obedience or overt expression whatever. They quote the passages that you have heard tonight to prove that a man is saved before and without obeying the gospel. Before he does anything, complies with any condition except to believe in his heart—to reach a certain mental attitude. But now, friends, if that is what the word believe means—if that is a correct understanding of those texts— then how shall we understand those passages that plainly state that one must obey the gospel in order to be saved? Those passages that name other steps that a sinner must take in order to be saved? Passages that name other conditions like repentance and baptism?

Let us hear some of those passages:

Paul says,

Tho He was a son, yet learned He obedience by the things which he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation. (Hebrews 5:8-9.) He is the author of eternal salvation to those who obey him. But hear Peter: For the time is come for judgment to begin at the house of God: and if it begin first at us, what shall be the end of them that obey not the gospel of God? (1 Peter 4:17.)

Again:

Seeing ye have purified your souls in your obedience to the truth unto unfeigned love of the brethren, love one another from the heart fervently. (1 Peter 1:22.)

You see that Peter clearly states that we must obey the gospel, and that our souls are purified or our sins forgiven when we obey the truth. But hear Paul again: When Christ shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire with his mighty angels, then shall he take vengeance upon all them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of his Son; punishing them with everlasting destruction from the presence of God and the glory of his power. (2 Thessalonians 1:7-10.) We can not misunderstand that passage. It says we must obey the gospel or be lost forever. But again: But thanks be to God, that, whereas ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered: and being made free from sin, ye became servants of righteousness. (Romans 6:17.)

Here Paul declares that these Roman Christians had been made free from sin by obeying, or when they obeyed a form of doctrine. There was something more than a mental assent in their conversion. Now, these passages prove beyond a doubt that one must obey the gospel in order to be saved: that one is purified or made free from sin when one obeys the truth or a form of doctrine. But they do not state just the conditions that one complies with. They do not name the specific acts of this obedience. Other passages tell us this, however.

Let us see upon what conditions the Author of our salvation promised to save us. He is the Savior; he has the right to name the terms. Hear him: But the eleven disciples went into Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they worshipped him; but some doubted. And Jesus came to them and spake unto them, saying, All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you; and lo, I ai with you always, even unto the end of the world. (Matthew 28:16-20.)

Again: And afterward he was manifested unto the eleven themselves as they sat at meat; ind he upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them that had seen him after he was risen. And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned. (Mark 16:14-16.) Or as Luke reports this same commission:

Then opened he their mind, that they might understand the scriptures; ind he said unto them, Thus it is written, thar the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should tie preached in his name unto all the nations beginning from Jerusalem. (Luke 24:46-47.)

According to these reports Jesus named belief, repentance and baptism as conditions of salvation. And then on the day of Pentecost, when the apostles began to execute this commission—when they began to preach repentance and remission at Jerusalem—when people heard the gospel and were pricked in their hearts and cried out for help or salvation, saying to Peter and the rest of the apostles, “Men and brethren, what shall we do ?” Then Peter told them to “repent and to be baptized for the remission of sins” (Acts 2:38). Now, how can these passages of Scripture ever be harmonized with those that promise salvation to a man who believes ? In Acts 2:38 Peter tells people to repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, and in Acts 10:43 he says whosoever believes shall receive remission of sins. How shall we understand this? Here is the explanation:

Believe is a comprehensive term and includes all the conditions of salvation. It has a generic meaning and also a specific meaning. Sometimes it is used to name only one condition of salvation and other conditions are added or named in connection with it. At other times it is used to include all the conditions and salvation is offered to those who do what is embraced in that one word.

Let us see both uses of this word in the New Testament. First, we will study THE SPECIFIC MEANING OF THE WORD BELIEVE.

Many of them that believed came, confessing and declaring their deeds. (Acts 19:18.)

Here we have people who believe—one step; and con-fessed—another step; and declared their deeds—a third step. And the hand of the Lord was with them: and a great number that believed turned unto the Lord. (Acts 11:21.)

Here again we have people who believed and then did something else, showing that the word believe just named one of the things they did.

Jesus said, “He that believeth”—one step—“and is baptized”—another step—“shall be saved” (Mark 16:15). But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women. (Acts 8:12.) That is the report of Philip’s work at Samaria. Those people believed. That is only one thing they did, and the record tells the rest. They were baptized. Here again the word believe is used in its specific sense. In the same chapter we have a report of Simon’s conversion. What steps did he take? Here is the report:

Then Simon himself believed also: and when he was baptized; he continued with Philip, and wondered, beholding the miracles and signs which were done. (Acts 8:13.) Simon believed—that

is one thing he did. But that was not all. The other steps are named.

Concerning the Corinthians we read:

Many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized. (Acts 18:8.)

What did diese people do? They first heard—one step; and next, believed—a second step, and were baptized—a third step.

These passages ought to be sufficient to convince any one that the word believe is sometimes used to name only one step or one condition of salvation. But all these quotations tell of people who not only believed, but who also took the other necessary steps-—complied with the other conditions. Now let us hear of some who believed in this specific sense, but who did not take the other steps and therefore were not saved.

Hear this:

Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue: For they ’.oved the praise of men more than the praise of God. (John 12 42.) The original text of this sermon stated plainly, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.” But here are some men who believed and were not saved. What is the explanation? Of course it is in the two senses in which the word believe is used. But hear this:

Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble. (James 2:19.) Here are some others who believed and were not saved.

Now, as we have sufficiently illustrated the specific use of the word believe, let us take up some passages that illustrate The GENERAL OR COMPREHENSIVE MEANING OF THE WORD BELIEVE

First, let us recall the Golden Text of the Bible. And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up. That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. (John 3:14-17.) In this well-known text the word believe is used twice and whosoever believeth is promised eternal life. No other condition named. But hear this also: And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ve might have life through his name. (John 20:30.) Believe—the only condition of salvation named. Another passage: For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. (Romans 1:16.) Believe and be saved. There it is again. But once more: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. (Romans 3:25-26.)

Now, as we saw some conversions reported in which reports the word believe just named one step in the process, let us examine some other cases in which the whole process is included in that one word. Right in the beginning of the gospel, when the apostles were preaching in Jerusalem and thousands were being converted, we have the report of those conversions given in this language:

Howbeit many of them which heard the word believed; and the number of the men was about five thousand. (Acts 4:4.) That means that those people became Christians. What did they do in becoming Christians? They believed. The conversion of Sergius Paulis, the governor of Cyprus, is reported thus:

Then the deputy, when he saw what was done, believed, being astonished at the doctrine of the Lord. (Acts 13:12.) What did Sergius Paulus do in becoming a Christian ? He believed. The report of the conversion of the Gentiles at Antioch, in Pisidia, is in the same language. And when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord: and as many as are ordained to eternal life believed. (Acts 13:48.) The result of Paul's preaching at Athens is told by this same one word:

Howbeit certain men clave unto him, and believed, among the which was Dionysius the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and others with them. (Acts 17:34.) The conversion of the people at Thessalonica is expressed in the one word also:

Therefore many of them believed; also of honourable women which were Greeks, and of men not a few. (Acts 17:12.) The best way in the world to preach is to just to let the Bible do the preaching. That is what we are listening to tonight. We are allowing the Bible to explain itself. We have found that in becoming Christians some people believed and then did something else. We have found other cases where it is said they believed and did not report anything else that they did. Following this same plan of allowing the Bible to interpret itself, we shall see that the word believe in these last-mentioned cases does include all the steps or conditions of the gospel and that those who believed did obey the gospel. THE WORD BELIEVE INCLUDES OBEDIENCE The first passage that we cite in proof of the statement is quoted from the Revised Version. It is the language of our Lord. Hear him:

He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth upon him. (John 3:36) You see "believeth" and "obeyeth" are here used as synonymous terms. But let us take a few more passages. In Romans 13:11 Paul says: And that, knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep: for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed.

Here Paul looks back to the time when these Romans became Christians and says, "Now is our salvation nearer than when" we first started: than when we were first converted—than when we first became Christians. But what term does he use to designate what they did in becoming Christians? The word believe. "Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed." Then these people became Christians by believing. Shall we conclude, therefore, that they did not obey the gospel? To do so would be to pervert God's word. For in this same letter just a few chapters back—and Paul did not divide this letter into chapters—Paul had alluded to this same time when these Romans became Christians or "believed" and ceased to be servants of sin, and here is the

way he speaks of the time when they "believed" in this reference: But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness. (Romans 6:17.)

Thus the apostle tells us that these people obeyed from the heart a form of doctrine at the time they became Christians, and then without dipping his pen in the ink, he tells us that when they became Christians they believed. Therefore he used the word believe to include that obedience. But there is more yet. When Paul looks back to the conversion of these Romans he speaks of it as the time when they believed, in the thirteenth chapter. But in the first part of the sixth chapter he looks back to this same time and reminds these Romans that they at that time died to sin and were buried with Christ in baptism and raised to walk in newness of life. Therefore he uses the term believe to embrace the whole process, including a burial in baptism. But we will find that the word is used that way in all places except where it is specific and other conditions are mentioned with it. Notice this: And it cam to pass that, while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper country came to Ephesus, and found certain disciples: and he said unto them, Did ye receive the Holy Spirit when ye believed? And they said unto him, Nay, «re did not so much as hear whether the Holy Spirit was given. (Acts 19:1-2.)

Paul did not ask these people if they had received the Holy Spirit when they repented. No, that is not the word. He did not say, Did ye receive the Holy Spirit when you were baptized? No, that is not the word either. “Did ye receive the Holy Spirit when ye believed?” That is the word he used.

They said, “Nay, we did not so much as hear whether the Holy Spirit was given.”

Now, hear Paul: And he said, "Into what then were ye baptized?" And they said, "Into John’s baptism." And Paul said,

John baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people thai they should believe on him that should come after him, that is, on Jesus. And when they heard this they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them ; and they spjvkc with tongues, and prophesied. And they were in all about twelve men. (Acts 19:3-7.) Do you get the idea? Have you received the Holy Spirit since ye believed? Answer, No. Into what then were you baptized? For of course if you believed you were baptized. Don’t you see that the word believe in his first question included the whole process?

Here is a case that is even clearer than that.

Paul came to Corinth and preached in the synagogues and as a result Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, was converted. But in reporting his conversion only one word is used. Luke says he believed. Here is the way it reads: And Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, believed in the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized. (Acts 18:8.)

What did Crispus do in becoming a Christian? He believed. That is all that is said; no mention of anything else. Do you suppose he repented of his sins?. There is no mention of it. Was he baptized? If so, it is all reported in the one word, believe. There is nothing else said in the whole book of Acts about the conversion of Crispus. Luke just tells us that he believed.

Now, if we can show you that Crispus was baptized at the time he believed you will know certainly that the word believe in this instance embraced baptism.

Well, this was at Corinth you know, and Crispus believed and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized. Later Paul wrote a letter to these disciples and reproved them for wearing the names of men. He did not want them to say “I am of Paul.” He was thankful that he had not baptized many of them lest they should claim that they were baptized in the name of Paul. However, he did baptize a few of them and he tells us the names of those whom he had baptized. Hear him: Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized nto the name of Paul? I thank God that I baptized none of you, save Crispus and Gaius; lest any man should say that ye were baptized into my name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other. (1 Corinthians 1:13-14.)

There we have it clearly stated that Paul baptized Crispus with his own hands. But in Acts his conversion is reported by the one word believe. If that does not prove that the word believe embraces the whole process of conversion, including baptism, I would not know how to prove anything. After every one of these points we could consistently write Q. E. D.

We will now, as the last case, return to the original text of the sermon. This is the story of the conversion of the Philippian jailor. You remember Paul and Silas had been beaten with rods because they, had cast the demon out of the poor slave girl who told fortunes by the power of this evil spirit. People then were not any more intelligent than some people are now, and they paid this girl money to tell their fortunes. Her masters took this money from her and in that way they had a source of income. When they saw that the girl was healed and could not any longer bring in money through her fortune telling, they had Paul and Silas arrested and arraigned before the city authorities. They made false accusations against them and as a result Paul and Silas were beaten —had many stripes laid upon them. Then they were turned over to the jailor and he was charged to keep them safely. In order to do that he put them into an inner dungeon and made their feet fast in the stocks. But at midnight Paul and Silas prayed and sang praises unto God and the other prisoners were all listening to them. The music of those songs not only went out into the cells and corridors of that prison, but it was wafted up past the stars and into the ears of Jehovah. He heard and regarded this worship offered unto him by these suffering but faithful disciples. He sent an earthquake and released these prisoners. The foundations of the house were shaken and that caused the walls to waver and drop out of “plumb”. That of course broke the locks or the hinges and threw the doors open. The stocks must have been made to the wall or the floor and the warping and creaking broke the stocks off of the prisoners’ feet. All the prisoners must have connected this earthquake in some way with Paul and Silas and gathered round them, otherwise Paul would not have known that they were all there. The jailor was awakened by this earthquake and when he saw the prison doors open he naturally supposed that all the prisoners had escaped and as that meant death for him he decided to kill himself there on the spot. He was out in the light where he could be seen while the prisoners were back in the darkness. They could see him but he could not see them. When Paul saw that he was going to kill himself he shouted to him and prevented the mad act. But let us hear the rest of it in Luke’s own words: But Paul cried with a loud voice, saying, Do thyself no harm: for we are all here. And he called for lights and sprang in, and, trembling for fear, fell down before Paul and Silas, and brought them out and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy

house. (Acts 16:28-31.) The man was full of fear and trembling, falling down on his face and anxious to know what to do to be saved. He was told to believe. That is the 31st verse.

Now, let us read the 34th verse: And he brought them up into his house, and set food before them, and rejoiced greatly, with all his house, having believed in God.

There is quite a difference in this man now. He is no longer falling down and trembling and crying out for salvation. He is calm and full of joy and rejoicing. What has caused this change? Why, this verse tells us. He has believed in God. In verse 31 he was told to believe and be saved. In verse 34 he has believed and is saved. Now if we will read verses 32 and 33 we will see what he did in believing or when he believed. Hear it: And they spake the word of the Lord unto him, with all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, immediately.

There is the whole story. He believed and was saved. But in believing he was baptized the same hour of the night, and it was midnight. So you see, beloved, that the word believe, even in this famous passage, includes the whole process of conversion—repentance, baptism and everything' else that has any part in the great transaction.

Don't let anybody make you believe that the Bible promises salvation to you upon a faith that is wholly mental and inward and that does not express itself in overt obedience. Salvation is by faith truly, and every one who believes shall be saved. But faith is not complete, or real, until it is expressed and actualized by a whole-hearted surrender and a submissive obedience to the will of the Lord. Do you wish to be saved tonight? "Believe upon the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved."

Now is the accepted time. Today is the day of salvation. If you hear his voice, harden not your heart.

00A.15 CHAPTER XII.—Christ's Bride—The Church

CHAPTER XII CHRIST'S BRIDE: THE CHURCH The subject that has been announced for this hour is, "The Bride of Christ," and the first scripture that I bring to your attention is from the fifth chapter of Ephesians, beginning at the 22nd verse:

Wives, be in subjection unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is the head of the church, being himself the saviour of the body. But as the church is subject to Christ, sc let the wives also be to their husbands in everything. Husbands, love your wives, oven as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it; that he might sanctify it, having leansed it by the washing of water with the word, that he might present the church to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish. Even so ought husbands also to love their own wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his own wife loveth himself: for no man ever hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as Christ also the church; because we are members of his body. For this pause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and the two shall become one flesh. This mystery is great but I speak in regard of Christ and of the church. Nevertheless do ye also severally love each one his own wife even as himself; and let the wife see that she fear her husband,

You notice that the Apostle Paul here uses the relationship that exists between the husband and wife to illustrate the relationship that exists between Christ and the church. Or rather he reverses the order. He uses the relationship that exists between Christ and the church to teach husbands and wives how they should behave toward each other.

First of all, the husband is the head of the wife, and the wife is in subjection to the husband, just as Christ is the head of the church and the church in subjection to Christ. Next, husbands are to love their wives as Christ also loved the church and gave himself up for it. Also the husband and the wife become one flesh. Paul says, "This mystery is great: but I speak in regard of Christ and of the church." That is sufficient to show you that Paul, by a figure of speech, uses the marriage ties to represent the relationship that exists between Christ and the church. And this may for the present exhaust the figure of speech. However this is not the only passage in which the figure is used. In the seventh chapter of Romans we have this language: For the woman that hath a husband is bound by law to the husband while he liveth; but if the husband die, she is discharged from the law of the husband So then if, while the husband liveth, she be joined to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if the husband die, she is free from the law, so that she is no adulteress, though she be joined to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also were made dead to the law through the body of Christ; that ye should be joined to another, even to him who was raised from the dead, that we might bring forth fruit unto God. (Romans 7:2-6.) Here is the same figure of speech. Christians are said to be joined or married to Christ.

Again, in the eleventh chapter of 2 Corinthians we have another example; For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a

chaste virgin to Christ. (2 Corinthians 11:2.) The same figure of speech is carried through the New Testament. In the twenty-first chapter of Revelation, the angel said to John:

Come hither, I will show thee the bride, the Lamb's wife. (Revelation 21:9.) This figure of speech is used in the Old Testament also. Even under the old covenant God's people were represented as married to God and when they proved unfaithful to God they were represented as breaking the marriage vows. Likewise the church of the Lord Jesus Christ, being the bride of Christ, is called upon to wear his name and to place all her affections upon him. She must not lust after the things of the world and thus prove untrue to Christ.

What a tremendous appeal there is, therefore, in this figure of speech for the purity of the church! She must be kept free from worldliness. She must ever be a holy church without spot, wrinkle, blemish or any such thing. She must not only be free from worldliness, but she must not disregard Christ's laws and teach the doctrines and commandments of men. She is to be a holy church—yea—a glorious church! But as another conclusion from this figure of speech, men ought to be made to respect the church with a reverential regard that no other illustration could inspire. For what man is there who would not resent an insult to his bride more quickly than he would to himself ? And what man would speak disparagingly of his friend's wife ? Even if a man did not respect the woman for her own sake, if he respects the man whose name she wears he would not speak disparagingly of her. This is a rule that is so well known among men that it is not necessary to empliasize it.

Then does it not seem strange that men will speak disparagingly of the bride of Christ, which is the church, as we have seen? But they do. It is nothing unusual to hear men say, "There is nothing in the church. It doesn't matter about the church. You do not need to give any consideration to the church", etc. But Christ loved the church more than any human being could love his bride. He gave himself up for it. He sanctified it and presents it to himself as a holy and a glorious bride. Can you say there is nothing in that institution ?

We may leave this bride figure of speech and find many plain, literal statements of scripture that prove that the church is sacred and important. Let me call your attention to a few of these statements. First, take the language of our Savior in Matthew 16:13-19 :

Now when Jesus came into the parts of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying,Who do men say that the Son of man is? And they said, Some say John the Baptist; some, Elijah; and others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But who say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou are the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth Shall be loosed in heaven.

Here, my friends. Jesus expressed the determination to build a church and he declared that the gates of Hades should not prevail against it. It would stand through all the storms and tempests of time. All the powers of the infernal world can not overthrow it or prevail against it, (The "it" here refers to the church, not to the building of it. You can not make a verb the antecedent of a pronoun.

Moreover, when the church is referred to as a kingdom it is said to be “everlasting” and “unshakable” or immovable. Daniel 2:44; Hebrews 12:28. Then why try to make this expression mean something else? Something ungrammatical, unnatural and unscriptural ?

If, therefore, the church can not be overthrown it must be a divine and worthy institution. Why say there is nothing in it? But let us hear other statements about the church. To the elders of the congregation at Ephesus Paul said

Tako heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood. (Acts 20:28.)

We usually judge the value of a thing by’the price we pay for it: by its cost. On that basis what is the value of the^church? Christ bought it with his blood! But hear Paul again: To the intent that now unto the principalities and the powers in the heavenly place might be made known through the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord. (Ephesians 3:10.) The manifold wisdom of God to be made known through the church!

Again:

Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in ue, unto him be the glory in the church and in Christ Jesus unto all generations for ever and ever. Amen. (Ephesians 3:20.) Unto God be glory in the church! But one more passage:

What the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according tc that working of the strength of his might which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, anu made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and minion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and he put all things in subjection under his feet, and gave lim to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all. (Ephesians 1:19-23.) Now, let us see what we have learned from all these references.

It is in the church that the manifold wisdom of God is made known.

It is in the church that the glory is given unto God throughout the ages, world without end.

It is in the church that we find the fullness of him that filleth all in all.

It is in the church that we find that Christ, who is the Head over all things, is Head over the church.

Surely it is enough in reference to the importance of this church to know that it is the bride of Christ, that it is founded upon a rock, that it will stand forever, that it is bought with the blood of Christ, that it is the fullness of him that filleth all in all, that it is through the church that the manifold wisdom of God is to be made known, that it is in the church, in Christ Jesus, that the glory is to be given unto God from generation throughout all the ages forever. Amen. For our next point, I wish to remind you that the word church is singular in all these references. And is always singular in the Bible, except where it is used to designate local churches or congregations, as the churches of Galatia or the churches of Judea or the seven churches of Asia, meaning the congregations within

those provinces. And in the last inenlioned country the names of the towns where these churches were located are given. Paul established these churches in Asia and Galatia and of course we all know he did not establish a Mormon church at Ephesus and a Campbellite church at Smyrna and a Catholic church at Laodicea. No one, I am sure, would accuse Paul of doing a thing like that. These were therefore all churches of Christ.

Even if the word church were not always singular when it refers to the body of Christ, since it is the bride of Christ, how many churches would you suppose Christ bought with his blood? How many brides has he? How many would you say, as a rough guess ? Of course I don't expect you to be accurate, but what is your best guess? Jesting aside, I know what you would say of course. You would not accuse Christ of being a polygamist. Even a modernist wouldn't do that. Therefore Christ has only one bride—one church.

Now we are up to the point where some of you are getting uneasy. We are ready for the question at which many people gel scared. But let us face it boldly regardless of cost. Here it is:

What church is that one church that is the bride of Christ?

Some one says, "Aren't you afraid to face that question?" No, sir—not at all. Why, bless your heart, I want to be in it—that church that is founded on the rock that is going to stand through all time, that church which is the bride of Christ, to stand glorified by his side on the great day of all days, I want to be in that church. I am not afraid to ask the question, and try to find the answer—what church is that church? Don't you want to be in it? Surely you do. "Well," says some one, "that is a hard question." Yes, if you look at it one way, it is a hard question. If we had to examine the claims of all the denominations and try to select from among them one that we could say is truly the bride of Christ, we would have an endless task and a very unpleasant one. But we are not going to attempt that. The fact is, we are not .going to discuss the claims of the respective denominations of today. We are not going to call the name of a single denomination, except we will use the word "Campbellite" once or twice to clear up a question that came to me through the mail in reference to the Campbellites and the Campbellite church. We will use that, but we are not going to name any other denomination.

Now, if I had to start out tonight to consider the claims of the different denominations of earth and choose from among them the one I wanted to belong to, I would be puzzled and discouraged, for right now, personally— I will say it from my heart—I don't have any choice between them. If I were forced to join one of them I wouldn't have any choice, and I don't know which one I would select. If I were forced to find out which one of these denominations teaches the most truth, for all of them teach some truth, of course, I would give up. I doubt not that every denomination beneath the sky teaches some truth, even the heathen religions, Confucianism, Shintiosm, Zoroastrianism, and Bhuddism, all teach truth. So I have no doubt in the world that all the Protestant denominations, and the Catholics as well, both Greek and Roman, teach some truth. I know they do, but now which one teaches the most truth, I don't know, for the simple reason I am not acquainted with all their doctrines. But I am thankful to God, dear friends, that I do not have to know about these denominational claims and questions in order to answer the question we are studying. I am thankful that as a preacher of the gospel I can come to you with a simple answer to that question—What church is the New Testament church—and never mention any denomination on the earth. But some of you are saying in your hearts: "Oh, of course, he is going to say that his church is that

one church." But you are mistaken, my friends. I am not' talking about my church. I am not talking about any denomination—yours or mine or anybodv else's. The church of Christ is not a denomination presided over by men and with earthly headquarters. When I talk about the church of Christ, I am not talking about my church. If you have that in your mind let me disabuse you of that at once—I am not talking about my church any more than I am talking about yours. I am not talking about the Campbellitesf and if there is a denomination in the world named "The Church of Christ", I am not talking about that. I am not talking about any denomination, and if there should be a denomination named the "Church of God", I am not talking about that.

I am talking about the church that the Lord referred to when he said, "Upon this rock I will build my church"; the church that the Lord bought with his blood, the church that was read about in these scriptural references—tliat is what I am talking about. So get it out of your mind that I am talking about your church, or my church, and that I am going to try to show that my church is that one church— no, sir. I am not talking about any denomination under heaven—I am just talking about that, whatever it is, and wliatever it means. Now, just in the simplest possible way we are going to find out how we may know without a doubt that we are in that church, and then when we find out that we are in that church, members of that body, that church, that bride, we needn't be concerned about anything further with reference to the church, or church relationship—that will settle that. Can we find it out? I think we can.

Now, I wish it were possible, for you and me to forget that we had ever heard the word "church" until tonight. Just let us suppose that we never heard the word "church" in our lives, never saw it in print, never saw any institution called a church, but that we came here and read tonight these scriptures that speak of something and call it a church and say it is founded upon a rock, that it was purchased by the blood of Christ, that it is the bride of Christ, and all of these other things that we have presented, naturally we have become interested and desire to find out about that church, where it is, is it in the earth today? If so, can I find it? If so, can I become a member of it? In order to answer that question—dismissing all denominations and all churches, forgetting we ever heard the word church until tonight— let us come to study the Bible in the simplest sort of way. We are going to summarize the entire New Testament right now—we will give in summary, or epitome, the entire New Testament.

First, there are four books called the gospels. These gospels are Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. These all tell the same story. Matthew, Mark, Luke and John tell the story of the birth of Christ, his life, death, burial and resurrection, then the great commission—the sending out of the disciples to all the world with the gospel story. Then we come to the fifth book. This book is called the Acts of the Apostles. Now, the word "Acts" means the deeds or the doings of the apostles, hence in that book we have a history of how the apostles acted under the guidance, of the Holy Spirit. In that book we see them executing the great commission. We see them making disciples, therefore the book of Acts may correctly be called the book of conversions. It tells how people became Christians under the preaching of the apostles.

Leaving the book of Acts and passing on through the New Testament, we come next to twenty-one books called Epistles—beginning with Romans and concluding with Jude. These Epistles were written to Christians to tell them how to live the Christian life. Some of them were written to churches or congregations of Christians, while others were written to individual Christians. But

they were all written for the purpose of telling men “how they ought to behave in the house of God, which is the church of the living God” (1 Timothy 3:15). The last book in the Bible tells of the home of the soul. There are many things in the book but we will let that answer as a summary.

There is the New Testament. Four books tell us of the life of Christ on earth. One book tells us how people become Christians, twenty-one books tell us how people should live Christian lives, and one book tells us the home of the soul. You say, “Well, take the one book—how to find out how to become members of the church, that would be sufficient”, but we are going to take four, and run through them, and then follow into the fifth book, and the point will be so clear that these children will understand it.

Matthew, He tells us of the birth of Christ. He tells us of the life of Christ. He tells us of the death of Christ on the cross. He tells us of the burial of Christ. He tells us of his resurrection. And then after Christ was raised from the dead, he said to his disciples:

All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations, oaptizing them into the nan>-> of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." (Matthew 28:18-20.)

Jesus told them to go forth and make disciples, baptizing them,- in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all tilings whatsoever he had commanded them.

He did not say “Go forth and ask somebody to join the church”. That expression is never found in the Bible anywhere, but he did tell them to go and make disciples, and then teach these disciples to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded them. I just wonder if when people were made disciples and then as disciples they were taught to observe all that Christ commanded—I just wonder if that made them members of any church, and if so, what church. If that made them members of the church that he founded on the rock, why wouldn’t the same thing make us members of the same church tonight? Now, we come to Mark. What does Mark tell? Mark tells the same story of the birth of Christ, the life of Christ, the death of Christ, the burial of Christ in the tomb, the resurrection of Christ from the tomb, and the great commission, and Mark said that he said to his disciples:

Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be damned. (Mark 16:16.)

He told them to go forth and preach the gospel. He didn’t tell them to go and ask anybody to join the church, but he told them to go forth and preach the gospel and he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. But when these people believed and were baptized, and therefore saved, I wonder if that made them members of a church. But for the present we will just wonder. So we come to Luke. Luke tells us of the birth of Christ, the life of Christ on the earth, the burial of Christ in the tomb, the resurrection of Christ, and the great commission, the sending forth of the disciples with the gospel proclamation, and here is the way Luke says he said it: And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. (Luke 24:46-47.)

Here he commanded his disciples to wait for the Holy Spirit, and then to preach repentance and remission of sins in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. He didn't tell them to go forth and ask anybody to join the church. But when people received the remission of their sins I wonder if they became members of any church, and if so, what church? But for the present we will just wonder.

Now, we come to the next book. The next book is the book of John, and John goes back a little further than the others. He goes hack to the time when Christ was with God in the beginning of the creation of all things, and then he says this Christ that existed with God in the beginning became flesh or was bom. Thus he tells us of the birth of Christ, the life of Christ on the earth, the death of Christ, the burial of Christ in the tomb, the resurrection of Christ, and the great commission, and here is the way John expresses it:

Then said Jesus unto them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. Ana when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit: Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained. (John 20:20-23.) Which was equal to saying, "When the Holy Spirit comes upon you, when you receive the Spirit as you will do in Jerusalem, then beginning at Jerusalem, preach repentance and remission of sins in my name". He didn't tell them to ask people to join the church. That expression does not appear in the Bible, but he did tell them to proclaim salvation, and preach remission of sins in his name, when the Holy Spirit came.

Now, we turn to the fifth book to see whether or not these disciples did go forth and make disciples, did go forth and preach salvation. In the first chapter of Acts we find Jesus again assembled with them, and he gave them charge that they were not to depart out of Jerusalem until they received the promise from the Father; for he said, "John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence." They were therefore waiting for the Holy Spirit, and when the Holy Spirit came they were to go forth and preach the gospel to every creature. The very next chapter tells us of the coming of the Holy Spirit, and when the Holy Spirit came upon these apostles They were filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues as the spirit gave them utterance. Then from the fifth verse to the fourteenth verse we are told that the multitude of Jews who were in Jerusalem celebrating Pentecost came together and were confounded because they heard these spirit baptized men speaking with tongues that they could all understand— seventeen nations of them—and they were amazed at that, marvelled at it, and some of them mocked and said, "These men are full of new wine". That is down to the fourteenth verse. Then, beginning at the fourteenth verse, Peter, one of these witnesses of the Lord, stood up and preached to that multitude, and you find his sermon given from the fourteenth to the thirty-sixth verse, and in those verses he proves to them that this was the Holy Spirit and not wine; and he said to them, "You crucified God's Son, the Christ, and God raised him from the dead, according to the prophecy of David, and he is now exalted at God's right hand, and has received the promise of the Holy Spirit", and when they heard that—that they had crucified the Christ, the Son of God, and that he was now made God and Christ— they were pricked in their hearts, and said to Peter and the rest of the apostles, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" The thirty-eighth verse says that Peter said to them,

"Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

He didn't say "join the church", but he told them to repent of their sins and to be baptized in the name of Christ for the remission of sin, and they should receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. When they had received the Holy Spirit, I wonder if they were members of any church, and if so, what church! If that made them members of the church which Christ founded on the rock, which he purchased with his blood, which he cleansed, and presents to himself as a bride, why would not the same thing make you a member of the same church tonight? It would. Is there anything said about their joining the church? No, sir. That expression is not found in the Bible. And what did they do? "They that gladly received his word were baptized, and there were added"—not ''unto them" —those words are not in the Greek—not in the Revision —"there were added"—that is, brought together, banded together, "about three thousand souls." And then what did they do? "They continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers."

I wonder if they were members of any church? If hearing the gospel, believing the gospel, repenting of sins, being baptized in the name of Christ—if that made them members of the church, why wouldn't the same thing make you a member of the same church now ? That is the beginning day. That is the day the Holy Spirit came. That is the time they began to preach repentance and remission of sins.

Now, the word "church" is from the Greek word "ecclesia". It is really two Greek words. One is "ec", and always means "out of", and the other is "clesia", which means "called", therefore we have the word "ecclesia", meaning "called out"—and who were called out ? Those who obeyed the gospel They were banded together in Christian love, hence these who were called out, or called together out of the world constituted the church*

Then read on through the rest of the chapter. The last verse says, "And the Lord added to the church day after day"—or daily—"those that were being saved"— added to what? To the church. He added those that day together, and then day after day, as people were being saved—saved by the gospel, repenting, and being baptized in the name of Christ—God added them to the church, and that is all they had to do. If people will hear the gospel today, and obey the gospel today, God adds them to the church, and you couldn't help it to save your life; hence, when you obey the gospel that makes you what God wants you to be—he adds you to the church and he doesn't add you to the wrong one—you need not be afraid of that.

Two or three other scriptures and we will close. Turn to the eighth chapter of Acts.

Here we find Philip, an inspired evangelist, going down to the town of Samaria, and when he reaches Samaria he preaches Christ, and when the people heard him preaching, what was the result? Here it is:

Now when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, in the name of Christ they were baptized, both men and women.

It doesn't say that they "joined" any church. That expression is never found in the Bible. Now, I wonder if that made them members of any church, and if so, what church, and if that made them

members of the church that Christ founded on the rock, that he purchased with his blood, that he cleanses and presents to himself as a bride, why wouldn't the same thing make you a mem ber of the same church now? That is all that is said about it then, and that is all they did. Did that make them members of the church, and if so, would the same thing make you a member of the same church now? It would, beloved, without doubt. This time we turn to the eighteenth chapter of Acts, eighth verse. We find Paul at Corinth, and he entered into the synagogue and preached, and Crispus, the chief" ruler of the synagogue, believed, and as a result of his preaching many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized. Paul preached at Corinth. He preached the gospel at Corinth. People heard the gospel at Corinth. They were baptized at Corinth. It doesn't say a word about their joining any church. But when they heard the gospel, believed the gospel, and were baptized, I wonder if that made them members of any church, and if so, what church. If that made them members of the church that Christ founded upon the rock, that he purchased with his blood, that he presents to himself as a bride, why wouldn't the same thing make you a member of the same church now? It would. Did that make them members of the church? Let's see. There is not one single mention of their joining the church—that is not in the Bible. What did they do? They heard, they believed, and were baptized—that is all they. did. What did that do for them? It made them members of the church. What church did it make them members of? It made them members of the church of God. Paul wrote to these people at Corinth who had heard the gospel, believed the gospel, and were baptized, and he addresses them this way:

Paul called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ tlirough the will of Cod, and Sosthenes, our brother, unto the church of God which is at Corinth. If people in Fort Worth, Texas, hear the gospel, believe the gospel, and are baptized in the name of Christ, why wouldn't that constitute those who heard the gospel, believed the gospel, and were baptized in the name of Christ here in Fort Worth, the church of God at Fort Worth? It would, beloved—no doubt about it.

Then, my friends, what church did that make them members of? The church of God. Now, if a man does those things today, would it make him a member of the Campbellite church? It couldn't possibly do it, because if there is a Campbellite church in the world now, it wasn't here then.

Alexander Campbell died less than a hundred years ago, hence if Alexander Campbell founded a church, which he didn't—I will say that to his credit and in honor to his memory—but if he did, these things wouldn't make you a member of it. You would have to get to be a member of it some other way. You would have to find out what that church teaches, then be received into its communion, and certainly, if somebody has done that, he may be a Campbellite. But these people in the days of Paul, and Peter, and Philip didn't become Campbellites—that is a foregone conclusion. So if you do exactly what they did that does not make you a Campbellite—it makes you exactly what it made them. This point is clear enough and I have preached long enough, but if you will bear with me a few minutes longer I wish to tell you a story that will illustrate the lesson and fix it in your minds. This is a true occurrence. I hope you will not think it a personal story—it is only an effort that I made once to get a good man to see the lesson I am endeavoring to teach here tonight. This is therefore the story of a conversation between a preacher of a denomination and me. That preacher might not appreciate my using his name and allowing it to go into the book, and for that reason I shall speak of him as Brother Blank. In every other respect the story is accurate in all details—time, place and language. I will report it as nearly in dialogue form as I can.

About fifteen years ago I was sitting in the Y. M. C. A. budding in Chattanooga, Tennessee, talking with one of the pastors of that city, who was also one of my good friends. We fell to discussing religious conditions of the world, when he said:

“Bro. Brewer, I hope and pray that the time will come when we will not.be divided into warring parties, but all be one great Christian body. One Lord and one people.”

BREWER: “Yes, I pray for that time to come also Christ prayed for that. Paul prayed for it, and it seems to me that any man who loves the Lord and the souls of men more than he loves his creed or his party would pray that same prayer.”

BRO. BLANK : “Well, here is how anxious I am to see us all united: I would be willing for my denomination to be lost in the merger; to be swallowed up and lose its name and its identity and become a disappearing brotherhood in the mighty meeting together.”

BREWER : “I thank God for that, Bro. Blank. If we all had that spirit we would soon see our prayers answered. It is the party spirit that keeps us divided. Each man fighting for his party—his peculiar doctrine ”

BRO. BLANK: “Yes, of course that is true. Pardon me, but would you be willing for that in reference to your Church, Bro. Brewer ?”

BREWER : “Would I give up any party name or doctrine in order for us all to be united? Well, if I know my heart I would.”

BRO. BLANK: “Would your brethren be willing to do that?”

BREWER : “Why, that is our plea!”

BRO. BLANK: “I know you people plead for unity, but I had the impression that you want everybody to agree with you. That at least some of your people are the most partisan people in the world—the worst sectarians.”

BREWER: “Of course I can not deny that we have sectarians among us. We have some who are as bad as any in the world. You know people can plead for the truth in a sectarian spirit. But surely there is such a thing as being a Christian, a child of God, without being a sectarian of any kind. That is what we endeavor to be. There is one point that I must explain. Bro. Blank, When you asked me if I would be willing to see my church lose its identity and its name in the great coming together, of course you were thinking of a denomination. Now, I have an advantage of you in that respect, Bro.

Blank, in that I do not belong to any denomination. Therefore I have no denominational name or creed to give up.”

BRO. BLANK: “I knew you made that claim, but I think you are wrong. At least I can not see why you are not. I can not see how a man who is as sincere and intelligent as you are can make himself believe that the church you belong to is not as much a denomination as the one I belong to. I know I can speak frankly to you, as we are friends, and that is just my feeling on that point.”

BREWER: “Of course you may speak frankly to me. I know, too, that you do feel lust as you have spoken, but I think you have not seen this question from my view point. You have allowed some quibbling brother with a ranting, ‘sputin’ ’ spirit to give you the wrong impression.”

BRO. BLANK: “Perhaps that is it. At least, I can not see why you do not have a denomination to give up as much as I have.”

BREWER: “TO illustrate, Bro. Blank, I claim to be a Christian and you claim to be a Christian. That name is common, then that name would not have to be gdven up in our efforts to unite. You wear in addition to our common name, a denominational name: a name peculiar to your people; that is the one you will have to give up. I wear no denominational name. Do you see?”

BRO. BLANK : “Well, I admit that the name is common, but I think you can use a scriptural name in a sectarian sense. I think you can give a Bible name to a human organization.”

BREWER: “Of course you can, but the name is right even if wrongly used, and we ought never to sectarianizc a scripture name or doctrine either.”

BRO. BLANK: “Honestly, that seems to me to be the very thing you do, for I must still say I can not see that you are not a member of a denomination.”

BREWER : “I believe I can prove to you that I am not, if you will permit me.”

BRO. BLANK : “Yes, go on, I want to see your viewpoint.”

BREWER: “Well, Bro. Blank, I have never joined any denomination, and if I am in one I don’t know when or how I got there and I certainly didn’t intend to get there at all.

“Some years ago when I was in my teens I heard a man preaching the gospel. He said he was not trying to get people to join any denomination, but that he was anxious to get them to become and be Christians by simply believing and obeying the gospel. I was not a Christian at that time, but I wanted to be and as I did not know yet what denomination I wanted to join, that proposition attracted me. I decided I would just become a Christian on the Lord’s own terms. Therefore I went forward one night and stood up before that audience and confessed that I believed with all my heart that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. Bro. Blank, was that a denominational doctrine, and did that make me a member of some denomination?”

BRO. BLANK: “NO, faith in Christ is not a sectarian doctrine. We all believe that.”

BREWER: “Exactly. Well, I repented of my sins, genuinely and sincerely. I didn’t think I would ever sin again. Is repentance a denominational doctrine? Did that put me into a religious party?”

BRO. BLANK: “No, that is common also.”

BREWER: “Yes. Then I was buried with my Lord in baptism in the name of the Father and of the S’on and of the Holy Spirit. Was that a denominational doctrine, and did that put me into a party ?”

BRO. BLANK: “Well,you know we differ on baptism and there is no need to argue.”

BREWER; “NO argument intended on baptism, Bro.Blank. Yes, we do differ on baptism, but that doesn’t affect my question. We all know the Lord did tell his disciples to baptize people in the

name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. And I think you will agree that my immersion in the Tennessee River in those solemn names met the requirement. Will you not say that satisfied that command?”

BRO. BLANK: “Oh, yes, I think so.”

BREWER: “Then did that put me into a religious denomination ?”

BRO. BLANK: “Well, it depends upon who baptized you, by what authority and for what purpose.”

BREWER: “I was baptized by a preacher of the gospel, by the authority of the Lord and for the purpose of obtaining his blessings. Bro. Blank, do you think I am a Christian ?”

BRO. BLANK: “Oh, yes, I think you are a real Christian.”

BREWER: “Thank you. Do you think I am a member of your denomination?”

BRO. BLANK : “No, you are not in our fold.”

BREWER: “What would I have to do to get in?”

BRO. BLANK: “Well, you would have to consent to be one of us first and then we would receive you according to our rules or our custom.”

BREWER: “Yes, of course. But note that is what I have never done. I have never been received into any denomination. Therefore I am a member of none. Do yob see it?”

BRO. BLANK: “Well, that presents your case in a pretty plausible light, but still I fear you have made denominational doctrines of which you are not aware, perhaps.”

BREWER: “What were the followers of Christ in the years and centuries before these present-day denominations were established?”

BRO. BLANK: “They were children of God, followers of Christ and by their enemies called Christians.”

BREWER : “Can we not be what they were and nothing more? Bro. Blank, suppose you were sitting out here on the side of Lookout Mountain above Blowing Springs one of these beautiful days, and as you sit there enjoying the scenery you chance to look up the road and your attention is attracted by a buggy that is approaching. You watch that buggy and as it draws nearer you observe that two men are in it. They have a Bible and one of them seems to be preaching to the other. You can not hear what he is saying, but as he shouts out a little louder on one point you catch the word ‘Jesus’ and you know he is not a Jew or a Unitarian, for he is preaching Jesus. But that is all you hear until they come up to the stream of water that crosses the road there beneath you. When they get there they stop to let the horses drink, and you hear the driver say to the preacher: ‘Why may I not be baptized right here and now in this water?’ You hear the preacher reply: ‘Well, if you believe, with all your heart you may."

“The driver answers: ‘I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.’

“Then without another word they both get out of the buggy and wade down into the water and the preacher baptizes him. Then you see them come up out of the water and you see the driver get

into his buggy and go off down the road singing and shouting. Now, Bro. Blank, suppose that should happen tomorrow under your eyes out here on our road, what sort of preacher would you say that preacher was and what church would you say that driver became a member of ?"

BRO. BLANK (smiling): "Why, Brewer, I would know he was one of your kind ?"

BREWER: "Very well, then are you ready to admit that the inspired Philip was one of my kind' Of course you know that was the story of Philip and the enunch brought up to date. Was Philip one of my kind?"

BRO. BLANK: "I am inclined to believe he was."

BREWER: "Thank you, Bro. Blank. But let me ask you to reverse the order. Instead of saying that Philip was one of my kind, just please say that I am one of Philip's kind."

Here endeth this lesson, my brethren. Why can we not all return to the New Testament and be Philip's kind? Christians, disciples, children of God, sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty, is that not enough?

Now, friends, is that clear? Did that make that eunuch a Camphellite? Why, a thousand times no! Would that make you a Campbellite? Certainly, it would not. What would it make you? It would make you a Christian, a disciple of Christ, a Son of God, a member of the blood-bought, blood-washed church of Christ, which will stand throughout the ages, and at last shall be presented as the bride of Christ, cleansed and glorified, and there and then when all the ransomed church of God are saved to sin no more, we will walk the streets of the New Jerusalem and dwell with God in the home of the soul forever. (Invitation not reported.)

00A.16 CHAPTER XIII.—The Gospel Paul Preached

CHAPTER XIII THE GOSPEL PAUL PREACHED Our lesson tonight is to be a discussion of the subject just announced—’“The Gospel Paul Preached”—The text is from the first chapter of Galatians (reads by memory) :

I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: Which is not another; but there be- some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you then that which wo have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach another gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.

F’or do I now persuade men, or God? or do I Seek tc please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ. But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. (Galatians 1:6-12.) This is very strong language and it makes us tremble at the fearful responsibility that rests upon a preacher. For if he preaches any gospel other than that which Paul preached or even if he perverts that gospel, he is lost. The King James translation says if a man preaches any other gospel, let him be accursed, whereas the Revision says, “Let him be anathema.” Why did the Revision put this work “anathema” in there instead of the word “accursed”? The fact is, they did not put in the word “anathema”—the word “anathema” is the Greek word itself. The King James translators translated the Greek word into English by the word “accursed”. But the Revisers didn’t translate it at all. They simply anglicized it and left it a Greek word in the English language. Why did they not translate it as the King Janies translators did ? W’hy did they not translate it “accursed”? The reason is that the English word “accursed” is not as strong as the Greek word “anathema”. To be accursed, in our understanding of the English word, is simply to come under disapproval, or condemnation, but to be anathematized means to be irrevocably cut off. When a man is anathema he is not simply accursed for a while or disapproved in that act, but he is hopelessly and irrevocably cut off—there is absolutely no possibility of his returning —he is gone forever, and ,so the Apostle Paul says, “If a man preaches any gospel other than that which we have preached, let him be anathema—let him be cut off, eternally, hopelessly lost forever—that is what he means.

Now, with that much of an introduction, or explanation of the reading, we want to come to the subject announced. A word in reference to that, and then we will discuss it.

I said, we are preaching tonight upon the question, the gospel Paul preached. In announcing that subject I do not want you to think that the gospel that Paul preached was different from the gospel preached by Peter, John, James, Philip. Stephen, or any other apostle or evangelist of New Testament days. The Apostle Paul preached exactly the same gospel these other men preached, and what Paul said is of no more authority that what Peter, James, or John said; neither has it any more authority than what any other inspired man said. There is no such thing as making a distinction between inspired men. There is no such thing as attaching more importance to what

one says than to what another says. We have sometimes what men call the Red Letter New Testament. This was devised by somebody for the purpose of getting the attention of the people to the language of Jesus, and hence the words spoken by the Lord Jesus Himself are printed in red ink, or red type, and the other in black-faced type. Now, there is nothing wrong in that, unless it creates the wrong impression; but I have sometimes feared that it created the impression upon those who read it that the red letter is more important than the black letters—-that what the Lord said is of more importance than what the apostles said. But that is not true. The words of the Lord Jesus Christ himself were no more inspired, therefore no more divine, than the words of his apostles. Jesus himself said so. When he sent his disciples out, he said: “The Father sent me; I send you,” and, “Whosoever receives you, receives me, and whosoever receives me, receives him that sent me. Likewise, whosoever rejects you, rejects me, and whosoever rejects me, rejects him than sent me.” Hence, according to the teachings of the Lord Jesus Christ, we must accept them all, or reject them all. There is a tendency today, especially among Modernists, to accept the Lord Jesus Christ and to reject the apostles, and especially Paul. They hate Paul, and they direct their fight against Paul, but the Lord Jesus Christ told us that the gospel that went from him went through these men, and that the Holy Spirit spoke through them, for he said:

I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye can not bear them now.

Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come.

He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you.

All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you. (John 16:12-15.) The Holy Spirit came to show or to declare the will of our Lord, Christ, to these disciples and therefore they preached the gospel as Jesus wanted it preached, and we can not reject their word without rejecting him.

I have said this much because I did not want anybody to think I was exhalting Paul to any pre-eminence, or giving him any priority over any other apostle or inspired man, and if you understand that point, we are ready to proceed. The sermon tonight is to be taken from Paul entirely, and there isn’t to be a single point in it that is not made by Paul. I want you to listen carefully and critically, if you please, and if there is a single point made by the speaker tonight that is not backed up immediately by a quotation from Paul, I just want you to speak right out where you are and call me to account for that, and I will either quote the scripture that states it or else I will eliminate the point and apologize for making it. If I should make a point tonight and quote a passage from Peter, James, or John , I will eliminate that point from the sermon unless Paul makes the same point. Paul is going to preach to you tonight.

I would say I challenge you, but that might seem ugly —I only want to get your attention, and if it would not sound ugly, I would say I challenge you to find a point in the sermon tonight that is not made by Paul. In other words, we are going to let Paul preach tonight. I will tell you where the sermon begins, so you can watch, and I will tell you when it ends so you can know what the sermon is, and what might be introduction or exhortation apart from the sermon. I will give you the exact moment when the sermon starts and when it ends.

Now, we are ready for the gospel that Paul preached, and the sermon begins just here.

First, we preach the gospel that Paul preached for four reasons. The first reason is that it is the power of God unto salvation. Who said so? The Apostle Paul in Romans 1:16. For I am not ashamed of the gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is revealed a righteousness of God from faith unto faith: as it is written, But the righteous shall live by faith. The Greek word which is here translated “power’’ is dunamis. The word from which we get “dynamic”, “dynamo”, "dynamite”, etc. Therefore the gospel is God’s dynamite—unto salvation. The gospel is the power of God to save souls, and if I am going out to save souls, of course I should preach that gospel that Paul preached, because that is the power that God uses in saving men. If I am interested along social lines and I go out and lecture to people, I might do them some good in that respect, but if am after the salvation of men, if I am not trying to better conditions on earth alone, hot simply trying to improve civic and social conditions, but trying to improve spiritual conditions and give men not only better life here, but hope of eternal life hereafter, then I must carry that to them which can reach their hearts and save them, and that is the gospel.

We preach the gospel Paul preached because it has saved people, and does save. Not only is it the power of God to save, but it does save. It has demonstrated the fact that it works and does save souls. Who said that? Paul, First Corinthians, fifteenth chapter, says:

Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel whicn I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand: by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. So here is the Apostle Paul declaring to these Corinthian Christians that they had been saved by the gospel— by the gospel which he preached unto them. And in 1 Corinthians 4:15 he said: For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel.

Hence, these people at Corinth had been begotten by the gospel that Paul preached—had been saved by the gospel that Paul preached. Hence, if we want people to be horn into the family of God—if we want their souls saved, we must preach the gospel which did actually save two thousand years ago, and which will save now.

Thirdly, we preach the gospel that Paul preached because it came to Paul, by a direct revelation, and we have already shown that. He said that in Galatians, first chapter and eleventh verse—that the gospel was not given to him by men, nor did he receive it from men, nor was he taught it, but it came unto him through a revelation of Jesus Christ.

Then, when I am preaching the gospel that came to Paul, I am not preaching a theory—I am not preaching an hypothesis—I am not preaching that which has been born from the brain of philosophers—I am not preaching anything that had its origin in the earth—I am preaching something that came directly from heaven through the Holy Spirit to this apostle, Paul; and then that same gospel that came to Paul two thousand years ago has been providentially preserved, and it has reached me.

Paul said to Timothy—2 Timothy 2:2: And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.

Hence the gospel came from God to Paul, from Paul to Timothy, and from Timothy to faithful men who taught, others, and the gospel has reached us through the hands of faithful men, guided, no

doubt, by the protecting power of God, and tonight we can preach that same gospel that came from God to Paul.

Again, we preach the gospel Paul preached, for the reason that if we preach any other gospel we are anathema, or cut off forever from God, from divine favor, and therefore with no hope of ever passing into his presence to live forever. Who said that? The Apostle Paul. He says it here in Galatians, first chapter, sixth and seventh verses, and in the eighth repeats it, that even though lie—even Paul himself—“preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be anathema.”

It makes no difference how learned a man is ; it makes no difference how eloquent he is, if he preaches any gospel other than that which Paul preached he is anathema. He may speak with the silver tongue of oratory, his words and phrases may flow in rhymical cadences and musical measure, but if the message that they announce is not the gospel revealed through the Holy Spirit long ago, he is under the frown of heaven. Though vast audiences may be held motionless by the power of such a preacher, or may be convulsed with laughter, or moved to tears at will by him, still if he preach a perverted gospel he is irrevocably cut off from divine favor. Even if an angel from heaven should come to earth and begin to lead men to look to something other than the good views of the atoning blood of the cross for salvation, that angel would be sent to the Tartarean prison and forever banished from the presence of God.

Then if a man will not preach the gospel Paul preached because it is the power of God unto salvation and has actually saved and because it came to Paul by revelation, he ought to preach it in order to escape eternal condemnation himself.

These four reasons we offer for preaching the gospel Paul preached and each reason is based on a statement from Paul.

Now, let us suppose there is a young man in this audience tonight who has been thinking about becoming a preacher. He has about decided to make preaching his life work. But he has heard these scriptures quoted and he is profoundly impressed with the seriousness of the question. He says in his heart that he will never preach a sermon until he learns definitely what the gospel Paul preached is. Of course, he doesn’t want to incur the displeasure of God and to be accursed) therefore he decides that whatever preparation may be necessary for preaching, the most essential thing is to learn the gospel and then preach that and only that. When he gets home this hypothetical young man begins at once his efforts to ascertain what the gospel is. The first thing he does is to get his English dictionary and look up the word gospel. His English lexicon tells him that the word means “good news”, “glad tidings” or “sweet story”'. Then the young man reflects that the gospel that Paul preached must have been “good news” or “glad tidings”. But he can not determine from that definition just what this "good news was. He knows it must have been good news, as that is the meaning of gospel, but “good news” is a general term and gives him no idea as to what was the particular good news that Paul carried. Therefore the young man decides to go to the Bible to learn what this good news was. Accordingly he gets a concordance and finds the word gospel. He is struck by the number of times that the word is used in the Bible. He resolves to read every reference that the concordance gives, but first he will read only those that are given to Paul’s writings. He must learn what Paul’s gospel was. But for the sake of a comparison he runs a reference to one of Peter’s epistles. Here is what he reads: For the time is come that judgment

must begin at the house of God: and if it first, begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God. (1 Peter 4:17.) The expression, “obey not the gospel of God,” impresses the young man. He says if Paul’s gospel is the same, then it can be obeyed. It must therefore carry conditions and bring obligations upon those who hear it. Peter’s language not only implies that the gospel can be obeyed but it indicates that the end of those who do not obey will be fearful. If judgment is to begin with God’s own children, what shall be the end of those who obey not the gospel?

That, however, is Peter and our young man says he will now see if Paul has anything to say on this point. The next reference is to Paul’s letter to the church at Thessalonica. It reads thus:

Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels. In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the gmry of his power; When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day. (2 Thessalonians 1:6-10.) From this our young man clearly perceives that the gospel is not only something that can be obeyed, but that it must be obeyed. Paul clearly declares that all those who obey not the gospel will be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of God and the glory of his power. Now he becomes more interested than he has ever been. When he learned that to pervert the gospel would mean his eternal damnation he was about to give up the idea of ever attempting to preach out of fear that, he might make that fatal mistake. But now he sees that those who do not obey the gospel are lost and he thinks of his friends and of millions of others who are going through life without heeding the solemn warning—without even trying to obey the gospel—and he feels a divine compulsion come over hiln. He must learn what that gospel is and obey it himself and get all others to obey it who will listen to him. Since men are lost if they do not obey the gospel the young man feels, “Woe is me if I preach not the gospel.’’ With your pardon, we will now leave the young man of our illustration for a moment, and press this point upon you. My friends, you have heard what Paul said. You can not be saved unless you obey the gospel. Have you obeyed the gospel? If not, what do you expect? Do you think Paul was mistaken? Surely you do not discredit his statement. Then you have no hope unless you obey the gospel. Is there anybody in this section of seats who has not obeyed the gospel ? What do you say? Where do you stand tonight? If you have not obeyed the gospel you have no hope. Or take this center tier, is there any one here who has not obeyed the gospel ? Do you know what it means to obey the gospel and have you done it? If you have not, what are you promising yourself? Have you deliberately chosen to be lost forever? If not, you would better obey the gospel now.

Here to my right—What do you people say? Have you all obeyed the gospel? Are you sure you have? What did you do when you obeyed the gospel? What is implied in that expression? Whatever that means, it must be done or you are lost. Have you all obeyed? Think seriously upon this question.

Now let us get back to our young man. He goes back to his concordance with renewed zeal and determination. And his next reference sends him to First Corinthians, fifteenth chapter. He reads the first verses:

“Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel.” “Ah,” says the young man, “now I have it. Paul says he is going to declare the gospel. If he does I will learn what it is. This is the very reference I was looking for.”

“Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you.” The young man is elated: “Oh, no, here is the very gospel Paul preached. I can hardly wait to see what it is.” But he reads on:

Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; By which also ye re saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures: And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve:

After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep.

After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time. (1 Corinthians 15:1-9.)

“Well,” says the young man, “I have found it and that ought not to be hard to preach. There is no need for any one to pervert, that. It is just the facts of the old, old story of Jesus and his love. How that Christ died for our sins, was buried and rose again the third day. Then the rest of the chapter is taken up on that third point—that Jesus was raised from the dead and was seen by witnesses. No wonder Paul had said to these Corinthians, ‘I determine to know nothing among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified,’ for that is the gospel and if he had preached anything else—or anything contrary to this, or that violated that, he would have been anathema. Also is is no wonder that Paul said to the Galatians, ‘God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord, Jesus Christ’ That is the gospel and he who leads men to believe that they can be saved without the vicarious atonement of Christ’s death is anathema, and he deserves to be. After Christ has suffered that most shameful death to save men, if I should go out and presumptuously set that sacrifice at naught, make it void, and tell men to trust their own strength and wisdom or their morality, their lodges or anything else for salvation, I would deserve to be anathema. I see Paul’s viewpoint now. That is what it means to pervert the gospel: to direct the minds of men ‘away from the grace of Christ’ to the works, wisdom or schemes of men.” And the young man now renews his determination to preach, and breathes a prayer, “Lord, help me to preach Christ and him crucified.”

We may now dismiss our young man and look at these facts on our own account and in our own interest. You noticed carefully the reference which we read, and you understood what Paul says the gospel is, but to get it before you again I shall now re-read it and write it down or abbreviate it, here on this black board.

“Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you, the gospel which I preached unto you .... by which ye were saved .... For I delivered unto you that which I also received.” Well, where did you receive it, Paul?

“I received it by a revelation from Jesus Christ” (Galatians 1:11).

“For I delivered unto you that which I also received how that Christ died”—(that D. stands for death).

D. B. R.

(The speaker makes a large D on the black board as he reads) :

*

“for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried [makes the B] and that he was raised [makes the R] again the third day according to the scriptures.”

There we have it. The death, burial and resurrection of our Lord. That is the gospel. Or those are the basic facts of the gospel. But the same one is ready, perhaps, to remind us that the word gospel means good news or glad tidings, and to ask what good news there is in the death, burial and resurrection of Christ?

You did not read the passage carefully. Why did Christ die? For his own sins? No; he “died for our sins.” Is there any good news in the fact that when you were lost in sin, without God and without hope, Jesus took your place and died for you? Then, that is not all. He rose from the dead and thereby brought the hope of eternal life to all the world. Now you see the good news, I am sure. But here is another question: How can you obey the death, burial and resurrection of Christ? Paul says we must obey the gospel and he says this is the gospel— represented here by this D. B. R.—How can you obey that? Can you answer that question? If not, what are you going to do, since you must obey the gospel or be lost ?

I could not answer that question if Paul had not given me the answer. I will let Paul tell you how that is. In Romans 6:17, we have this language: But thanks be to God, that, whereas ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart to that teaching whereunto ye were delivered; and being made free from sin, ye became servants of righteousness.

Here Paul declares that these people were made free from sin when they obeyed from their hearts the form of doctrine or teaching which was delivered unto them. Paul said he delivered the gospel—how that Christ died for our sins, was buried and rose again the third day. That is what Paul delivered and what all others must have delivered or else they were accursed. Now these Romans had obeyed the form, mould, pattern or likeness of that doctrine. A form or likeness of the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. What is that form or likeness? Can you, my friends, point to a specific form of doctrine that you obeyed in becoming free from sin? Was there a likeness of Christ’s death, burial and resurrection? What is that form? Let Paul tell us:

What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. We who died to sin, how shall we any longer live therein? Or ar ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that ike as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united with him in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection; knowing this, that our ola man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in hondage to sin; for he that hath died is justified from sin. (Romans 6:1-8.) There we have the complete likeness. Let us run Death<=====>Burial<=====>Resurrection

BAPTISM out these lines and see the perfect form. Look at this diagram once more.

“Know ye not that as many of you as were baptized unto Christ were baptized into his death? [speaker draws line from Baptism to Death]. Wherefore being buried with him by baptism [draws line from Baptism to Burial] into death; [connects D. and B.] that like as Christ was raised from the dead [draws line from Baptism to Resurrection] by the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life.”

There is a likeness of Christ’s death; a likeness of his burial and a likeness of his resurrection in our death to sin, our burial in baptism and our resurrection to a new life. But some one may object that such an arrangement makes baptism the whole thing. No indeed, beloved. However it does make the whole process become visible and actual in baptism. Baptism pictures and symbolizes the complete form. But it must be a baptism into death. There must be a likeness of the death or else the baptism is invalid. There must be a likeness of the burial or your baptism is invalid. You have not obeyed the form—you have not obeyed the gospel. Also there must be a likeness of his resurrection or the baptism is invalid and you have not obeyed the gospel. In this sixth chapter of Romans Paul was not discussing baptism. No inspired man ever discussed baptism. It is not discussed in the Bible. The resurrection is discussed. .Spiritual gifts are discussed, but baptism is not discussed. It is commanded and we see people obeying the command in the Bible, but the question is not discussed. Incidentally Paul gives us some very fine information on the form or mode and the design of baptism in this chapter, but that was not his theme. He was discussing sin. In the last part of the fifth chapter (and Paul did not divide it into chapters) Paul had said, “Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.” Well, now some objector or critic would be sure to say, let us continue in sin that grace may abound. The more we sin the more grace will abound. Paul foresaw that argument and answered it in the sixth chapter. Christians have died to sin like as Christ died in the flesh. They have been buried in baptism like as Christ was buried in the tomb. They have been raised to a new life—a life of Christianity—like as Christ was raised to immortality. As death has no more dominion over Christ neither should sin have any more dominion over the Christian.

Then Paul uses an illustration or, as he says, speaks as a man. He, by a figure of speech, represents sin as a master owning slaves or servants, and Righteousness as another master having servants. Now, when you were servants of Sin what control or authority did this other master—Righteousness—have over you? Why, none, of course. Very well, now a change of masters—you were once servants of Sin, but you passed through a transaction that made you free from Sin and you became the servants of this master Righteousness. Then what authority of control does the old master—Sin, have over you now? None at all, of course. All right, when you served Sin what did he pay you? “The wages of sin is death.” What is your reward for serving Righteousness? “The gift of God is eternal life.” Do you see the argument, my friends? To assure these people that they were no longer servants of sin, Paul reminded them that their obedience to the gospel had symbolized a death, a burial and a resurrection. Look back down the path over which you have come. Do you see that grave? That is where the old man died. That is where a life to sin came to an end. That is where a life to righteousness began.

You die to sin when you hear the gospel and believe it, and the desire to live on in sin dies out in your heart and you earnestly desire to flee away from sinful things and serve God in the beauty of

holiness. With such a state of mind you confess your faith in Christ and show outwardly your desire to quit sin—your death to sin— by your burial in baptism. Thus your faith and your repentance both are visualized, actualized and declared by your baptism. A funeral or a burial always indicates that a death has occurred. If people have not died to sin they can. not be baptized into Christ. They may be ducked, but they are not baptized. Thus you see, friends, that baptism alone is not all, rather it is nothing, it is even impossible, but a real baptism must be preceded by genuine faith and sincere repentance—by a death to sin. This concludes the sermon and we will now rehearse the points in order that you may know that Paul made them all.

1. The gospel is the power of God unto salvation. So said Paul. Romans 1:16.

2. The gospel does save—has saved. 1 Corinthians 15:1-2.

3. The gospel came to Paul by divine revelation. Galatians 1:11.

4. If any preach any other gospel than that which Paul preached he is anathema. Galatians 1:6-8.

5. The gospel must be obeyed. 2 Thessalonians 1:7-11.

6. The gospel is the death of Christ for our sins, his burial and resurrection. 1 Corinthians 15:1-4.

7. We obey the form of this doctrine—this gospel. Romans 6:17.

8. We are baptized into the likeness of Christ's death. We are buried with him by baptism.

We are raised in the likeness of his resurrection. Romans 6:1-6.

(Invitation not reported.)

00A.17 CHAPTER XIV.—The Immovable Kingdom

CHAPTER XIV THE IMMOVABLE KINGDOM The subject for our lesson tonight is “The Immovable Kingdom”, or “The Kingdom That Can not Be Shaken.” Paul speaks of this kingdom in the twelfth chapter of Hebrews. This is what he says: And this word, Yet once more, signified the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that nave been made, that those things which are not shaken may remain. Wherefore, receiving a kingdom that can not be shaken, let ui have grace, whereby we may offer service well-pleasing to God with reverence and awe: for our God is a consuming fire. (Hebrews 12:27-28.) Or to read it from the King James translation: Whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven. And this word, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which can not be shaken may remain. Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which can not be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear: For our God is a consuming fire.

Beginning at the eighteenth verse of this chapter Paul draws a contrast between the things to which we are not come and things to which we are come. He clearly describes the two covenants. He tells first of the phenomena that attended the giving of the law at Mount Sinai, when the earth shook and the thunders rolled and rattled and roared over the smoking summit of the quivering mountain. We are not come to that. But we are come to Mount Zion in contrast to Mount Sinai. Then he names the other things that are superior to and contrast with the Sinai covenant. The voice that spoke there shook the earth, but there is a time coming when be will shake both the earth and the heavens, for both are to pass away. But there is something that will not be shaken or moved and that something is a kingdom. This should encourage or inspire us with grace to offer service well pleasing unto God with reverence and awe for our God is a consuming fire.

If that thought would not so inspire us, what would? There is no thought that is more comforting in a world of change and decay than that there is something that is not subject to decay. Nothing that belongs to time or earth will remain. Every moment changes are taking place. Delapidation, death and decay are written upon everything around us. Men may feel that they have built something that will endure through the flight of years and through the ravages of millenniums, but their hope is vain. Old time moves on in his destructive march and effaces every mark that men have made on the earth We sometimes speak of things that are as enduring as the hills, but the hills themselves are brought low by the hand of time and the valleys are lifted up in the mighty upheavals of the restless earth. Even the earth itself must some day be consumed—dissolve into gases and pass out of existence.

Man himself only begins to learn how to live when his allotted time is out and he must relinquish his claim and leave his unfinished labors to another generation. He just begins to learn the proper use of his faculties when these faculties begin to become enfeebled and to fail. Does it not seem sad? Is not the thought depressing? In the Bible man’s life is likened to a weaver’s shuttle. It is likened to the flowers that blossom in spring and wither in the summer. And again it is likened to a

vapor, a fleecy fleck of cloud that hangs out under the blue dome of a perfect morning, shimmering in the rays of the rising sun and then vanishes before the sun crosses the Meridian. Or yet again, man's life is compared to a shadow that is cast upon the earth by a cloud that flits across the photosphere of the sun. William Cullen Bryant wrote:

Ar shadows cast by cloud and sun Flit o'er the summer's grass, So in thy sight, Almighty One, Earth's generations pass.

While through the years ar endless host Come pressing swiftly on, The brightest; names that earth can boast Just glisten and are gone.

Gone! The earth knows them no more.

"Only a grave in the vale and a memory of me", and that grave will soon be lost and that memory will fail. And the unfortunate part is, tliat man does not realize that his years are passing, never to return until they are gone. He wastes his opportunities and trifles with time until his life is over. He is too prone to expect to do something great or good in the future and to let opportunities for service pass by unimproved. Man dreams of things that are passed and hopes and speculates about things that are future, and lets the precious present moments slip by unheeded.

It was Shelly who said:

We look before and after, And pine for what is not; Our sincerest laughter Often with some pain is frought; Our sweetest songs tell of saddest thought.

I sometimes illustrate this tendency in man by a man standing on an embarking ship. He stands upon the deck and looks out to his boyhood home, which can be seen from the ship, and as he waves a fond farewell to the old home, memory begins to awaken to the scenes of childhood and he lives over the days that are gone. He loses himself in reverie. But as he stands and muses over those happy hours spent in that loved spot the ship upon which he stands is silently bearing him farther and farther away. Farther toward the other shore.

Just so the swiftly moving chariot of time on which we are traveling is constantly bearing us farther out on life's ocean, farther toward eternity's shore. And while we are looking back on the scenes of long ago they are fading out of view in the dim distance. But in the midst of these transitory tilings there is one thing that does not change with changing seasons: one thing that can not be moved by the storms of time, nor affected by the laws of dissolution. That is the Kingdom of Christ. And this kingdom was here in Paul's day and these people to whom he writes were in possession of it. It is here now and we all have the privilege of being citizens of it. It is not something that is imaginary and mythical. It is real. It is not something that is going to come to men in some far-off future day. It is here now. Daniel foresaw and foretold the coming of this kingdom among men. He told also that it would be an everlasting kingdom and therefore, of course, an immovable kingdom.

Nebuchadnezzar had a dream, and although the dream "had gone from him", he remembered that there had been a dream and he was exceedingly troubled in spirit. He wished to know what the dream was and what was the interpretation. He summoned before him his enchanters and magicians and sorcerers and Chaldeans and required of them that they tell his dream and then interpret it for him. These wise men told him that never was such a thing required by any king or ruler. They said, "You tell us the dream and we will give you the interpretation. But it is impossible

for any wise men to tell the king what he has dreamt." But the king thought that if they had power to interpret dreams they ought also to be able to reveal his dream to him. He made it a test and told these wise men that if they did not make known his dream he would know that all their claims had been false. But the wise men insisted that the King's request was impossible and that no man on earth could do the thing he required. The king became very angry and commanded that all the wise men of Babylon be destroyed. This included Daniel and his three companions, for they were reckoned among the wise men, although they had not been brought before the king on this occasion. When Daniel knew of the decree he requested that the king appoint him a time and he would make known the dream. Then he and his three companions began earnestly to pray to God for light on this matter. In due time God answered that prayer and Daniel went before the king. He told the king frankly that it was not any superior wisdom that he possessed that enabled him to show the dream. He said that the thing was (impossible with men, but that there was a God in heaven and this great Jehovah had seen fit to make this matter known unto the king.

Then Daniel told the king what he had seen in his dream.

There was an image, in the form of man and its brightness was excellent and its aspect was terrible. It was a composite structure, The head was gold, its breast and arms were silver, its belly and thighs were brass and its legs were iron and the feet were part iron and part clay. This was the image that the king had beheld in his dream, and while he looked upon it and wondered he saw a little stone cut out of the mountain without hands and it rolled down and struck this image upon the feet and brake it—the entire image—in pieces. The gold and silver and brass and iron and clay all fell apart and in pieces. Then all these materials that composed this image were blown away by the wind like chaff from the summer's threshing floor. Then the little stone began to grow and to spread until it became a great mountain and filled the whole earth. This completed the story of the king's dream and Daniel is ready to give the interpretation thereof. The image represented kingdoms, each material a separate kingdom except the clay. It was a part of another kingdom. The :ron and the clay together represented one kingdom, but it was to be a divided kingdom. Daniel told Nebuchadnezzar that he was that head of gold, for he was a mighty king in power and splendor. He bore rule over all the earth. After him there was to come another nation or kingdom which was to be inferior to Babylon—Nebuchadnezzar's empire. This was to be the silver kingdom. Following that there would come another kingdom—the brass kingdom—and it too would be a universal empire. Then next the iron kingdom would come. It would be destructive and would break down and crush out other nations, and it would also be universal in its reach. However, it would be a divided kingdom. Then "in the days of these kings" would the God of heaven set up a kingdom—represented by the little stone—which would break in pieces and consume all other kingdoms and stand forever—it would never be destroyed. This is Daniel's interpretation; and since he tells who the first king was it is no trouble at all for us to see from history what kingdom succeeded the first and then what overthrew the second, and so on until we see the fou: universal empires rise on the ruins of each other, and it was in the days of these kings that the immovable kingdom was to be set up. Let us see those kingdoms rise and fall.

Nebuchadnezzar reigned in Babylon in splendor and great glory. You are acquainted with the history of that city, with its hanging gardens, its walls upon which four chariots could drive abreast, its streets that cut each other at right angles and divided the city into twenty-five squares. Then there was the river Euphrates, which ran through the city and brass gates across it and quays and

brass steps leading down to the water. The king had made a great excavation up the river beyond the walls of the city, with a canal and gates, into which the high waters were diverted to prevent an overflow of the beautiful city. On either side of the river was a marble palace with a passage over the river and another under the river, from palace to palace. This is a brief description of the ancient city of Babylon.

Here Nebuchadnezzar—the head of gold of the vision —-reigned as king of kings and as lord over many defeated and subjugated nations. Among the nations that had come under his power was the Jewish nation—God's people. Because of their sins God had permitted Nebuchadnezzar to defeat them and to carry them away captives into the land of Babylon. Daniel and his three companions were among these captives. Nebuchadnezzar had thrown down the walls of Jerusalem and sacked the temple and had robbed the Holy of holies of its sacred vessels of gold and had carried them away to Babylon. He, however, wicked as he was, had enough reverence for these vessels to put them away among his sacred things in the house of his idols. When Nebuchadnezzar had been removed Belshazzar reigned in his stead and it seems that he was even more wicked than his father. He made a great feast to a thousand of his lords and ladies. As they were reveling in the royal palace halls and drinking wine to inebriety the king commanded that the vessels of gold which his father had taken from the house of God be brought out for service. And he and his drunken lords drank wine from these sacred vessels and praised the gods of wood and stone. But while they were in the midst of this hilarity and the profanation of these sacred vessels there came out of the dark sleeve of night a hand that wrote upon the palace wall the sentence of doom for Belshazzar and his kingdom. Rapidly the mystic hand inscribed upon the plaster of the wall the bewildering words, Mene, Mene, Tekel Upharsin. The king beheld the hand as it wrote and it struck consternation to his soul. His joints were loosed and his knees smote each other. He cried out for some one to read the writing. The wise men were brought in before him, but no one could read the writing. Then the queen mother told Belshazzar of Daniel who interpreted Nebuchadnezzar's dream. Daniel was brought in and he fearlessly read out the writing which told the king that he was weighed in the balances and found wanting, and that his kingdom was to be divided and given to the Medes and the Persians. That very night Darius, the king of the Medes, came down from the North with the swiftness of a bird and opened the canal gates and turned the river into that revervoir and led his soldiers down the river bed and under the walls into the city. The lords of all the land were there assembled in drunken revelry and the Medes slaughtered them and their blood ran like wine down the marble steps of the palace, Balshazzar was slain and Babylon was no more. The empire of gold had given place to the kingdom of silver. The Medes and the Persians divided their kingdom into a hundred and twenty-seven provinces and had their palace at Shushan.

Alexander the Great came in due time with his devastating hordes and overthrew the Medo-Persian empire and set up the third universal empire—the kingdom of brass. After the death of Alexander his kingdom was divided among his four generals and they fought each other and soon two of them were swallowed up by the other two.

It was out of these contending forces that the iron kings arose. Rome was the capital, the chief metropolis and finally became the mistress of the world, The Roman rulers were represented by the iron legs in the Nebuchadnezzar vision and some think that the two divisions of the empire were symbolized by the two legs. However I do not take to the idea of making too literal a figure of

speech. I never try to trace out exact analogies to all incidentals or details of parabolic language. If we should do that we would find things in the Daniel prophecy that are not yet fulfilled. And we would be forced to have the complete image standing intact when the little stone stone strikes it. Therefore all those ancient empires would necessarily have to be reestablished and all exist at one time. To me that would be forcing a figure or making symbolic language literal. The rule of the Roman emperors has long been thought of as an iron rule. Rome and iron are synonymous in our thinking. Literature came through the Greeks and the knowledge of God came through the Jews, but law is a heritage from the Romans.

These iron kings did crush and destroy other nations. A battle with the Roman soldiers meant defeat and desolation for any nation, until finally all the nations bowed to Rome's authority and sent their tribute into the em- perial city. Rome, proud mistress that sat upon her seven hills and from her throne of beauty ruled the world!

It was during the days of these kings that the immovable kingdom was to be set up in the earth. During the reign of Augustus Caesar Jesus was born in Bethlehem to be the King and Savior of men. Under the reign of Tiberias Caesar he was crucified outside the walls of Jerusalem. He was raised from the dead by the power of God and ascended to heaven and took his seat on the throne of the majesty of God. Then being enthroned and glorified, he sent the Holy Spirit back to the earth to guide, inspire and empower his witnesses. They received this power upon the day of Pentecost, and that day three thousand souls acknowledged Christ as their Ruler and by submission to his will entered into the benefits of his kingdom. That day the Holy Spirit began to execute the laws of the King and therefore he began that day to reign over his earthly subjects.

Then in the Epistles we read of people who were in the kingdom. (Colossians 1:13.) And in the text for this sermon we saw that those people were in possession of the kingdom which is unshakable. This is bound to be the kingdom of Daniel's prophecy or else Christ will have two kingdoms at the same time, for this kingdom being immovable can not give place to another. If another is to be set up in future it will have to run parallel with this one.

It takes three things to constitute a kingdom. If it were an earthly or material kingdom it would take four. These, the three things, are: The King, his laws and his subjects. As it is a spiritual kingdom we do not need the fourth, which is territory. Christ said my kingdom is not of this world. Again he said the kingdom of heaven cometh not with observation for lo, the kingdom is within you. Paul said the kingdom is love, peace and joy m the Holy Spirit. And in the Daniel prophecy the kingdom was represented by a little stone cut out of the mountains without hands. The kingdom did not come nor is it advanced by the carnal sword. It did not come with the blast of trumpets, the unfurling of colors and the roar of the cannon. It is a kingdom of principles—living, active, formative and transforming principles.

It will remove hate from the hearts of men and fill them with love. It will, if truly received, remove war and strife from the earth and cause peace to flow like a gentle river to earth's remotest bounds. It will take fear, dread and sin out of the heart and fill it with joy. Love, Peace and Joy in the Holy Spirit—-that is the kingdom. Now, in order for this kingdom to be immovable each of the three elements that we have mentioned must be imperishable. Let us consider them and see if they are all immovable.

1. THE KING. Of course we all know that Christ is the King and he must reign till all enemies are put under his feet. Peter announced that he was made Lord and Christ. Paul calls him the King of kings and Lord of lords, and in Revelation we read that the kingdom of this world are to become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. Then is it necessary to argue that our King is immovable? Paul calls him immovable, invisible, eternal. He himself said to John, “I am he that was dead, and, behold, I am alive forevermore, And I hold the keys of death and of Hades.” He has all power in heaven and on earth and he can not therefore be deposed. He is beyond the touch of time ana the dominion of death. Therefore the King of the kingdom is immovable.

2. The LAWS. What are the laws of this kingdom? Common sense would reply: Why, the laws that are made by the King. His decrees, his commands. While Christ was here on earth he announced principles and gave laws that were to govern his followers. He had witnesses specially chosen to hear these things and to confirm them later. Then before he left the earth he told his disciples to go and make disciples and to enjoin upon them all that he had commanded or imparted to his original witnesses. (Matthew 28:18-20.) Then he told them that he had many other things to say to them, but they were not able to receive them. However the Holy Spirit would come after his departure and teach them all things, guide them into all truth and bring to their remembrance all the things Christ had commanded them. He, the Holy Spirit, would take of the things of Christ—his Avill—and declare them unto the apostles. (John 14:26; John 16:8-16.) The Holy Spirit did come upon these apostles and enabled them to work miracles to attest their message or to confirm their word. (Mark 16:17-18; Hebrews 2:1-4.) They were the ambassadors of the new King; envoys extraordinary and plenipotentiary. Through them the complete system of laws of the heavenly kingdom was made known. And all disciples of Christ in all the Christian age are told to contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered unto these saints. (Jude 1:3.) We may say, therefore, that the New Testament is the law bool: of the immovable kingdom. It contains the divine enactments. The teaching of the apostles was normative.

Then are these iaws—the New Testament Scriptures —immovable ana imperishable? They claim to be. Isaiah said the “word of God liveth and abideth forever” and Peter repeats this and says, “And this is that word which by the gospel is preached unto you” (1 Peter 1:25; Isaiah 40:6). Jesus himself said, “Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass awav” (Matthew 24:35). But some one may say that it looks now as if the Bible is going out of date and that it will soon have lost its influence over the hearts of men. We know that many people today reject the Bible and every now and then we hear a cry for a “new Bible” Even those who profess to believe the Bible want to edit the old book and expunge those parts that do not comport with modern ideas and speculations. But this is no new thing. It is true that there is more opposition to the Bible today than was ever before known in America. The United States Government was founded by people who believed the Bible and it will be maintained, if maintained at all, by people who believe the Bible. The propaganda against the Bible is also against the principles and traditions of our government. The more rapidly our people become victims of this propaganda the more rapid will be the decline of our government. But the Bible is much older than the United States Government, and it had been the object of many a violent attack from unbelievers before our government was brought forth. Infidels have tried to ridicule its claims and laugh it out of public respect. Ecclesiastic authority, jealous of its control over the conscience of people, has tried to destroy the Bible off of the earth, but the Bible has lived on in spite of all this hatred and has been triumphant over every

scheme and device that have been employed for its destruction. Millions of copies are being sold every year, and although they may disregard much that the Bible teaches in their daily lives, most people—the great majority—in their subjective consciousness still recognize the teaching of Christ as final. The Bible has by no means been repudiated by the public nor has it lost its appeal to the inner nature of men when men will recognize that they have an inner nature with needs and longings. The Bible still lives and according to its own claims it will live on forever. And if its principles are true, as we believe they are, of course it must live. Truth can't perish. In his debate with Douglass, Abraham Lincoln said, "I will die and my name will be forgotten, but the principles for which I am contending will live on forever." All truth will live on forever and the Bible being true, must therefore abide through the ages.

Suppose this world should stand a million years longer. Think of a million years. Can you realize how long a time that is and the changes that would take place? It has not been a million days yet since Jesus was born in Bethlehem. Thing of a million years! Scientists claim that the earth has been here for many millions of years, but even if that is true we do not have the history of the earth except for a few thousand years. Seven thousand years are nothing compared with a million years. And yet in these few thousand years civilizations have grown up and blossomed in the earth and then withered and decayed. Kingdoms have been founded, have flourished and have fallen. Today we dig up the ruins of ancient cities and decipher the heiroglyphs of ancient people—though they lived only three or four thousand years ago. What would happen in a million years ? A million years from tonight men will dig up New York and Chicago and London and Paris, but they will have to dig through the ruins of greater cities than these that were built by men who perhaps knew not of the buried glory of our civilization. In that far off future day our political parties will have been forgotten and the issues over which they fought will have perished. Our religious denominations will have perished from the memories of men and the sectarian doctrines over which we fight and divide and disfellowship each other will have been forgotten and buried beneath millenniums of oblivion. Yet the Book of God will be there and it will tell in whatever language that race uses that Christ was born in Bethlehem. That he was crucified on the hill of Calvary. That he was buried in Joseph's new tomb. That he arose from the dead and commanded his disciples to "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature: He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." They will read that "the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch'*. They will read that the disciples at Troas came together upon the first day of the week to break bread. They will read that Jesus is coming back to earth again to take his children home. They will read all this because it is in the word of God and it liveth and abideth forever.

3. THE SUBJECTS OF THE KING OR THE CITIZENS OF THE KINGDOM. Who are the subjects? All those who acknowledge the King as their Ruler and obey his laws are, of course, his subjects. All those who enthrone him in their hearts and allow him to rule and order their lives-—these are citizens of the Immovable Kingdom. All real Christians are citizens of that kingdom. Then will Christians live forever? Are they not subject to death? Yes, Christians must put off the body of llesh, but they do not cease to be. From our point of view they are defeated by Death and taken captives by him and locked in his prison house. But Christ has overcome him who has the power of death and he, Christ, now holds the keys of Death and of Hades, and at his call all the captives shall be set free and be brought forth shouting victory. This is the Christian's hope, and what would life be worth without it?

Death is such a dark and hideous monster that stands down in the path of life and he casts his shadow so far down toward the cradle that from the dawn of mind till the day of death we would be compelled to walk in his gloom, if it were not for our faith in Christ, which dispels the shadows and enables us to see the sunlit shores of the land beyond.

Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this?

Yes, Christians will live on forever. They, too, are imperishable. No part of the kingdom shall fail. It shall stand forever. When day and night shall he no more and the moon shall cease to wax and wane and the sea shall flow and ebb no more; when earth and heaven shall be shaken and shall pass away with a great noise, this kingdom shall firm remain. How enrapturing is the thought! How glorious the consummation: Are you a citizen of that kingdom? Have you sworn allegiance to the King? Take the step now, my brother.

I love thy kingdom, Lord, The house of thine abode; The church our blest Redeemer saved, With his own precious blood.

I love thy church, O God! Her walls before thee stand Dear as the apple of thine eye And graven on thy hand. For her my tears shall fall, To her my pray’rs ascend, To her my cares and toils be giv’n, Till toils and cares shall end.

Beyond my highest joy I prize her heav’nly ways, Her sweet communion, solemn vows, Her hymns of love and praise.

Jesus, Thou Friend divine, Our Savior and our King!

Thy hand from every snare and foe, Shall great deliv’rance bring, Sure as thy truth shall last, To Zion shall be given The brightest glories earth can yield, And blighter bliss of heav’n.

Amen and Amen.

00A.18 CHAPTER XV.—Where Are the Dead?

CHAPTER XV WHERE ARE THE DEAD? The subject for our sermon this evening is, “Where are the dead between death and the judgment?” Do they sleep in an unconscious state or do they go to an inter-mediate state or do they go immediately to their eternal destiny? Each of these three questions is held by some people to be the teaching of the Scriptures. We shall consider the three and determine, if we can, what the word of the Lord teaches upon this question.

We are all interested in any question that relates to the future life. We would like to know, if possible, where we go immediately after death, and we would like to know whether our friends wfio have crossed the river are conscious, and if so, do they know what we are doing and how we grieve for their departure. Some of these questions we can not answer, There is nothing revealed that will satisfy all the longings that we have in reference to these things. I think, however, that this is a gracious provision of our Father. It would not be a comfortable thought to believe that our departed loved ones are always near us and always taking cognizance of the things that we are doing and thinking. Further-more, I believe that the Lord wishes us to live in only one world at a time. It would probably disqualify us for the practical things of this life if he allowed us to dwell to too great an extent upon the things of another life; upon the things of the Spirit world. For this reason, our Father has closed the door and shut out from us some of the things that we would like to know.

We read in the Bible the story of a man who had died and who remained in the grave until the fourth day. Then our Savior spoke the word that restored life to his putrefying body and he again lived and walked among men. He was naturally an object of great interest to the people of that day. They came as far to see him as they did to see our Lord who had raised him from the dead. And so great was the interest aroused by him that the enemies of our Lord suggested that he should be put out of the way, for he was a living argument in favor of the divine power of the Savior. Do you not imagine that those pe.ople who came to see Lazarus and crowded around him with such interest asked him questions in reference to where he was while he was dead; and what he saw, and what he heard? There is not the slightest intimation in the Scripture that such questions were put to him, yet I know they were., and I base this statement upon human nature, I would have asked him such questions if I had been there. You would have done the same thing. Then why may we not assume that those people who were interested in him in the same way that we would have been asked him the same questions? But did he answer their questions? If so, why did not the writers of the gospels record those answers, and give us the benefit of them as well as the people living at that time? Not only did these strangers and friends ask such questions of Lazarus, but I can imagine that when he was alone in the quiet little home at Bethany that Martha and Mary put these questions to him. Can’t you hear them saying, “Brother, where were you after you left us? Did you know how we grieved for you? Did you see the funeral and know how that all our friends had come to sympathize with us? What did you know, brother ? How’ did you feel ? What did you see ? Where did you go? Tell us all about it.” Surely these sisters asked such questions of their brother. Yet, there is no mention of it in the Scriptures; and, of course, therefore,

no answers made to such questions. Why is it that the answers to these questions are not recorded, since we know that such questions must have been asked? My conclusion is that he did not answer these questions; and the reason he did not answer them was he could not. I have an idea that the curtain upon the scene and all that had taken place faded out of the memory of Lazarus when he came back into his body. I base this upon Paul's statement that when he was caught up into the third heaven he heard things that were unlawful to be uttered. If it was unlawful for Paul to utter the things that he heard in the spirit world, it must also have been unlawful for Lazarus to reveal what he heard and saw while he was out of the body. If then it is the Father's will to keep some of these things from us, we must be satisfied and as in all other things, say "Thy will be done". But, if there is anything revealed upon the question, it is ours and we have a right to know it and to enjoy whatever blessing such information may give to us. We will, therefore, enter into a study of this question tonight and see what we can learn.

Then, where are the dead ? One man answers: They are not: they have ceased to be, for man is wholly mortal and at death he ceases to be a conscious entity. This is said not by unbelievers only, but there are religious people who hold this view. They claim that there will be a resurrection, which according to their theory, would have to be a re-creation, when all the dead will be brought back into life again and then the righteous will be given immortality, but the wicked will be annihilated, according to the theory. If this theory is correct, then any further discussion of our question is unnecessary. The answer to "Where are the dead" is already given. They are non-est. But I do not believe this theory. I believe that man possesses an element in his nature which we call soul that may live independent of the physical organism. At death, the soul, or spirit, departs from the body in consequence of which the body decays but the spirit lives on. Those who hold to the No-Soul doctrine, make a play upon the word death. They say that if the spirit lives after death, then the person is not dead. But they put an arbitrary meaning upon the word death. They think it means extinction, but this is not the meaning of the word, either according to the Scriptures or according to the lexicons. The word, death means a separation and the end of a state or condition. One may, therefore, be dead in one sense and alive in another. When one state or condition comes to an end, that is a death. The Apostle Paul says in the seventh chapter of Romans: For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. That does not mean that he became extinct, or ceased to be, but it means that he ceased to be ignorant of sin. He had not formerly known sin, but the law revealed the fact that he was a sinner. Then he was no longer in blindness. Again the Apostle Paul says to the Colossians:

Ye are dead and your life is hid with Christ in God.

Here were people who were living, active Christians, and yet Paul says that they were dead. That does not mean that they had no existence. It means that they were dead to the world and to the things that are sinful, but they were alive unto God. Again the Apostle Paul says in 1 Timothy 5:6, concerning a young widow, who loves pleasure and therefore deserts the Lord, that "she is dead while she liveth". So we have a person living and dead at the same time. Living in one sense and dead in another. In this case she was dead unto God and alive unto sin. Now when physical death comes, it simply means that the spirit departs from the body and that our earthly existence is at an end. No longer is there life in the flesh. A few passages of Scripture will prove beyond a doubt that this is correct. Before we cite these passages, it would be well to consider the meaning of the word "soul". The soul-sleepers, or annihilationists claim that the soul dies and they quote such

Scriptures as, The soul that sinneth, it shall die. But this is a different use of the word “soul”. Here it simply means individuals. The person that sins shall die, not any one else for him, but he for himself. The father shall not bear the iniquity1 for the son, or the son the iniquity for the father, but the soul that sinneth, it shall die. Many times in the Bible the word soul is used in that way. We read that eight souls were saved in the ark, meaning eigiht individuals. We read of three score and fifteen souls, meaning, of course, three score and fifteen persons. The word that is used in the Scripture to designate the immortal part of man is not “soul” but “spirit”. The word “soul” is sometimes used to designate the immortal part of man, but not nearly so often as the word “spirit”. But whichever word is used, we shall find that there is beyond question such a thing as a man’s living apart from his body. The first reference that we suggest in proof of this is Genesis 35:18. Here we have the story of the death of Rachael and the birth of Benjamin, and we read, And it came to pass, as her soul was departing (for she died), that she called his name Benoni; but his father called him Benjamin. Her death simply means a departing of the spirit. Her spirit was departing and the writer threw into parenthesis the statement that she died. Again we read in the seventeenth chapter of the Book of Kings of the death of the widow’s son and of the restoration to life of that son by the prophet of God. The record says that Elijah stretched himself upon the corpse and prayed, O Lord, my God, I pray thee, let this child’s soul come into him”, and the soul did come into him and he revived. This shows clearly that the soul had departed and consequently the body was lifeless. The soul returned and again the boy lived in the body. In the twelfth chapter of Ecclesiastes, we have a picture of old age and death. And in Ecclesiastes 12:7, the wise man says, And the dust shall return as it was, but the spirit unto God who gave it.

Here the body, that which was made out of dust, returns to the dust, but the spirit which did not come from dust, but came from God, goes back to God.

Then when we come into the New Testament, we read the same expressions. In Luke 23:43, Jesus said to the penitent thief, Verily I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with me in paradise.

Jesus and the thief both died that day and their mutilated bodies were taken down from the cross, but according to the statement of our Lord, they were both in some place together called paradise. Then, in Luke 23:46, Jesus cried with a loud voice and said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.

Then he gave up the ghost and his body was lifeless.

There was something in Jesus that departed and went into the hands of the Father, while his body was given into the hands of friends who buried if in the tomb. In the seventh chapter of Acts, we have the story of the death of Stephen, and as Stephen died, he cried, Lord, Jesus, receive my spirit. His spirit was being forced from the body by the cruel stones hurled upon him by the mob, but that spirit went into the hands of Jesus while his body was left mangled in the dust of the earth.

Again in the fourth chapter of Second Corinthians Paul said, Though our outer man is decaying, yet our inner man is renewed day by day.

Here man is looked upon as having two sides to his nature, and while one is going down, so to speak, the other is going up. One is failing, the other is taking on new life and strength. Then continuing this thought into the next chapter, 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 heaven.

So, the apostle considers the body a house and says, though this house tumbles down and is dissolved, we have another house. That shows that the real living, thinking being, is not dependent upon the house in which it lives. It can change houses. Then he says, For to be at home in the body is to be absent from the Lord and to be absent from the body is to be at home with the Lord. This shows that the house which he is discussing means the body, and it also shows beyond any doubt that according to Paul's teaching, one may be absent from one's body and still be a living, conscious entity and even be at home with the Lord. How can a man who says that man is wholly mortal believe this passage of Scripture, and what can he do with it? I have discussed this question with some intelligent men, but I have never yet found one who could do anything with this passage of Scripture worthy of an intelligent man. They can make play upon the metaphor, but they can not answer the reasoning. Then, again in the first chapter of Philip- p:ans, Paul said he was in a strait betwixt two, not knowing whether to depart to be with the Lord or to remain and be with Christians on this earth. He said, To die is gain, but to live is Christ

So, Paul considers death a departing from something and a going to join something else. Departing from the earth, from his friends on the earth, from his body, and a joining of the Lord somewhere in the spirit realm.

One more passage of Scripture: In Hebrews 12:9, the Apostle Paul says:

Furthermore, we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence; shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live?

Here the apostle clearly divides the human being into flesh and spirit and declares that the flesh came from one source and the spirit came from another. Flesh came from our earthly parents by fleshly birth, and the spirit came from God, the Father of spirits. This surely proves to the satisfaction of any one who will believe the Scriptures that there is spirit in man that may depart from the body and live on even after the body has decayed. If some one asks where this spirit comes from and when it enters into the body, we answer simply that it is stated in the first verse of the twelfth chapter of Zachariah, that the Lord formeth the spirit in man. Now when this is done, that is, whether at birth or how long before birth, we do not know, nor does it matter. Then, if the spirit lives after death, we are ready to ask the question again, Where does the spirit go when one dies?

One man answers that it goes immediately to its eternal destiny. If it is a righteous spirit, it goes immediately to heaven, and if -t is a wicked spirit, it goes immediately to Gehenna. I do not believe this, however, I believe the Scriptures teach that the spirit goes into an intermediate state and remains there until the judgment. The first argument that I offer in support of this is the fact that there is to be a great general judgment day, when all men shall be judged, and shall be given their rewards. If people are judged at death, there would be no need for such a final judgment. But is there to be such a judgment? Yes, indeed. The Scriptures are very emphatic upon this point, and it is even one of the first principles of the Gospel of Christ. It is sometimes stated that our fathers put too much emphasis upon the day of judgment, and upon the state of the wicked after judgment I do not know whether this is true or not. 1 do not know whether it is possible for a man to put too much emphasis upon these things or not, but if our fathers did swing to an extreme in that

direction, we have certainly swung to an opposite extreme, for we say so little about it these days that the people in general seem to have lost the idea that there is to be such a thing as a judgment. The Bible still teaches, however, that that day is coming. In John 16:8, Jesus said: And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment. And when Paul reasoned before the wicked Felix and Drucilla, he reasoned of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come. And when he stood in the great city of Athens, Greece, preaching to those heathen philosophers th^t the time when man thought that the God head was made of gold and of silver had now passed, and that God had appointed a day in which he would judge the world by that man whom he raised from the dead. In enumerating the first principles of the Gospel of Christ, in the sixth chapter of Hebrews, the Apostle Paul refers to eternal judgment. Oh, yes, there is such a thing as a Great Day coining, for God has appointed a day in which he will judge the world.

Just as stated in Matthew 25, that when the Son of man shall sit upon the throne of his glory, And before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from his goats. But some one is ready to say that this simply means that the Lord will gather the nations living at the time of his coming and will separate them; that it does not therefore prove that those who have died were not judged at death. But in the twelfth chapter of Matthew Jesus said: The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; because they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold a greater than Jonah is here, The men of Nineveh had lived five hundred years or more before that generation, before whom Jonas was speaking, and yet Jesus declared that these two generations would he in the same judgment Again he says: The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here. The queen of the south had lived a thousand years before that generation, and yet Jesus declared that these two generations shall stand together in the same judgment.

Now, Jesus declared that it would be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for those cities in which he had preached and wrought miracles and which had rejected him. This shows that the generation of people that lived in the days of Jesus will be in the same, judgment with the generations that lived in the time of Sodom and Gomorrah, But we can go farther back than that, for both Peter and Jude declare that the angels which sinned have been cast down into pits of darkness and are held in chains until the judgment of the great day.

Now, you see that there is indeed a great judgment day coming, in which not only all the nations then living shall be judged, but in which all the generations that have lived from the early morning of time down unto the dawning of that day shall likewise be judged. A great day indeed! This being true, we know that men are not judged at death. Peter declared that God knows how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust until the day of judgment to be punished. This statement alone puts beyond doubt the question of whether or not the wicked enter into their punishment at death. They do not. They are held until the day of judgment, at which time their punishment shall begin. But some one asks if this is true of the righteous. I think the righteous will also go into an intermediate state and there remain until the day of judgment, at which time they shall be given their crowns.

There are two passages of Scripture which would seem to indicate that the righteous go immediately to their rewards, and if there were not other Scriptures bearing upon the question, I would conclude frim this that the righteous do go to their eternal destiny at death. These two passages have already been recited in this discourse. They are both from Paul. He says, “To be absent from the body, is to be at home with the Lord.” And he said he was going to depart and be with Christ. These expressions seem to teach that at death the righteous person would go into the immediate presence of God, there to abide with him. But I know from other passages of Scripture that they do not mean this. In some sense, of course, the righteous are at home with God and are with Christ, but they do not receive their crowns then, for we shall see that although Paul has been with Christ for nearly two thousand years, he has not yet received his crown. Let us cite a few passages of Scripture upon this point. In the fourteenth chapter of Luke, Jesus said: When you make a feast, do not invite the wealthy, for if you do they will make another feast and invite you in return and you will be repaid. But when you make a feast invite the poor and the halt and the maimed, for they shall not be able to invite you in return, but you shall receive your recompense at the resurrection of the just. This shows that the reward given to the righteous will come at the resurrection of the just. In the fourteenth chapter of John, Jesus said: In my father’s house are many mansions. If it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go to prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am there ye may be also.

Here Jesus shows that the disciples shall be with him where he is when he comes again. He connects his coming with their entrance into the place prepared for them. In Acts 2:32, Peter declares:

David has not yet ascended into heaven.

David was a righteous man and had been dead hundreds of years, but he had not yet ascended into heaven. In Revelation 6:9, John saw the souls of the martyrs under the altar, and he heard them crying:

How long, 0 Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? But the answer came back to them, to wait a little while until their brethren who are upon the earth have sealed their testimony with their blood. This seems to indicate that those who have died in the service of the Lord must wait until all of the Lord’s servants have finished their course and until the Lord’s will has been completely fulfilled and his purposes worked out, and then all of his servants shall be rewarded at the same time. But to settle the matter, the Apostle Paul says in the last chapter of the last book that he ever wrote, just before he was ready to depart and to be with Christ:

I have fought a good fight. I have finished the course. I have kept the faith and henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give to me in that day, and not only unto me, but unto all them also that love his appearing.

Here we see that the crown is laid up; that it will be given unto Paul in that day; and that day, evidently means the time of the coming of the Lord, for he says the crowns shall then be given to all others who love his appearing. These passages of Scripture satisfy me that the dead wait in an inter-mediate state and that they will be given their rewards in that great day that is coming. The

next question then is, "Where do the dead go from death to the judgment?" I will now direct your attention to the diagram that is on the board before you. You see this large circle, which is called Sheol or Hades. Sheol is a Hebrew word and Hades is a Greek word. They mean the same thing. Therefore, Hades is the unseen world, or the world of departed spirit.?—the Spirit world. It includes all of the different departments of CHART ON HEAVEN/HELL JUDGMENT/THE DEAD the spirit world. God himself is in Hades, in the sense that he is in a world that is invisible to us—in a world that is not material. Every soul that dies goes into Hades, but the righteous go into one division and the wicked into another. They are all in Hades. Now, sometimes the word “Hades” is used to designate only one division, and again it is used to include all of the divisions or the departments.

You will notice here that the Great Gulf rolls through the center of this circle. Upon one side we have a department called Heaven, and on the same side a department called Paradise. On the other side of the gulf we have two divisions again; one of these divisions I have named Tartarus and the other Gehenna. Now Tartarus is the place where the wicked are held until the day of judgment. This word is found only one time in all the Bible, In the second chapter of Second Peter and in the fourth verse, Peter says that God cast the angels that sinned down to Tartarus.

If you read the King James version, you will notice that it says that he cast these angels down to hell. When I used to read that and notice that they were cast down to hell to await the day of judgment, I wondered what was going to he done with them after the day of judgment. If they were in hell awaiting that day, would God take them out of hell then and save them, or would he take them out and judge them and send them immediately hack to hell. What was the sense of that? That passage puzzled me. But in after years, I read from the Revised translation that God cast them down to hell, but the revisers directed my attention to the margin, and I saw that the word for hell in the Greek is Tartarus. Still I was not relieved, for I had not the slightest idea what the word Tartarus meant. But when in the goodness of God I was permitted to study Greek, the first thing I did when I learned how to use the lexicon was to look up the word Tartarus.

These authorities told me that Tartarus means an abyss, a dungeon, or a prison house. It is not the word that designates the place where the wicked will go after judgment. That word is Gehenna. This may be correctly translated a hell, for that is what it means, hut Tartarus is a prison, Then we have learned that the wicked are held until the day of judgment to be punished. Since Tartarus is the place where these angels are held that are also awaiting the day of judgment, we naturally conclude that this is the same prison house in which all the wicked are held until that day.

Now (indicated by pointer), this division is called Paradise. Jesus and the thief went into a place called Paradise the day they died. But after Jesus was raised from the dead we read in John 20:17, that he said to Mary:

Touch me not, for I have not yet ascended to the Father.

Three days ago he went to Paradise. And presumably he had been in Paradise during the entire three days, but yet he tells Mary that he had not yet ascended to the Father. Therefore, Paradise is not the place where the Father is. But the word Paradise does sometimes designate Heaven. Paul calls the third heaven paradise. But the word “Paradise” is a Persian word. It was not translated into Greek. It was simply trans-literared. Then it was not translated from Greek into

English, but . was simply anglicized, In Greek it is Paradise; in English Paradise. So, we really have a Persian word designating this place where the righteous go. The word means a pleasure garden. Therefore, any place of pleasure or a pleasure garden might be called Paradise, and it is correct to speak of Heaven, of course, as Paradise. But because the word paradise is sometimes applied to heaven is no reason that it could never be applied to anything else, or that it always means heaven. Heaven is also called a city, but no one would imagine that every time he sees the word city, that heaven is indicated. It might mean Fort Worth. This great gulf, of course, is taken from the story of the rich man and Lazarus. The great gulf rolled between Lazarus and the rich man. Lazarus was in Abraham's bosom, which is just simply another way of speaking of the place where the righteous go. It is a figure of speech, designating the place that we have here called Paradise. The rich man was over here in Tartarus. But some one may say that the rich man was being tormented and that he as being tormented by flames.

Yes, the rich man was by no means happy, and I am sure that no one in Tartarus is happy. Of course, the flame is figurative, just as Abraham's bosom is figurative. The rich man was not in hell; he was in Hades and the division of Hades that he was in must have been Tartarus, because this all happened before the general judgment day, as we know from the fact that the rich man's brothers were still back on the earth and still had time to escape that terrible place if they would but hear Moses and the prophets. But any way, there was no passing from where the rich man was to where Lazarus was. His opportunities were all gone. His doom was sealed and this is true of every one who is either in Tartarus or Gehenna. From neither of these places, as you will see from the diagram, can a soul pass to either paradise or heaven. But some one will say, "What is the use in having a great judgment day? Have these souls not already been judged, separated, and is not their sentence rre- vocable?" Yes, this is true. Nevertheless, this is the plain teaching of God's word and why God has arranged it this way we do not know. It is sufficient to us to know that he has done so. I might suggest a reason, however. These souls have truly been separated and they have been sent to a place from which they can not escape. At least, they can not escape into any better place. Their sentence has been pronounced, but they are sent away to await a day of execution, so to speak. Likewise, the righteous know that they are to enter the presence of God; tliat they are to have their crowns, but those crowns are not to be given unto them until the great day, as we have seen.- It may be that their rewards can not be completely reckoned until the end of time. Their works do follow them—both good works and evil works. Paul has been in paradise nearly two thousand years and yet his influence has continued in the earth and has come down through the ages like a breath from heaven blessing untold millions and no doubt saving thousands of souls. It may be that Paul's reward will be reckoned upon the basis of his influence, and that being true, it can not be determined until his influence has spent its force. This would make necessary the degrees of rewards, and I believe that such a thing is taught in the Scriptures, but I shall not take time now to discuss that point. But one other consideration comes to our attention here. This is the question: "Don't the Catholics teach this same doctrine?" No, not exactly. They teach that souls go into an intermediate state, but where we have Tartarus on this chart, they put Purgatory. Purgatory, as the word indicates, means a place where souls are cleansed or purged from their sins. The Catholics, therefore, teach that those who go to Purgatory after having been cleansed by purgatorial fires, will be admitted into paradise, or into heaven. Thus, they teach that there is a chance after death for those who die with sin upon their souls. . This is certainly not the teaching of the Scriptures.

Jesus said in John 8:21 :

Except you believe that I am he, you shall die in your sins and where I am you can not come. This shows that those who die in their sins are hopelessly cut off from the presence of God, the Father.

Again Jesus said, in Revelation 2:10 : Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.

Here again the eternal reward is predicated upon the condition at death. But one other passage will settle this forever. In Second Corinthians, fifth chapter and tenth verse, Paul says:

We must be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive for the things done in the body according to that which he hath done, whether it be good or bad. This shows that we shall be judged for the tilings done in the body and rewarded accordingly. What the soul may do after it has left the body does not enter into the consideration. It is while we are living in the body that we have our opportunity of making ready for the judgment. It is while we are living here that we must decide where we wish to live throughout eternity. This shows, my friends, that when death comes, your day of probation has ended. Your doom will then be sealed. If you are found in your sins you must go away from the presence of God into the dismal abode of the wicked, and there you must spend the endless ages of eternity. Then, my friends, while you are living in this world, while you have the use of your mind, and while the opportunity is offered unto you, why not settle the question by turning away from sin and entering unto the Lord, be saved by the power of his blood and be kept by his grace and goodness, which are supplied unto you if you walk in the light? Walking in that light, enjoying the companionship of the Savior, and dying in the triumphs of a living faith, you shall pass into the presence of God, there to rest, abide and rejoice forever and forever. Settle this question now, for life is too uncertain and the consequences too terrible for you to delay or to take a risk. It is true that life is the time to serve the Lord; life is the time to insure the great reward and while the candle holds out to burn, the vilest sinner may return, but you know not when the candle may be snuffed out; therefore, decide now.

00A.19 CHAPTER XVI.—Heaven:What Will It Be to Be There?

CHAPTER XVI HEAVEN AND WHAT WILL IT BE TO BE THERE?

We have read tonight in your presence the entire twenty-first chapter of the Book of Revelation and down to the seventh verse of the twenty-second chapter. This is a beautiful description of the city that hath foundation, whose builder and maker is God, to which city we all hope to come some day, there to abide forever. This, however, is a material description of something that is spiritual—not material. I do not suppose that anyone who thinks would contend that this city is a literal city, with literal walls around it, as if there would be enemies to shut out; or that the street is of literal gold and the precious stones of the walls are the literal stones that we know in this material earth. When we speak of this city as spiritual and of the description as figurative, some people may think that we do not accept this description or believe these statements. But no one who thinks straight would reach such a conclusion. Certainly the Home of the Soul will be equal in beauty, majesty and glory to the description. Yea, and it will even go far beyond anything that mortal mind can grasp. God accommodated himself to man's understanding and described spiritual things on a material basis. The place where the wicked go is described as a lake of fire, and again it is described as a place of outer darkness. This, therefore, proves that the description is figurative, as we would know when we consider that a spiritual being could mot be* effected by a material element. But if the fire were literal liquid fire, the place would certainly not be one of outer darkness, but it would be one of great light as well as of great heat. It does not change the teaching of the word of the Lord to understand that these are simply pictorial representations of things that are real. If the place of punishment is not equal in suffering to a place of fire, then God has overdrawn the picture and the description is exaggerated. This, of course, is not true. Therefore, whatever hell is, it is understood by us to be equal with the burning of the flesh in physical fire.

Likewise, we know that the joy of heaven is equal and goes far beyond any impressions that we receive, or any emotions of joy and rapture that are stirred in our souls by the description. If we tried to conceive of these wonderful things of the spirit and bring them down to a material basis, we would destroy their beauty and even destroy our faith.

I once knew a man who had been a good Christian for many years and an elder in the church, but he began to study the Bible with a sort of literalistic and materialistic view of the spirit world, and when he read that heaven is a city that lies four-square twelve thousand furlongs every way, he consulted an encyclopedia to find out what a furlong is, and then he reduced the dimensions of heaven to terms with which he was acquainted and estimated the number of square miles in the city. He found that heaven is fifteen hundred miles square. He then reduced this to square feet and estimated how much space it would take for a soul to stand throughout all eternity, and he found by the process of mathematics how many souls heaven would contain. He thought he knew, therefore, exactly how many people would be saved. And then he compared that number with the vast billions of people that have lived and are living and may live, and he said the number of the

saved was so small that it was negligible or that it didn't count. He, therefore, gave up his faith and said there was no use trying to be saved. When he told me this, of course, I knew his mistake was in trying to measure the great Spirit World by metes and bounds of a material meaning, but I knew it would be useless to try to convince him of that mistake. Therefore, I simply met him on his own ground and said, "Brother, you have made a mistake in your calculations; you have only figured on the ground floor of the city. You must remember that the walls are fifteen hundred miles high. Now, you will put another floor every ten feet and run your stories up fifteen hundred miles and multiply the number of floors by the number of people on your first floor, and you will find that you have a bigger percent of humanity in heaven than you had estimated." Of course, this was foolish, but it paralyzed him. His eyes opened wide with wonder and he said, "We can get the whole human race in on that kind of calculation." But I am sure, my friends, that you see it is foolish to try to figure on things of the spirit in any such manner as that. It is because men are materialistic in their thinking that they can not make real to themselves the idea of an immortal spirit living on apart from the physical body.

Men have attempted to find the soul in the anatomy of a human' being. They have even undertaken to weigh the soul. They have placed the body of a dying person upon the scales to see how much less it will weigh after death than before, and thus to determine the weight of the soul. I think they claim that the soul weighs four ounces. However, I have seen some people whose souls would not weigh anything like that much. But because men can not find the soul by any method of physical research or analysis, is no argument at all that the soul does not exist. For neither can they find the mind of man which, after all, is another term for the soul.

Let's take Mr. Thomas A. Edison, if you please. Suppose when that great man has died, the physicists should take his body into a chemist's laboratory and analyze it by every method known to science. Let them take the brain, and can they by any method of analysis find any tract of the mind that gave to us so many marvelous inventions? No, they can not. The brain of Mr. Edison will show the same analysis that the brain of any other human being would show. There is something connected with that brain which is not physical, not visible or tangible or in any way discernible by physical analysis.

Dr. Charles Mayo says he knows that man has a soul, for he has seen preachers go into his hospital and do things for a patient that he could not do. Dr. Mayo certainly knows the human anatomy and yet by his science he can not get hold of that which responds to the sympathy, the hope and the consolation that a spiritual adviser or comforter can bring to the patient.

I have one key which unlocks to me the door of all mystery connected with things of the spirit. This key proposition is the belief that there is in the universe an Infinite God. If you grant me that premise, I see no reason to deny any conclusion, for if God is infinite then nothing is impossible to him. If we should grant that man is wholly mortal and that at death he ceases to be, if there is an Infinite God who created man, there is no reason to believe that that God can not retain the memory of him and re-create him whenever he should see fit to do so. Allow me to illustrate this point. My father has been dead more than a quarter of a century. His body has long ago returned to the dust, yet I can speak the word tonight and he stands there before me. I see his form. I see the expression of his face, the curl of his mustache, the color of his hair, the twinkle of his eye. I can hear the tone of his voice and recognize it. That, of course, is only an image of my father. He

stands there in this pulpit before me. You can not see him, but I see him. By a moment of concentration, I can bring the picture of my father before my mind. If then my finite mind can retain the complete image and personality of my father for a quarter of a century, and then cause him to re-appear before me in mental image, how easy it would be for the Infinite Mind to cause him to re-appear in reality!

I once used this illustration in the pulpit. There sat before me in my audience Brother J. O. Blaine, who was then ninety years old, but whose mind was still alert. After the sermon, Brother Blaine came to me and said, “Brother Brewer, I can distinctly recall the image of a man who stood in the pulpit and preached here seventy- five years ago. He has been dead seventy-five years and yet I can hear him speaking. I remember the quality and tone of his voice. I see the size of his stature, the color of his eye and the expression of his face.” This very thought seemed so to thrill that good old brother that he realized in a way that he never did before that the Infinite Mind of our Father could retain the image of all things that it had created and known, and could therefore, in a second of time, re-create or restore to life those persons in reality as we poor finite beings can restore them in mental picture. But the question comes into the minds of people as to how the dead are going to be raised up, and with what body will they come. The Apostle Paul said this was a foolish question, and he argued from the fact that there is such a variety of bodies and such a variety among all things in this material world that the Maker of all these things could easily have us exist in different bodies—one a terrestrial body and the other a celestial body. But while we all understand that our bodies will be spiritual and celestial and like the glorified body of our Lord, yet it seems difficult for us to grasp the idea that we shall retain our identity or our personality without our hody as it -now is, without our now well-known physical features. But with a little thought, this does not appear at all unreasonable, certainly not impossible. I believe that our personalities shall persist; that we shall retain our identity throughout all eternity; otherwise, the future life or heaven would have no meaning to me, for if I am so changed that I will be an entirely different individual, with no memory of my present self and no recollections of my earthly life and my earthly associations, then I, this being, will not live; that will be an entirely different being and there would be no need of calling it a spirit being. I would just as well die and cease to be and some entirely different being live on here in this earth with no relation to me. The very idea of personal immortality, the very idea of eternal life makes necessary the idea that I as a living, rational being, must continue to live and must retain my individuality. This is ’not unreasonable, for our personality, whatever that is, is not dependent upon our physical organism. We know each other by certain physical markings, yet we recognize spiritual values and mental characteristics in each other. Furthermore, man’s body is not the same during his life. It is undergoing changes all the time. Here is a feeble, tottery aged person. Yet this man can remember himself when he was not feeble and tottery. He can remember himself when he was a stalwart young man, proud of his physical strength and ready to put it to test in various contests with other young men. He knows that he is the same individual that did those things, but he also knows that his body now is entirely different Yea, his memory can go farther back than young manhood. He can remember himself as a barefoot, ruddyfaced boy of ten years. He can remember that he would climb trees and throw stones, run and jump, and climb a fence when a gate was in ten feet of him, or even climb a gate in preference to opening it- He knows he is the same individual. But the body is entirely different. The changes have been so radical that his own mother who knew him as a child, if she had not seen him as the changes came along through the years, would not after the passing of three or

four decades recognize her own child. He is the same being. He knows he is the same being and he is conscious of his identity through all the changes of his body. This proves that identity or personality is not dependent upon the body.

If I may use another illustration, I will tell of a little incident of my own life that brought to my mind this conclusion with a force that I had never felt before. I hope you will not think this illustration too intensely personal and I use it in the hope of making you see the point as I felt it, I was born in Tennessee not many miles from the town of Lawrenceburg. When I was a child my father sold his farm and moved over into the State of Alabama. I had not been back to the old homestead until I came into that region preaching the gospel. It had been some thirty years since I had seen the place of my birth and early childhood, but while I was near it I planned to visit that old home. A company of young people went with me and we planned to have dinner on the ground out near the old spout spring. One of the things that lived in my memory was that old spout spring, I remembered very distinctly standing upon my tiptoe, holding to the old trough with both my hands while I drank water that flowed from under the hill. That picture was so distinct in my memory that I fully intended to repeat that action and I was in a hurry to reach that spring and I could see myself standing tiptoe and grasping the trough with my two hands and drinking the clear, cold water. When we reached this place I sprang out of the car and rushed to the spring. I can not express to you the feeling I had when I came to that old trough. There it was, but it was away down about my waist, or even below. I was disappointed and almost paralyzed. I stood still and tears came into my eyes. I could not realize what had happened. There was no denying the fact. My memory would not be refuted, I was the same person who once drank from that trough by standing on tiptoe, but now I must bow down and bend my body to drink out of that old spout. I km the same individual, but my body has undergone a marvelous change.

, You can see, my friends, that our identity is not dependent upon our body, and even if this old body should be brought back into existence, to what stage of its existence would it be restored? Would the old physical body of the aged map come back into the existence that it had in its last days, or would it come back into the condition of childhood or young manhood? Ah! this physical body will have no more existence for which we may thank the Lord, but we will have a spiritual body and with the same individuality will live on and on forever. Is this not to you an enkindling thought, my friends ? With the fact established that our identity persists, then the question of future recognition and of the memory of this life is answered. That we shall know each ether is a necessary conclusion from this problem. If I know you here and I meet you over there, and we are the same individuals, certainly we shall know each other there. There is not a great deal said in the Scripture on this point, but all that is said is in favor of the idea that we shall know each other. But I reach this conclusion by the process of reasoning to which you have just listened. But some one will say, if we know each other there and if we remember ourselves and the conditions in which we lived here upon the earth, we should know all the ties that exist here. For example, a man would know that a certain woman was his wife upon earth and she would know that he was her husband. Mothers would know their children; children would know their mothers. Yes, this also follows as a necessary conclusion. I think there is no doubt but that we shall know that such relationships existed between us here upon earth. Those relationships will not exist there, and none of these ties will bind us together and therefore, separate us from others in that Fair Land. Now, you say you can mot understand how that the memory that such ties existed upon this earth could exist,

and at the same time the ties themselves no longer exist. I think you can. Let me illustrate that. You remember your mother. You remember when you ran to her with every little complaint and when she kissed away the hurt. You remember when she rocked you to sleep upon her bosom and when she tucked you away at night with a motherly kiss. Yet, the years have come and gone and their cruel changes have broken up all such associations. No longer do you go to your mother to kiss away your hurt. No longer does she rock you to sleep upon her bosom or tuck you away at night. Yet you can look at your mother sitting there and know that she is the same woman that once did those things. You remember that those conditions existed and yet they no longer exist. And as the years go on, the situation is not only changed, but the conditions are reversed. Your mother becomes childish and helpless and dependent. Then you must humor her and take care of her. Your memory tells you that she is the same woman that once took care of you and on whom you were wholly dependent, and you and she, the same individuals, are living together in the same house, but the conditions have changed. The relationship that once existed no longer exists. It has even been reversed. Then if your memory can hold relationships, when those relationships no longer exist and all that has taken place in the short space of a lifetime, how easy it will be, you see, when all the conditions of earth have been changed and we no longer live in flesh and blood, for us to remember what once existed even though such things no longer exist.

Another objection that is sometimes raised when we say that we shall know each other in the Glory World is that if we should miss some of our loved ones from that happy home we would know that they were in the other place and, therefore, we could not be happy in heaven. Sometimes we hear a man say, “If my wife is not in heaven, I would not be happy there”. Or, “If my mother is not in heaven, I do not want to live there”. This objection is illogical. It is nothing more than an effort to put God in a dilemma, as though we said, “God has promised this, but we know he can not perform it”. This is the wrong attitude to have toward God. And it is a little strange that people will get so solicitous about their loved ones and their friends when they get to talking about living in heaven, and yet they pay so little attention to the welfare of such friends and loved ones here upon this earth. That only shows that this is a suggestion of the evil one to tfy to discourage, us in our efforts to go to heaven. A man once said to me that he could not be happy in heaven if he realized that there was suffering in the other place. But people do not find any trouble being happy on this earth in the midst of want and woe, sin and suffering. You could climb to the top of a building in any city and within the scope of your view, there is misery mountain high. Nevertheless, we live on in the midst of this in good homes and enjoy life, but when we come to thinking of heaven, we get all concerned about the suffering of those who do not go to heaven, and imagine that our happiness would be de- stro3red by the knowledge of the fact that some are lost. But some say, “Doesn’t the thought ever come to you that you might miss some of those whom you love and do you not imagine that your heart would feel a pang?” Oh, yes, this thought comes to me. I explain it by my key proposition, Right here I solve all riddles. tou remember my statement. There is an Infinite God. God is not only infinite in power and wisdom, but he is infinite in power and mercy. Shall I imagine that I shall ever reach a state in which I have more sympathy and love for fallen man than our Father has? Shall I imagine that I will have greater tenderness and greater solicitude for souls than our Lord Jesus Christ had when he left heaven to come to earth and die for man, and when he prayed on the cross for those who crucified him? Then if he, with his great heart of compassion, with his tenderness and love—if Hebrews , 1 say, can be happy there, why should I worry or trouble myself with doubts as to my own condition? Ah, we shall not only see him

and be like him, but we shall then see things as he sees them and he is happy, so shall we be happy. Don’t let these doubts trouble you, my friends. Whatever God says is true and whatever God does is right. Let us bring ourselves into harmony with him and then we shall be prepared to live with him forever.

If we are correct in these conclusions, we can begin to see something of what it will be to be in heaven. We will meet our loved ones who have gone before and be reunited with them forever. We shall meet our friends that we have known upon this earth and I take a good deal of pleasure in imagining myself bringing together there my friends and brethren in Christ whom I have known in different parts of the earth. What a pleasure it will be to say I knew this brother in Texas, I knew this brother in Tennessee. I labored with this brother in Alabama, and we shall sit down together at the feet of our Lord and talk of our trials, now forever passed, and rejoice in the redemption that was made possible for us through the death of our Savior. We shall sing the song of the Lamb and that song, of course, will be the sweet old story of the Lamb that was slain, that we, through his blood, might be cleansed.

You may call these thoughts speculative, and perhaps they are, but this is one field in which speculation can do no harm, for we are told in the Scriptures that “Eye hath not seen, ear hath not heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man what God hath in store for his children". Then, if our hearts can not conceive of the wonder and glory of the Home of the Soul, certainty we can not overdraw the picture. We can not get out of bounds in our descriptions of the happy conditions that will exist there. We may cut our fancies loose and let them fly. We can give our imaginations free play, and yet we can not go beyond the wonder of that world, for it is not possible for our hearts to conceive of what it will be in all of its fullness and glory. No poet’s dream is comparable with the sublime pleasures and joys of that Happy Home. Our ears have never heard anything that is comparable with the music of that Celestial Home, and yet our ears have heard sweet music that hath stirred the emotions of our souls until we were filled with raptures of bliss.

We have heard music of the song birds. We have listened to the melodies of the woodland. We have been entranced by the joys of an early spring morning, when the earth is vibrating with song, but no sounds of earth, no harmonies of nature can compare with what we shall hear when we reach that far away shore. Our eyes have not seen anything that is equal to the beauty that shall burst upon our enraptured vision when the curtain is lifted. Yet think of the things upon which we have looked with wonder and awe. You have climbed to the top of some mountain and looked far away over the landscape as it rolled away to meet the sky in the dim distance. You have seen the little brooklet like a thread of molten silver wending its way across the meadow. You have seen a fleck of cloud hanging out beneath the blue vault of heaven and shimmering in the rays of the rising sun and the glory of that view has lifted you out of yourself and translated you into a world of wonder and of beauty sublime! And yet, you have never seen anything that is comparable to the glory of heaven. Go out at night and look up into the skies and see the stars hanging like pendent gems in the liquid turquoise of the sky, and again you are lost in wonder at the glory of the view. But your eye hath not seen anything comparable to the glory of heaven.

Perhaps you have sat upon the brow of a hill at the end of a perfect day and looked away to the gorgeous sunset. You saw it shooting its shafts of glory to the zenith. You saw the cloud islands of ruby and amethyst floating in a sea of gold. The glory of that scene defies the efforts of any artist

to reproduce it and renders the tongue of an orator speechless when he undertakes to describe it. He is dumb and awed to silence. But there is a greater glory than the sunset, for our eyes hai'e not yet beheld what is to be in that world. Perhaps, you have sailed over the bosom of the ocean and have seen the sun go down at sea. You have seen it form a path of gold from your feet over the rolling billows to its far away grave in the depth of the sea. You have seen the changing colors as the night comes over the mighty deep, and again your soul has been transformed by the glory of the scene and your sense of appreciation of its wonder makes you realize that there must be a power and a wisdom beyond the ken of man. And it makes you feel that there is something in you that craves to be away from the sordid things of earth and out of the narrow limits of human experience, to be lost in that sublime world that has appealed to your inner nature. All of these beautiful things upon which our eyes have looked are only suggestions of the glory that we shall know, and the emotions that are stirred in our soul by the wonders of nature and the glory of the visible creation are only foretastes of the joy divine that shall be ours when this life is over. And his servants shall serve him and they shall see his face. Does that not appeal to your soul? Are you not happy in the thought that you shall serve the Lord throughout all eternity? Oh, yes, it is wonderful to think that when all the singers reach home, when all the imperfections have been taken from our voices and all discords removed, that we shall join in one sweet song of praise. That fills our souls with joy and makes us impatient for the Dime to come. But I am glad it $hall not be one day of endless song-singing, and that eternity shall not be spent in idleness. I am happy to think that the Lord will have work for me to do and that I shall serve him even there. I love that old song that said, When we see thee as thou art, then we'll serve thee as we ought.

We realize that at best, we are unprofitable servants here. We know that our efforts are very feeble and our lives are full of faults. But there, when we shall join that band of the spirits of just men made perfect we shall serve the Lord perfectly. None of us who have the ideal of Christian perfection are very satisfied with our services here. We are not satisfied with our singing, with our preaching, or with anything we do. We are always wanting to do better and that is as it should be, but, like the Psalmist of old, we say, "When I awake In thy likeness then shall I be sacisfied", and then shall we serve him as we ought. 1 know not what ministrations he shall have for me off other stars. I only know that I shall serve him and that means that there will be something for me to do. Oh, may I be prepared for that great promotion and be sent on a greater mission than any mortal of earth was ever trusted with. And then that thought that we shall see his face. Can you realize what that means? Do you get the vision ? It was said that it was worth a trip across the Atlantic Ocean to look upon the face of Mr. William E. Gladstone. If the face of a mortal man was so wonderful in expressions of intelligence, of kindness, of human sympathy and love, that other mortals delighted to look upon it, and would travel far to see that countenance, what will it be to look upon the face of our Blessed Lord? What will it mean to see the expression of his eye and to meet his smile of approval. Ah, that means more to me. friends, than any walls of jasper or gate of pearl or street of gold. Have you ever been away from home and then at last the day has come for you to return and you are homeward bound? You are impatient with your journey. You are anxious to reach that home that you love. You know that there will be those who love you to welcome you at the gate, and that the association will be sweeter because of the separation, and as you get near the old home you see the form of a loved-one standing in the door looking up the road, shading the eyes with the hand from the rays of the setting sun, anxiously looking for you to come. Then, when at last that loved one recognizes you, you see the smile of recognition and of welcome

as it plays across the face. How sweet it is to be received into the arms of that loved one! That is what it will be when at last our earthly pilgrimage shall have come to an end. As we are passing down through the valley into the shadows, as our loved ones are standing about our bedside, weeping because there is nothing else they can do—loving hearts and tender hands have done all that can be done. Then, as they stand about the dying bed, helpless, going with us as far as they can, as their faces and all of the scenes^f earth begin to grow dim to our eyes and the sounds of their voices are dull upon our ears, we are drifting out with the tide and all suddenly the curtain drops upon the scenes of earth—we are out of sight of the shore. Then what a beautiful thought, my friends, that there will burst upon our enraptured vision the face of the Blessed Lord. A smile of recognition and welcome will play across his countenance and he will touch us with bis rod and say, “Be not afraid, it is I”. He shall take us across the valley and over the river into that Home of the Soul. Does this mean anything to you, my friends? What are the brief moments of sinful pleasure to compare with this? Do you want to see that face ? If so, the opportunity is yours. Salvation is full and free. Jesus is anxious now to save you from your sins, to guide you through life, and to take you to glory when life is over. To see that face, what does it mean? Perhaps, you can begin to imagine the glory of the face when you realize that it shall be the light of that city, for they need no sun there, neither moon, for the glory of God and the Lamb shall light the city from center to circumference. And the gates of that city shall never be shut and there shall he no night there. No good byes will ever be said. No crepe will ever hang upon the door and no hearse shall roll down the golden street; and there will be no sin and no sorrow. No heart will ever ache, or bleed or break.

Perhaps, the things that we have said tonight may cause you to have some idea of what it will be to be there, and may the Lord bless this message to the good of your soul and may he bring us all at last into that Happy Land, is my prayer.

00A.20 CHAPTER XVII.—In Memoriam

CHAPTER XVII IN MEMORIAM

It was suggested by some of my friends that a brief biography of me should be placed as an introductory chapter in this book. But this did not appeal to me. There is nothing about me worth telling. But for several years I have had in mind the intention to bring out a tract consisting of three chapters. The first to comprise the sermon on Where are the Dead, the second to discuss heaven and the third to consist of the obituaries of my Sister Eillie and my Brother Will, which were written at the time of their deaths. Since the sermons on the state of the dead and on heaven are both in this book, I have ventured to insert those obituaries in this special chapter called In Memoriam.

Also I am giving a family record which includes the names of all the members, both living and dead. This, with the facts about the family which are given in the obituaries will serve as a pretty complete biography, after all, but it has the merit of including all the family and is not, therefore, so entirely and intensely personal. The obituary of Sister Lillie entitled, “A Loved One Gone”, was published in the “Chattanooga Christian”, of which I had the misfortune to be founder, editor and publisher. The article entitled, “A Tribute to Our Brother, William Calvin Brewer”, was published in the Gospel Advocate. Also the article on “Reflections at the Bedside of a Dying Brother”, was published in the Gospel Advocate. The reflections and emotions which are delineated in these articles are, of course, very personal, perhaps too personal for some readers. But because there is some philosophy on death and the hereafter in them and because even these emotions, these sad expediences, find a responsive chord in the hearts of many people, I have felt that perhaps it would not be a blunder to put them in this book. Years after these articles were published I have found them preserved by readers of the papers in which they appeared. In one instance I found a man who had kept the article, “A Loved One Gone”, for twelve years and he was a total stranger to the writer and to the one about whom it was written. But the brightest reason I offer for this entire chapter is the belief that it will please the mothei of this broken family, who is still living, but who is now going down the shady side of life. She bore the family and then bore the burden of rearing us and then knew the poignant grief of burying three of her children after they were grown. Her husband—our father—was taken from her when she, and we, seemed to need him most. She bore all this philosophically—even more so than some of us—and bravely faced the problems of life. Now, in the hope that it may bring some joy to her declining days, I wish not only to give her the credit for any degree of success I may have attained, but also to share with all the other members of the family any honor that may be attached to being the author of this book. As those who have gone before can not share with us the joy that comes from any achievement, I place this chapter in memory of them in this book.

Four of those who have gone are buried at Florence, Alabama; one at Huntsville, Alabama, and one at Old Nebo, in Lawrence County, Tennessee. The father and five children are gone. The mother and five children abide in the flesh.

Looking back from this distance I now regard the grief, the emotions I knew at the time our loved ones went away, as more or less morbid. Death does not have the terror for me that once it had.

We sadly watched the close of all Life balanced on a breath,

We saw upon their features fall The awful shade of death;

All dark and desolate we were, And Nature, murmuring, cried—

Ah, Lord! if Thou hadst but been here, But when its glance the memory cast On all that grace had done; And thought of life-long warfare past, And endless victories won, Then Faith, prevailing, wiped the tear, And looking upward, cried—

Ah, Lord! Thou surely hast been here Our loved ones have not died.

Hiram S. Brewer was born April 25, 1854. He died at Florence, Ala., July 15, 1901.

Virginia A. Maxey was born March 16, 1857. She now lives at Decatur, Ala.

Hiram S. Brewer and Virginia A. Maxey were married Nov. 27, 1879. To this union the following children were born: Mary Eliza, Aug. 30, 1880.

She was married to S. M. Burns Feb. 24, 1903. She now lives at Decatur, Ala. Mother of six children. Lillie Belle, Dec. 14, 1881.

She was married to Eulous L. Key, Nov. 15, 1905. Mother of two children. Died at Huntsville, Ala., July 26, 1913.

Ada Florence, April 16, 1883.

Died at Florence, Ala., Sept. 18, 1902.

Grover Cleveland, Dec. 25, 1884.

Author of this book now lives at Sherman, Texas. Robert Larimore, Sept. 18, 1886.

Now lives at Chattanooga, Tenn.

Rosie L^, Aug. 23, 188. Was married to Boyd Wells Nov. 18, 1913. Now lives at Birmingham, Ala. Mother of five children.

Charles Richard, Jan. 17, 1890.

Now lives at Abilene, Texas. Teacher in Abilene Christian College.

William Calvin, Oct. 24, 1891.

Died at Camp Pike, Little Rock, Ark., Oct 14, 1918.

Emma Pearl, Dec. 18, 1893.

Died at Wayland Springs, Tenrt., April 9, 1894.

Mamie Sula, Oct. 1, 1895.

Died at Florence, Ala., March 7, 1900. A LOVED ONE GONE

Lillie Belle Brewer was bom December 14, 1881, near Lawrence burg. Tenn. In her 13th year she gave her life to Christ and was baptized by Brother C. E. Holt at Iron City, Tenn. On November 15, 1905, she was married to Eulous L. Key by Brother James K. Hill at Florence, Ala. She leaves a husband, two children, a mother, two sisters and four brothers, one of whom is the editor of this paper, to mourn her death. She was a kind, obedient daughter, a sweet sympathetic sister, a loyal and devoted wife, a loving mother and a consecrated Christian. She bore her last suffering in patience and in true faith and fortitude. While it would seem to us that her death was very untimely, yet we doubt not that she is in a better country and in a much happier condition. It was sad to give her up, but she fell asleep in Jesus and the Lord told us that he would bring her with him when he comes again.

Lillie was the fifth member of our family that death has claimed as his victim. What a few short years ago was a large, united, singing, laughing, happy family, is now broken and scattered. The first that was taken was a babe that came to stay only a few brief months and only the mother's heart felt so deeply the loss we then suffered. But the cruel monster entered the home again and robbed it of its dearest treasure, its youngest member, the child we all idolize. The tears had hardly stopped f,ailing before the dreaded demon, as if not satisfied with the grief he had caused us and as if determined to utterly ruin the home, stalked again into our midst and struck down the father, the head of the house, the only support and protection we had. Now the ruin seemed complete. A widow with eight almost helpless children, the oldest of whom was yet in her teens, stood looking through their tears out upon a hopeless future and wondering if it were not better for death to return in the form of a disaster and take all at one time. But no, we must remain and await his pleasure. The great sorrow had melted all our hearts into one, and our hot tears ran down together at mother's feet and in one voice our prayers went up to him from whom our help must come. Together we began to struggle to wrest a meager living from the hands of a reluctant and merciless world. Then singing our gratitude to God we broke the crust of poverty with singleness of heart. But lest we should become satisfied with our mere existence and lest our hearts should cease to ache for a moment, that terrible and insatiable monster again entered our home and again selected as its victim the rarest jewel in the house, the sweetest singer of the family, the most consecrated Christian of us all, the inspir-ation of the remaining sorrowing circle. Again for a moment we halted and wondered and wept. But we each had learned to say:

I do not seek my cross To understand my way to see—

Better in the darkness Just to feel thy hand and follow thee. So with our trust in him we began again to battle for bread. Then I do not know what happened. I know there were sorrows, disappointments and rebuffs. I know there were days of toiling and nights of weeping. I know there were poverty and penury and privations. I can not remember how it was. It has been too long ago. But, no, it has not been long. The record says I am not 30 years old by nearly two years. Surely it was in another world that I had those experiences! Surely it is a story of somebody's life that I have read! I must be dreaming! No, it is all real. These are facts. The swlift years have sped by and they have been so crowded with events that I am over-whelmed and as I pause for a moment upon this sad occasion to take a backward look I can not believe the facts. I hardly know myself. Our home is broken up. We are scattered. My older sisters have married. Yes, they have homes of their own—good homes. They say this is my home and this is my wife and baby. They say I worked my way into school—into college. They say I finished a course. They say I am a preacher, an editor

and that I am honored with many friends and with a place in a good church. They say my brothers are grow'n and that they are preachers, too. But I do not believe it all. I only know that 1 am still toiling, still busy; that I am still surrounded in mystery still trusting and waiting and Wondering. But behold! who comes here? What brings this panting messenger ? What hasty news is this ? Oh, the mon ster has returned. He has sought and found and claimed another of our family. Yes, lay down your pen, the message says, put up your book and come away. Another pause in life's swift race. Another night of weeping. Yes, here we are all together again weeping before the open tomb. What tall young men are these who mourn as if their hearts knew well this sorrow? My brothers! Can it be? Who is this in black that stands so near me whose eyes stream out in tears? Eliza—can I call that name withous the other?—ah, she is the oldest, she has known full well this sting before. And this is my younger sister, prostrate there? How those sisters loved each other! What white locks are these upon my shoulders? Who sobs upon my bosom here? Mother! Why are we not weeping with our heads together upon her knees as we did but yesterday ? Who is he so bowed in grief and who the little ones that cling to him ? Her husband—children! Yes, they have entered our circle and they, too, must taste the gall—must weep with us. What cold, pale, face is that before us? Lillie! Ah, yes, our own dear sister, who shared this sorrow with us so often; who used to weep with us. But there are no tears in her eyes now. Her chin does not quiver, her bosom does not heave. No, she does not feel our sorrow—she has gone from among us. She has left us to weep alone. She has stopped beside the road to rest. She has laid her burden down and gone to sleep. The bird has flown away to its native country. The spirit has gone from this tabernacle to the mansion built above.

We do not know which one of our number death will claim next, nor do we know when he will come again. He had not disturbed us for eleven years, but whether he will wait that long again we can not tell. He took one every year for three years in the sad long ago and he may do the same again. That he will finally take us all we certainly know. We have no continuing city here and we, above all others, should seek for one to come. May the Lord our God help us to be ready to meet him in peace. A TRIBUTE TO OUR BROTHER, WILLIAM

CALVIN BREWER BY G. C. AND CHARLES R. BREWER

William Calvin Brewer was bom in Lawrence County, Tenn., on October 24, 1891, and died at Camp Pike, Ark., on October 14, 1918. He lacked exactly ten days of reaching the twenty-seventh anniversary of his birth. Those twenty-seven years were years of hardships, of struggles and sorrows, yet he spent the greater portion of them in laughter and song. He was the eighth child in a family of ten children; but the two younger children died in infancy, and William was, therefore, always considered the "baby" of the family, but he was never in any sense a "baby" after he reached the years of responsibility. With very little help he had made his own way in the world, and he was always able to hold his place among men. When he entered the army, he was soon made a noncommissioned officer, and later, while in the Officers' Training School, he was said by his captain to be the best soldier in his company. He was attentive to his duties, obedient to the rules, alert, quick, and always courteous. All this was told us by his officers and comrades in the army.

William was reared without a father and practically without a home. Our father died in William's early childhood, and when he was yet in the early teens, our sisters having married, mother broke up housekeeping in order to not be an expense to her boys and to allow them to work their way

through school if possible. For a while mother was with her daughters and the older boys were in school, but the “baby boy” was out in the world doing the best he could. One year mother was matron of the boys’ dormitory at the Nashville Bible School, and for one term of that year all four of the boys were students in the school. At the end of the term, as there was no work for William in the school and as he had no money and no one to defray his expenses, he was forced to drop out of school and go to work.

Dux mg this period of his life he was, by the weakness of youth and by the many temptations that surrounded him, led away from his Christian duties and into indifference to the church; and those were days of anxiety on our part. He still desired to go to school, however, and was ambitious to make something of himself. When Brethren Klingman and Slayden took charge of the Potter Bible College, William decided to try to enter that school. A way was found for him and he was enrolled as a student there, much to his delight and to our satisfaction. We feel, however, that we could not fulfill our brother’s wishes without saying just here that he had, prior to his entrance at Potter College, been led to confess his wrongs and to renew his allegiance to God under the preaching of Brother R. H. Boll. He never ceased to credit Brother Boll with a great deal of influence for good over him. But he was well pleased with his work at Potter College and fell in love with Brother Slayden. He admired Brother Klingman also; but Brother Slayden seemed to be his type of a man, and he never ceased to love him and to imitate him in some things, either consciously or unconsciously. From Potter College he went with Brother Slayden to Texas and was a student under him at Sabinal Christian College. He advanced rapidly in his studies, but his advancement in music and sight singing was the most marked, He soon began to be in demand as a song leader, and one year he was given his tuition in Cordell Christian College in return for his teaching sight singing. The last few years of William’s life were spent in preaching and singing. One winter he lived in the Cortner home at Normandy, Tenn., and preached for the church there. He spent one summer with Brother S. R. Cogue in missionary work in East Tennessee. He sang in meetings with T. B. Larimore, S. P. Pittman, E. A. Elam, G. Dallas Smith, R. H. Boll, W. S. Long, George A. Klingman, and several other prominent preachers. Brother T, B. Larimore paid him a very high tribute in the Gospel Advacote as a song leader, and many persons have spoken of his earnestness in singing the “sweet old story”. In the autumn of 1917 brother William went to Louisville, Ky., where he hoped to take some studies in the university while working at some employment for a livelihood. He was progressing very nicely in his work at Louisville when, in March, 1918, he was drafted for service in the army. He had not claimed exemption as a preacher or as a “divinity student”, because he was engaged in other work not classed as “professional preacher’s work”. He had, however, asked for noncombatant duties on the ground that he could not conscientiously fight with carnal weapons. But this claim was not respected and his appeal was ignored by both the local and district exemption boards at Huntsville, Ala. They refused to reopen his case, to consider his appeal, or to treat either him or us with courtesy, notwithstanding the fact that both his claim and his appeal were legal and that he could have legally, truthfully and rightfully claimed exemption as a preacher of the gospel, The boards did pot know this, however, for they refused to hear anything on his case. It was not patriotism, hut religious prejudice, that caused this. When William was examined at Camp Pike, his vision was found defective and he was classed for limited military service and given a clerical position. His eyes were treated and brought up to normal condition and he was transferred to other duties. Whether he sought a transfer, as published in a daily paper, or whether he was transferred without his consent, we do

not know; and whether he changed his conviction about participating in carnal warfare or just decided it was useless to try to avoid it, we do not knew. We do know that some time after he had been given full military duties he entered the Officers' Training School, had made good, and was just ready to be commissioned lieutenant when he died. He never came home after he went to camp, and he never wrote us as fully about his work as we often wished he would. He never referred to his attitude toward fighting. About two weeks before he died he wrote that he thought he would soon be sent to France and he said: "Now that I am in it, let me get into the worst of it, and I don't care how soon my part of it is over." His part of it is now forever over, and, thank God, he never had to kill. Our estimate of our brother's character is as follows: He was of a sunny disposition; he had a fine sense of humor; he was affable and courteous; he was courageous, yet tender-hearted and affectionate; and beneath his fun- loving, somewhat dashing youthful nature there was a substratum of piety and religious devotion.

He was baptized into Christ by Brother James K. Hill in 1902, before he was eleven years old, and, with the little exception noted above, he was faithful till the Lord took him home. He stated on his deathbed that the temptations in the army were very great and that he feared he was not as strong as he should be, but that he had never turned loose of the Lord, had never ceased to pray to him and to beg for his mercy. He said "amen" to the prayers prayed by his dying bed and fell asleep murmuring: "There is rest for the weary."

It is hard for us to give him up, for we shall miss his companionship, and we had bright hopes for his future here; but we confidently believe he has passed into that rest that remaineth for the people of God. Still we sorrow—we can not help it; and we are thankful that the apostle does not tell us not to woriy, but to "sorrow not as those who have no hope." Our dear little brother William—in babyhood "Willie", the pet of the family, in manhood "Will"; and in affectionate speech "Billy"'—has gone to that far-away, unseen shore; but he was no stranger there. His father and four sisters had preceded him to that fair land. Of a once large, laughing, singing, happy family, the father and five children are now on eternity's strand, while the mother and five children still sail on the stormy sea of time. May we all anchor there some day.

REFLECTIONS AT THE BEDSIDE OF A DYING

BROTHER BY G. C. BREWER

How large a part death plays in all life's considerations! If we should take the subject of death out of our hymn books, the sweetest melodies that ever blessed the earth would be destroyed. It was the tragic death of his loved ones that inspired H. G. Spafford to give the world that soul-exultant song, "It Is Well With My Soul"—that song of hopeful joy, the cry of a chastened soul thrown helpless on the Savior, which found his grace sufficient. It was the sweet hope that when "The night is gone..." And with the morn those angel faces smile Which I have loved long since and lost a while, that led John Henry Newman to bless poor groping humanity with that classic in hymnology, the sentiment of which should be in the heart of every man constantly, known as "Lead, Kindly Light." And no hymn writer has ever voiced the prayer of a sad and lonely soul more aptly than did Mrs. Smith when she wrote "Tarry With Me, O My Savior"; and she was influenced, no doubt, by the thought that Many friends were gathered round me In the bright days of the last; But the grave has closed above them, And I linger here the last.

If we should take away the influence of death from the literature of the world, our finest classics would be ruined. Two of the best orations this country has ever produced are the address of John J. Ingalls in the United States Senate on the death of Senator Hill and the speech of Robert G. Ingersoll at the funeral of his brother. Both are masterpieces of eloquence. And what of poetry? What gave us Tennyson's "In Memoriam", or Gray's "Elegy", or Milton's "Lycidas", or Bryant's "Thanatop- sis", or Poe's "Annabel Lee"? And what is the crowning merit of "The Raven"? What is it that has made "Hamlet" immortal? Did not Shakespeare excel in his philosophies on death? And yet what is there in either literature, philosophies, or science that will satisfy the heart of one standing at the brink of the grave? Who has solved the problem of death? Who has surveyed his land? Biology gives us a scientific treatment of death. History knows it as a universal fact. Poetry draws near and hovers over it a moment, only to withdraw in terror. Philosophy finds it a mystery of being, the one great mystery of not being. All contributions to the theme are marked by an essential vagueness; every avenue of approach seems darkened by an impenetrable shadow. We can go just so far, and then there yawns before us an abyss, forbidding, dark, dank and dismal. We can go with our loved ones into the shadows, and then something separates us. That trembling soul that loved our company, that clung to us, that shared our anxiety, suddenly springs from us and refuses to be touched by our tears or to respond to our cries. Then we see the grave close above all that we ever saw or could see and love of oUr dear one. The form we loved, the features once radiant with life, the eyes that sparkled with joy or were suffused with tears of sympathy, the tongue that spoke to us, the vocal organs that once gave the sounds of a voice resonant and musical —they are all there, but the features are cold and blank, the eyes are expressionless, the tongue is still, and the voice is hushed. All these must now mingle with the dust of the earth and become a brother of the insensible and insensate clod. What a wreck! And yet this is the common fate of all. "Into the night go all," wrote Henely. And Ingersoll said: "Whether in mid-sea or among the breakers of the farther shore, a wreck at last must mark the end of each and all. And every life, no matter if its every hour is rich with love, and every moment jeweled with a joy, will, at its close, become a tragedy as sad and deep and dark as can be woven out of the warp and woof of the mystery of death. Life is a narrow vale between the cold and barren peaks of two eternities. We strive in vain to look beyond the heights. We cry aloud, and the only answer is the echo of our wailing cry." In this beautiful language the eloquent unbeliever uttered the despairing cry of all humanity when it, unaided, tries to read the riddle of life and death. In vain Reason beats its wings against the bars of its cage and falls back in breathless exhaustion. Yet the soul revolts at the thought that endless silence and pathetic dust is the ultimate end of all human hopes and achievements. It refuses to accept the sentence and says with Emerson: This is not the whole sad story of creation Told by toiling millions o'er and o'er;

One day, then black annihilation, A sunlit passage to a sunless shore. When Knowledge admits its limitations and Reason acknowledges its helplessness, then "Faith sees a star". Faith alone can dispel this mortal darkness; nothing but faith can give us the victory over this ghastly foe. But even faith can not make death sweet or lovely. Death is an enemy, and it is but natural that the flesh should dread it. Even the psalmist who sang so sweetly of "fearing no evil" in the "valley and the shadow", when sickness overtook him and death threatened him, prayed earnestly: "O spare me, that I may recover strength before I go hence and be no more." And the Wise Man who taught us to fear God and keep his commandments, and who taught that at death the body goes to dust and the spirit returns to God who gave it, when contemplating the fate of the body, grew gloomy and

pessimistic. The flesh does not anticipate its ultimate end with pleasure, however much the spirit may rejoice in the hope of dwelling in a “house not made with hands”. And as there is often suffering in the flesh, there is also often a struggle in death that faith and hope may lessen, but can not prevent. Have you ever seen a loved one join battle with death and fight a losing fight? Have you ever seen a heroic soul torn from its earthly tabernacle when the flesh was reluctant to give it up? On the night of October 13, 1918, it was my bitter experience to sit alone by the bedside of a beloved brother who was breathing his last hours away in intense suffering; far from home and loved ones—with the one exception-—with no friend or acquaintance near; dying in an army hospital where disease was rampant and where death was holding high carnival, where sympathy was crowded out and where he was known only by the number of his bed. During the day of Sunday, the thirteenth, his bed had been moved out on the veranda of the base hospital, where there were many other sufferers, but where their beds were not crowded so close together as they were in the ward. Now there was room for a chair between the beds, and I was permitted to sit near my brother. This was the ostensible purpose in moving to the outside, but the real purpose was very different. A death in the hospital was kept as quiet as possible and a body was always removed without any commotion. I noticed that there was unusual space between my brother’s bed and the beds on either side of it. I observed, too, that his bed was placed near the door (the veranda was screened). This confirmed my fears. But there was evidently no purpose to hide the truth from me, for when I approached the captain—the doctor in charge of the ward—he told me plainly that death was certain and that it was not more than twenty-four hours away, and was likely to occur any hour. It was then my duty to overcome the shock as best I could and control myself and sit near the dying man till his suffering should end. There was nothing to do; just wait for death, and be as cheerful as I could while I waited. The night came on, and the patients on the neighboring beds had all yielded to the sedatives and were sleeping. The heavy groans of my brother had brought the order from the head nurse: “Give number forty-two another hypodermic—double the dose.” When this order had been obeyed, he, realizing that he would soon pass into unconsciousness, probably never to wake again in this life, said: “Lean over, brother, and let me put my arms around your neck just as I would mother’s if she were here.” Then, with his arm still about my neck, he fell into a semiconscious slumber, breathing with short, jerky respiration and emitting groans with every breath.

Thus surrounded. I sat alone through the night, waiting, expecting, yet dreading what was to come. It was a chill October night; the night breeze kept up a constant rustling in the yellow autumn leaves of the oaks that stood thick around the hospital. That, with my brother’s incessant groaning and the heavy, monotonous breathing of the sleepers around me, was all that could be heard. A heavy and painful stillness had settled over the camp. My mind, agitated and quickened by such conditions, was left free to rove through heavens and earth and to puzzle over the mysteries of life and death. It sped away to a far-away city and saw an anxious mother engaged in prayer for her “baby boy”; it knew, too, that there was a petition for her first-born son who was with him. It took notice also that Christian friends had gathered in that home and that there was a prayer meeting. It even knew the names of those in the meeting. Then, with this seemingly certain knowledge, with this almost real presence of those far away, the mystery of telepathy presented itself and occupied the thoughts for a while.

Then Memory with her magic wand called up many scenes of past life. She took me back to childhood—to a happy home when the family circle was unbroken; the dying than before me was again a bright-eyed baby toddling from one to another of that happy circle, and all were laughing in affectionate joy.

Then there came a more somber scene. I was again sitting by the bedside of my baby brother. Mother was with me, and her face was full of anxiety. My boy heart was beating rapidly, and I was afraid to leave the bed and yet afraid to stay. As the scene became vivid, the unshaven face of the soldier before me became the round, sweet face of a child of four, and golden curls fringed the baby brow. O, how we prayed that this baby be not taken away from us! And he had been spared these few years, only now to be cut down in the bloom of young manhood, while in love with life and raptured with the world. Would it not have been better had he gone on that sad day long ago? Then, is not life worth living? Have these years been worth nothing to him? Shall I agree with the faithless Bryon when he said:

Count o'er the joys thine hours have seen, Count o'er the days from anguish free, And know, whatever thou hast been, 'Tis something better not to be.

No, I do not believe it. Life is sweet; it is the priceless gift of a merciful Creator, and it is good to live even if all our days are not "from anguish free". And who knows what effect our growth and attainments here will have on our life in the great beyond? But just here my thoughts are disturbed by the movements of the sufferer. The effect of the opiate is dying out, or—death is hovering nearer! Ah, yes! How terrible his presence! Is there no limit to suffering? Why will not cruel Death cease his tortures and release the spirit? Would I not now freely let him go?

Thus the mind starts off on another strain and Memory again begins her work. How often have I heard this noble boy sing sweet songs about death being a dream, about crossing the rolling river, about light at the river, about passing into the Savior's presence, etc.! How often, when we were in meetings together, had he requested me to .preach on the twenty-third Psalm! And he always wept when the death scene was presented. How sweet to him had been the promise that the rod and the staff should comfort us when we pass into the valley and are lost in the shadows! Yea, how often had I heard him conclude a prayer with some such petition as, "Be with us in the hour of death!" Now that hour has come to him; he is in the valley and the shadows are growing deeper. But how he suffers! There is no poetry in this! There seems no light here! Where now, O Lord, is thy promise? Then, with a shock, memory seized the very words of our dying Lord: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Even he felt forsaken. It must be so. Death has a sting. It brings suffering which must be endured. It is a dark valley. The psalmist did not say it was not; he rather emphasized that fact, but rejoiced that the Lord would be with him. But is that promise being fulfilled now? Perhaps I do not know. It may be that I can not see. The dying man has uttered no complaint. He is tracing it without a tremor. He is suffering, but endures it with a courage heroic, and even yet, I think, hopes to defeat death. And there are considerations, too. Was it not the good providence of God that brought me here? Was he not merciful in sparing him till I got here? Are not men dying here every day with no relative or friend near them? Are there not now many bodies lying in the morgue, tagged like so many blocks of stone, awaiting a message from that home that they will never see as to the disposal of their bodies? Then, is there nothing for which we may be thankful?

Such were some of the sad reflections and ruminations or a distressed mind on that never-to-be-forgotten night.

I may state that my brother lived through the night and till two o'clock the next day, and during the forenoon of the day the chaplain came, and we had scripture reading, prayer, and worship, in which my brother was able to join. Possibly this, too, was a fulfillment of the Lord's promise. The chaplain did not visit all the dying men. He could not; and, then, they often died without his knowing it. How came he to come this time? Peculiarly enough. A new nurse had just come into Ward 29, who was a religious girl, and, seeing that number forty-two was dying, she telephoned the chaplain. Of course I do not know that' the Lord had a hand in that, nor do I know that the chaplain was a true servant of God. He was a Lutheran, but he was tender and sympathetic, and I shall always remember him gratefully. My brother died believing the promise. Then why should I doubt it? "How excellent is thy name, O Lord, in all the earth!"

00B.02 Contending for the Faith

CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH Being A compilation of articles that have been

published before, most of them in the

Gospel Advocate, together with some new

matter By

G. C. BREWER

Author of

” BREWER’S SERMONS,” ” THE MODEL CHURCH,” ” THE

BREWER-LINDSEY DEBATE,” ” THE IMMORTALITY OF THE

SOUL,” "COMMUNISM AND THE FOUR HORSEMEN,” ETC.

COPYRIGHT BY

GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

1941 Note: This Electronic Version contains the Complete Text. However, the Chaptes are divided up differently from what appears in the Contents.

00B.05 Prayer

"That I May Finish My Course"

Father, grant ere set of sun That I may see my task well done; Something attempted— let it be A finished work, Dear Lord, for thee. At dawn I looked upon my field And dreamed of harvest's golden yield;

I set my hand, Lord, to the plow, Nor have I yet turned back, but now, I pray thee strength and wisdom send To carry on unto the end.

Through winter snow, and summer heat, I've walked thy way with willing feet.

I've cleared thy land of brush and weed And plowed the soil and sowed the seed, And felt the joy of those who know The seed they sow will live and grow. But other fields are waste and bare, And I would fain go labor there:

Give me strength, O Lord, and years, To work with joy and even with tears. That other workers may be won, To take the task when mine is done. And grant me ere the darkness close To earn a share in that repose That waits for those who spend their days, In faith and prayer and work and praise— The joy of harvest, full, complete Sheaves to lay, Lord, at thy feet.

00B.06 Preface

Preface In presenting this volume to the public the author makes no apology, for he holds the strong conviction that he has taught the truth upon the questions discussed and he has never yet apologized for any truth. The articles here compiled were written in response to questions or requests. They were called forth by a demand and as the demand for the truth on these subjects still exists the articles are still timely: as truth is eternal these lessons will not go out of date. This is the author’s conviction. If it seems like a boast to any reader, he begs that reader to take note of the fact that he claims nothing for the quality of the writing or for the strength of reasoning herein displayed. Nor does he imagine that the book will show any evidence of scholarship. He simply and humbly believes that the truth of God has been plainly presented on the various themes, and in that confidence he offers the book to his fellow men.

All the questions and requests that called forth these articles did not come directly to the author—though many of them did. Some of them came into the Gospel Advocate office and were by the editor turned over to the author with the request that he answer them. In some cases this will be seen from the reading of these articles, as they are printed here just as they first appeared in the Gospel Advocate. This was true of the discussion with a Catholic and also of the questions about organizations. At the time these were published there was much questioning and some controversy about schools and orphan homes and suchlike institutions— and especially about churches as such contributing to these institutions. These questions had been presented at the panel discussions at various lectureships or preachers’ meetings. They had been published in several religious journals, and the boast or complaint was made that no one had undertaken to answer them. The editor of the Gospel Advocate sent the questions to the author with the request that he "attend to the gentlemen." But he warned that we might expect a fight and cautioned that the author take only safe positions and make them strong. (At that time the editor was not in complete agreement with the author on all these points, but when the series was sent into the office the editor wrote the author that he wanted to be his first convert.) Having received this warning and knowing the possibility of a many-sided controversy, the author completed the series and submitted or read them to a number of representative brethren for their approval or criticism before they were given to the public. Especially did he consult the brethren who are connected with the schools. When the articles appeared no challenge came from any direction and the agitation was hushed, for the time at least. It was suggested to the author when this book was first proposed that he publish a photostatic copy of some of the letters endorsing these articles in this book, but he does not wish to take advantage of anyone, and if any brother wishes to talk two ways he will have enough to answer for without any accusations from this book. The articles must stand on their own merit. The author is still ready to defend any position taken. He does not, however, expect to have a controversy with everyone who may criticize him or differ from him on minor or nonessential points. He rather invites such criticisms. He does not claim perfection in anything, but he sincerely believes he is right in any position he takes; otherwise he would not take it.

There are only two questions discussed in this book on which there is much likelihood of differences of opinion among the brethren. They are: Organizations and the Beginning o f the Lord’s Day. These touch the practices of the brethren today, but they will probably not bring about any change. People are so bound by custom that they will not change even when they are shown that the custom is wrong, and there are always men who will rush to the defense of anything "we do." At any rate what the author has written he has written and he is willing for his brethren to deal with it as they deem proper. At the time that most of these articles were appearing in the Gospel Advocate the author was editor of a department known as "Topics for Thought" and many of these were published in that department. Some, however, that are in this book were published on the editorial page. This is true of some of the series dealing with organizations and it is true of all those on Denominational Baptism. In order that the reader may note any changes in the author’s style and especially mark his continued fight for the faith, he gives under Fugitive Pieces an article criticizing a professor in the University of Chicago which was first published in 1911, and immediately following is an article dealing with something that issued from the University of Chicago Press which was published this year—1941. Thirty years between them. These articles are titled, "The Criterion of Life and Religion" and "Illustration and Perversion," respectively.

Much of this book is, of course, controversial and at times the style may be sharp and the language harsh. That has ever been one of the author’s weaknesses. He has long known it and has often confessed it. He does not apologize for being a controversialist, but he does desire and pray "to be gentle, showing all meekness toward all men." His nature and his ideal have always been at war on this point, and the reader must not be surprised at seeing him fall short.

He must declare, however, that he has no ill feeling for any man with whom he clashes in these articles—Catholic, Christian Scientist, Methodist, Baptist, atheist, agnostic, modernist, or sensualist. As he is an uncompromising opponent of their views and doctrines, he nevertheless protests that he is their friend personally and that he would delight to do them good. As the author has written every line that goes into the make-up of this book—except what is quoted and credited in the body of the articles—there is no room for acknowledgments on that score, but he humbly and gratefully acknowledges his indebtedness to many men and many books for all he knows on any subject he has discussed. His brother, Charles R. Brewer of David Lipscomb College, so changed and improved the poem that stands as a prayer in the front of this book that he should be called its author. The author wrote a poem on this same idea of plowing a field, but his brother said the metre was not good and proceeded to write over i t until he had really written it over. So here goes the credit to him. Just how bad the author’s poetry is may be seen from the samples given under "Desultory Descanting." May our heavenly Father abundantly bless everyone who is either opposed or approved in this book. And may his richest benedictions rest upon every reader of these pages. This is the fervent prayer of THE AUTHOR.

Lubbock, Texas, July 6, 1941.

00B.08 Chapter I -- Contending For The Faith

I. Contending for the Faith

"Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James, to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called: Mercy unto you, and peace, and love, be multiplied. Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ." (Jude 1:1-4.)

1. Jude. The writer of this Epistle tells us who he is in a way that anyone who is acquainted with the New Testament will understand. He is Jude or Judas, and he announces himself as a servant or a bond servant of Jesus Christ. This would not identify him as there are many Judases and as all Christians are bond servants of Jesus Christ. He, therefore, tells us that he is a brother of James. This would indicate that James was well known to those who would read this Epistle. The fact that he used James to make himself known proves that James was already well known. This is the James who wrote the Epistle that bears that name and he is the James who acted as chairman in the consultation about circumcision. (Acts 15.) He was said to be a pillar in the church at Jerusalem. (Galatians 2:9.) He is the one to whom the apostle Paul reported when he came to Jerusalem, bringing the money that he had collected throughout the country. (Acts 21:18.) When men came down from Jerusalem to Antioch they were said to have come from James. (Galatians 2:12.) But, and here is the point of emphasis in this study, James is said to be the Lord’s brother. (Galatians 1:19.) This, then, makes Jude also the Lord’s brother. We have the names of the Lord’s four brothers given in Matthew 13:55 and they were: James, Joseph, Simon, and Judas. This is the Judas who wrote the Epistle. It is noteworthy that Jude makes no mention of the fact that he was the Lord’s brother. This indicates Jude’s humility. He did not want to claim any advantage over the people t o whom h e wrote or over any other disciple o f Christ. Christ is not now in the flesh and fleshly ties receive no recognition in the kingdom of God. (2 Corinthians 5:16.) Jesus taught while he was here on earth that everyone who does the will of the father is his brother or sister. (Matthew 12:46-50.) Jude understood this spiritual relationship and therefore made no mention of the fact that he was the Lord’s brother and had been reared in the same family circle. This is a strong condemnation of those who speak of the Jews as being related to our Lord in the flesh and therefore having any advantage or connection that all other human beings may not have. This also is a condemnation of those who exalt and beatify Mary because she was the mother of our Lord’s body. Whatever credit Mary may deserve for this service of God does not extend into the kingdom. Mary is never mentioned after the kingdom of God came with power or after the Son of man came in his kingdom. (Mark 9:1; Matthew 16:28.) The last time that Mary is mentioned is in the first chapter of Acts. The coming of the kingdom and the coronation of Christ is told in the next chapter.

Constrained t o Write. Jude intimated that he was writing under compulsion. He had been giving all diligence to this matter. This indicates that he was reluctant to write and that he had been considering it thoughtfully and prayerfully, but he felt constrained to write this Epistle. The fact that he made the Epistle very short shows that he was not afflicted with the mania seribendi. He wrote only what was necessary but he covered a wide field in these short verses. He had something to say and felt impelled by the importance of his message and by the exigency of the moment to say it.

Our Common Salvation. Jude calls the subject about which he was writing our common salvation. It was common in that these persons addressed shared it with Jude. They were his fellow Christians, and he announces by this expression that he has no intention of writing something new or of imparting to them information that they did not already possess. He is simply writing an exhortation and is warning the brethren against dangers that had then come upon them. This salvation may also be called common in that it embraces Jew and Gentile alike. It is intended for all men. (Titus 2:11.) The expression "our common salvation" and "the faith" mean the same thing. Paul speaks of "the common faith." (Titus 1:4.) The common faith and the common salvation mean the same thing.

The Faith Once for All Delivered t o the Saints. Here again Jude disclaims any intention to write something new to the disciples. In this we see his humility further manifested and we also see that this Epistle deserves a place in the canon even if Jude was not inspired. He does not reveal anything but pleads for that which had already been revealed and which was then a common possession of all saints. He declares that this had been delivered once for all. The King James Version says once delivered, but a thing that has been delivered once certainly has not been delivered twice or repeatedly and the meaning is therefore the same. It was delivered one time for all time. This is an impeachment of those who come to us with new revelations or visions or dreams. The Lord did not intend that his will should be made in installments, these installments to be given as the centuries pass by. He delivered the faith to the saints and expects them to keep it unto the end. This passage alone is sufficient to refute the claim of the Roman Catholic Church that the voice of the pope is the voice of God and that God continues to speak through any such living representative. It is also a refutation of such pretended revelators as Joseph Smith, Mrs. Ellen G. White, or any other person who claims to speak by inspiration or revelation today. If what these persons say is exactly the same as the faith once delivered, then there is no need for their revelation. If it is in any way different from the faith once delivered, then it must be repudiated. We, therefore, should give especial emphasis to Jude’s exhortation to "contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints."

The question may arise as to whom these saints were. The claim is made by the Roman Church that these were official representatives of the Lord and that the faith was from them passed on to their successors. This claim is refuted by the fact that the faith was common. It did not belong to a specially chosen group of officials but it belonged to all of God’s servants. Some people think that a saint is a heavenly being and that no mortal person or earth dweller could be a saint. Those who hold this idea have never read the New Testament—or the Old either—very carefully. All Christians are saints and they are called saints in the New Testament more often than they are called anything else. This word is applied to God’s children fifty times in the New Testament. It is also applied to God’s servants in the Old Testament. It is used thirty times in that part of the Bible.

It is sometimes used to designate heavenly beings or angels, and the saints on earth are spoken of in contrast with some saints who are not on earth. (Psalms 16:3.) The word literally means "holy ones" and it may easily be applied to heavenly beings as it is in Deuteronomy 33:2 and Daniel 8:13. All the New Testament uses of the term, however, apply to Christians or children of God. The faith has, therefore, been committed to God's children. Paul tells us that this gospel was given to the saints just as Jude does. (Colossians 1:26.) He also speaks of having the gospel entrusted to or committed to him. (Titus 1:3 : 1 Timothy 1:11; Galatians 2:7.) He and the other apostles were ambassadors through whom this faith was given to all the saints. (Ephesians 3:5; 2 Corinthians 5:19-20.) They were the inspired and miraculously empowered agents to whom the faith was committed and through whom it has been given once for all to God's children. We are to hold that faith and to contend for it throughout the Christian age. (Hebrews 2:1-4; 2 Timothy 2:2.)

5. What Is the Faith? The explanation of the faith has already been implied in what has been said in the paragraph above but, that there may be no misunderstanding, we shall give a special explanation and emphasis to this part of the exhortation. The expression "the faith" is found often in the New Testament. Paul says some shall depart from the faith. (1 Timothy 4:1.) He speaks of some who denied the faith. (1 Timothy 5:8.) He said some make shipwreck of the faith. (1 Timothy 1:19.) But Paul declared that he had kept the faith. (2 Timothy 4:7.) The faith means the gospel or the Christian religion. In Galatians 1:6-9 the apostle declares that he had preached the gospel and pronounces an anathema on any man or angel who preaches another gospel or a different gospel from that which he had preached. Yet in this same chapter, Galatians 1:23, he says he preached the faith. Therefore the gospel and the faith are one and the same thing. He also says that he had formerly made havoc of the faith. He did this by persecuting Christians or by trying to exterminate Christianity. This makes it plain that the gospel, Christianity, and the faith are all just different expressions that have the same meaning. The question may arise as to why the gospel is called the faith. It is because it is a system of salvation by faith. In this respect, the gospel is different from anything that had ever been offered to man up to that time or that has ever been offered since that time. The Jews had a system of law and this meant salvation on human merit or worth. Men had to keep the law and thereby obtain righteousness that would entitle them to heaven. No one was ever able to reach this goal. The gospel presents a Savior who through his atoning sacrifice took away our sins and through his righteousness covers us with a robe of purity. We accept this gracious offer by faith. In this, the gospel of Christ is different from any religion that the heathen world, ancient or modern, had ever conceived. In our day we hear much of comparative religions. Courses in college cover this field. Students are taught to compare Christianity with Buddhism, Confucianism. Shintoism. The teachers often try to make it appear that these older religions excel Christianity. They imply and sometimes assert that Christianity was borrowed from these ancient religions. The young student might not be expected to see the fallacy in all this. Christianity is not to be thought of as in the same class with these religions. They are not comparable to the religion of Christ. Even if certain ethical principles could be found that are equal to or excel the principles of the gospel, there would still be no comparison. The gospel is not merely a system of ethics, though it contains the highest ethics the world has ever known. The heathen religion simply gives lofty principles by which men are to regulate their lives. They present to man a blueprint by which he is to build his character. If, therefore, their followers should attain perfection according to their standards, they still would be lost sinners and all that they had would be their own achievement of which they might rightfully boast, but which would not entitle them to

heaven. These religions present no Savior, but leave men to save themselves. They present no grace and mercy, no healing fountain, and no atoning sacrifice. The gospel of Christ offers all of these things to a fallen race. In it we have help for the helpless, pardon for the condemned, and salvation for the sinful. All this offered freely by love divine.

There can be no wonder that the gospel is spoken of as the faith, since faith is the ground of our salvation. Faith, not works; grace, not law; a gift, and not an achievement. Paul speaks of the law age as a time when faith had not come. "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring u s unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." (Galatians 3:22-29.) Does it seem a little strange that he could speak of faith as not having yet come; "the faith" as not yet revealed when we know that all the ancient worthies from Abel down lived and served by faith? (Hebrews 11:1-40) They wrought mighty things by faith. Abraham is the "father of the faithful." In the last day when all of the redeemed—redeemed by faith—stand on the plains of judgment the man at the head of the class will be Abraham. Yes, these men had faith as individuals and conquered. But "the faith" that i s the salvation that is on the ground of faith, had not then been revealed. This faith came when Christ came and died and rose again, ascended to heaven, and sent back the Holy Spirit to preach the good news of salvation through his death and suffering. We are now the children of God by faith. (Galatians 3:26.) We are justified by faith. (Romans 5:1.) Our hearts are purified by faith. (Acts 15:9.) And a contrast is clearly drawn between the law and the faith, between the doing of that which was required by the law and the accepting by faith that which is offered in the gospel. Paul says, "Now that no man is justified by the law before God is evident: for, The righteous shall live by faith; and the law is not of faith; but, He that doeth them shall live in them." (Galatians 3:11-12.) Here are two methods of living described. One man lives by doing, the other man lives b y faith. Surely, then, we will not preach that man lives by doing today. Nothing we do has any merit in it. Our obedience deserves no reward. Our salvation is on the. ground of our faith.

Some reader may conclude that this would exclude obedience and make any act of obedience nonessential. This is sometimes done by our denominational friends. They argue that, since we are saved by faith and not by doing, we do nothing; that we simply reach a certain mental or heart state in reference to Christ and that we are then and thereby saved. This is a mistake, as may be clearly seen from many passages of Scripture. It seems pathetic that people who will put such splendid emphasis on salvation by faith in contrast with works of merit cannot see that the "obedience of faith" is not works. Our obedience is not something added to faith but it is faith itself: faith manifested, faith actualized, faith made perfect. This is so forcefully expressed and so plainly argued by Dr. Stifler that I beg here to quote a paragraph. He says: But must it not be said now that Paul has abandoned his theme, salvation by faith, in substituting the word "baptism"? Why did he not say, "All we who believed into Christ," a common phrase in the New Testament (10: 14; Galatians 2:16), "believed into his death"? The difficulty arises from the modern wrong conception

of the New Testament meaning of the word "baptism," that it is a mere rite, an act to be done, at the best, because one believes in Christ. The New Testament writers never separate it from the faith which it embodies and expresses. It is the fixed sign for faith, just as any appropriate order of letters in a word is the sign of an idea. The sign stands for the thing and is constantly used for the thing. Hence, Paul can say that Christ was "put on" in baptism (Galatians 3:27), and Peter does not hesitate to declare that "baptism doth also now save us" (1 Peter 3:21). It is referred to as the "laver of regeneration" (Titus 3:5), and said to "wash away sins" (Acts 22:16). To refuse to be baptized is to reject God, and the opposite is to accept him (Luke 7:29-30). Every one of these passages—and there are more like them—would teach salvation by a rite, salvation by water, but that the word for baptism is used as a symbol of faith. Faith SO far IS not one thing and baptism another; they are the same thing. The faith that accepted Christ in Paul's day was the faith that showed its acceptance in baptism. The water without the preceding faith was nothing. The faith without the water could not be allowed. Believers were baptized into Christ or they were not considered TO be in him. The word being so used, it is easy to see that Paul has not departed from the gem doctrine of justification by faith; and by employing it he has gained definiteness of statement. Faith is a wide term and shows itself in many ways, each exhibition being exactly appropriate to the way in which faith is then exercised. The exhibition is an exponent of the faith. In faith of a coming flood, Noah appropriately built an ark. In faith that Israel would one day leave Egypt, Joseph gave commandment concerning his bones, that they be not left behind. In faith that one dies with Jesus, he is buried with him in baptism, the faith taking this fit form. The Romans had a broad faith that ran out in many lines, and it was known far and wide. (Romans 1:8) Just one of these lines led to salvation—the one that found its appropriate exhibition in baptism. When Paul said they were baptized into Christ, they knew instantly to what hour (see on Romans 16:7) and to what line of their multiform faith he referred— the faith that saw the man and not merely his sins on the cross and in the tomb, so that to show itself appropriately the whole man must be buried with Christ in baptism. The act of baptism is an exponent, first of all, not of the remission of sins, but of the death of the believer in Christ, so that his sinfulness is atoned for. He himself has died to sin. (The Epistles to the Romans, a Commentary by James M. Stiller, D.D., professor of New Testament Exegesis in Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pennsylvania. Publisher, Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, Chicago, Toronto.)

6. Why This Exhortation? Jude does not leave us to guess why he was constrained to exhort the brethren to contend for the faith. He tells us that certain false teachers had come in among them, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, and denying the Lord Jesus Christ. He says these teachers had crept in privily. The Greek of this passage seems to indicate that they had slipped in by a side door. This means that these men had got themselves recognized as Christians without making a full confession of their faith in Christ as Lord, or else they had made a false statement. It is possible that they had professed great admiration for the teaching of Christ and, as Peter had said, they used "great swelling words of vanity" and had thereby deceived the people into thinking that they had a superior culture; that they were devout Christians, and yet they had not acknowledged themselves as sinners and claimed the Lord Jesus Christ as Savior. It is no new thing for false teachers to profess superior spirituality, a higher degree of culture, than others possess. They do not take the word of God at face value. They are not literalists! No, indeed. They profess a deep spiritual penetration. They give the word of God a mystic meaning and therefore one must have a special "key to the Scriptures" before one can share in their superior views.

These were the type of men that Jude warned the disciples against. They denied the Lord that bought them, Peter tells us. To acknowledge the existence of sin would not be complimentary to man! The idea of the cross is crude and repulsive! Since they claim man is not a sinner, he needs no Savior. Thus Christ is denied.

7. What the False Teachers Taught. We have indicated in the above paragraph what it was that these teachers denied, but we may see from Jude's explanation something of what they taught. They turned the grace of "God into lasciviousness." This means that they claimed license to indulge the flesh. Peter speaks of these same false teachers, declaring that they led Christians astray by promising them liberty. (2 Peter 2:19.) They based this license on the grace of God. This means that they claimed since we had been freed from law and are now under grace (Romans 6:14) we are free to commit the sins that were prohibited by the law. There was a class of men in the early church who made this argument. These men are refuted by Peter and Paul as well as by Jude. In history these men were called Antinomians. This means "against law." But it is not probable that the teachers to whom Jude refers were of this class. Jude's false teachers denied the Lord Jesus, and therefore they did not claim that his grace had made us free. These men evidently emphasized the fact that God is love, and therefore he would not punish men for sin. They claimed that he is too good to inflict punishment upon his children, and thus they based their claim of exemption from punishment upon God's grace and goodness. Lasciviousness means lust or lewdness. These false teachers, therefore, were corrupt men and spread immorality among those who came under their influence. This was the teaching of the Nicolaitans. This sect taught free love and abolished marriage. (Revelation 2:6.) They justified fornication and any other sin that might be called a natural passion o f the flesh. They were found in the church at Ephesus, at Pergamos and at Thyatira. This sect was later succeeded by the Gnostics or knowing ones. Like our modernists, they professed superior knowledge. In fact, these were typical modernists. They denied the divinity of Christ, vicarious atonement, promised liberty, professed superior knowledge, and practiced free love. But the New Testament tells us that God hated this sect and its teaching, and Jude and Peter warned us against such teachers and exhorted us to reject these errors and t o contend earnestly for the faith.

00B.09 Chapter 2--"Where Art Thou?"

II. "Where Art Thou?”

1. If we take the Bible as our source of information, the second interrogatory that was ever uttered in the language of earth or that registered upon the human sense of hearing was Jehovah’s call to his fallen son, Adam, "Where art thou?" The first question had been propounded by Satan as a method of approach to the curiosity and vanity of the woman’s heart. "Hath God said?" It is significant that the first shadow that cast its dark form across the threshold of man’s happy home was caused by a question mark placed after Jehovah’s warning. It sought to discredit God’s word and to create a doubt in the heart of God’s child. First, God’s word must be taken out of the way by some means. If the woman can be made to forget or to disbelieve what God hath said, then she will give audience to the plea for the pleasures and advantages of this fruit. If she yields, there is no doubt about what man will do. There will be no necessity for talking to him about the falsity of God’s word or the advantages of sin, the woman’s soft request will be enough to captivate his responsive soul. But if the echo of Jehovah’s warning does give him pause, the same seductive speech that beguiled the woman will drown the echo and silence his scruples. And who can make the speech better than the wife of his bosom?

2. Satan’s scheme was well laid, and his first attack was intended to sweep away the only barrier to sin. "Hath God said?" He knew what God had said, but he did not simply repeat the statement and then contradict it. Nay, that is too crude a method for the subtle artist that is Satan! He is talking to a woman, and he will not for a moment forget his finesse. He asks the question and evinces great surprise and bewilderment. "Hath God said?" Is it possible that he told you that? I am at a loss to know how he could have told you such a thing when the reverse is true. He must have underestimated your intellectual ability and thought he could scare you into submission. He wanted to limit your freedom, keep you in ignorance, and hold you under his authority. He threatened a fearful punishment, but you are too strong-minded to believe that. He was talking to you as though you were a child. Why, he himself is too good and loving to visit affliction upon you in any such unmerciful manner. He knows that no such calamity will befall you, but he knows that if you are strong enough, independent enough, intellectual enough and brave enough to defy him and eat this fruit you will become wise, free, intelligent, and the master of your own soul. In fact you will be a god yourself and no longer be the cringing slave of a tyrannical God who keeps you in bondage through superstition and fear! Come on now, assert yourself! Partake of this beautiful tree! Eat of this luscious fruit and enjoy it! Don’t be a stupid child! Don’t be an ignorant pagan! Join the intelligentsia, express your own personality, flout superstition, defy tradition, and thumb your nose at God! Become a modern! You know this tree appeals to you; I can see that you admire its beauty and long to know its flavor and to enjoy its delicious goodness. Is it any worse to take it than it is to want it? Why not be brave and intelligent enough to do what in your heart you want to do? Why suppress your desires and dwarf your personality? Why yield to a false fear and pretend to obey God when you are disobedient in your heart? Why feign purity when your mind is filled with mephitic nastiness? Why become a repressed neurotic? Why mope about in morbid unhappi-

ness and under restraints that you hate? Be yourself! Be frank and honest. There is no virtue in hypocrisy. If there is such a thing as right and wrong, you will be able to decide for yourself what is right and what is wrong after you throw off this arbitrary authority.

3. Our poor progenitors fell victims to this false reasoning and decided to try the high adventure of defying authority and of indulging their vanity with the thought that they were intellectually independent enough to do exactly what they desired to do! They, like all their posterity, were deluded into thinking that by sinning they were exhibiting broad-mindedness and intellectual independence. They were not analytical enough to see that instead of doing their own independent will they were doing exactly what someone else wanted them to do, and they were thereby becoming the most servile slaves of the forces of evil.

4. Now where is man? The next scene in the tragic drama shows him conscious of his guilt, ashamed and hiding. Had he found Satan’s promises true? No, he admits that he has been defrauded by deception. What else does beguile mean? True, he knew the difference between good and evil, only to find himself aligned with evil and conscious that he was a sinner. He now knew the difference between guilt and innocence by his sad loss of the joy of the latter and his poignant sense of the former. He did not enjoy his intellectual independence and was not proud of his acquired wisdom and was not bold toward God. He did not want to see God or rely upon him to supply his needs. He ran away into hiding and endeavored by his own devices to manufacture a covering for his shame. He thought he could cloak his sin in the flimsy pretense of fig leaves, but this miserable makeshift, instead of disguising his disobedience, merely announced his guilt. He was afraid, ashamed, confused, and lost. Adam, "where art thou?" "Who told thee that thou wast naked?" Not merely who informed you that you were without covering, surely Adam and Eve knew this, but who made you conscious of your nudity? Who caused you to take notice of it and to be ashamed? What guilty feeling makes you hide from your Father, Adam? "Where art thou?"

Poor man could not justify his act, enjoy his condition, or get out of his predicament. He felt resentment toward his wife and tried to lay the blame on her. From that day to this, sinful men and women have antagonized each other and preyed upon each other. There is never a broken home but that each partner tries to lay the blame upon the other. Only where the order of the Lord is respected and the word of the Lord is obeyed can there be peace and harmony in the home.

Poor, trembling Mother Eve could not deny the charge of her husband, and in her humiliation and shame she felt keenly the fraud that had been perpetrated upon her. "The serpent beguiled me." Yes, he told her she would be free and independent and that she could ignore God or even throw him completely out of the reckoning. Ah, how monstrous that falsehood seems as she stands face to face with her Maker and must answer for her conduct. How dark and damnable is that lie as she is driven out of her beautiful home and away from the tree of life! Out into a cruel and bloody world to fight and struggle and toil for an existence; to suffer and sorrow and mourn for a few brief years and then grow old and decrepit and stumble into the grave and return to the dust!

"Where art thou?" Can you find yourselves in your present state of mind, with conflicting emotions tearing your hearts, with memories of lost joys haunting you and with the chaotic confusion of ideas, theories, doubts, and fears that fill your souls, O my children?

5. Thousands of generations have been born and buried since that first sin of our parents bequeathed suffering and death to all the human race. The voice of Jehovah has been calling to his children through the ages, and in his mercy he has offered us a way out of our woe through the cross of Christ. But Satan is still preaching his falsehoods and poor, vain mortals still lend their ears to his honeyed tones.

6. The old serpent has never changed his method or varied his plea. He attacks now just as he did on that bright Monday morning in the infancy of lime. His first move is to place a question mark after the word of God; beget doubt in the heart of his victim; deny that there is any punishment for sin and, if the subject seems attentive, deny that there is any sin; stir resentment against God’s "arbitrary authority" and incite rebellion against such unreasonable restraints! Then he flatters man’s intellect and urges him to demand freedom and independence. Next he pictures the pleasure of sin and points to the primrose path that to the beguiled vision of mortals leads into the garden of eternal delights.

7. We should not be ignorant of his devices. He destroys faith in God through falsehood and deception and then destroys souls through disbelief. Whether he is dealing with a dizzy daughter of Eve or a sapient son of Adam, he uses the same method and attacks at the same point. Whether his plea comes through the scholarly and sedate utterances of a doctor of philosophy in the college classroom, through the fulsome flattery of the social siren, through the seductive sounds of the ballroom, or through the raucous call of the roadside honky-tonk, it is directed at the same vital weakness in the human heart, and it accomplishes the same result in every case. It induces men to disregard God, and then come sin, suffering, and suicides; broken homes, wrecked Edens, divorces, drunkenness, death, and damnation: among nations, upheavals, revolutions, a confusion of tongues, a babel of voices, clashing ideologies, wars, and hell on earth. Where art thou, O human race?

00B.10 Chapter 3--Men Ought Always To Pray--No. 1

III. "Men Ought Always to Pray"

No. 1 The following questions were sent to me by my good brother and erstwhile yokefellow, C. A. Buchanan, with the request that I answer him through the paper. He apologized for submitting these questions to me instead of Brother Hinds, who conducts the regular query department of this paper. He says that he desires that I answer them because he knows my views on these questions, and he wants me to set forth these views for the readers of the Gospel Advocate. I, too, believe that some teaching on these very vital questions would be appropriate now or at any other time, and I shall therefore make these questions the topic for two or three weeks' editorials. But I shall first give a categorical answer to each question and then discuss the subject about which the questions are propounded in several of its ramifications. Read now the questions:

Do the Scriptures teach that God will give temporal blessings to his saints today in answer to prayer that they will not receive in the same measure without prayer through the operation of natural law?

Does the following passage apply since the days of miracles? "In nothing be anxious: but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God." (Php 4:6.)

Does it do any good to pray for the recovery of the sick today?

Paul requested the Colossians (Colossians 4:3) to pray God to open unto them a door for the word. He requested others to pray that the word might run and be glorified. (2 Thessalonians 3:1-18; 2 Thessalonians 1:1-12) Do such prayers in connection with gospel preaching today have any efficacy?

Is there an added power in united prayer?

Answering these in the order that they are given, let me say:

Yes, the Scriptures do teach that we receive temporal blessings in answer to prayer and because of a righteous life.

This passage applies now with the same force and in the same way that it did when it was written. There is no suggestion of a miracle in it. So far as the record shows, there was no one at Philippi who could work miracles. This letter was written to "all the saints in Christ Jesus that are at Philippi," and they were the same sort of ordinary human beings that we are; but they had faith in God, and therefore they obeyed and prayed. No one is a saint, or Christian, who does not do both.

It does the same good today to pray for the sick that it ever did in any other day, and in the same way. There is a vast difference in praying for the recovery of the sick and in healing the sick by miracle. If it does not "do any good" to pray for the sick, it does not do any good to pray for anything anywhere or at any time. If prayer does not bring any benefit or blessing that we cannot

obtain ourselves without prayer or that would not come to us through the natural and mechanical processes of life without prayer to God, without trust in God, or even without a belief in the existence of God, then why should we ever pray? Even prayer in our public assemblies is crass mockery and open blasphemy, if that is our view. And what advantage does Christianity have over heathen religions, and in what way is Jehovah better than a dumb idol? How can anybody profess to believe the Bible and not believe in prayer?

There cannot be any real gospel preaching today unless such prayers are connected with it. Unless the preacher lives in vital touch with God, and therefore gives himself "continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word" (Acts 6:4), and unless the brethren associated with him are men of prayer, their efforts to preach the gospel will be a hollow mockery; an artificial thing; a counterfeit; a form without the power. Their preaching will be simply a partisan pleading for a creed, an effort to "defend" or establish a doctrine; a series of arguments to prove "our contention" or to "convince" people of the Scripturalness of "our position." It is proper and right for a preacher to smite with the sword of the Spirit; but any preacher who breaks the inspired sentence and takes the first part of it and rejects the last part, and therefore attempts to take the sword and leave off the prayer, deals more dishonestly with God's word than the atheist who rejects it all outright. That preacher has no more God than does the atheist; he only has a theory or some ideas about God. His God is no more than "the great god Dagon"—a heathen idol or a tombstone in the cemetery. "And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God: with all prayer and supplication praying at all seasons in the Spirit, and watching thereunto in all perseverance and supplication for all the saints, and on my behalf, that utterance may be given unto me in opening my mouth, to make known with boldness the mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in chains; that in it I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak." (Ephesians 6:17-20.) "Finally, brethren, pray for us, that the word of the Lord may run and be glorified, even as also it is with you; and that we may be delivered from unreasonable and evil men; for all have not faith." (2 Thessalonians 3:1-2.) "What then is Apollos? and what is Paul? Ministers through whom ye believed; and each as the Lord gave to him. I planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase." (1 Corinthians 3:5-7.) The preacher—and all other Christians—should teach and persuade the sinful and the erring in all kindness and patience in the hope that 'God may give them repentance unto the knowledge of the truth. " (2 Timothy 2:25.)

Yes, there seems to be an added power in united prayer.

Having now given direct answer to these questions, it seems essential to give some general observations on prayer and then to discuss more fully questions No. 1, 3, and 5. As stated above, this will take us through three or four weeks. First, let us consider GOD'S SERVANTS AND PRAYER In Genesis 4:26 we read: "Then began men to call upon the name of Jehovah." We know that Abel and perhaps others had worshiped God before this time, but with the introduction of Enos it seems to be announced that men began regularly to call upon Jehovah, and his faithful servants walked with him. From that time on to the end of the inspired volume we find that all of God's servants called upon his name. We never read of a servant of God in any age of the world who was not a man of prayer, whether the history of that servant is written by the inspired writers or by uninspired writers. In fact, it would be as great an anomaly to find a real servant of God who does not constantly pray unto God as it would be to find a fish that lives on dry land. No man can

serve God acceptably or have any spiritual life who does not pray. Abel prayed, Enoch prayed, Noah prayed, Abraham prayed, Isaac and Jacob prayed, Moses prayed, Joshua prayed, David prayed. "Evening, and morning, and at noon, will I pray, and cry aloud: and he shall hear my voice." (Psalms 55:17.) Daniel prayed. "And he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God." (Daniel 6:10.) Isaiah prayed. "But they that wait for Jehovah shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; they shall walk, and not faint'." (Isaiah 40:31.)

Coming into the New Testament, we find that all the servants of God who are mentioned in that book were men of prayer. Our Lord Jesus Christ, notwithstanding the fact that he was sinless and divine and that he had the Spirit without measure, prayed always. He prayed both publicly and privately. He prayed long and earnestly. He prayed all night. He persisted in prayer—prayed the same petition over repeatedly. He taught his disciples to pray, and assured them that the heavenly Father would hear and answer their prayers. He illustrated this point by appealing to earthly fathers: "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father who is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?"

He said that "men ought always to pray, and not to faint." He taught men to be importunate in prayer—to entreat—and to cry unto the Lord day and night. (Luke 18:1-8; Luke 11:8.) He said: "Every one that asketh receiveth." He taught his disciples to "watch and pray, lest ye enter into temptation." He thought that their prayers would in some way save them from temptation. He commanded them: "Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he send forth laborers into his harvest." (Matthew 9:38.) He thought their prayers would in some way increase the number of missionaries.

How can any man have any faith at all in Jesus Christ and not believe in prayer? To answer our own question, we must say that no one does. One may believe the truth about baptism and not believe in prayer, but one cannot believe in Jesus Christ and not believe in prayer. And it makes no difference how much truth a man believes, he cannot be saved unless he believes in the Author of truth.

Continuing our survey of the history of God's servants, we find that the church was born in a prayer meeting. "And when they were come in, they went up into the upper chamber, where they were abiding; both Peter and John and James and Andrew, Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon the Zealot, and Judas the son of James. These all with one accord continued stedfastly in prayer, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren." And after it was filled with the Holy Spirit and thousands of converts had been made, we read that these newly made disciples "continued stedfastly in . . . the prayers." (Acts 2:42.) We should notice that they did not merely continue in prayer, but that they continued steadfastly in "the prayers," according to the Revised Version. "The prayers" meant the united prayers, the prayers of the disciples, hence the prayer meetings. They met together for prayers.

Peter. Peter was a man of prayer, and we find him going into the temple at the hour of prayer. He taught Christians that the Lord's ears are open unto their prayers (1 Peter 3:12), and he exhorted them to live in such a way that their prayers would not be hindered (1 Peter 3:7). He admonished them to "be sober unto prayer" (1 Peter 4:7), and told them that God would give grace unto the humble (1 Peter 5:5).

Paul. No man in the whole New Testament, not excepting our Savior, ever said as much about prayer as did the apostle Paul, nor do we see any one personally practicing this teaching more consistently than did Paul. No other do we find as often in the act and attitude of prayer. And yet Paul was the most philosophical writer of all the inspired writers. He prayed for his disciples unceasingly and begged them to pray for him. In every Epistle that he wrote he told of his prayers for his friends, and enjoined upon those whom he addressed the duty and necessity of prayer, and requested them to pray for him. He desired that "the men pray in every place" (1 Timothy 2:8), and he exhorted them to pray for "all men" (1 Timothy 2:1). He thought the prayers of Christians for kings and rulers would help in governmental affairs and keep conditions favorable for Christian worship, living, and service. No inspired man ever intimated that a Christian might, by participating in political matters, bring about happy conditions, yet many good brethren think that is exactly the way to do it. But an inspired apostle emphatically taught that Christians can by their prayers achieve such conditions, and many good brethren act as if they do not believe a word of that. Paul thought that the prayers of Christians would deliver him out of the hands of unbelieving and wicked men. (Romans 15:30; 2 Thessalonians 3:2.) He believed their prayers would cause him to be released from prison. (Philemon 1:22.) He thought their prayers, though they were a thousand miles away, would have influence in causing the prejudiced Jewish brethren at Jerusalem to accept the money which he had collected among the Gentile Christians, and he entreated the brethren at Rome to strive with him in their prayers to God for him as he went to Jerusalem with this money. (Romans 15:30.) Paul prayed that wicked Israel might be saved. (Romans 10:1.) He thought that the prayers of God’s children would cause a door to be opened through which the gospel might enter. (Colossians 4:2-5.) He believed that because of and in answer to the prayers of Christians he would be given strength and courage and boldness in his preaching. (Ephesians 6:18-20.) Paul preached that God is living and present and powerful; that he sustains and strengthens and guides Christians, and also thwarts and overrules the antagonisms of evil men.

James. James was a man of prayer, and he comes nearer reasoning upon prayer and of trying to remove any doubts that Christians might have about prayer than any other writer of the New Testament. The others did not seem to recognize the fact that any such doubts could exist. James referred to Elijah and his prayers in urging disciples to pray, and he anticipated any suggestion that what was done in Elijah’s case was miraculous and answered it by saying that Elijah was "a man of like passions with us." He commanded the sick to pray and taught that others should pray for the sick. (A special article on this passage will be given in this series.) James taught that God would give a disciple wisdom in answer to prayer. (James 1:5-7.) He said that God’s children forfeited many blessings by not asking for them. (James 4:3.) He said that when they did pray their prayers were not answered, because they prayed amiss. He said: "The supplication of a righteous man availeth much." James taught that we should not plan to do anything or expect to receive anything, it matters not how much natural law is involved or how many human agencies are concerned, without recognizing that God is also involved and concerned, and that we might propose and God would dispose, and he therefore instructs us to say: "If the Lord will, we shall both live, and do this or thai." (James 4:15.) This same principle and spirit breathes through the whole New Testament.

John. John, "the apostle of love," was also an apostle of prayer. He taught Christians to confess their sins to God and to pray for forgiveness. (1 John 1:5-9.) He taught them to pray for a brother

who sins. (1 John 5:16.) He showed what would cause a man to be unbelieving and timid about prayer. Hear him: "Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, we have boldness toward God; and whatsoever we ask we receive of him, because we keep his commandments and do the things that are pleasing in his sight." (1 John 3:21-22.) He showed his own great faith and boldness in prayer in this language: "And this is the boldness which we have toward him, that, if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us: and if we know that he heareth us whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions which we have asked of him." (1 John 5:14-15.)

Finally, we see through the visions of the apocalypse the elders and beings of the celestial world falling down before our God and shouting praises to his name, saying: "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God, the Almighty." (Revelation 4:8.) And we hear the souls of the beheaded saints pleading in prayer. (Revelation 6:9.) And the inspired volume closes with the fervent prayer of an inspired man: "Amen: come, Lord Jesus." In view of all this teaching, what shall we say of a man who claims to "speak where the Bible speaks" and to "be silent where the Bible is silent," or who has the audacity to profess to have any regard for the Bible, or to contend for any doctrine, point, or principle taught in the Bible, but who does not believe in prayer, does not pray personally about all his affairs in health and in sickness, does not join with other Christians in prayer and in prayer meetings at every opportunity; who sneers at praying for temporal blessings, at praying for the sick, at praying for the preacher, for the church, for the missionaries, etc.? What shall we say of such a man? We should say that he has no more chance of going to heaven than the rankest atheist in Russia, and that he is a greater hindrance to Christianity than any unbeliever outside of the church in the whole world.

Chapter 26

00B.11 Chapter 4--Men Ought Always To Pray--No. 2

IV. "Men Ought Always to Pray"

No. 2

Last week this answer to Brother Buchanan's first question was given: "Yes, the Scriptures do teach that we receive temporal blessings in answer to prayer and because of a righteous life." This week this point is to be discussed more fully. The following thoughts from Brother J. W. McGarvey's excellent sermon on prayer will help us to answer many of the questions that arise when this subject is under study:

I think that there is no subject of revelation on which there is more skepticism than on that of prayer. This skepticism is not due to little being said on the subject in the Bible; neither does it arise from any ambiguity in the Scripture statements. You will all bear witness, if you read the Bible much, that there is no duty or privilege more frequently emphasized in the Bible than this; and that no assurance is more solemnly given than that God is a prayer-hearing God, answering the prayers of his people. This skepticism grows out of our own shortsightedness. We look around and think of the laws of nature, and remember that God does not work miracles in this day, and we do not see how he can alter things to suit our wishes and petitions. We are told that he is an unchanging God; how can he then answer prayer? Thus we set limits to God's ability to act without doing miracles. God can bring about certain things by miracles, and it seems but reasonable to suppose that he can do some things without a miracle. . . .

Now, if James tells the truth, "the supplication of a righteous man" avails much. What he says is that it "avails much." He does not say that it avails to the full extent that the petitioner wishes it to avail; he does not affirm that it will always accomplish precisely what is asked for by the petitioner, but he affirms that it "avails much." It may be in this way, it may be in that way; but in some way it avails much. . . . When the apostle had laid down this great rule, had stated that the prayer of a good man avails much, he brought up as proof an instance in which it struck the mark in the very center. . . . He says: "Elijah was a man of like passions with us" (being a prophet did not lift him above being a man, a man of passions just like ours, though, of course, his passions were held in restraint), "and he prayed fervently that it might not rain" (there are a great many prayers of that kind among the farmers in our own day). "And it rained not on the earth for three years and six months. And he prayed again; and the heaven gave rain, and the earth brought forth her fruit."

Brother McGarvey then shows that this was Elijah's plan to bring the people back to God. He tells the whole story, which he concludes in these words:

How did the rain come? If it had come without the cloud, that would have been a miracle. If it had come from over the desert, that would have been a miracle. How did it come? The clouds came up from the sea, as every rain cloud does. The wind blew it eastward, and when it came in contact with the cooler volumes of air, its vapor was condensed, and the rain fell. It came just as any other rain comes.

1. An Inspired Man Cites Elijah’s Prayer as an Example for Us. James tells us that Elijah was a man of like passions with us. This means that he in his prayer worked no miracle, exercised no supernatural power, or did anything else that any other faithful, humble servant of God might not do. If he did, then his example could not be followed by us, and the inspired James made a mistake in using it as an illustration of what we may accomplish by prayer. If we accept his example as applicable to us, we are forced to conclude that weather conditions may, at least at times—when it is the Lord’s will—be affected by the prayers of God’s children, and that temporal and national affairs may be changed by prayer. Of course, we know that it would never do for such things to be left entirely, absolutely, and unconditionally at the discretion of shortsighted and capricious human beings, however humble and devoted they may be and however honest and worthy their intentions may always be. The whole human family would object at once to having such power put into the hands of any man or any group of men on earth. Therefore, God must necessarily overrule and control in all these things and answer the prayers of his children when and in the way that is wisest and best, all the beings and all the forces involved being considered. Therefore, all true Christians will always qualify every prayer with the expression, "Thy will, not mine, be done."

2. Elijah’s Prayer Was i n Harmony with the Written Will of God. As Elijah was a submissive and humble, as well as a courageous, servant of God, of course he said in his prayer, in attitude if not in words, "Thy will be done in this matter," or, "If it please thee, let this come to pass," etc. If there had been anything in God’s law or his revealed will that forbade or inhibited such a prayer, Elijah would not have offered that prayer. If Elijah knew his own Scriptures, he knew that this was in harmony with the Lord’s threaten- ings and promises. Through Moses, God had said to Israel: But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of Jehovah thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day, that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee. Cursed shalt thou be in the city, and cursed shalt thou be in the field. Cursed shall be thy basket and thy kneading-trough. Cursed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy ground, the increase of thy cattle, and the young of thy flock. Cursed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and cursed shalt thou be when thou goest out.

Jehovah will send upon thee cursing, discomfiture, and rebuke, in all that thou puttest thy hand unto to do, until thou be destroyed, and until thou perish quickly; because of the evil of thy doings, whereby thou hast forsaken me. Jehovah will make the pestilence cleave unto thee, until he have consumed thee from off the land, whither thou goest in to possess it. Jehovah will smite thee with consumption, and with fever, and with inflammation, and with fiery heat, and with the sword, and with blasting, and with mildew; and they shall pursue thee until thou perish. And thy heaven that is over thy head shall be brass, and the earth that is under thee shall be iron. Jehovah will make the rain of thy land powder and dust: from heaven shall it come down upon thee, until thou be destroyed. (Deuteronomy 28:15-24.) In harmony with this, Elijah could easily pray for the drought to come upon his wicked generation. In the same chapter God had promised to bless their land and prosper them when they were faithful and obedient. In many places he had said he would remove the curse when they repented. Therefore, Elijah could pray for rain after the people repented of their idolatry at Carmel. Read this: When heaven is shut up, and there is no rain, because they have sinned against thee; if they pray toward this place, and confess thy name, and turn from their sin, when thou dost afflict them: then hear thou in heaven, and forgive the sin of thy

servants, and of thy people Israel, when thou teachest them the good way wherein they should walk; and send rain upon thy land, which thou hast given to thy people for an inheritance. (1 Kings 8:35-36.)

Read this also:

If I shut up the heavens so that there is no rain, or if I command the locust to devour the land, or if I send pestilence among my people; if my people, who are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land. Now mine eyes shall be open, and mine ears attend unto the prayer that is made in this place. (2 Chronicles 7:13-15.)

There are many other places in the Old Testament where God promised health, prosperity, and all temporal blessings to those who faithfully serve him. David declared that the man who delights in the law of the Lord shall be blessed and that "whatsoever he doeth shall prosper." (Psalms 1:1-3.)

Through Isaiah, God says that those who do not recognize the fact that their food and all their temporal blessings come from him do not show as much sense as the ox and the ass. "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master’s crib; but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider." (Isaiah 1:3.) God taught his people to cast all of their cares upon him and he would care for them. (Psalms 55:22; 1 Peter 5:7.) He also said: "The angel of Jehovah encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them." (Psalms 34:7.) And again: "For he will give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone." (Psalms 91:11-12.)

Nearly all of these promises apply to us in this age. Even if some of the threatenings and promises made to ancient Israel do not apply directly to us, the principle still obtains. Since Elijah’s example is set before us as an illustration and we are urged to follow it, we know that the laws under which he prayed must in some way apply to us.

3. The New Testament Promises Temporal Blessings to Those Who in Implicit Faith Serve the Lord. No man who is acquainted with the Sermon on the Mount can doubt that our Savior taught us to trust God and to look to him for all temporal blessings and creature comforts. How could any poor doubting and quibbling soul imagine that the promises of the Old Testament are too temporal, too full, too tender, too personal and direct to apply to us, or that Paul’s language in Philippians, chapter four, verso six. belongs to a miraculous age, with the sixth chapter of Matthew open before him? Tho trouble is not in God’s promises; it is in our faith. We cannot fail to understand what our Lord says. His language is even plainer than the great commission or than Acts 2:38, but many of us who would fight the whole world on those passages d o not even believe wha t Christ says i n Matthew six. 11 is no wonder at all that we do not convince anybody on the passages we contend for. Read carefully what our Savior says:

Therefore I say unto you. Re not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat. or what ye shall drink: nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than the food, and the body than the raiment? Behold the birds of the heaven, that they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; and your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not ye of much more value than they? And which of you by being anxious can add one cubit unto the measure of his life? And why are ye anxious concerning raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow: they toil not, neither do

they spin: yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. But if God doth so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith? Be not therefore anxious, saying. What shall we eat? or. What shall we drink? or. Wherewithal shall we be clothed? For after all these things do the Gentiles seek: for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first his kingdom, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you. (Matthew 6:25-33.) Then consider this promise:

Peter began to say unto him, Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee. Jesus said. Verily I say unto you. There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or mother, or father, or children, or lands, for my sake, and for the gospel's sake, but he shall receive a hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come eternal life. But many that are first shall be last; and the last first. The apostles taught the same dependence upon and trust in God that our Savior inculcated. They also assure us that God's blessings will be measured to us according to our service and according to our attitude toward God. When Paul instructed Christians to lay by in store upon the first day of the week "as God hath prospered" them, he clearly implied that whatever degree of prosperity they had enjoyed had come fro m God. It mattered not how hard they had labored to obtain their money, nor through what natural processes it had come into their possession, it nevertheless had come to them through God's mercies and providences. That is true with us today. Let us not forget that fact, brethren.

Paul plainly tells us that God is able to make all grace abound unto us so that we may have such a sufficiency as to be able to abound in every good work. He declares that God will supply us seed for sowing and increase our fruit. And God will measure these blessings to us according to our service—according to what we give into the Lord's service. Study these verses: But this I say. He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully. Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver. And God is able to make all grace abound toward you: that ye, always having all sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work: (as it is written. He hath dispersed abroad; he hath given to the poor: his righteousness remaineth for ever. Now he that ministereth seed to the sower both minister bread for your food, and multiply your seed sown, and increase the fruits of your righteousness;) being enriched in every thing to all bountifulness, which causeth through us thanksgiving to God. (2 Corinthians 9:6-11.) The apostle James says: But he that looketh into the perfect law, the law of liberty, and so continueth. being not a hearer that forgetteth but a doer that worketh, this man shall be blessed in his doing. (James 1:25.)

"This man shall be blessed in his doing," or, according to the psalmist, "whatsoever he doeth shall prosper." When the Lord has so repeatedly promised to give temporal blessings to those who love him and obey his word, we certainly can pray in full assurance for these blessings if our lives are in harmony with his word. "Ye have not, because ye ask not." Thai James here meant temporal, material things is made certain by his statement that when they did ask they received not, because they wanted the thing asked for to consume or spend upon their own lusts: (James 4:2-3.) This passage implies that even though we are living the Christian life, we may not receive certain blessings if we do not ask for them. "O ye of little faith!" "Lord, . . . help thou mine unbelief."

00B.12 Chapter 5--Men Ought Always To Pray--No. 3

V. "Men Ought Always to Pray”

No. 3

1. "Does it do any good to pray for the recovery of the sick today?" If there were no example and no admonition in the Scriptures of praying for the sick, the general teaching of the Scriptures on prayer is sufficient authority for praying for them. Since "men ought always to pray"; since we are admonished to "pray without ceasing"; since we are told to cast all our care upon the Lord; since it is in God that "we live, and move, and have our being"; since we are taught. "In nothing be anxious; but in everything b y prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God"; and since we are admonished to be "praying at all seasons in the Spirit, and watching thereunto in all perseverance," of course we will pray for the sick always. To refuse or to fail to do so is to disregard the word of the Lord, to manifest a woeful want of faith, and to rob ourselves and our friends of one of the sublimest and most precious privileges vouchsafed unto the children of God. We should pray for the recovery of the sick if that be the Lord’s will. Of course, every patient that we pray for will not recover. If that happens, then no praying Christian—and there is no other kind of Christian—or any of his friends would ever die. When it is, and when it is not, the Lord’s will for a sick person to recover, we cannot know until the sickness terminates one way or the other. Therefore, we should always pray for recovery, but with the understood and expressed attitude of submission to the will of the Lord. The age of the patient and the nature and state of the disease may give us some indication of what the will of the Lord is, since we do not expect a miracle; but these things do not always determine the matter. To rely wholly upon these conditions would be to rule God out of the equation entirely and to look only to natural conditions, laws, and forces. Not only that, but it would be to decide by what wo know and see of natural laws, with no allowance for elements and contingencies that are unknown to us. All Christians who have had any extended experience in such things have seen patients recover when the prognosis held no hope; when the physicians and all those who judged by natural laws and forces thought there was no chance for recovery. These cases occur so frequently that it is an established rule of ethics with the medical profession to keep a patient alive as long as possible; for "where there is life, there is hope." Physicians often keep patients alive by various methods when even praying Christians feel that it would be better to let them go. The cases of recovery just mentioned are not cited as instances of "divine healing" in the sense of miraculous cures. Such cases and the practice of medical men in continuing their efforts to the end are here used to show that we should not judge too quickly by appearances and give up hope and cease praying because conditions seem to indicate that it would take a miracle to effect a cure. Medical men—men of science—admit that they cannot say definitely and absolutely that there is no hope till the end comes. Then why should Christians reason upon a basis of natural science and conclude that there is no room for supernatural or providential aid to the natural chances which physicians admit may exist? If we hope for or would like to see the sick person recover, then that is unquestionably the desire or prayer that we should express to Jehovah. That i s our sincere feeling.But all sensible

men will admit that the absolute decision of such cases cannot be placed in the hands of frail and fallible men.

2. There is a difference in "divine healing" as those terms are now used and in praying for the sick and expecting their recovery in answer to prayer. "Divine healing," in the general acceptation of those terms, means miraculous healing, instantaneous cures without medical aid or any other natural curative element. Such miracles were done by Christ and the apostles. In those cases often no special prayer was offered and no natural agencies or means were used. They simply spoke the word and the afflicted ones were healed. Sometimes they did touch them with their hands, as when Christ opened the eyes of the two blind men (Matthew 20:29-34), or as when Peter lifted up the lame man (Acts 3:1-26); and sometimes they anointed with oil (Mark 6:13). But in many cases even this was not done. There was no laying on of hands, no special praying, no anointing with oil, and no resorting to curative agencies in these miraculous healings. But in praying for the recovery of the sick, as in praying for anything else, we must comply with all the known laws of Jehovah, whether those laws be revealed in nature or in the Bible or in both. The answer may come after long delay, come gradually through one means or another, or it may come speedily and without our being able to determine through just what particular means or process it arrived. Perhaps many things were used by providence. Then, again, the answer in the sense of the thing prayed for may not come at all. The Lord in his wisdom and goodness must decide, and we will always submit and be resigned.

3. There are examples in the Scriptures where the sick recovered in answer to prayer, and there are also examples of the servants of God praying for the sick when they did not recover. Hezekiah was "sick unto death." He had a fatal trouble, and the Lord had declared that he would die. There seemed to be no chance lor him; but old Hezekiah did not want to die, and he set up an awful wailing and contended with the Lord and begged to live. He turned his face to the wall and wept sore. So great was his bitterness and distress that he afterwards composed a song about it. He says he thought or reckoned about it all through the night. He roared like a lion and chattered like a crane or a swallow in distress. He said: "I shall go softly all my years in the bitterness of my soul." Or differently translated: "Through the rest of my years will I reflect on this bitterness of my soul." Or another rendering: "Through all my years I shall walk as in solemn procession because of this bitterness of my soul." (See Isaiah 38:1-20.)

Now, all this earnest praying was not in vain. Jehovah heard his prayer and raised him up and prolonged his life fifteen years. That this was because of and in answer to his prayer cannot be doubted, for God said to him through Isaiah: "I have heard thy prayer, I have seen thy tears: behold, I will add unto thy days fifteen years." This, then, was a recovery from a fatal sickness in answer to prayer. Yet natural means were used. The prophet directed that a plaster of figs be placed on the boil, "and he shall recover." (Isaiah 38:21.) In the New Testament we have an example of prayer availing for a sick man, although the story is not told in detail. Epaphroditus had gone from Philippi to Rome to carry a contribution which the church at Philippi was sending to Paul. While he was far away from home, at Rome, he became seriously ill. Paul says, "He was sick nigh unto death." Although Paul was there and could work miracles, he did not seem to use his power at this time, for knowledge of it got back to Philippi; and this troubled Epaphroditus, because he knew it caused great solicitude among the brethren at home. This sickness caused sorrow in the heart of Paul, too. Did the brethren at Philippi pray for his recovery? Of course they

did, for they were instructed "in everything by prayer and supplication" to make their wishes or requests known unto God. Did Paul pray for his recovery? We know he did, for he prayed "at all seasons" and for "all men" and made "all prayers for all saints" and entreated God in behalf of the "bodies," "souls," and "spirits" of his friends and converts. Furthermore, his language concerning Epaphroditus shows that he looked to God for his recovery and then attributed the recovery to Jehovah's mercy. "Indeed he was sick nigh unto death: but God had mercy on him; and not on him only, but on me also, that I might not have sorrow upon sorrow." Jehovah had mercy upon these his faithful servants and regarded the sorrows of their hearts, heard their cries, and restored the sick man to health and spared the apostle a great sorrow. There was no miracle here, but great yearning of Christian hearts; and as a result of that yearning and to spare those hearts further sorrow, Jehovah showed mercy and healed the sick man. Did prayer or the condition of a saint's heart "do any good" in that case? When the psalmist was sick, he prayed to be spared and to recover strength. Hear him: "Hear my prayer, O Jehovah, and give ear unto my cry; hold not thy peace at my tears: for I am a stranger with thee, a sojourner, as all my fathers were. Oh spare me, that I may recover strength, before I go hence, and be no more." (Psalms 39:12-13.)

4. But we find cases in both the Old and New Testaments where the sick did not recover, even though prayers were offered i n their behalf. David's child was sick, and David fasted and prayed and prostrated himself upon the earth in his earnest entreaties in behalf of the child. The child died. It was not the Lord's will for it to live. David was resigned to the Lord's will and did not mourn for the child. (See 2 Samuel 12:15-24.)

Trophimus was a Gentile convert whom Paul brought to the Lord at Ephesus. He became one of Paul's companions in his missionary travels. He was with Paul at Jerusalem and was the Gentile whom the Jews accused Paul of bringing into the temple and thus profaning the temple. After Paul's release from prison and before his second imprisonment, Paul and Trophimus had been traveling together again. When they reached Miletus, Trophimus became sick, too sick to go on with Paul, and, therefore, Paul left him. Did Paul pray for him? It is useless to ask that question after we have learned of Paul's teaching and practice in reference to prayer. Did the Lord answer this prayer? Perhaps he did, but he did not restore Trophimus immediately. Paul left him sick. The question may be asked, Why did Paul not use his miraculous power here? For some reason it was not God's will for him so to use it any more than it was to use such power to prevent his own death, or than it was for Christ to save himself from the cross.

Paul himself had an infirmity which he did not heal. It is supposed by some Bible scholars that what Paul speaks of as a thorn in the flesh was his infirmity. If that be true, then Paul prayed that this infirmity might be healed or removed, but it was not removed. (2 Corinthians 12:7-10.) Timothy also had "often infirmities," and lie was not miraculously healed. Paul instructed him to use natural means which he at least thought would be beneficial. (1 Timothy 5:23.)

We have, therefore, found that there is an abundance of authority for praying for the recovery of the sick, and at the same time accompanying our prayers with whatever natural means are available. But we must know that even then the sick will not always recover, for it is "appointed unto men once to die."

There is yet an important passage of Scripture that we have not considered, and that is James 5:1-20. That passage calls for a special article next week.

00B.13 Chapter 6--Men Ought Always To Pray--No. 4

VI. "Men Ought Always to Pray"

No. 4 "Does it do any good to pray for the recovery of the sick today?"

James said: "Is any among you afflicted? let him pray." If an afflicted man prays at all, of course he will pray for relief from his affliction. And since the apostle commanded the afflicted man to pray, he must have thought that such a prayer would "do some good." (James 5:13.) Whatever the calling for the elders and the anointing with oil mentioned in verse 14 may mean, it must not be understood to nullify the admonition to the afflicted man to pray. Neither can it make void the exhortation of verse 16: "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed." And the emphatic statement which the apostle made to encourage such praying must not be rendered meaningless by an explanation of verses 14 and 15. He said: "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." Then James further encourages and exhorts Christians to pray by referring to Elijah and his prayers. Unquestionably, then, the apostle James teaches us to pray. He teaches a sick man to pray. He teaches a mutual confessing of faults and a mutual praying one for another among disciples, that they "may be healed." These points in James 5:1-20 are plain. Any difficulties that may be encountered in James 5:14-15 should not be allowed to obscure these plain admonitions, and they should not dull our appreciation of the general teaching of this chapter upon the subject of prayer. But shall we examine those much-discussed verses? They read: "Is any among you sick? let him call for the elders of the church: and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up: and if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him."

Two views on these verses are held by Bible scholars. One is that this was miraculous healing by elders who had the gifts of healing or of miracles, which gifts we know were distributed among members of the church in the first century. (1 Corinthians 12:1-31) The other view is that this was prayer by Christians, who had no special gifts or miraculous powers, for the recovery of the sick through natural means, aided or used by providence, and that the oil was used as a medicinal means or a curative agent.

If the first view is correct, then these verses do not apply to us in this age at all. We have no spiritual gifts now. These were done away as Paul said they would be. (1 Corinthians 13:8; Ephesians 4:11-14.) Church history shows that these gifts did not extend even into the second century.

If the second view is correct, these verses do apply to us, and we should practice what they teach. Of course, we would not have to use oil, but we would avail ourselves of whatever curative means are now used, and the principle would be the same. We have found from other passages that this should be our practice, whether these verses apply to us or not. It matters little, then, as to how we take these troublesome verses; for, if they do not apply to us, we cannot disobey their teaching;

and if they do apply to us, we are practicing what they teach already when we obey the general teaching of the Bible on prayer. But if we desire to make an analytical study of the verses, let us observe the following points in favor of the second view—that this was not miraculous healing:

James was known to be strict and regular in his observance of Jewish customs. (Acts 15:1-41; Acts 21:18; Galatians 2:12.)

He addresses this Epistle to "the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad"; but of course he meant Christian Jews, since he signs his name as a servant of "the Lord Jesus Christ." These disciples would know the customs of the Jews.

It was a well-known custom among the Jews to call in the religious leaders or rabbis to pray when there was sickness in the family. (Sec Clarke's Commentaries.)

Oil was used for many purposes by the Jews. In travel or on journeys they carried oil with them. (See the case of the good Samaritan.) We read of "the anointing oil" dozens of times in the Old Testament. The Jews anointed their bodies with oil for comfort and for cleanliness.

They anointed the head with oil as a signal of honor. Thus Samuel anointed Saul and David. In the Twenty- Third Psalm, David said, "Thou anointest my head with oil," referring to the blessings and honors Jehovah bestows upon his child. Referring to the exaltation of Christ, the psalmist said: "Therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." They also anointed the head as a social custom and as an act of hospitality. "My head with oil thou didst not anoint." (Luke 7:46.)

They used oil to relieve suffering and to heal wounds. The good Samaritan bound up the afflicted man's wounds, "pouring on them oil and wine." (Luke 10:34.) The people of that age knew nothing of germs and the infections they cause, but they knew the experience of such suffering just the same as we do, and they had possibly learned that wine would sometimes prevent this suffering. It would sterilize and disinfect the wounds. The oil would soothe and comfort and perhaps heal wounds. Therefore, it was used as a medicine. Speaking of the afflictions of his people, Isaiah said: "From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and fresh stripes: they have not been dosed, neither bound up, neither mollified with oil." This proves that in treating wounds they used oil.

If James had here referred to miraculous healing, he would not have instructed them to use their common remedies or any natural means, as a miracle is independent of and excludes these things. The conclusion is, therefore, that James taught Jewish Christians to follow their old custom, except, instead of calling in the rabbis they should call for the elders of the church, and they would minister to the sick person and pray for him. On the other hand, the following points are made to prove that the verses allude to miraculous healings:

Such gifts of healing were distributed among the leaders in the church in that age. (1 Corinthians 12:1-31)

Oil was sometimes used even in performing miraculous cures. (Mark 6:13.)

The "afflicted" man (A. V.), or "suffering" man (R. V.), was instructed to pray. (Verse 13.) But the "sick" man should call for the elders. Two different kinds or degrees of afflictions must be

contemplated here.

All Christians should pray one for another that they "may be healed" in ordinary sickness (verse 16), such Christians not having the power to work miracles.

But in dangerous sickness, fatal sickness, somebody with more power than ordinary Christians possess must be depended upon. Therefore the elders — those who had spiritual gifts—should be called in.

Now, which view is correct? We cannot say. But we have already found that it does not matter which view we take if we obey the plain teaching of other passages of Scripture.

Personally, I am inclined to the view that this was nonmiraculous healing; that it was prayer for the sick, such prayers being accompanied by such natural means and curative agents as they had. In the years gone by the editors of the Gospel Advocate answered questions upon this passage many times. On page 143 of "Queries and Answers," Brother David Lipscomb said:

I have given my opinion of James 5:14-15. I do not believe the healing was ever miraculous, or that all the sick on whom hands were laid recovered. If so, why should any ever have died? If men could all be healed now by laying on of hands of the elders and anointing with oil, who would die or remain sick? All would comply with the conditions and live. They were just as anxious to live and keep well in the days of the apostles as they are now. When one got sick, he would have sent for the elders and would be living now. The only way for people to get to heaven would be to be translated, as was Enoch; yet we find persons sickening and dying with the elders and the apostles with them. (Php 2:26; 2 Timothy 4:20.) What is the meaning then? Anointing with oil was the common curative agent of that period and time. The plan was while using this to connect with it the prayers of the elders. They represented the church, and through them the church prayed for the sick. In the use of these means, combining 1he prayers of Christians with remedial agencies, all who could be cured would be. I think it certain that there was no miraculous healing then and has been none since.

"There is a place where thou canst touch the eyes Of blinded men to instant perfect sight;

There is a place where thou canst say, Arise!’ To dying captives, bound in chains of night;

There is a place where thou canst search the store Of hoarded gold and free it for the Lord;

There is a place—upon some distant shore— Where thou canst send the worker and the Word. Where is that blessed place? Dost thou ask, ’Where?’

O, soul, it is the blessed place of prayer!"

00B.14 Chapter 7--Men Ought Always To Pray-- No. 5

VII. "Men Ought Always to Pray"

No. 5 "Is there an added force or special power in united prayer?" The most natural conclusion that we can draw from the teaching of the Scriptures is that united prayers or the prayers of several earnest souls together have more efficacy than the prayer of a single individual. If the Bible teaches this, we must accept it as true, whether or not we can know why it is true. Let us, therefore, study:

1. The Teaching o f the Scripture o n Thin Question. In Matthew 18:19-20, our Savior says: "Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father who is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." This seems to teach that the fact that "two of you" are agreed in prayer will be a special guarantee that the prayer will be heard. However, the teaching of this entire paragraph is of the concerted action of the disciples—what they do as a body or a congregation. It relates to the decision of the church—the unanimous action of the body in a case of discipline. No doubt the principle applies in all decisions, and not only in disciplinary matters. "Verily I say unto you, What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." The emphasis is, therefore, on the word "agree" in our Lord’s promise that what they ask shall be granted. The disciples are here thought of as "gathered together" in Christ’s name; acting together with one accord; praying together in "agreement." The word for "agree" in this passage is "sumphonesosin" in the Greek. It is a musical term, and from it we get the word "symphony." Jesus teaches that our hearts should sym- phonize in prayer. Our prayers should go up like a beautiful melody unto the throne of God. This will assure us that they will be heard. This language of our Lord might be understood, then, as teaching that when two or more pray together, they must agree and pray with one purpose; that there should be no factions and contradictory prayers among them. The thought that the prayer of two souls would be more efficacious than the prayer of one soul would not necessarily be implied in this passage if there were nothing else in the Bible bearing on this question. But this idea is implied in the teaching of the whole Bible. In the Old Testament when the people of God were in distress, the whole nation was called upon to fast and pray. When the nation was threatened with annihilation and Esther threw herself between her people and the death decree, she not only prayed herself, but had her maidens pray with her, and called upon all the Jews throughout the hundred twenty-seven provinces to join with her in prayer. When Daniel had persuaded the angry king to appoint him a time for the interpretation of the king’s dream, and when the time was set, Daniel began to pray that the Lord would enable him to reveal this secret. But he did not depend upon his own prayers alone. He asked his three companions to unite with him in this earnest praying. In the New Testament, Christians are taught both by precept and example to pray together. United prayers and intercessory prayers are repeatedly enjoined. Christ prayed for Peter, that his faith might not fail. (See Luke 22:31-32.) He prayed for all his disciples, that "they may be one." (See John 17:11.) He taught them to pray for one another, and even to

pray for their enemies; and, as we have seen, to pray together in agreement.

Paul called upon his converts to join him in prayer for certain specified things. He was praying night and day for these ends that he desired to accomplish, but he must have thought that the prayers of others would add force to his petitions. If their prayers did not help his, why would he request their prayers? In fact, Paul uses the expression, "Ye also helping together by prayer." (2 Corinthians 1:11.) He praised God for delivering him from death, but he said that Christians had "helped" in this deliverance by their prayers. Peter also was once sentenced to die. "But prayer was made earnestly of the church unto God for him" (Acts 12:5), and he was delivered. When Paul was so weighed down with forebodings and anxiety that he was "striving" with God in prayer, he solemnly entreated his friends to "strive" with him: "Now I beseech you, brethren, by our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me; that I may be delivered from them that are disobedient in Judea, and that my ministration which I have for Jerusalem may be acceptable to the saints; that I may come unto you in joy through the will of God, and together with you find rest." (Romans 15:30-32.) Surely we are justified by these passages in drawing the conclusion that united prayers are especially efficacious; that we can "help" one another in our prayers.

2. "Things Hard to Be Understood." We are all ready to ask, why is it that God is more easily persuaded by two persons than by one? Since God has promised to hear and answer the prayer of his humblest child, since the "supplication of a righteous man availeth much," why does such a prayer need to be augmented by the pleadings of other righteous men? Is prayer to God, like a petition to an earthly ruler, made stronger by the number of names signed to the petition? These are hard questions, but they are no more difficult for us to answer than many other questions that arise in our minds when we study the subject of prayer. God loves men better than I can love them; then why should I have to beg him to bless those whom he loves? Why should I, a sinful man, be found beseeching the infinitely good and holy God to work some good in the world? For what else does he sit upon the throne of the universe? Is he not much more concerned about the welfare of all his work than I can possibly be? Does he need my feeble prayer to remind him of some duty he has neglected, or of some sufferer he has overlooked, or of some obligation he has failed to fulfill? Is he not infinitely more interested in the salvation of men than I am, and has he not given his own Son to die for their redemption? Has he not sent his agents to the ends of the earth? Then, why should I pray him to "send forth laborers into his harvest?" Is God stubborn and implacable, that I should have to "strive" and plead and importune him in order to get him willing to do a good deed? Do we need to unite and organize and besiege God en masse in order to get his attention?

These questions are distracting and enervating to the spirit of prayer, and from one point of view they are dishonoring to God. But despite that fact we are nevertheless taught to do the very things that these questions inquire about. What is the explanation?

3. Suggested Answers to These Hard Questions. One solution to the whole problem is suggested by those who say that prayer does not move the will of God at all; that it is solely subjective; that it has only a reflex influence; that all altruistic prayers cultivate a spirit of altruism, and that is why we are enjoined to pray for others. That earnest, sincere prayers do have a reflex influence upon the one who prays is no doubt true. But when a man comes to believe that his prayer never reaches

God and that it can have no influence upon anyone except those who participate in it, he will no longer pray in an earnest and sincere manner. That which incited him to pray is gone. He will not pour out his soul unto God when he knows God is not hearing and that his prayer is wholly ineffectual, except as a means of working himself into a certain psychological state; and as such a means it is futile as soon as he realizes that he must arouse his soul to desire, long lor, and plead for the attention of a deaf God. In order for a man to pray in a way to bring about beneficial reactions in his own life, he must be deceived into believing that he is reaching divine favor. This would be to impute dishonesty to God. It is to attribute to God an uncandid makeshift. It is to say that in teaching us to pray to him and in promising to hear us and to give unto us the things that we ask for, God has deliberately deceived us by a monstrous falsehood. This explanation of prayer, therefore, becomes ultimately impossible. When God calls upon us to pray that some good may come into the world, we must seriously believe that our prayer is in some way capable of bringing in that good, otherwise we shall not pray.

4. The Working of Prayer. There is an expression in the Epistle of James that may give us an idea about prayer that will help to answer some of the perplexing questions that have been propounded. James says: "The supplication of a righteous man availeth much in its working." (James 5:16.) The word "effectual," in the King James Version, has been replaced by the three words, "in its working," by the Revised Version. Anyone who will think for a moment will sec that "effectual" only restates what is already expressed by the word "availeth." If a prayer is "effectual," of course it "avails"; and if it "avails," of course it is "effectual." Moreover, the Greek participle, which is translated "in its working," expresses lively and aggressive action. There is the idea of active energy in it. James conceived prayer as a force at work. It is a psychical force, a soul force, but a real and powerful force. It is unseen, like ether waves or like electricity, but it may be more powerful than either. Under this idea we can see that prayer is not intended to move the will of God, but that it puts at the disposal of God a force which he uses to move the wills of men. Thus, when we pray, we become "labourers together with God" as much as when we preach or do good deeds. In physical science there is a law known as the conservation of energy. No force is ever lost. No mite of energy is ever wasted in the divine frugality of the physical world. As energy exhausts itself it creates new energy. The consumption of energy is the creation of energy. Work is always a sort of combustion, the eating up of fuel. May there not be some similar law to this in the spiritual world? May not spiritual force be produced by the wear which liberates power? Is not prayer the expending of spiritual energy? Is it not a sort of combustion of the soul? Is not the soul of a man in the act of passionate willing a living dynamo? Does not the soul afterwards feel the weary reactions of toil? Any man who has longed mightily for something knows that "virtue" has gone out of him because of this yearning. Shall we say, then, that the God who in nature gathers all the fragments of dynamics and allows nothing to go to waste will not gather in and use the spiritual dynamics that are created by the exercise of the yearning souls of his children?

If this is what the working of prayer means, if this is the kind of force that prayer is, we can see that the law of the conservation of spiritual forces would attend to the utilizing of every sigh for the spread of righteousness or for the relief and salvation of men. it would see to the enfranchisement of every noble hope and aspiration that swells the human heart and consumes it. We can see, also, why the greater the number of souls that are being burned up by a given desire, the greater would be the energy created. Again, if this be a correct explanation of the force of prayer, we can

understand why we have to "strive" in prayer and why we are taught to entreat God and to persist in prayer. The more we strive, the more of our souls we burn up; to keep up the figure, the more energy we create. We see at once, also, why a heartless, insincere, formal prayer would be worthless. A prayer that would avail would necessarily be a prayer that consumed the soul. Mere words and phrases would be ineffectual. Beautiful sentences and eloquent periods and perorations would be hollow mockery; and our Lord has taught us that such prayers are vain, whether our explanation of the working of prayer is correct or not.

There is no virtue in vehemence, and boisterousness will not render a prayer efficacious; but earnestness, soul ache, and soul agony will. "A broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." Therefore, let us get together and pray. Let us unite our hearts in a consuming purpose. Let us stretch the sinews of our souls in reaching out for the salvation of men. Let us pray.

PUBLIC PRAYERS

We have considered the phraseology of prayer, vain repetitions, and meaningless expressions in prayer. We may now say that public prayer is one of the most difficult functions that any leader in religious services has to perform. It is difficult to close the audience out of one’s consciousness and talk to Jehovah in sincerity and with concentrated thoughts. The human listeners are in the leader’s subconscious mind, if not in his conscious mind, and he words his prayer with a view to impressing them. Sometimes he preaches to them and argues some point of doctrine or advertises some special interest or condemns some prevalent practice. Of course it is plain to all who hear such a prayer that the leader is saying these things for the effect he thinks such a prayer will have upon the audience. The prayer, therefore, fails of its purpose. It defeats itself. It will even cripple the influence of the leader over the people whom he desires to teach. A man who will take that sort of an advantage of an audience or who is that anxious to stress his point will be regarded as an extremist or a crank.

Moreover, the people will not have any regard for his spirituality or professed love for God. They will conclude that he has more zeal for his doctrine or his hobby than he has reverence for Jehovah, since, while he is ostensibly addressing the infinite Father, he is in reality preaching to men. Men will judge a leader’s sincerity much more quickly by the way he talks to God than they will by the way he talks to them. But regardless of what men think of a prayer, what must Jehovah think of a man who talks to him with his lips, but regards men in his heart? Such a prayer is vain worship. A long verbal prayer giving information to the Deity is irreverent. A prayer that recites the news of the week, or that sings off a long catalogue of petitions for things that are not expected, and which, if granted, would produce astonishment, is blasphemous. It is to be hoped that the religious consciousness, the sense of reverence and true worship, in the churches may be so developed that such prayers will never be heard—that such leaders in prayer will not be countenanced.

Public prayers are scriptural, if they are not made for the purpose of being heard of men; yet it is doubtful that our Lord expected us so often to pray before an audience of nonpraying people. Preachers are called upon to pray on all occasions of public gatherings; to "open with prayer" all kinds of meetings. Not infrequently there are other things in these meetings opened with a corkscrew. It is a matter of serious doubt as to whether any of our prayers on such occasions are acceptable to God. In fact, do we really pray to God on such occasions?

What the Bible sets forth as public prayer is a band or group of worshipers praying together. All are praying, and if only one man is speaking audibly, he is leading the others and they will all say the "amen." We would as well do away with congregational singing as to lose sight of, and therefore do away with, congregational praying. The song leader would as well sing by himself as for the prayer leader to pray b y himself. And as it is incumbent upon the song leader to sing such songs as the congregation can sing, just so it is the duty of the prayer leader to utter such prayers as the members can join in. It should be a concerted prayer. It should express the special desire of the people on that special occasion and should not include every petition the leader can think of or that he ever heard expressed by other leaders on other occasions. The special purpose of the prayer should be announced before the people are called upon to engage in the prayer. Then the leader should lead the souls o fhis fellow worshipers right up to the throne of God—lead them to draw nigh unto God, that he may, according to his promise, draw nigh unto them, and that they may have the consciousness of his presence and be filled with reverence and awe. "Lord, teach us to pray." Lord, give us men who can lead thy saints in prayer! The prayer leader should be up in front of the audience and should speak loud enough for all to hear. Otherwise, how can he lead them? Or how can they say the "amen"? He would as well speak in an unknown tongue as to speak in tones so low that the congregation cannot hear. The leader should go upon the stand or into the pulpit and pray with his face toward the audience. If he kneels, he should stand upon his knees.

Often men who are back in the audience are called upon to lead in prayer, and sometimes they kneel or squat or "hunker" down between the pews and mumble and mutter. The only way the audience knows when they have quit is by the movements of those who are near enough to hear or by a loud "amen" from the preacher who is up in the stand. His "amen" was not a "Lord, grant it," but it was an announcement to the audience that the prayer was over. Even leaders who go up into the pulpit sometimes have little enough grace to turn their backs to the audience and squat before them in ugly posture, put their faces down in the pulpit chair, and mumble words. "These things ought not so to be."

But, someone suggests, the people should not look at the leader and think about his posture and looks. No, they should not. Neither should they look at the preacher or the song leader to admire or criticize his dress or manners or gestures, but they d o just the same; and the preachers and song leaders know this, and most of them endeavor not to be offensive in appearance. The prayer leader should act upon the same principle.

Public prayer is public worship, and all worship must take place in the heart. All outward signs and postures and movements and all audible tones are simply manifestations or expressions of the worship that i s taking place i n the souL If the worshipful emotions are not in the soul, then the outward gestures and genuflections are mere mockery.

Prayer is not primarily petition. To many the primary idea of prayer is simply the asking for something that we do not have; too often it is a kind of spiritual beggary or even worse. Prayer, in its essence, should be the soul’s realization of its vital relation to the universal indwelling Spirit; the consciousness of the nearness, the living presence, of the Father, who is the "life of our life." He is not a "God afar off," to whom the soul must call from a distant country.

Mrs. Browning said that in its deepest agony the soul’s only prayer is "O God!" because we want God himself rather than anything he can do for us. A young man has gone far from home and becomes ill. He longs for his mother—not for her services, that she may watch at his bedside night and day, but for her simple presence. So the strongest aspiration of the human soul is for a consciousness of the infinite Presence, for a realization of the Spirit, an awareness of that Being in whom "we live, and move, and have our being." The deepest and fullest prayer that any soul can ever pray is, "Thy will be done." This is no objective petition; it is entirely subjective. In this the soul seeks to submerge itself in the divine will; to become one with the great Jehovah. Aspiration can go no higher.

Let us pray.

00B.15 Chapter 8--Marriage and Divorce

Marriage and Divorce

(1) Questions About Divorce. (2) More About Divorce. (3) Shall We Make Exceptions to God's Law? (4) "Marriage and Divorce." (5) How Does God Join Man and Woman Together in Wedlock? (6) Were They Really Married? (7) Line Upon Line, Precept Upon Precept, Here a Little, There a Little. (8) The Divorce Problem. (9) God Hates Divorce. (10) Was What Jesus Taught on Divorce Bound by the Apostles? (11) Christ and Paul on Divorce. (12) Wife Bound; Brother or Sister Not Bound—Paul.

DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE The question of divorce will not down. It has not been long since a series of articles on this question was published in this paper. But now the request has come to this department for a full explanation of what constitutes scriptural divorce, and the question is raised about a second marriage while the first companion is yet living. The brother thinks that married persons may be separated, but he does not think either party can ever scripturally marry again while the other party to the contract lives.

Another reader has sent a tract on the subject of divorce and requested the editor to review it.

Before we enter into a study of this problem let us first observe that the word of God must not be entirely plain on this question, else why would there be so much difference of opinion even among those who know all that the Bible says? The question is debated even among Bible scholars. There is, therefore, room for doubt. The one and only infallibly safe course or conclusion, then, is one man for one woman and the two made into one or joined by Jehovah, never to be separated until death; or if separated, never marry another while the former partner lives. A careful study of all that the Bible says on this subject will lead us to sec just how much uncertainty there is about the ground for a divorce and second marriage. The following passages give us just about all the Bible teaches on this point: And Jehovah God said. It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a help meet for him. (Genesis 2:18.)

Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart. (Matthew 5:27-28.)

It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: but I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wile, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery. (Matthew 5:31-32.) The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a

writing of divorcement, and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery. (Matthew 19:3-9.) And there came unto him Pharisees, and asked him. Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? trying him. And he answered and said unto them. What did Moses command you? And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away. But Jesus said unto them. For your hardness of heart he wrote you this commandment. But from the beginning of the creation, Male and female made he them. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and the two shall become one flesh: so that they are no more two, but one flesh.

What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. And in the house the disciples asked him again of this matter. And he saith unto them. Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her: and if she herself shall put away her husband, and marry another, she committeth adultery. (Mark 10:2-12.)

Every one that putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth one that is put away from a husband committeth adultery. (Luke 16:18.) For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth: but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if. while her husband liveth, she be married to another man. she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. (Romans 7:2-3.) But unto the married I give charge, yea not I, but the Lord, That the wife depart not from her husband (but should she depart, let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband); and that the husband leave not his wife. (1 Corinthians 7:10-11.) A wife is bound for so long time as her husband liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is free to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord. (1 Corinthians 7:39.) From these quotations we see that it clearly was God’s purpose from the beginning for a man and a woman to be joined together for life. Nothing to put them asunder. But we are reminded that Jesus mentioned one exception. He intimated that if fornication is committed the guilty party may be divorced, or put away, and the innocent party may marry another and not be guilty of adultery. This certainly is implied in his language as given by Matthew. But Mark and Luke do not mention this exception. It is given twice in Matthew, but is never mentioned anywhere else. Paul did not seem to know that such an exception existed. He states emphatically that a woman is bound to her husband as long as he lives, and if she be married to another while he lives (regardless of what he has done), she is an adulteress. This is exactly what Paul says.

We are told, however, that Paul’s language must not be made to contradict our Savior’s statement and that his words are plain. Of course, it will be admitted that if our Lord stated anything one time in unmistakable terms, that is enough to settle the question for all time to come. If his language is not misunderstood, he teaches that fornication will dissolve the marriage vow and leave the innocent party free to marry again.

Now, what is fornication? On this point the tract mentioned above makes the following strong argument:

He told them further: "But I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery." Here we have fornication the only Bible exception and reason for putting away a companion and marrying another one while the first one still lives. The same exception as given in Matthew 5:32, "fornication," not "adultery." They are different words and have a different application.

Unmarried persons commit fornication, but only married persons can violate the marriage covenant and commit adultery. In this one, only, exception Jesus mentions, the wrong act is committed before the woman is ever married, hence called "fornication." If committed after marriage, while living with her first husband, he would have called it "adultery"; the same as he called it when she remarried and was living with her second husband. Furthermore, he would not have used these two different words, "fornication" and "adultery," in the same verse if they meant the same thing.

It is vital that we should search out the meaning of these two words, and not risk our inheritance on a possible wrong understanding of them. Webster gives the primary meaning of "fornication" as the act of an unmarried person, and "adultery" as the act of a married person. The Bible makes a distinction between "fornication" and "adultery."

Matthew 15:19 : "Out of the heart proceedeth adulteries, fornications," etc.

Galatians 5:19 : "The works of the flesh are adultery, fornication," etc.

Mark 7:21 : "From within proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications," etc.

1 Corinthians 7:2 : "To avoid fornication [not to avoid adultery], let every man have his own wife [get married]."

1 Corinthians 6:9-10 : "Neither fornicators nor adulterers shall inherit the kingdom of God." In John 8:41 the Pharisees told Jesus they were not born of fornication (out of wedlock), insinuating that he (Jesus) was. In Matthew 1:19 we find Joseph thought to put away the "Virgin Mary," thinking she was a fornicator. So we see a man may put away a woman when he finds out she was a fornicator, and not a virgin, when he married her. He finds an uncleanness in her. (Deuteronomy 24:1; also Deuteronomy 22:13-14; Deuteronomy 22:19.)

Marriage is a contract entered into by the man and the woman. The law of contracts requires that each should be qualified t o contract. The qualifications, essence of, and essential element in this case Jesus mentions is: that the woman should be a virgin (a chaste virgin, espoused to one husband—2 Corinthians 11:2), or a virtuous woman whose husband is dead. If she was a fornicator instead, she was guilty of "fraud" in contracting marriage, and this '"fraud'" annuls the marriage and sets it aside as being "illegal, unscriptural," and the man being an innocent party was free to marry another woman, as he had not i nfact been really married. Had the woman confessed her sin of fornication to her intended husband before the marriage took place, she would have been clear and the marriage binding. In Bible type or symbol, the bride becomes the bride of Christ by first confessing and forsaking sin. By making this distinction between "fornication and adultery," we are then enabled to see the harmony existing in the Scriptures on the subject of divorce, etc., and it clears up many Seeming contradictions, and makes plain the types and symbols used throughout the Bible.

According to this teaching, nothing that i s done after marriage will o r can break the vow. The author says that fornication is the act of an unmarried person. IS THIS CONCLUSION CORRECT? The teaching of this tract is much safer than the ordinary teaching on this question. In fact, no one will go wrong who follows this instruction, even if it is not technically correct.

It is true that fornication usually refers to unmarried persons and adultery to married people. The Scriptures do often mention the two words in close connection as indicating separate sins, and both are severely condemned. But it seems to be going too far to say that this distinction always exists and that the words are never used interchangeably. This would be to make an arbitrary rule that would apply to only a very few words in our language. Nearly all words are used in different senses. In the Greek the word for "fornication" is "porneia," and the Greek word for "adultery" is "moicheia." They are defined in about the same language. The lexicons do not seem to make the radical distinction between these Greek words that Webster makes between the English words. Furthermore, the distinction does not seem always to be recognized by the inspired writers. In Hosea (Hosea 2:2), we read that this prophet’s wife, the mother of his children (a married woman, of course), was guilty of whoredom. The word "whoredom" in the King James Version is "porneia" (fornication) in the Septuagint. In the fifth chapter of First Corinthians Paul tells us that there was a flagrant case of fornication in that church. A man had his father’s wife.

Here we know that one party to this case of fornication was a married person. In Revelation (Revelation 2:20), we are told that the church at Thyatira had a woman—called "Jezebel" because of her resemblance to that wicked woman of the Old Testament, no doubt—who taught the brethren to commit fornication. Some translations read "thy wife Jezebel." If this be correct, this woman was the wife of the angel or messenger of the church at Thyatira. A married woman, but guilty offornication, not adultery. The language of our Savior seems to show that a married person may commit fornication. He spoke of the pair as married and of their effort to dissolve the vow—to put away the married partner. He says a man cannot put away his wife, except for fornication. That certainly seems to show that a married person can be guilty of fornication. Jesus used "fornication" and "adultery" as synonyms in this passage—at least, so it seems.

We shall have to look for some other way of harmonizing the language of Christ and of Paul. The explanation seems to lie in the fact that our Lord was discussing what would dissolve the marriage and thus violate the original purpose and law of marriage given by Jehovah in the beginning. Paul was not discussing any violations of this law, but merely setting forth the law. He set forth marriage as God intends for it to be—a man and a woman joined for life. This is God’s law, and this Jesus plainly taught. He showed that it can be broken, but the one who breaks it is bound for hell. Whenever, therefore, married people are even scripturally divorced, it means that at least one soul is sunk. In the name of the Lord, let us quit talking about scriptural divorce as though it were a light matter. N o divorce i s ever scriptural for both sides. When a marriage is broken, a soul is lost.

QUESTIONS ABOUT DIVORCE The article on "Divorce and Remarriage" in our issue of July 30 has provoked a number of questions. The first letter is from our good brother, R. C. White. Read what he says:

Georgetown, Tennessee, August 5, 1931.—Mr. G. C. Brewer,

Memphis, Tennessee.—Dear Brother Brewer: I have just finished your article, "Divorce and Remarriage," in the Gospel Advocate of July 30, 1931. There are several things I feel like mentioning, but will content myself with one or two—namely:

I want to endorse your teaching that "fornication" and "adultery" are sometimes used interchangeably in the Bible. I am much interested in your conclusion, and am anxious to know more about it. You suggest one new idea, if I understand you. Do you mean to say that there is no pardon for the guilty soul in a divorce? Even though a divorce is granted to the innocent party (and surely neither is altogether innocent, if we count indirect causes, though perfectly innocent so far as the marriage vow goes), and though it be granted that such a one may remarry and does, cannot the guilty one obey the gospel, or be restored if a Christian? Of course, I know no remarriage can be thought of. Please clear up this point.

Let me say "amen" to the statement, "Let us quit talking about scriptural divorce as though it were a light matter."

I did not mean to write even this much, but will be glad to hear from you in the paper.

Fraternally and gratefully,

R. C. WHITE.

Answering the questions, let us observe that the sin of breaking the marriage vow may be forgiven if it is repented of and if the guilty person sins "no more." If the man repents, his innocent companion should forgive him, and in that case no divorce would occur. But we spoke of a case where the divorce has occurred. Where that takes place and the innocent party has married another, there is no chance for the guilty party unless he repents of his sins and turns to God in the gospel way and then lives in absolute celibacy the rest of his days. As it is so improbable that one who has been weak enough to break his marriage vow will do this, we just counted such an unfortunate soul as lost. However, it is not impossible for him to be saved.

Brother O. H. Cline, of Cordova, Alabama, writes the following letter:

Dear Brother Brewer: This is to congratulate you on your composition on divorce and second marriage. There is a question I would like to ask you concerning the same subject. You said that Paul’s language must not contradict that of the Savior. It seems to me that if Paul did teach differently on this or any other subject, in so doing he was guided by the Holy Spirit, which makes it law, and for a difference in the two laws to occur would not make it a matter of contradiction. Jesus, in Matthew, taught that under the law of Moses a man could put his wife away for the cause of fornication. The apostle, under the supervision of the Holy Spirit, did not teach the like in this the Christian era. Is it safe to teach (after rightly dividing the word of truth) that there is no such thing as remarriage, or being married twice? As quoted, Acts 2:42 teaches us to continue steadfastly in the apostles’ teaching, not in things behind the cross, which were of the law of Moses. The apostles never, with or without the Holy Spirit, taught that fornication or any other sin would permit a man to put away his wife.

If we are going behind the cross to get a reason for breaking marriage ties, then it seems that we would have an equal right to go back there to get us a scriptural reason for keeping the Sabbath.

I am deeply impressed with the thought that there is no reason whereby a man and a woman may break the marriage vows and stand justified before God in the same. I do not want to teach the wrong thing, and want to know if I am right.

Brother Cline has some good ideas, but he seems to be slightly confused on the proper division of the word. It is true that Jesus kept the law of Moses and taught his disciples to do the same. It is also most certainly true that the law was abolished at the cross and ceased to be in effect after Pentecost. All things, therefore, that belonged to the types and ceremonies of the law were taken away and do not belong to Christians. Also all other laws—positive, divine laws—were abolished unless they are inculcated in the New Covenant. But our Savior taught many things that were not in the law, and these are binding upon us. He put his "I say" in contrast with what the law said. The law allowed divorce "for every cause," but Christ allows only one cause.

Paul does not contradict Christ. They agree upon what the will of God on marriage is: one man and one woman joined for life. Christ showed that a man may violate God’s law and break the vow. Paul only discussed the law, not any violations that might occur.

Questions from Brother John Craig, of Detroit, Michigan, will be given space in another issue.

MORE ABOUT DIVORCE The article on "Divorce and Remarriage" which appeared in our issue of July 30 brought in many letters. Some were congratulatory, some were critical, and others asked for more light. The divorce question is a living question of vital interest, and it is not at all surprising that any discussion of it would stir up some controversy, but it is surprising that people who have been reading the Gospel Advocate for many years would see in the article of July 30 anything new. The position taken in that article is the same position that the Advocate has held for more than fifty years, and it is the same position that is held by practically all the orthodox Protestant denominations. (By "orthodox" we mean those who accept Christ as divine and the Bible as inspired.) There was nothing at all in the article that was new or unusual, except the quotation from a tract which contended that fornication cannot be committed by a married person, and that, therefore, the only cause for divorce is an act committed before marriage. This was shown to be incorrect. If fornication dissolves a marriage, then it must be committed by a married person. The following letter gives us an opportunity to correct some exceedingly fallacious reasoning in which others may share with the author of this letter. We print the letter in full:

Grand Rapids, Michigan.—Editor, Gospel Advocate.—Dear Brother: I have carefully read and reread the article written by Brother G. C. Brewer under date of July 30, and wish to have a plainer and more complete explanation of the subject. Brother Brewer closes his article with this statement: "A soul is lost."

Now, if Brother Brewer is correct, what is the matter with our preachers? In the first place, we know who Christ was talking to, and we know who Paul was talking to; but what I would like to know is, who is Brother Brewer talking to? Is he talking to Christians, or is he talking to the world? If he is talking to Christians, I feel he needs more study on the matter; for I know, if every preacher would adopt his teaching and hew close to the line, they would shake the very foundation of many of our churches of Christ. Many elders and deacons and some preachers would have to step down and out.

If he is putting himself up as an evangelist holding a meeting and talking to worldly people and exhorting them to give up their evil ways and come to Christ, does he use that good old hymn, "Just as I Am"? Does he forget Christ's words, "Whosoever will may come"? Does he, when he gives the invitation and the hymn is being sung and those sinners walk down the aisles, ask these questions: "Have you ever been married before?" "Are you a divorced person, and are you remarried to another husband or wife?" If not, why not?

If Brother Brewer's theory is right, he must know these things before he performs the ordinance of baptism.

Now, I have supposed I was a member of the church of Christ for twenty years, and I have lived up to it just as well as I possibly could; have heard many good preachers and have seen many walk down the aisle, make the good confession, and be baptized, but never heard the above questions asked. Also, I have very carefully studied this matter during the past six months because of a hobbyriding preacher who nearly broke up our little congregation here. I have corresponded with some of our very best learned men on the subject, and I find that the majority of them are broad-minded enough to say it is a matter for the individual to settle for himself or herself.

There are already several divisions in the church of Christ. Why harp on this question and make another division when we are preaching unity?

I do not wish to criticize Brother Brewer in the matter, but I do think if he is going to handle the subject at all, he should make it as plain as A, B, C.

Very sincerely and prayerfully, CHARLES J. HAUGHEY.

216 Main Street, S. W.

REMARKS

The assumption that the language of Christ and of Paul on marriage and divorce was addressed only to disciples or Christians is erroneous. This is met with often, and it needs to be exposed. The Sermon on the Mount was addressed to the disciples, it is true, and Paul's Epistles were addressed to Christians. That far the assumption is correct, but to assume that Christ and Paul did not lay down principles of universal application is both gratuitous and reprehensible. They both often spoke truths that had been applicable to all mankind in all ages and will be perpetually applicable as long as the race endures. The law on marriage that Christ and Paul stated and upheld was the law that God gave to man in the beginning of his life on earth. It applies to all men and women of marriageable age and condition. Furthermore, the language of Christ in Matthew nineteen was not addressed to his disciples, but directed to the unbelieving Jews who were trying to entrap him. There is not one law of marriage and divorce governing Christians and another law governing people of the world. Such a position is not only unscriptural; it is exceedingly hurtful.

The author of the letter thinks that if all the preachers would preach the truth on this question as it was set forth in this department, the churches would be shaken up, or perhaps torn up. If he is right in this, that is all the more reason why we should all "cry aloud, spare not." The truth will not tear up anything that does not need to be torn up. There is no doubt that the truth on this question, plainly and strongly preached, would shake the earth under the feet of some people; and it will also bring suffering to the preacher. It cost John the Baptist his head. Even the disciples were so

astonished by it that they said: "If this is the case with a man in relation to his wife, it is better not to marry." (Matthew 19:10, Weymouth.) It is not surprising that some disciples today write such letters as the one given above.

The brother's idea that we would have to ask about the marriage records of one who comes forward to obey the gospel involves several errors. Do we ask a candidate for baptism if he is a "bootlegger" and if he means to quit that business? Do we ask him if he is a drunkard and if he now purposes to quit drinking? If not, why not? Does the hymn, "Just as I Am," mean to the drunkard that he is to come to Christ as a drunkard and remain a drunkard? Some of us need to study not only the Bible, but also the hymn- book.

We must always so preach the gospel that those who come to obey it will know that they cannot obey the gospel, cannot be forgiven and saved, unless they repent of their sins. And repentance requires them to get out of any unlawful business in which they are engaged, to quit sinful habits or practices, and to break up any sinful relationship or alignment in which they are bound. This includes unlawful marriages, of course. When repentance is thus preached, and when people respond to such preaching, there is only one question to be asked. All the rest is implied.

However strange or new it may be to the author of the letter, there have been many cases where the gospel preacher has refused to baptize persons who were unscripturally married and who would not cease to live in this unholy relationship.

Any preacher who says that each individual is a law unto himself on the marriage question is a traitor to Christ. He would as well say that each individual may decide for himself whether or not it is right to get drunk or to commit murder. But the brother, no doubt, does not say what he means. The preachers must have told him that the question of whether or not a man has the scriptural cause for divorce must be decided by the man himself.

If this is not as plain as A, B, C, we can at least take comfort from the fact that our worthy and honored predecessors on the Gospel Advocate staff were no more successful on this point than are we. Brother David Lipscomb met exactly the same criticisms in his day that we meet. The following letter, criticizing Brother Lipscomb, and his reply, will illustrate this point. Also, since Brother Lipscomb answered the same objections that we have answered in this article, his language will help us to make the matter as clear as A, B, C.

This is taken from "Queries and Answers," pages 282-284. Read it all carefully: In a recent issue of the Gospel Advocate a question was asked about a woman who separated from A and B, then obeyed the gospel and lived a consistent member several years, then married C, when she was withdrawn from for living in adultery, and now wants to come back to the church. She wants to know what steps to take. You say: "I am afraid she has done too much marrying and separating ever to be saved." You make the impression on my mind that she is past redemption. I am seventy-one years old, have preached over twenty-seven years, have read the Advocate about thirty years, have helped to settle several such troubles, and I cannot harmonize your position with the Scriptures. Do you believe that she is a greater sinner than Saul of Tarsus, who persecuted the Son of God and called himself "chief of sinners," and yet obtained mercy (1 Timothy 1:13-16): or the Jews that crucified the Son of God, and were ottered remission of their sins (Acts 2:23; Acts 2:36; Acts 2:38)? John says: "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (1 John

1:7.) If the blood of Jesus "cleanseth us from all sin," the sin of the "chief of sinners" and murderers, will it not also cleanse from adultery? The questioner does not state what she separated from her first husband for, so how do we know but what she had the "one cause"? I lived in the sectarian world about forty-two years, and I found very few men but what their wives could have proven the "one cause," if they could have secured the right witnesses to testify. Is a sinner, a citizen of the devil's kingdom, subject to the law of Christ? My understanding of the Scriptures is that a citizen of the world is not under the law of Christ, but is under the law of our land; and if a woman gets a legal divorce from her husband, she has a right to marry again, and is not living in adultery, according to the laws of our land. If she then obeys the gospel, all of her past sins are blotted out, washed away, and will be remembered against her no more forever. If I do not misunderstand you, your position brings the sin she committed in separating from her first husband over into the church. How can a sin be blotted out, washed away, and still be held against her? This is a very important QUEStion. To this Brother Lipscomb replied: This quitting one man or woman and taking up with another ought not to be called marriage. This was a more demoralizing plea than usual, so I publish and notice.

There are many worse sinners than was Paul or the crucifiers of the Son of God. Paul said he was "chief of sinners," but said that he obtained pardon because he "did it ignorantly in unbelief." (1 Timothy 1:13.) He was chief of those who sinned ignorantly. There were sins for which there was no forgiveness. Those who committed these sins were worse sinners than Paul or the murderers of Christ, and the apostle declared that the rulers crucified him "in ignorance." (Acts 3:17.) Then there are pretending Christians who "crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." (Hebrews 6:6.) It is impossible to renew that class of repentance. They are much worse than Paul or the murderers of God's Son. Those who betray and maltreat and corrupt the spiritual body of Christ are worse sinners and more hopeless than those who crucified his fleshly body. Those who knowingly and willfully change, add to, or take from the commands of God are more hopeless and worse sinners than Paul or the murderers of God's Son, who sinned ignorantly and repented.

Some sins were not even to be prayed for. The reckless repetition of a sin adds to its enormity. I know nothing of the case criticized, save that the woman, without scriptural ground, married and unmarried and remarried with such reckless disregard to the law of God or common virtue and decency as to destroy her sense of right, and there is no foundation on which to found a Christian life or to build a Christian character. A person is then in a hopeless condition. Only a good and honest heart can produce good fruit. Whom does the blood of Christ cleanse from sin? Only those who obey his laws, only those who repent of their sins. This woman married a man, left him, took up with another, left him, and while separated obeyed the gospel, and the writer says that she lived a consistent life until another fellow came along who was willing, and she took up with him, and while with him now wants to come back to the church. It ought not to be called marrying. The case as stated is that the woman did the separating without scriptural ground. If so, I deny that the blood of Christ cleansed her from any of her sins. She did not repent. Had she repented, she would have sought to live with her scriptural husband. She was not only guilty of adultery herself, but was guilty of tempting her husband to adultery by refusing to be a wife to him. (Matthew 5:32.) These things are true, not of that woman alone, but of every man and woman who refuses to discharge the marriage duties to the one to whom married. If they separate and one becomes a

Christian, the first thing to do is to seek reconciliation and try to live with the unbeliever. The idea that God takes no cognizance of the sinful lives and states they enter before becoming Christians, and they are all blotted out and forgotten when baptized, and the person may persist in the same course afterwards, is contrary to the truth and most demoralizing. Read 1 Corinthians 7:1-40 and see there that the marriage between sinners is recognized as sacred. The man is sanctified to the woman, the woman to the man, else your children are unclean. It seems to me that is on a par with saying that a man might steal a fortune before he obeys the gospel. God does not deal with him then, but the civil law. He then obeys the gospel, all his sins are washed away by the blood of Christ, and he is left in the possession of his ill- gotten gains. God forgives no sin until it is repented of and undone to the extent of the ability of the penitent person. The writer of the above, in a private note, says that he knows a preacher who married a woman while his fust wife was living. He now wishes to get rid of the second one to take up with a third one. He thinks he uses the position I advocate as an excuse for this. Paul could not prevent hypocrites from perverting most sacred truths for wicked purposes. Neither can I. But the man who could use a truth for an end so base is unfit to associate with penitentiary convicts. That people could retain a man who would so act in a church shows how low their estimate of Christianity is. SHALL WE MAKE EXCEPTIONS TO GOD'S LAW?

There has been quite enough said in this department in recent weeks on the divorce question, and we do not want to wear our readers out by continually haggling over this issue; but a brother in Grand Rapids, Michigan, is not satisfied with what has been said, and he is considerably disturbed because of some particular case he has in mind in which he says the teaching of the Scriptures as set forth by the Gospel Advocate could not be applied. For this reason and for the additional reasons that his letter presents some points that have not been discussed and gives us an opportunity to advance some ideas that are applicable to questions other than divorce, we are giving space to some questions that it raises.

1. The brother says different preachers of equal ability will give different and conflicting interpretations or explanations. That may be true on some points, but it is not true o n the divorce question. Bible scholars are agreed on what the Scriptures teach on that issue, except some contend that divorce is not allowed on any ground at all and others say Jesus allowed divorce on the ground of fornication. No Bible scholar, or even Bible student, will say that the Bible allows divorce on any other grounds. (By divorce we mean such separation as will allow either party to marry again.)

It should be remembered that the same argument is always presented by those who do not want to obey God's law. When we show people that God requires baptism as a condition of pardon, many of them are ready to say: "Well, why do so many smart men differ on this question?" etc. Who has not met that objection? "Smart men" do not differ as to what the Bible teaches. They differ in their opinions as to whether it is necessary strictly to follow its teaching. We should be careful to distinguish at this point.

2. In your article of July 30, 1931, you speak of "scriptural divorce." Well, if there is a scriptural divorce, there must be a scriptural marriage. Is there not? Will you tell the readers of the Gospel Advocate what constitutes a scriptural marriage? They are entitled to know. They take the paper to get information on the Bible. Jacob worked seven years for Rachel for a wife, and then her father

deceived him and gave him Leah instead; then he worked seven years more for Rachel. Which one was his scriptural wife, the one he wanted or the one which was forced on him? King Solomon was the wisest king Israel ever had because he asked God to give him wisdom instead of riches; and God blessed him and gave him both, so that he was the wisest and richest king. Which one of the seven hundred women which were called "wives" of Solomon was his scriptural wife? This wisest of kings said: "It is better to dwell in a corner of the housetop, than with a brawling woman." (Proverbs 21:9.) Again he said: "It is better to dwell in the wilderness, than with a contentious and an angry woman." (Proverbs 21:19.) Again: "A continual dropping in a very rainy day and a contentious woman are alike." (Proverbs 27:15.) And this same wise king said: "A virtuous woman is a crown to her husband." (Proverbs 12:4.) "Her price is far above rubies." (Proverbs 31:10.) "Her husband is known in the gates, when he sitteth among the elders of the land. . . . She openeth her mouth with wisdom; and in her tongue is the law of kindness. She looketh well to the ways of her household, and eateth not the bread of idleness." (Proverbs 31:23-27.) Solomon obtained this wisdom from the Lord; therefore, it was inspired, or so I understand it; and having so many wives, he surely knew women. The brother asks us to define scriptural marriage. Scriptural marriage is the blending of the lives of two eligible persons of opposite sex into one through mutual agreement, legal contract, and sexual cohabitation. The union is further confirmed, scaled, and exemplified in the offspring. In that the two are literally become one flesh, and no power can separate their blood as long as their descendants survive. In this sense marriage is a status or condition which, though originating in a contract, is not capable of being terminated by the parties' rescission of the contract, because the interests of the state, of society, of the children, to say nothing of regard for God's law, require the affixing of certain permanent duties and obligations upon the parties. This ought to be as clear as A, B, C, but we should not overlook the word "eligible" in the above definition. A person who cannot perform marriage functions is not eligible. A person who has a living wedded companion is not eligible. That is why Brother Lipscomb said the union of divorced persons is not marriage. We agree. That we may see that this is exactly what is set forth by our Savior as God's law "from the beginning," we here quote J. W. Mc- Garvey's comments on Matthew 19:4-6 : The argument contained in his answer presents the following premises and conclusions: First, in the beginning God made a male and a female, and said:"For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife." (4, 5; comp. Genesis 2:24.) Now the relation to father and mother can be dissolved only by death: yet the marriage relation is more intimate than that, and its obligations are more binding. Second, in the same sentence (Genesis 2:24) God said: "They shall be one flesh." If they are one flesh, the relation can be dissolved only by death, which dissolves the body itself. Third, from these premises the conclusion follows (verse 6) that what God has thus joined together, man shall not put asunder. Of course, God, who joined them together, may put them asunder by prescribing the conditions of lawful divorce, but man has nothing to do in the case except to obey God's law. Any act of divorce, therefore, or any legislation by state or church on the subject, inconsistent with the divine law, is open rebellion against the authority of Christ.

How dare any of us to say that men may put asunder what God has joined together?

3. The reference to Jacob and Solomon cannot nullify the Savior's words. Moreover, neither one of these men can serve as an example for us on marriage. They were both polygamists—which God did not authorize "from the beginning." We have no case parallel to Jacob and Leah. Such a

forced marriage would not meet the requirements of the above definition. If we say Rachel was Jacob's wife because he wanted her and Leah was not his wife because he preferred Rachel, we open the way for any sensualist who has grown tired of his wife to put her away on any pretext and take up with his "affinity"—which would be any "new flame" who excited his passions. That is exactly the "affinity" argument. Which one of the seven hundred women would our brother say was Solomon's wife? Let him answer. Will he say that more than one was his wife and thus endorse polygamy? If not, which one was his wife? The truth is, Solomon did not have any wife. He could not be one flesh with any one woman after he was joined to so many. He was too promiscuous to be capable of a scriptural marriage. If he was scripturally joined to his first woman companion, then she was his wife until he undid it by his promiscuity. We must say again that we cannot take Solomon or Jacob as an example for a Christian husband. Our brother surely knows this. Yes, Solomon knew women; and if men would heed his instruction before they are joined to any woman, they would do well. But most men, like Solomon, insist on learning by experience. Solomon said a "worthy woman" is hard to find, and we will all agree that there are many of the other kind; but the women have a tale to tell themselves. Court records will show that most divorces are sued for by women, and in many cases they sue only because they need the law to force the man to support them. But there are bad cases on both sides. Solomon was inspired, but his conduct was not divine by any means.

What father or mother or teacher ever told children that a man and woman who were married according to the laws of the government under which they were living were committing adultery? Or teachers who teach children that their parents (who procured a marriage license and went before a justice of the peace or a preacher and had been pronounced husband and wife) are living in adultery? Or how many preachers stand before their congregations and tell them that if they had been divorced and married again they are living in adultery and cannot be forgiven unless they put their companion away and live the virgin life the rest of their lives?

The difference between our teaching on murder, drunkenness, etc., and divorce is not as great as our brother seems to think it is. It is true that the state recognizes divorce and sanctions the marriage of divorced persons. That far the argument has force. Though some states will not grant divorce at all. But all gospel preachers stand in the pulpit and tell their audiences that persons who are divorced for any cause except fornication and marry again are living in adultery. What sort of preaching has our brother been hearing? Gospel preachers have always preached that way. They not only preach it along with faith, repentance, and baptism, but it is included in repentance. The Gospel Advocate has preached that for more than a half century. All Christian parents so teach their children. Nearly all the denominations hold this view and preach it. The Catholic Church does not allow divorce at all. The Episcopal Church does not allow divorce, except for fornication, and will not allow her ministers to say the ceremony for divorced persons. The Methodist Church holds the same view and has the same law. How does our brother make out the claim that this is new, untaught, or unheard of? Even advocates of free love, companionate marriage, etc., know this well, and they spend most of their time complaining at and clamoring against this teaching of "the church." Yet our brother supposes that the world in general is ignorant on this point.

You know that there is a great deal of difference between the meaning of adultery the way you teach it and the way the majority of people understand it. Most people think of it only as Webster gives it. That is why you or anyone else who teach it as you do should preach it along with faith,

repentance, confession, and baptism, because you make it an unpardonable sin. But Christ said that blaspheming against the Holy Ghost is the only unpardonable sin. (Mark 3:1-35; Matthew 12:31; Matthew 9:34.)

Why did you not give what Jesus answered the disciples in Matthew 19:10? Read on down to Matthew 19:13 : "But he said unto them, All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. For there are some eunuchs, which were so born: . . . and there aresome eunuchs, whichweremade eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which havemadethemselves eunuchsfor the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it." Evidently those who cannot understand your teaching are not eunuchs. Your answer did not make your teaching plain as A, B, C, neither did Brother Lipscomb's. The Bible teaches that there is only one unpardonable sin, and so we teach. But the Bible also teaches that any sin persisted in, unrepented of, will damn the soul. Does our brother wish to be understood as teaching that a man can live in adultery, refuse to break the relation, die in sin, and go to heaven? Because there is only one unpardonable sin, are we to infer that no other sin will damn? That all others will be pardoned unconditionally? That is the logic of our brother's argument. This fallacy is very hurtful and dangerous. Beware, brother! As to what our Lord says about eunuchs, we beg leave to quote from Brother McGarvey again: The answer of Jesus to the objection of the disciples is confessedly obscure. In searching for its meaning, the first thing to be determined is the reference of the expression, "this saying." It must refer either to the saying of the disciples (verse 10), "If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry," or to the saying of Jesus in his answer to the Pharisees. It cannot refer to the former, because that saying was objectionable, and the saying in question is one that should be received; for Jesus says (verse 12), "He that is able to receive it." It must, then, refer to his own saying in answer to the Pharisees. His entire speech to the Pharisees is a unit, and its point of unity is the remark that the married couple are one flesh. It is this which makes the marital relation more intimate than that of parent and child, and that makes it wrong to put asunder those whom God has thus joined together. (Verses 5, 6.) Now, Jesus says of this saying, "Not all men can receive this saying, but they to whom it is given"—that is, they to whom it is given to receive it. This implies that the greater part of men do, and that those who do not are the exceptions. Eunuchs are then introduced as an exceptional class. They cannot receive the saying, because a eunuch cannot become "one flesh" with a woman; and, seeing that his marriage would be a nullity, separation after such a marriage would not be the divorce which Jesus forbids, nor would subsequent marriage on the woman's part be adultery. Jesus admits, then, that, so far as eunuchs are concerned, it is good not to marry, because his doctrine cannot be received or be made practical in their cases; but he insists that all shall receive it and abide by it who can and do enter really into marriage.

We see, therefore, that the law of marriage and divorce as set forth herein is applicable to everybody except eunuchs, or ineligibles.

A man marries the second time. He had never heard the gospel preached until he had remarried and has eight children; then he attends a meeting and hears Christ preached, and it is made plain to him that if he wants to be a Christian he must stop stealing or lying or getting drunk or committing adultery. He is converted and baptized into Christ; he becomes a new creature; old things are blotted out and he commences to live the Christian life; all goes well for some time. Then along comes a preacher and tells him that he is living in adultery and that he cannot be

forgiven unless he breaks up his home and casts out his wife to be scoffed at and to die of a broken heart. He just cannot believe that God is any such a being. He reads in the Bible where Christ promised to help him bear his burdens if he will only trust him, so he decides to just put his trust in God and fight for his wife and children, for he knows that even wild beasts will fight to protect their young, and he decides to do the same, and so would I, and I believe Christ will plead his cause at the judgment day. Surely the breaking up of a family and casting little, helpless children out into strange homes, denying them the blessings and love of their father and mother, is something God would not approve.

Our brother gives us a case—supposed or real, the principle is the same—where to apply the law of Christ would break up a home and rob eight children of the care of their parents. No Christian would want to break up such a home, and most of us would be slow to say that the law of Christ demands it. Other duties, obligations, and laws of the Lord come into the equation now and have to be dealt with. Certainly no one, not even the strictest literalist or legalist, would demand that the children be scattered and neglected or that the woman be cast out and not supported. No law of God can be correctly interpreted as giving a man permission ruthlessly to violate other divine laws. The man in this case owes an obligation to the children and to their mother, even if he had not been legally married to her. Our civil laws recognize this, and in some states, when a man lives with a woman for a stipulated length of time, she becomes his "common-law" wife and a legal heir to his estate.

If a man is living in adultery with a woman, all the law of Christ requires is that he cease the adultery—cease to cohabit with her. It does not demand that he mistreat her; other Christian principles forbid it. In the case our brother mentions (if the man is not scripturally married to the mother of his eight children, a point on which we do not presume to say yea or nay), all that the man and woman need to do is to cease to live in marriage relation. The world does not need to know this. The children do not need to be told. The man could become a eunuch—not by emasculation, but by celibacy—for the kingdom of heaven’s sake. Is not salvation worth it? But even then the man might in some degree be responsible for his first wife’s soul and for the soul of the one who marries her. We will have to let God untangle cases of this kind, while we do our best to keep others out of such a situation. We would well be careful about what exactions we make in such, a case. Certainly n o church should divide over such a n affair. Any church would be foolish to undertake to "discipline" such a man as our brother presents. Such a course could not do any good at all, and it would be sure to do untold harm. But this should not in the least deter us in teaching what God says. We should labor to prevent others from making a similar mistake and getting into such a tangle. Because we find difficulty in applying God’s law in a particular case is no reason for ignoring, nullifying, or changing the law. This is another common fallacy. When we show that baptism is a condition of pardon and quote the words of Christ and the Holy Spirit, some preachers will begin trying to suppose a case where baptism would be impossible. Suppose such a case exists—and they do often—does that change the law? Does that justify those who can obey the law in ignoring it? There is a vast difference between those who would obey the law and cannot and those who can and will not. There may be exceptions to all of God’s laws, but in the nature of things we have to let God make the exceptions. When we teach God’s law on marriage faithfully, our duty stops. We cannot force people to obey it. We should teach it fearlessly in this dissolute age.

"MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE"

Under the caption of "Marriage and Divorce," Mr. Edward Worcester, chaplain of the Texas State Tubercular Sanatorium, of Sanatorium, Texas, writes in "The Chaser," a monthly bulletin, the following editorial:

"What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

I am reluctant to discuss a subject which is certain to provoke controversy, regardless of what views are expressed. There is probably no human relation about which there is more diversity of opinion, and I shall make no claim of infallibility for my own thought concerning marriage and divorce.

It seems to me that true marriage is a great deal more than a legalized conjugal union between a man and a woman. The law cannot join them together except in a legal sense. The Lord alone can fully unite two individuals in a true marriage, and he does it with profound mutual love and respect. This love must be far more than the reproduction urge. True marriage never rests on such a flimsy and transitory foundation. There must be also an earnest mutual respect and admiration for those elusive factors that make up personality. These qualities endure and seldom undergo any radical changes or modifications. They make up a lasting foundation for true marriage. Happy indeed are those whose marriages were made in heaven and by the infinite Father.

Many true and lasting marriages grow out of legal unions that begin with little more than strong mutual desire, but thousands of others inevitably fail when their foundations begin to weaken. They are never joined together by God at all and their unions are little more than legalized adulteries recognized by society. We know that lawful regulation and marriage ceremonies are absolutely essential for the protection of society and the rights of children, but haven’t we expected the law of man to do a work which God alone can perform?

If the Lord does not join them in the bonds of true and sacred love, they are never really and truly married, except in the legal sense, regardless of how long they may live together, or how many children may be born to them. Since the law alone has joined together these merely legal unions, let the law grant them separations or divorces when they find themselves mismated, unhappy, and desirous of their freedom. Man alone has united them; let man separate them when the situation becomes intolerable. They always suffer enough from their hasty blunders. So let us not insist that the misery be prolonged for life under the delusion that God has joined them and their union is therefore sacred and permanent. Those united by the Lord do not seek divorces.

Dr. E. O. Deal, of Mertzon, Texas, sent this clipping to me "with the request that it be reviewed in the Gospel Advocate. What is said by this chaplain is the same thing that is being said by every apologist for divorce. And therein is the evil. If this were said for the purpose of making men and women more careful in entering into the marriage relationship instead of justifying them in breaking the bonds, it would not be objectionable.

Like all the more dangerous errors, this plea has enough truth mixed with it to make it specious and palliative. It is said on every hand that God would not expect a man and a woman to live together in conjugal union when they hate each other; that it is immoral for a man and a woman to cohabit when their relation is not sanctified by love. But the question that we would ask is, How

came the man and the woman who hate each other to be bound together in marriage? The answer, of course, is: They once desired each other and thought they were in love, but later they find out that they do not love each other. But another question arises: Have they ceased to desire and to need marriage companionship? No, they have not. Then why do they no longer desire each other? The answer is, They desire someone else. Either they, one or both of them, have already become infatuated with someone else or they are in love with some ideal—some imaginary perfect person; someone that will be different; that will not have the faults and annoying habits or mannerisms that the present partner has. But suppose we grant that such a feeling or attitude is a just cause for divorce and set such persons free, will they find that ideal person and be satisfied with their next choice? If we had to answer that question from a purely philosophic and psychologic basis, we would say: "No, they will not be satisfied." But we have actual experience on which to base an answer. In this day of easy divorce we see the matter tried out. Most of those who get one divorce keep on getting them until it becomes a habit. Therefore, men and women should know that the disposition to find fault with each other should be overcome; that maudlin restlessness and morbid hankering for something they do not have and should not have must not be countenanced. It does not comport with sound sense. It is evidence of a diseased mind. Such a person is a neuropathic individual. Such a disposition will make a person dissatisfied and unsuccessful in any line. Any work is better than the work he is doing; any place is better than the place where he is, etc. But it is said that sometimes one partner in the marriage partnership will behave in such a way toward the other as to destroy love and alienate this one. Even so; but both should be taught the same lessons. That is, each should respect the other, be thoughtful of the other, show deference to the other, forbear and be long-suffering toward the other. Where each does this, there will not be any trouble. Our chaplain says we should not expect a law of man to do a work which God alone can perform. No, we should not; but we certainly do have a right to expect all chaplains and other preachers and moralists to teach young people that they should calmly and deliberately determine whether or not they have the feeling for each other and the attitude toward each other that God requires a husband and a wife to have before they invoke the law of man or submit to a legal ceremony. Then they must be taught that when they do take this deliberate step they are bound together for life. If they understand that, they will give and take, bear and forbear, and grow into each other’s lives in the way that God intends that they should.

Let us suppose a case. A man is cast upon a lonely island after a shipwreck. At first he seems to be the only living human being upon the island, a true Robinson Crusoe. But later he finds that a woman from the same ship was also cast upon the island; a woman of his own race. They are strangers; they never saw each other before they met upon the island. They soon find that they are the only human inhabitants of the island. After a time, hope of ever being rescued dies and they become resigned to the idea of spending their lives together and alone, so far as other human beings are concerned. Can anyone believe that a normal man and a normal woman would not under such circumstances become real companions and find consolation and comfort and strength in such a companionship? They might be very different at first. They might have come from different stations in life and might have entirely different ideas and views, but they would become adjusted to each other and each would help the other.

O,but someone suggests that necessity would be upon that pair and they would, of course, make the best of their situation. That is the point. Then, if we can make husbands and wives see that

they must, by the necessity of God’s requirements and by the necessity of their family’s needs and by the necessity of their soul’s salvation, dwell together in mutual helpfulness and companionship, they will make the best of their situation also. It is only because they feel free from restraint and responsibility and exempt from censure and disgrace and eternal damnation that men and women run to the divorce courts every time they meet a magnetic person of the opposite sex and see an opportunity for a fresh adventure in carnality. The chaplain says: "If the Lord does not join them in the bonds of true sacred love, they are never really and truly married, except in the legal sense, regardless of how long they may live together, or how many children may be born to them." When men argue simply for the purpose of justifying a popular practice and of pleasing the people, they never are consistent and they never go to the bottom of a question. For instance, it is usually argued that if a man lives with a woman and has children by her, she thereby becomes his wife whether there has been a legal ceremony or not. But now we are told that such a pair are not married, i f there has been a legal ceremony. In the chaplain’s own state the law recognizes a "common-law" marriage. If a man and woman live together for three years in Texas, whether they have children or not, the law recognizes them as married and the woman can claim a wife’s protection and support. She is an heir to his property, etc. The "common-law" idea comes nearer being scriptural than the chaplain’s theory. It is true that men and women can be married legally when they are not married scripturally; but the only time that it is safe to say that this is the case is when they were not marriageable scripturally at the time the legal ceremony was performed.

Next week we shall discuss this question: How Does God Join a Man and Woman Together in Wedlock?

HOW DOES GOD JOIN A MAN AND WOMAN TOGETHER IN WEDLOCK? Our Texas chaplain says: "If the Lord does not join them in the bonds of true and sacred love, they are never really and truly married, except in the legal sense, regardless of how long they may live together, or how many children may be born to them." In this he seems to go a step further than the advocates of "companionate marriage"; for they make a distinction between "companion marriage" and "family marriage," and they claim that couples that have children are out of the companionate-marriage class. Under the chaplain’s theory a man and a woman may at any period of life, no matter how long they have lived together or how many children they have, decide that they have never been joined together by God, and therefore separate and each marry another to whom he or she feels joined by "true and sacred love”! A few questions should be answered here: What is "true and sacred love,” and how will a man and a woman be able to determine when God has joined them in this holy passion? Are they left to decide it wholly by their feeling for or toward each other? When a pair has lived together for a long period and had children born to them, is it not reasonable to suppose that they, at least at first, had a feeling for each other that they thought was true and sacred love? Do not all couples think they have this love for each other? Then, if they were mistaken the first time, how will they know that they are not mistaken the next time? If they have to live together in the marriage relation for a while in order to ascertain whether or not God has joined them in the bonds of true and sacred love, what i s that but trial marriage? And does that not make trial marriage or marriages, one or several, essential to a real or permanent marriage? Is it not true that such experimentations in love and sex affairs disqualify rather than qualify men and women for true and sacred love? Is not true love to be measured by something other than feeling, sentiment, romance, or passion?

These questions bring us to a discussion of the question that heads this article: "How does God join a man and woman together in wedlock?" This will be answered in the following propositions:

By Love. Love is that which causes a man and a woman to be attracted to each other and to choose each other from among other associates. They desire each other. They may not be wholly conscious that it is a sexual desire, as that should be largely a subconscious state of mind during courtship, but it is, of course, at the basis of the attraction. Otherwise, men would love men and women would love women. But recognizing this mutual attraction, each individual should consider, deliberate, and see if the other has the character that demands respect, the accomplishments that are worthy, the health and the background that will insure sound offspring; if there is congeniality of taste and temperament between them. If these things exist between a man and a woman who are attracted to each other and desire each other, then that is all love can mean between any man and woman before they are joined in body.

By Legal Ceremony. This is a ceremony required by man-made laws for the protection of society. God requires us to submit to such laws of our government. No couples should ever apply for this legal act who have not already reached the decision in their hearts that the vows required by the ceremony will express their desires and their deliberately formed purpose. That is to join their lives and fortunes for better or for worse, in sickness and in health, in poverty or in wealth, till death does them part. When they take such a step, God regards it as a solemn vow, a deliberate oath, and he expects them to perform it or fulfill it. They should not be counted worthy of the sublime privileges and the tremendous possibilities of marriage and procreation, if they are not firm and constant enough to be true to an oath of their secret souls made in the name of God.

By the Sex Act. In 1 Corinthians 6:16, Paul says that a man who is joined to a harlot is one body with the harlot. He not only becomes equal with her, but their bodies have merged and the natural result would be a new body made up of the two bodies. This is the intention of the sex connections, and it is therefore the consummation, of the marriage vow and the fulfilling of the nature of the male and female, the merging of the bodies and the blending of the blood streams in the offspring. The two have thus in reality and in a literal way become one flesh. No court decree, no act of man, can separate their blood or bodies as long as any offspring live, even through a thousand generations. They are one flesh, and they must not allow whims, faults, hysterics, emotional states, or imagined affinities for some other to cause them to attempt to do that which God says "let not man" do. These things should be endured and mastered just as one masters misfortune or endures ill- health.

By the Experiences o fLife. When two lives are blended and when they share the same joys and the same sorrows; when they have the same hope and the same purpose; when they have struggled together to attain the same ambition, and when they have suffered the same failures and the same disappointments, there is an understanding and a sympathy that unites them with bands stronger than romance can know or lust can conceive. The two lives have grown into each other; and if there has been some disillusionment, and if the romance has faded and the dreams have vanished, there is a deeper and a saner kinship and union. There is sympathy and understanding; there are memories to revive and hold sacred, there are hopes to cherish. There are evils of heart and life to be mutually fought and put down, there is happiness to be mutually fostered and achieved. There is a grave awaiting both, and a judgment at which each must answer for the

treatment of the other.

WERE THEY REALLY MARRIED? The following letter from a brother in Ohio asks some questions and presents a problem. Here is his case: A young lady at the age of seventeen married a man according to the law of a certain state, lived with him sixty days, and left him. According to her evidence, she left him because she did not love him —did not love him when she married him. She was advised to marry him by other members of her family, and she did so thinking she would get a home for herself and her sister, with no intention of making him a life companion, but to leave him if she was not successful. She was not successful and left him within two months; said she was sorry she took the step in five minutes after the ceremony. Did God join them together, or did Satan join them? Was that a scriptural marriage—a union to be severed by death only?

Some years pass. She marries a different man, whose former wife was dead and leaving him with two children, this man being a member of the church. Before this time she was not a member of any church and knew practically nothing of the church. She becomes as a mother to these children, also a member of the church, and helps in bringing up the children accordingly, living peaceably together as a family and peaceably in the church.

Another member learns of her former marriage, takes the position that they are living in adultery, and urges withdrawing fellowship from them unless they cease living together as man and wife. It was considered by the leading members, and they decided not to withdraw. No accusation whatever except her first marriage. Since learning more of the Bible and becoming a member of the church, she does not believe that God ever joined her to the first man as his wife and refuses to be separated from her present husband. Are the conditions sufficient grounds for withdrawing fellowship from them? Should it be brought against them?

It caused some confusion and resulted in causing them to stop attending worship, and they refuse to attend as long as the ones attend who pressed the matter of withdrawal. Would the congregation be justifiable in withdrawals, if to do so would cause disturbance? What would be the scriptural procedure now? In case their returning would cause the family, who so urged the matter, to stay away, then what?

1. A Serious Lesson on the Sanctity of Marriage. The chief purpose of all our teaching on marriage and divorce is to prevent such mistakes as the young sister made in this case. What shall we do with those who have already made a mistake, or what shall we teach them? No general rule can be laid down. If this poor girl of seventeen had been properly taught on the sacredness of the marriage vow and on the permanency of the marital union, she would never have made this mistake. She would have known that the attitude of her heart was not scriptural and that the vows were untrue. We must teach the young.

2. Were They Really Married? The sister thinks now, since she has learned what real marriage is, that she was never married to the man with whom she lived for sixty days. If she is now an honest and sincere Christian, her word should have great weight on this point, since she knows better than anyone else can know what was the condition of her heart at the time of the other legal marriage ceremony. She should be warned against trying to justify herself and urged to be honest in striving to meet the conditions demanded by the word of God. But shall we agree that she was not really married to the first man? This is a question that we cannot answer with absolute finality,

any more than we can say with infallible certainty that a person has or has not been baptized scripturally when that person has submitted to the scriptural form of baptism. Let those who are insisting that this sister and her husband be put out of the fellowship answer these questions: If this sister should tell you that when she was baptized she did it for some earthly or temporal benefit, with the set intention in her heart of renouncing her baptism and ceasing to follow the Lord if these temporal benefits did not follow according to expectation, and that she later saw that such a baptism was not scriptural and that she was then baptized sincerely in obedience to God's word, would you insist that her first baptism was scriptural and that the second was a farce? Of course, you would not. But is not her case very similar?

Or, again, suppose this girl had lived with a man sixty days without a marriage ceremony as an experiment, would you insist that she is his wife and could not repent of her sin, leave the man (repentance would include that), and then later be scripturally married to another man? No. Then what makes a marriage—a mere legal ceremony?

3. What Is the Purpose of a Withdrawal? In withdrawing fellowship from any member of the body of Christ, what do we hope to accomplish? Do we wish good or evil to come as a result? Of course, all Christians wish for good results. Very well, what good can come from a withdrawal that divides the church? The purpose of church discipline is twofold. First, it corrects the evil and brings the evildoer to repentance and thereby saves his soul. (1 Corinthians 5:5; 1 Timothy 1:20; 2 Thessalonians 3:14.) But in this case the accused persons do not acknowledge their guilt; no one can prove positively that they are guilty; and, therefore, they cannot be brought to repentance until they are first convicted. Second, it purifies the church, or puts sin out of the sanction and connivance of the disciples. (1 Corinthians 5:5; 1 Corinthians 5:13.) But in this case the persons in question do not confess guilt, and the others cannot convict them beyond a question. Moreover, what they are accused of does not bring public reproach upon the church, for their lives are correct in every respect except the relationship which some church members theoretically condemn. In the eyes of the law the relationship is regular and legal. In the eyes of the world it is respectable and righteous. Possibly very few would even know anything of past mistakes if their brethren in Christ did not dig them up for display.

Brethren must have a very anomalous idea of what it takes to honor Christ, save souls, and glorify God, if they imagine that they can take punitive action in a case like this. It could not correct any wrong that may exist. It would disrupt the church and alienate brethren and bring reproach on the cause and discourage and disgust young people. If some one or two insist that such action must be taken or else they will quit the church, that very threat is evidence that they are more interested in carrying their point and enforcing their idea than they are in saving these souls and honoring Christ. In enforcing the will of Christ, disciples cannot be arbitrary, dictatorial, and imperious. They must be full of meekness (Galatians 6:1-2), long-suffering , patience, and prayer (1 Thessalonians 5:14; 1 Timothy 5:22; James 5:16; James 5:19-20; 1 John 5:14-16).

It would not be at all wrong for brethren to tell this sister that they believe she was not scripturally divorced and that they think that she and the brother who is now her husband are living in sin. If brethren feel that way about it and are actually concerned for their salvation, they should speak to them; but they should manifest a tender solicitude for them and not try to exact something of them. They will have done their duty. So let it rest.

Suppose the sister and brother should separate, could the brother find another wife? Would he not be charged with leaving this woman without scriptural cause? Could she go back to the man with whom she lived for sixty days? If her marriage to him was ever scriptural, has it not now been broken up? Better serve God in humility and consecration, and leave such problems to him.

LINE UPON LINE, PRECEPT UPON PRECEPT, HERE A LITTLE, THERE A LITTLE

Once again we are called upon to answer some questions that relate to, or grow out of, the divorce question. One thing should be kept in mind always when we come to study what God's word teaches on the question of marriage and divorce: W e are not primarily concerned with problems that men have brought upon themselves by not knowing or not heeding God's word, but we are first and most fervently interested i n what God's law actually is. If there are cases where God's law cannot be applied or obeyed, then God himself will have to dispose of them according to his wisdom. If there are some people who have involved themselves in such a marriage mess that even Solomon could not tell them how to extricate themselves, the only thing they can do is to apply the principles of righteousness as far as possible, and let God decide the rest.

"Do the laws o f Christ apply to those who are not citizens of his kingdom ? "

This depends entirely on what laws you have reference to. There are some things taught in the Bible that apply only to Christians, but these relate to the Christian's duty and privilege toward God and apply only to him because his relationship to God is different from that of other men. Moral principles apply to all alike. Truths that God has revealed to the human race are the truths by which the human race will be judged. (John 12:48; John 15:22; Romans 2:12.) If the laws of God and of Christ do not apply to aliens, then why do aliens sin when they reject and violate these laws? If they do not sin in such rejection and violation, then in what do their sins consist? Can there be sin without law? (Romans 5:13.) Why is God's wrath revealed against the unrighteousness of men, if these men are not responsible for this unrighteousness because they have refused to walk according to the principles of righteousness? (Romans 1:18.) Remember that God's law concerning marriage was given in the beginning of man's life on the earth, and it has been God's will on the subject in all ages and applicable to all men, whether men have respected it or not. (Matthew 19:3-10.)

"Is a record kept i n heaven o f the acts o f aliens, o r will they be condemned solely because of failure to become citizens of Christ's kingdom?"

The idea that there is some sort of literal record kept in heaven of anyone's deeds is perhaps only fanciful, but it represents a truth often taught in the Scriptures. Indeed, this truth is taught by that very figure of a book—a record. This record seems to include all men. The wise man said: "God will bring every work into judgment, with every hidden thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." (Ecclesiastes 12:14.) Our Lord said: "Every idle word that men [not Christians only| shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment." (Matthew 12:36.) In that judgment picture given by Christ in Matthew twenty-five those upon the left are reminded of the good deeds they did not do. Also the rich man was reminded of his former life and of Lazarus' former state. Some sort of account of these things had been kept. If murderers, idolaters, fornicators, and liars are to be thrust out of the city, the memory or account of these sins is implied. (Revelation 21:8.) Don't get too technical in your divisions and application of God's word. Remember the Pharisees.

They made void God’s word with their traditions.

"What must a man do to repent, when he responds to the gospel invitation, who has defrauded his neighbor by stealing, having transgressed the law of the state as well as the law of Christ? "

This man should "steal no more: but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing that is good, that he may have whereof to give to him that hath need." (Ephesians 4:28.) Second, he should make restitution, if possible—pay back what he has taken wrongfully. Repentance always includes restitution as far as possible. Read Paul’s letter to Philemon and get a lesson on this point. Restitution is not always possible. We cannot in any case undo our sins; we must depend upon God’s grace and mercy for forgiveness. Incidentally, if God’s law against stealing does not apply to an alien, why would an alien need to repent of stealing and make restitution? All repentance is toward God, not toward the state, and it must be brought about by godly sorrow.

An alien wants t o obey the gospel who has been married twice, divorced by first wife for cruelty, has children by both marriages, his first wife remarried also. The second marriage was "legal," but not "scriptural." What must he do to repent?

This man transgressed the law of God when he put away his wife without scriptural cause. When he married again, he committed adultery; and when his wife married another man, she committed adultery. If she was guilty of "cruelty" or in any other way caused her husband to leave her, she is not only responsible for her own sin, but she is also partially responsible for his. If she was not at all in fault and her husband put her away because of his infatuation for another woman, then she is not at all responsible for his sin, but he is for her sin. He caused her to commit adultery. But that does not excuse her. Four persons are guilty of adultery in this case. Read your New Testament. What should he do to repent? The thing that would be right without question or doubt—the infallibly safe thing—would be for all four of them to separate and live in celibacy the rest of their lives, each, however, bearing an equitable share of responsibility for the children and for the women, financial responsibility included, of course. It will probably never be possible to get the four persons involved to consent to this course. But the man originally responsible for the whole affair, if he is the one who wants to obey God, may follow this course, regardless of whether the others will or not. He should tell them of his sins in this matter, show them what God says, and make known to them what his decision is, and let them do as they will.

While this would certainly be the safe course, it is not affirmed that it would be absolutely necessary for the man to leave his second wife, mother of his children, and live in celibacy. This man committed adultery when he married the second woman. His wife committed adultery when she married another man. But now it may be that these adulteries have so completely undone the first marriage that it could not again exist; could not be resumed. Indeed, we believe it could not. And it may be that faithfulness in the other union (if such has been the case) and parenthood have now so joined these two that God would not expect or require them to separate. He would certainly require them to live righteous lives after they come to him; to abhor and teach against their former sins. This may b e the case. God alone knows, and we must leave him to decide. We should teach what God says and let the persons involved make their own application and decision in this matter. We should then encourage them to do all else that God says, regardless of what they decide about separating, since we cannot know exactly how God would regard this particular case. THE DIVORCE PROBLEM

There has been a good deal said on the question of divorce in this department in the last three years, but the question will not down. There is no problem that we face today that is as dangerous as this problem. The ideas of the people around us are so lax and confused and their practices are so far away from the scriptural ideal that we need not be surprised if many of our own people become entangled in marital mix-ups. Nor should we be surprised if we find that many of our young people have wrong ideas about the marriage vows. They read much that is wrong in the papers and magazines; they see much that is immoral on the picture screens; and they hear the wrong sort of teaching in their social contacts and often in the schoolrooms. If we do not, therefore, consistently and persistently set forth the teaching of God's word on this question, we cannot expect young disciples to know what God teaches. This question also demands frequent discussion, because many of our people have already departed from the teaching of God's word and become involved in divorce proceedings. Nearly every church in the land has in its membership persons who have been divorced and have married a second time. This brings a problem to the church, and often elders and other members of the church come to the editors of religious papers for advice and help. The problem also demands discussion, because of the misunderstanding of what the Bible teaches on the question. This failure to properly investigate, collate, and analyze all the Bible teaches on this question causes disagreement among some teachers and preachers. Some hold that fornication dissolves the marriage vow and gives the innocent party a right to be married to another. This conclusion is based on what Christ himself said. Others think that this belonged only to those living under the law of Moses and under the Christian dispensation nothing but death can separate married persons in a way that would permit a second marriage. They base their argument for this conclusion upon the teaching of Paul. Now, anyone who reads thoughtfully what Christ says and then reads what Paul says will have to admit that some explanation is needed. There is an apparent conflict, yet a complete analysis will show that there is no real conflict. It is our purpose to discuss in this article, and one or two that shall follow this, the problem of harmonizing the teaching of Christ and Paul. We shall endeavor to give a complete exegesis of 1 Corinthians 7:1-40. The following letter from a good brother in Texas will set before our readers the problem that we are undertaking to solve. Read this letter and preserve your paper and wait for the reply in the issues that follow: In the Gospel Advocate of April 27, 1933, you have some logic and deductions hard for me to accept in the light of the Holy Scriptures.

I may not understand God's teaching on marriage and divorce, but I have the Bible before me and believe God is its author.

God granted Moses to give a law on putting away (Deuteronomy 24:1 ff.) for the cause stated, "uncleanness"; Jesus lived, taught, and died under that law; his interpretation of that law while living as a man and teacher sent from God was that uncleanness—infidelity to the marital vow—was the only cause for putting away.

Malachi (Malachi 2:16), the prophet of God, states that God hates "putting away"; so let us keep this fact before us while we go on in this study.

Jesus said to the apostles: "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth [including in the church] shall be bound in heaven"; and, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore"; and, "Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until" the Holy Spirit comes, and power too; and, "He will guide you into all truth."

Now we read Acts 2:1 ff.: "When the day of Pentecost was fully come." Previous to this time and place there was no binding on earth and no binding in heaven—only teaching the truth and truth only. At Pentecost, in Jerusalem, the binding by the apostles began, and so the binding by Jesus Christ the Lord began in heaven— God's plan.

Therefore, whatever the apostles have bound on earth regarding putting away, the Lord has bound in heaven; not what Jesus taught under the law of Moses; not what men have taught as expedient. No! No! What say the "binders on earth"? "For the woman that hath a husband is bound by law to the husband while he liveth; but if the husband die, she is discharged from the law of the husband. So then if, while the husband liveth, she be joined to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if the husband die, she is free from the law, so that she is no adulteress, though she be joined to another man." (Romans 7:2-3.) "But unto the married I give charge, yea not I, but the Lord, That the wife depart not from her husband (but should she depart, let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband); and that the husband leave not his wife." (1 Corinthians 7:10-11.) This is the Lord's doing, and binding on earth to all humanity; as universal as the invitation to come; add not, subtract not.

We are not under the law of Moses with its divorce code; we are freed from the law that allowed what God hates.

Jesus gave the correct interpretation of Moses' law to the Jews.

Let us be sure that an apostle has bound before we go forward with any teaching. "Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." Where this side of Pentecost has God the Father, Jesus Christ our Savior, or the Holy Spirit the teacher, through the binders, the apostles, granted divorce or remarriage? If they have not, shall we?

Brother Brewer, I write you this not to criticize, but in the love of him who died for us, and with the full and confident idea that it is the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus our Lord. "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" May grace, mercy, and peace be with us all.

We shall reply to this letter under the following divisions:

God Hates Putting Away.

What Jesus Taught Was Not What Moses Taught.

Was What Jesus Taught Bound by the Apostles?

How Shall We Harmonize Jesus and Paul?

Under the fourth heading we shall give an article to an examination of 1 Corinthians 7:1-40. We shall endeavor to answer the question of whether or not a believing brother or sister, whose unbelieving companion has deserted him or her on account of religion, is free to marry again. Once again we request our readers to keep this copy of the paper and watch for the articles that shall follow.

GOD HATES DIVORCE

1. Jehovah Hates Putting Away. (Malachi 2:16.) Our Texas correspondent whose letter was published last week cited the reference here given to show that God hates divorce, and he seemed to think that if we interpret Christ to allow divorce on the ground of fornication, we will not show the proper hatred for divorce; that we will be too tolerant toward divorce; that we will be thereby showing a lax attitude toward divorce. But our brother is wrong in this. According to Matthew (Matthew 5:32; Matthew 19:9), Christ did allow divorce for fornication, or whoredom, for so the word should be translated here. Now, if we teach just what Christ taught, then it must be obvious that our attitude toward divorce is just what Christ's attitude was. Any charge that is made against our teaching applies primarily against what Christ taught. Shall we say that Christ did not hate divorce in the same way that Jehovah hates this sin? No, indeed! Christ was not tolerant toward divorce in allowing divorce for whoredom, unless we want to claim that he was tolerant of whoredom. Christ condemned divorce and strongly decried the practice of the Jews from Moses' day down. He plainly said that what Moses allowed, and what the Jews practiced, was not in harmony with the will of God concerning the marriage relationship. God's will from the beginning has been, and ever will be, that the husband and wife are one flesh by divine fiat, by spiritual bonds, by fleshly functions, and by natural offspring. They are no longer two, but one. Anyone, therefore, who puts them asunder—be he one of the contracting parties who by whoredom rends asunder the union, or be he civil judge who by legal decree separates them, or be he religious teacher who by false teaching moves them to put each other away—has violated the will and law of Jehovah and has brought himself under condemnation. Docs that look like a lax attitude toward divorce? That was Christ's attitude, and it is the attitude of all who now believe and apply the teaching of Christ. We have said in this department that there can be no divorce without a sin against God that jeopardizes the soul of someone—the guilty one and perhaps others. Often the souls of many are put into peril.

He sets forth marriage as God intends for it to be—a man and a woman joined for life. This is God's law and this Jesus plainly taught. He showed that this law can be broken, but the one who breaks it is bound for hell. Whenever, therefore, married people are even scripturally divorced—divorced for whoredom—it means that at least one soul is sunk. In the name of the Lord, let us quit talking about scriptural divorce as though it were a light matter. No divorce is ever scriptural for both sides. When a marriage is broken, a soul is lost. Of course, Jehovah hates divorce, because he hates whoredom, and that alone justifies divorce. In the quotation from Malachi, Jehovah condemns the men for dealing treacherously with their wives—for being unfaithful to them. He did not condemn them for putting away their wives because they, the wives, were unfaithful. That was not the situation. Those who did the putting away were themselves the unfaithful ones. The prophet said that Jehovah hated this practice. He hates it even now.

What Jesus Taught Was Not What Moses Taught. Our correspondent thinks that what Jesus said about divorce was only a restatement of the law of Moses, that it does not therefore apply to us now, and never did apply to any except those who were under the law of Moses. This is rather a strange idea when we study carefully the reference in which our Lord spoke. He taught something that was entirely different from what Moses had allowed. The place where Moses speaks of putting away a wife is Deuteronomy 24:1-4. He says: "When a man taketh a wife, and marrieth her, then it shall be, if she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some unseemly | uncleanness, A. V. | thing in her, that he shall write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her

out of his house."

The brother thinks that the "unseemly thing" here means unchastity and that it is the same ground, therefore, upon which Christ allowed divorce. The Jews themselves were divided over the meaning of this language. There were among them two famous divinity schools—that of Shammai and that of Hillel. The school of Shammai held that a man could not legally put away his wife except for whoredom. The school of Hillel taught that a man might put away his wife "for every cause," if she did not find favor in his sight— that is, if he saw some other woman he liked better. If he became displeased with his wife, he interpreted Moses' expression, "if she find no favor in his eyes," to cover his case, and therefore put her away. Josephus, the celebrated Jewish historian, tells us of his own experience with the utmost coolness and indifference. He says: "About this time I put away my wife, who had borne me three children, not being pleased with her manners." This gives us an idea of the prevailing views of divorce when our Lord spoke. But it must be clear to all who read the nineteenth chapter of Matthew that our Lord taught something different from that which Moses taught. When he had answered their question about putting away a wife, the Jews understood that what he said was not what Moses had taught them, and they asked: "Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorcement, and to put her away?" In other words, if what you say is true, then why did Moses say something else? He then told them that it was because of the hardness of their hearts that Moses gave that law, but that what Moses commanded had not been the purpose and will of God from the beginning. Then he adds, "AndI say unto yon." not what Moses said on account of the hardness of your hearts, but what God ordained from the beginning. This law here announced by Jesus was so much stricter than what Moses had taught, and what therefore the Jews had believed, that even the Lord's own disciples drew the conclusion that it would not be expedient to marry. In effect they said: "Lord, if what you have just said is true, it would be dangerous to get married; it would be too great a risk to take!" This shows clearly that our Lord did not just repeat Moses' law. The language of Moses in Deuteronomy did not refer to fornication. The word "uncleanness" evidently meant some physical defect, deformity, or disease—something that would render the woman obnoxious to her husband. And yet it did not refer to some defect that would wholly disqualify the woman as a wife, for he speaks of her marrying another man, who may or may not overlook and tolerate this defect. Evidently a good man might bear with the "unseemly thing," but those of "hardness of heart"—that is, of wicked hearts— would be embittered by it, would probably be abusive of the wife and perhaps even kill her; and if not that, they would be unfaithful to her and seek solace from other women. To prevent this condition from prevailing in their society, Moses permitted men to put away a wife if they found her obnoxious. But Jesus taught that if men want to be in harmony with the will of God they will not be so wicked and will not seek to disobey that which was God's will from the beginning.

Wait for the rent of it. WAS WHAT JESUS TAUGHT ON DIVORCE BOUND BY THE APOSTLES? The third division of our reply to the letter published in this department two weeks ago is:

Was What Jesus Taught o n Divorce Bound b y the Apostles? Our brother contends that Jesus was living under the law; that he taught obedience to the law; and that, therefore, we are not to accept his teaching as applicable to us, unless we find it repeated by the apostles, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Only thus can we accept what Jesus taught as a part of the new covenant. This is a dangerous conclusion, and we need wisdom in making some necessary distinctions here. Let us be reminded that:

Jesus did live under the old covenant, and he did teach his disciples to obey the law. (Matthew 5:19; Matthew 23:1-3.)

Jesus did teach his disciples to require others to observe all that he had commanded them (Matthew 28:18-20); and he promised to send the Holy Spirit to bring to their remembrance all that he had said to them, and to guide them into all the truth (John 14:26; John 16:13).

The Holy Spirit came on Pentecost, and from that time on the apostles were guided by divine power. What they taught in Acts, the Epistles, and Revelation is the will of Christ, revealed by the Holy Spirit,

But, we must remember that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John also wrote after the coming of the Holy Spirit, after the inauguration of the new covenant, and that their records of the life and sayings of Christ were brought to their remembrance and revealed to them by the Holy Spirit. Their writings are a part of the New Testament Scriptures, and are profitable for us. (2 Timothy 3:16.)

In these records of our Lord's life we find: (1) that he obeyed the law, but that he also did things that were unique; things that were in harmony with the law, but that went far beyond the actual demands of the law; (2) that he taught the precepts of the law, but that he also taught principles of morality that were eternal, that existed before the law, and will continue to exist for all time; (3) that he also gave some new principles and commandments to the sons of men; (4) that he established a new institution —kingdom or church —of which he is founder and head, and that offers its benefits to all nations of the earth.

Shall we now conclude that all those things which we find in the Gospels that are not repeated in the Acts or the Epistles are to be rejected by us as belonging to the covenant under which they were uttered? No, indeed! Such a conclusion would be worse than foolish. It would rob us of some of the finest rules and principles that were announced by our Lord. To illustrate: Take the Sermon on the Mount; how much of it is repeated this side of Pentecost? How much of that sermon would we know, if we did not learn it from Matthew? Yet, examine it and see how much of it, or rather how little, belonged to the law of Moses. If we take none of it except what may be found repeated in Acts or the Epistles, we will cheat ourselves woefully. We will not have the Beatitudes. We will not have the Golden Rule. We will not have the teaching on how to treat an enemy. (Matthew 5:43-46.) We will not have the principle that anger is murder, and that the thought is adultery. (Matthew 5:21-28.) (It is true that Paul and John announce some similar principles, but they are not given in this inimitable style.) To further illustrate: We know that Matthew tells us that Jesus instructed his disciples to baptize into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. We do not find either precept or example of this after the coming of the Holy Spirit. Shall we say, therefore, that this was not bound by the apostles? Such a conclusion would be absurd.

Again, Matthew tells us about what Jesus said in reference to the procedure of church discipline: "Tell it unto the church." (Matthew 18:15-21.) We do not have a mention of this procedure by any of the "binders on earth." Shall we throw this out as belonging to the law? But to settle the point, how would we know that the apostles had power to bind on earth and loose on earth, if we did not learn it from Matthew? What apostle mentions this in the Acts or the Epistles? Surely we can see, now, that we must not reject the teachings of Christ because they are not repeated this side of Pentecost. But an objector might inquire: "Since Christ taught some things that belonged to the

law and some that did not; since he taught some things that are applicable to us and some that are not, how can we discriminate between them, unless we take only that which the apostles repeated?" We answer: "By the use of a little common sense." When Christ commanded his disciples to go and loose an ass colt and bring him to Christ, we all know, without the use of any unusual intellectual powers, that this command was limited and local. It applied only to the apostles, and only to one occasion, and to only one particular ass. No one feels obligated to bring ass colts to the Lord now. The same reasoning applies to the command to prepare the Passover; the command to cast the fish net on the other side of the ship; the command to catch a fish and take a coin from its mouth; the command to loose Lazarus and let him go, etc. Should any responsible soul find trouble in making proper discriminations in commands like these, and those that apply to us? When the church was announced as something future, something yet to be built, and then, when instructions were given about how this church is to carry on its work, after it is built, does it take men of extraordinary acumen to know that these instructions to the church—not then established— did not go out of effect the day the church was established? Or, when the Great Commission was given, at the close of our Lord's stay on earth, and since it commanded something to be done in the future, to begin when the Holy Spirit should come, and to continue to the end of the world, does it take an intellectual giant to know that that commission did not go out of effect the day the Holy Spirit came?

Oh, but an objector might say: "All that is plain, of course, but how will we know what part of the teaching of Christ belongs to the law, and what is to be in the new covenant?" In reply we say: "We still have the law of Moses; we can easily learn what it teaches." "Search the scriptures." We can compare what Christ taught with what Moses said. Often, Christ himself drew a contrast between what Moses taught and what he enjoined. He did this on the divorce questions, as we saw last week. Therefore, what Jesus taught on divorce applies to us now.

There is no need for confusion. That should not give us any trouble. Our problem is in obeying the teachings of Christ, and in getting others to do so.

Next week Christ and Paul on divorce. How shall we harmonize them?

CHRIST AND PAUL ON DIVORCE

How Shal l We Harmonize Christ and Paul on Divorce? Twice in the Gospel by Matthew, our Lord said that if a man shall put away his wife, except for the cause of fornication, and marry another, he commits adultery. If language means anything, this teaches that if he puts his wife away for the cause of fornication he does not commit adultery if he marries another. That is the one exception to the rule. That sin will justify a divorce, or permit a divorce. But, twice the apostle Paul says that a woman is bound to her husband a s long as he lives —no exception mentioned—and that if she is married to another man while her husband lives she is an adulteress. (Romans 7:2-3; 1 Corinthians 7:39.)

Since, in this language, Paul mentions no exception to the rule, some have assumed that Paul allows no exception, and that, therefore, according to the apostle, nothing but death can dissolve the marriage bond; a husband and wife may separate, but they cannot marry again. If this conclusion be correct, then we have Christ teaching one thing and Paul teaching another. Christ allows divorce for infidelity, but Paul does not allow divorce for any cause. What shall we say as to

this seeming conflict?

Those who argue that Paul does not allow divorce try to avoid making him contradict Christ by saying that what Christ said belonged to the law of Moses and is not binding upon us now, while Paul's teaching belongs to the new covenant and is the will of Christ revealed by the Holy Spirit. Those who offer this explanation have not examined the Scriptures on this point very carefully. We have seen, in a former article, that what Christ taught was different from what Moses taught. Moses allowed a man to put away his wife "for every cause." Christ said this had not been God's will from the beginning, but that it was God's decree that husband and wife should be one flesh; that God had thus joined them together, and that man should not put them asunder. He then showed that because of this decree of God, if a man puts away his wife except for fornication, he is a sinner. Since it is so clear that what Jesus teaches is different from what Moses taught, and is such an emphatic statement of the will and purpose of God from the beginning, we must see that the exception laid down, or the cause of divorce allowed by Jesus, is either (1) the will of God from the beginning, or (2) a new condition allowed by our Lord, as other conditions were allowed by Moses. In either case, Paul's teaching must be in accord with this. If Jesus simply reaffirmed what had been the will of God from the beginning, we would not expect Paul to change and restrict this original purpose of God, thus reaffirmed by him through whom God speaks to us in these last days. And if Jesus announced a new condition, we certainly would not expect this will of Christ to be abrogated by those who were his ambassadors, and who were to teach us "all things whatsoever" he had taught. Therefore, from either point of view, we are forced to conclude that Paul did not contradict Christ, but that what he taught must be in harmony with what Christ taught, whether we see the harmony or not. But another evidence that those who say Paul was teaching something that belongs to the new covenant only have not examined the Scriptures is seen in the fact that in both passages Paul clearly states that according t o the law a woman is bound to her husband as long as he lives. Paul did not give a new law, just now revealed by the Holy Spirit, but he merely stated what the law required.

What law did Paul allude to when he said that a woman is "bound by the law as long as her husband liveth"? Not to the law of Moses, evidently, because that law allowed divorce for "every cause." But someone suggests that the law of Moses only allowed men t oput away their wives; that there is not a word about a woman's putting away her husband; that the wife was bound, but the husband was not bound. It is a fact that there is no mention of a woman's putting away her husband in the books of Moses, and this must be accounted for by the fact that the women of that age, because of social conditions, did not have the wickedness and hardness of heart that the men had, which made it necessary for Moses to make concessions to them. But whatever Moses did, in this particular, does not change the will of God originally expressed, and Christ shows that the obligations of the husband and the wife are equal in this respect. (Mark 10:12.) But even if we grant that the woman had no right to put away her husband under the law of Moses, still, Paul could not have said that a woman is bound to her husband as long as he lives, according to the law of Moses, for under that law the husband could put away his wife if she found "no favor in his eyes," and give her a bill of divorcement into her hands, and "she may go and be another man's wife." (Deuteronomy 24:1-2.) A woman with a bill of divorcement was not bound to her husband, but was free to go and find another husband. This was the law of Moses. Then by what law is a woman bound to her husband so "long as her husband liveth"? Evidently, by the law of marriage

given in the beginning—the law of her husband, the law that made him her husband and made her his wife. This is, therefore, the same law that Jesus stated and emphasized in contrast to the law of Moses. But why did Paul say a woman is bound by this law until the death of her husband, when Jesus said that she is released from her husband if he is guilty of fornication? Why did Paul not mention this exception? In answer, we say, first, in giving a rule or a law, we do not have to name the exceptions, especially where the law is not being discussed, but is only used as an illustration. In Romans seven, Paul was not discussing marriage at all. He only used the marriage bond as an illustration. His emphasis is not so much upon the fact that a woman is bound while her husband lives as it is upon the fact that she is free when he is dead, so that she may be married to another. This is the phase of the relationship that is in point in the illustration. As a woman whose husband is dead is free to be married to another man, so the Jews who were once bound to the law of Moses were now free by a death and were married to Christ. This is Paul's argument and his illustration. Since he was not discussing marriage, but only using it as an illustration, of course, he would use marriage as God intended it to be, and only broken as God intends that marriage could be broken. He would not take time to argue, in such an illustration, that some marriages are broken by sin, which is not according to, but contrary to, God's will and purpose. In the second place, all marriages are by God's law intended to last until the death of one of the parties to the contract. It is not God's will that fornication should break the bond, for it is not God's will that fornication should be committed. Hence, married persons are bound till death by the law, just as Paul says. It is only by a violation of the law that they can be divorced. The law of God is one thing, the violation of the law is another thing. Paul only mentions what the law is. But someone may suggest that in the seventh chapter of First Corinthians Paul was discussing the specific question of marriage and divorce, and that in that chapter he again says a wife is bound to her husband as long as he lives; that he there mentions no exceptions. What about the fifteenth verse? He there says that under certain conditions, which he names, a husband or wife is not bound— the same word that is used in verse 39, where he says she is bound until death. The question now is, How shall we harmonize Paul with Paul? not Paul with Christ.

Next week we shall conclude these articles by attempting to give a complete exegesis of The Seventh Chapter o f First Corinthians.

WIFE BOUND: BROTHER OR SISTER NOT BOUND—PAUL A RUNNING REVIEW OF 1 Corinthians 7:1-40 In order to have any fair understanding of this chapter there are a few things that we must know, and also a few discriminations and divisions we must make of the chapter itself. First, we must remember that the saints at Corinth were surrounded with and torn by conflicting theories and philosophies. On the one hand, Judaizing teachers told them that marriage is a divine obligation, and that to refuse or fail to marry was to be dishonorable and disobedient. On the other hand, some of the Grecian philosophers affirmed that if a man would live happily, he should not marry. And some of them, the Pythagoreans, contended that the matrimonial relationship is inconsistent with purity. In addition to these conflicting opinions, the Corinthians were surrounded with the most degrading practices and immoral influences, and these evils had not failed to affect some members of the church. Because these brethren were troubled by these theories, they had written to Paul and asked for instruction on the question of marriage and the relationship of husband and wife. (1 Corinthians 7:1)

1. Paul answered that it was better not to marry (on account of the present distress, but because of or to avoid fornication, a thing so common in Corinth, each man should have his wife and each woman her husband, and the wife or the husband should not deprive the other of the marriage privilege on any false ideas of purity, and thus expose the denied one to temptation. (1 Corinthians 7:1-5)

But, what he was next to say, in answer to the question, was not an injunction like his declaration of the duties of the wife to the husband and the husband to the wife, but was only inspired advice, suited to their present condition (1 Corinthians 7:6)—namely, he wished that all of them could, like him, live chastily unmarried (1 Corinthians 7:7). He addressed this more particularly to the widowers and widows in the church. (1 Corinthians 7:8) But at the same time, he told them, if they found it too difficult, it was better for them to marry than to be tormented with passion. (1 Corinthians 7:9)

Next, in answer to their question about the separation and divorce of married persons, Paul considered, first, those married persons who are both Christians , but who on account of the inconvenience attending marriage, or because of their ideas of devotion and purity, might decide to separate. To these, the apostle's command and the command of the Lord (Matthew 19:6-9; Mark 10:6-12) was not to separate. The wife should not depart; the husband should not put the wife away. But if anyone should depart and attempt to live apart, and find it too difficult, he or she should not marry another, but should return and be reconciled to his or her spouse, as their marriage still existed—they were not divorced. (1 Corinthians 7:10-11) In the second place, he considers those Christians who were married to heathens, they having become Christians since their marriage. Concerning these, the apostle says he has no commandment from the Lord, meaning that Christ, while on earth, had given no precept touching this point. Only by inspiration given him as a faithful servant of God could he speak here. He then ordered that such couples live together, if the heathen partner is willing so to do, because differences of religion do not necessarily dissolve marriage. (1 Corinthians 7:12-13) The heathen husband is sanctified, or rendered a fit husband to his believing wife, by the strength of his affections for her, which made him want to remain with her despite his different beliefs and ideas. And by the same affection and choice is a heathen wife sanctified to her Christian husband. (1 Corinthians 7:14) And, he told them, by remaining together the Christian partner in such marriages might convert the heathen partner. (1 Corinthians 7:16) But, if the unbelieving or heathen party maliciously deserted his or her Christian companion, notwithstanding due means of reconciliation had been used, the marriage was, by that desertion, dissolved with respect to the Christian party willing to adhere, and who had done all that was right to hold the heathen party in the marriage relationship. (1 Corinthians 7:15)

2. In that section of the chapter including 1 Corinthians 7:17-24, the apostle showed the brethren that the privileges of the gospel did not free them from former political, racial, and natural obligations. When these relationships did not interfere with obedience to Christ, they were to abide. The converted Jew was still to be a Jew as to customs and civil laws. The converted Gentile was not to become a Jew bybeing circumcised. Everyone, therefore, was to remain in the political state in which he was converted. In the third place, the apostle considered those persons who had never married. This class of persons, of both sexes, he calls virgins, and declared that he had no commandment of the Lord concerning them. By this he meant that Christ, during his ministry on

earth, had given no commandment concerning them; but the apostle gave his judgment in the case, as one who had obtained mercy from the Lord to be faithful—that is, he gave his judgment as an apostle who had received inspiration to enable him faithfully to declare Christ's will. (1 Corinthians 7:25) Beginning, then, with the case of the male virgin, he declared it to be good, in the present distress, for such to remain unmarried. (1 Corinthians 7:26) But if they married, they were not to seek to be loosed. And if their wives happened to die, he told them they would find it prudent not to seek a second wife. (1 Corinthians 7:27) However, he declared that if such persons married, they did not commit sin. The same he declared concerning female virgins— only both the one and the other would find marriage, in that time of distress, attended with great inconvenience and trouble, and he wished to spare them of this, hence this warning. (1 Corinthians 7:28)

Then, in order to make Christians less solicitous about present pleasures and pains, the apostle put them in mind of the brevity of life, and from that consideration exhorted them to beware of being too much elevated with prosperity, or too much dejected by adversity. (1 Corinthians 7:29-31) And to show that he had good reason for advising both sexes against marriage, he observed that the unmarried man, being free from the cares of a family, had more time and opportunity to please the Lord; whereas the married man was obliged to mind the things of the world that he might please his wife. (1 Corinthians 7:32-33) The same things he observed concerning wives and unmarried women. (1 Corinthians 7:34) He, therefore, gave them this advice, not to throw a bond upon them, but that they might see what would best enable them to serve the Lord. (1 Corinthians 7:35)

Lastly, with respect to female virgins who were in their fathers' families and under the power of their father, the apostle pointed out to the fathers of these unmarried and dependent girls the considerations which should determine their decision, whether to give their daughters in marriage or to keep them single. (1 Corinthians 7:36-38) This long discourse the apostle concluded by declaring that all women, whether old or young, are by their marriage vows bound to their husbands as long as their husbands live (this point, too, should be considered in deciding whether or not to give a virgin in marriage); but if their husbands die, they may marry a second time. Yet, he gave his opinion that they would be happier if they remained widows. And in so saying, he told them he was sure that he spoke by the Spirit of God. (1 Corinthians 7:39-40)

Having completed the running review of 1 Corinthians 7:1-40, we shall study in a more analytical way two points—namely: Did Paul Speak by Inspiration on All Points, or Is a Part of the Chapter Only His Human Opinion? and, second, When He Said a Brother or Sister Is Not Bound, Did He Mean That They Are Free to Marry Again? Taking up these points in order, let us ask:

(1) I s the Entire Chapter Inspired? Because Paul says in 1 Corinthians 7:10 that what he there enjoins is from the Lord, and not from himself, and then at two other places in the chapter he says he has no commandment from the Lord, but gives his own judgment, some have concluded that his judgment was not inspired, but was only his opinion. On this point the following argument from Dr. Macknight seems to be conclusive. He says:

Yet not I, but the Lord. The Lord Jesus, during his ministry on earth, delivered many precepts of his law in the hearing of his disciples. And those which he did not deliver in person, he promised to reveal to them by the Spirit, after his departure. Therefore, there is a just foundation for distinguishing the commandments which the Lord delivered in person from the commandments

which he revealed to the apostles by the Spirit, and which they made known to the world in their sermons and writings. This distinction is not peculiar to Paul. It is insinuated likewise by Peter and Jude. See 2 Peter 3:2; Jude 1:17, where the commandments of the apostles of the Lord and Savior are mentioned, not as inferior in authority to the commandments of the Lord (for they were all as really his commandments as those which he delivered in person), but as different in the manner of their communication. This authority of the commandments of the apostles will be acknowledged, if we consider that, agreeably to Christ's promise (John 14:16), the Holy Spirit dwelt with the apostles forever (John 16:13) to lead them into all truth—that is, to give them the perfect knowledge of all the doctrines and precepts of the gospel. This abiding inspiration St. Paul enjoyed equally with all the rest of the apostles, since, as he himself tells us repeatedly (2 Corinthians 11:5; 2 Corinthians 12:11), he was in nothing behind the very greatest of the apostles. So that he could say with truth concerning himself, as well as concerning them (1 Corinthians 2:16), We have the mind of Christ; and affirm (1 Thessalonians 4:8), He who despiseth us, despiseth not man, but God, who certainly hath given his Spirit, the Holy Spirit, to us. Since, therefore, the apostle Paul enjoyed the abiding inspiration of the Spirit, it is evident that in answering the questions proposed to him by the Corinthians, when he distinguished the commandments of the Lord from his own commandments, his intention was not, as many have imagined, to tell us in what things he was inspired, and in what not; but to show us what commandments the Lord delivered personally, in his own lifetime, and what the Spirit inspired the apostles to deliver after his departure. This, Paul could do with certainty: because, although he was not of the number of those who accompanied our Lord during his ministry, all the particulars of his life and doctrine were made known to him by revelation, as may be gathered from 1 Corinthians 11:23. Note 1 Corinthians 15:3; 1 Timothy 5:18, and from the many allusions to the words and actions of Christ, found in the Epistles which Paul wrote before any of the Gospels were published, and from his mentioning one of Christ's sayings not recorded by any of the evangelists. (Acts 20:35.) Further, that the apostle's intention in distinguishing the Lord's commandments from what he calls his own commandments was not to show us what things he spake by inspiration, and what not, I think evident from his adding certain circumstances, which prove that in delivering his own commandments, he was really inspired. Thus, when he says (1 Corinthians 7:25), "Now concerning virgins I have no commandment of the Lord: but I give my judgment, as having obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful," by affirming that he had obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful, he certainly meant to tell us that in giving his judgment concerning virgins lie was inspired. So, also, when he gave his judgment that a widow was at liberty to marry a second time, by adding (verse 40), "She is happier if she abide according to my judgment: and I am certain that even I have the Spirit of God," he plainly asserted that he was inspired in giving that judgment or determination. Lastly, when he called on those among the Corinthians who had the gilt of discerning spirits, to declare whether or not all the doctrines and precepts which he had delivered in this, his first Epistle to the Corinthians, were the commandments of the Lord, he certainly, in the most express manner, asserted that he had delivered these doctrines and precepts by the inspiration of the Spirit. (1 Corinthians 14:37.) If anyone is really a prophet, or a spiritual person, let him acknowledge the things which I write to you, that they are the commandments of the Lord Upon the whole, I appeal to every candid reader, whether the apostle could have said these things, if the judgment which he delivered on the different subjects in this chapter had been a mere human or uninspired judgment, and not a judgment dictated by the Spirit of God.

If we accept this as the correct meaning of the apostle's language, we see that he alludes to what Christ said while on earth about a husband's putting away his wife, or a wife's putting away her husband. This teaching of Christ we have recorded in Matthew and Mark. Then, since Paul alludes to this, it is foolish to suggest that Paul taught something contrary to what our Lord said. Then, when Christ made fornication a ground for divorce, we must not construe any statement made by Paul as contradicting this.

(2) Is the Christian Husband o r Wif e Who Has Been Maliciously Deserted by an Infidel Partner Free to Marry Again? If not, it would be difficult to see how such "a brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases." If they are not any longer bound to these deserting partners, nor i n bondage to them, they certainly are free. If they are not free to marry again, then they are not free from this marriage bondage at all, and are, therefore, still bound. If Paul does not mean that the marriage bondage is broken and does not any longer exist, so far as the Christian is concerned, then his language has no meaning at all. To make it mean something else is to destroy his whole point. But someone suggests that he means that the Christian is not bound to live with and to give the marriage privilege to such a deserting partner. That would be a wise statement from an inspired man! Even Christians could live apart, if they so desired. He has already told them to live with these heathen spouses if they can. It would now be absurd to tell them that they are under no obligation to live with those who have deserted them, and refused their companionship. How could they live with such a person? But someone else suggests that he had said in verse 10 that those who depart should remain unmarried, or be reconciled to their mate. Yes, he said that to Christians who might desire to separate. But this is to those who are deserted by heathen partners. And, since they were not able to hold these heathen mates, what would be the sense in telling Christians later to be reconciled to them? The Christian was never other than reconciled. It was the heathen that departed. Did Paul call on these heathen to remain unmarried, or to be reconciled to their Christian companions whom they, because of their religion, had deserted?

Absurd!

Then, someone is ready to say, according to that, Paul allowed divorce for desertion, whereas Christ made fornication the only ground for divorce. There is no conflict there. Desertion by a heathen includes or presupposes unfaithfulness to the partner, of course. Could anyone suppose that such a heathen, with no ideas of Christian morality, but who because of opposition to such Christian ideals deserts his partner, would live a chaste and celibate life henceforth?

Jesus said that a man who puts away his wife causes her to commit adultery. How would merely putting her away cause her to commit this sin? Would she be guilty of adultery if she lived unmarried the rest of her days? Of course not. Then how is she caused to commit adultery? It i s understood that she will find another partner, and in doing this without being scripturally released from her husband, she is guilty of adultery. The husband caused this sin by putting her away. If, therefore, it is so well understood that a woman who is put away will marry again that Christ before mentioning a second marriage declared the woman guilty of adultery, shall we not say that Paul implied that the heathen who departs breaks the marriage bond by seeking another partner of his own kind? That is most certainly understood.

Christians might separate in order to live a pure and holy life, free from any concessions to the flesh. But Paul indicated that even they would find this too difficult, and would need to be

reconciled to or come together again. Shall we assume that a heathen who forsakes his companion because of that companion’s holy religion will live a holy, celibate life, or shall we know and proceed on the basis that he will form another connection? Paul assumed that he would seek another partner, and. therefore, held the Christian whom he had deserted as free from all obligation and responsibility. With this conclusion reached, we see that Paul agrees with Christ exactly. When, therefore, he says a woman is bound to her husband as long as he lives, he must be understood to mean that this is true provided he desires to remain her husband, and docs not forsake her and form a connection with another woman.

Only thus can we escape making the apostle contradict what he said in verse 15. Now, what Paul here says about a heathen would not apply to a person who is a member of some so-called "Christian denomination." Such a person, if true to his creed, believes in the Christian moralities and ideals. He might leave a member of the body of Christ, and still live a celibate life. In that case the marriage bond is not broken. Paul’s language should not be interpreted as meaning that the marriage bond is broken, except by unfaithfulness to the marriage vow. When a man or a woman who is worldly, who lives after the flesh, who makes no claim to Christian living, forsakes his or her companion, and stays away for years, it may be safely assumed that the bond is broken, even as Paul assumes this in reference to a heathen of his day.

00B.16 Chapter 9--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No. 1

IX. "Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies"

No. 1 As has been mentioned on this page recently, Mr. W. A. Swift, editor of the Methodist Herald, is writing a series of editorials on baptism. In the issue of June 10 of his paper he gives his reasons for writing on this subject, and on the same page with his article he publishes the picture of John the Baptist pouring water upon the head of Jesus. He gave this picture to his readers when he announced his purpose to write on this question. He gives it to them again when he writes his apology for his promised editorials on this subject, and now he tells us that the picture shall appear each week as long as the discussion continues. No doubt he feels the need of the help the picture will give him; and when we remember that the picture is not only purely imaginary, a fiction, but that it is also a forgery, we see how extremely weak the editor's cause is. But it is interesting to read the editor's reasons for discussing this question. His article is brief, and we give it in full below:

We are beginning a series of articles on "Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies." In the outset we are giving some reasons for doing so. When the writer was a boy, he was baptized by pouring and was perfectly satisfied with this mode. Hearing much preaching that assigned all perrons to the bad world who were not immersed, we were made to feel we would be lost if we did not change our attitude. No one can imagine the torment we endured for a time. Our preachers not believing that outward, exterior rites are necessary to salvation, they say very little upon the subject of baptism. Notwithstanding this, many of our people have been bothered over this subject, and, more than this, hundreds of thousands in the past have left our church for no other reason than they were made to believe that pouring was not the proper mode of baptism. In our own dilemma we turned to the Bible for proof of the whole matter. We decided to settle the question solely on the word of God and not on the opinion of any man. It was soon settled in our mind, but the subject became so interesting that we have studied it more than almost any other subject outside of salvation. We were led to the conclusion, honestly and sincerely, that there is not a single passage of Scripture in the Bible that even indicates immersion, and in the articles to follow we propose to try to show our reasons for believing this way. We have never had a public debate on this subject and have no such intentions now. If others BELIEVE in baptism by immersion, we are not trying to change them from their views. We do not mean to waste a sheet of paper answering a letter for an argument. We merely want people to know what we do believe as Methodists and why we believe it. Could anyone object to this? Others have given their opinions almost every Sunday on what they believe. Why would not fairness and a Christian spirit accord to us such a privilege once in a lifetime?

We feel sure our people and those not of our persuasion who are fair and honest will welcome our free discussion. What would the average Methodist say were he asked, "Why do Methodists baptize by pouring and baptize babies?" He would have no reasonable answer at all. This, to the

outsider, looks like Methodists have no reason for their attitude and that we are not honest in our contention. We do have reasons for our attitude, and this is why we are writing these articles. The word "immerse" or "immersion" is not found in the King James translation of our Bible, considered by the greatest scholars to be the best translation ever given to the world. The words "pour" and "sprinkle" are found in this same translation two hundred and four times. Can you imagine why? In the articles to follow we will try to tell you why. There is no account of the twelve apostles, men Christ called, being baptized by any mode whatever. If they did not have this rite in infancy, why did the Lord not see that they were baptized when he called them to this great work?

REMARKS Upon this article we desire to make a few observations.

1. Why Apologize? In our view of things, Editor Swift did not need to give any reasons to justify his efforts to find scriptural authority for his religious practice. The man who will not give such authority for his practice is the man to be condemned and avoided. The editor’s apology rather weakens his cause. Would a man feel it necessary to apologize for affirming that God is, or that Jesus is divine, or that morality is required of God? Do the Methodist editors and preachers apologize for writing and preaching on prohibition? No, indeed; they are all militant on that point! Why? The answer is easy: because they are right on that question. Millions of Methodists have had water sprinkled or poured upon them for baptism. Millions of other honest and intelligent people say this is not baptism at all; that this practice has absolutely no authority from the Bible, but that it is a relic of Roman Catholic presumption to change God’s laws. In view of this fact, the Methodist leaders should apologize to their people every day for not giving them a plain "Thus saith the Lord," so that they could not only feel safe and satisfy themselves, but could then answer their critics and refute the above charge.

2. Solely b y the Word o f God. The editor says that he settled this question for himself solely b y the word o f God. But when he comes to settle it for his readers he rakes up a relic of the Dark Ages, a picture which belongs among the superstitious falsehoods of Rome and which is on a par with the bones of the saints, the beard of the monks, and the milk from the breast of the "Ever Blessed Virgin" which the Catholics exhibit at Rome. And this picture must accompany and reinforce every article! Would not a plain statement from the word of God satisfy the Methodist readers?

3. Immersion Not Even Indicated! The editor says: "We were led to the conclusion, honestly and sincerely, that there is not a single passage of Scripture in the Bible that even indicates immersion." But still the Methodist "Discipline" authorizes the preachers to immerse people who prefer it! Thus the editor admits that a part of that which is authorized by his "Discipline" is not even indicated in the Bible! Thus he admits that the practice of his church on one point does not have a single passage of Scripture to support it! It is done solely to please the whims of the people! When a man will place himself and his authorities before the world in that light, there is certainly no excuse for people who follow such a leader.

4. Will Not Argue. The editor said he would not waste a single sheet of paper in answering letters in argument. He seems to have some dark forebodings. Why did he think he would get such letters? But the editor says he does not want to change the views of anyone on this question. Then why is he writing? Why, he hopes to satisfy the consciences of those who are already committed to his view. It is easy to find Bible proof to satisfy us when we take our views with us to the word of

God instead of going there to get our views. Our editor says that he is writing these articles because an "average" Methodist would have "no reasonable answer at all" to give anyone who might ask, "Why do Methodists baptize by pouring and baptize babies?" Does not the "average Methodist" have the Bible? When Editor Swift gets through with this discussion, the "average Methodist" who reads the Herald will be fully equipped for battle. He can silence his opponents by showing them a picture of John pouring water upon the head of our Savior! "Immerse" Not in the Bible. The editor says that the words "immerse" and "immersion" are not in the Bible, but that "sprinkle" and "pour" are in there two hundred and four times. Yes, and the word "Christian" is in the Bible only three times, but the word "devil" is in there hundreds of times! Shall we conclude, therefore, that the Bible sanctions devils much more than it does Christians? Of course not. We should learn how the Bible uses the two words. Exactly, and intelligent and honest people will see how the Bible uses "sprinkle" and "pour." Neither word is ever remotely related to baptism, and they are never used in connection with a baptismal service.

5. The Apostles Baptized. The editor says that Christ did not say anything to the apostles about being baptized when he called them, and he infers, therefore, that the apostles must have received this rite in infancy!

Baptism had never been heard of when the apostles were infants. Furthermore, Christ chose his apostles from among the disciples of John the Baptist. (See John 1:1-51) In Acts 1:1-26, when the apostles selected a man to take the place of Judas, Peter said he must be a man who had been with them from the baptism of John. The qualifications of an apostle, therefore, required a man whose experience dated back to the baptism of John. The apostles were baptized by John in the Jordan River. The ’’average Methodist" is still waiting for a "reasonable answer."

Chapter 32

00B.17 Chapter 10--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No. 2

X. "Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies"

No. 2 The Methodist Herald has begun its series of articles on baptism. These articles have been promised to the readers for some weeks, and in announcing them the editor ran a picture of John the Baptist pouring water upon the head of our Savior. The editor announced that many people were subscribing for the paper for the express purpose of reading these articles. The first article appeared in its issue of June 17. Again the picture accompanies the article, and the editor announced that this picture will appear each week while this discussion lasts. Of course, the picture is a forgery, as no photograph was taken of the scenes of Christ's life. No drawings were made and no picture was ever given to the world of Christ until many centuries after he had gone from the earth. Then the pictures were made out of the imagination of the artist. But the picture is no worse a misrepresentation of facts than are the arguments by the editor. We do not know how long the editor means to continue this discussion, and we do not promise to review each article in detail, but the following is the second article from the pen of the editor. Read it carefully and then read the review: The reason why most Methodists differ on the mode of baptism from some who practice immersion is because of their difference of viewpoint.

Those who practice immersion believe that it represents the burial and resurrection of Christ. We believe that water baptism should represent the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and we believe that this was done by pouring. Jesus said: "John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." He referred to the day of Pentecost.

Joel the prophet (Joel 2:28) says: "And it shall come to pass afterwards that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." This refers to the same thing.

Peter, speaking of this baptism, said: "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; and it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." (Acts 2:16-17.) Peter, referring to this same promise (Acts 11:15-16), says:

"The Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."

Peter here is reminded that John's baptism was by pouring, for at Jerusalem the Holy Ghost baptism was by pouring. How could "with water" mean immersion if "with the Holy Ghost" means pouring? Some of our immersionist friends have translated the expression of Christ this way: "John indeed baptized in water, but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Ghost." Try using "in" with other expressions like "with a kiss," "with a rod," "with an iron," etc. See Acts 1:8 : "Holy Ghost is come upon you." Isaiah 32:15 : "Until the Spirit be poured upon us from on high." The people were astonished "because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." The manner of the purifying of the Jews was by sprinkling and pouring. These signified purity. This was

so common that sprinkling and pouring are mentioned in the Bible two hundred and four times. The Jews sprinkled the people and vessels (see Hebrews 9:1921), and this was a symbol of the purifying of the Holy Ghost. At the marriage in Cana of Galilee, when Jesus performed his first miracle, we read in John 2:6 : "And there were set there six water- pots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews." This was the custom of the Jews, signifying the purifying of the Holy Ghost. The Old Testament was the only Bible in the days of Jesus. He never saw a New Testament. The apostles preached from the Old Testament, too. In the Old Testament under the Mosaic law the outward sign of purification was by pouring and sprinkling. John the Baptist was a priest under the Mosaic law and knew nothing but pouring and sprinkling as an outward sign of cleansing. It would be perverting reason to say that he was familiar with immersion in his work of baptizing. He baptized the multitude, no doubt, with hyssop weeds by sprinkling. He baptized Jesus, no doubt, by pouring—a greater profusion of water as in the case of priests. Pouring and sprinkling came from the same Greek word. When we say it pours rain, we mean it sprinkles harder. In the Bible we do not read of rubber suits, baptisteries, and persons being taken to rivers and creeks, as is a custom today. Such are modern inventions and do not belong to apostolic days. Name any church with a baptistery of the early church. In fact, a modern building like unto what we know was not built until the third century. Now, since the people were more in the open those days, name a river where they took a candidate for baptism to baptize him. In conclusion on this article, let us say that if immersion were the only mode of baptism, many people of the icy regions of the North and deserts like the Sahara, where sufficient water could not be secured, could not be baptized, and God would have commanded an impossibility.

REVIEW

I. The Apostles Baptized with the Holy Spirit—The Holy Spirit Poured Out The editor makes an argument from the fact that the apostles were baptized with or in the Holy Spirit, and he cites a number of Scriptures to show that the Holy Spirit was poured out upon them, etc. We do not deny that the apostles were baptized with the Holy Spirit. We do not deny that the Holy Spirit was poured out upon them. But we do deny that the pouring was baptism. The word "baptize" means to dip, to plunge, to immerse, to submerge, to overwhelm. The apostles were completely overwhelmed in the Holy Spirit. They were filled with the Holy Spirit and passed completely under the control of the Holy Spirit, and in that way were swallowed up or submerged in the Holy Spirit. If you say this was done by pouring, we reply that persons can be baptized with water in the same way.

If we pour water upon them until they are completely overwhelmed, covered up, submerged in water, they will be baptized. But let us notice the grammar of this language. Who was to be baptized? The answer is, the apostles, the witnesses of our Lord’s death and resurrection. (Acts 1:3-5.) The word "baptize" is a verb, and it takes an object. The apostles were the object. The action of the verb "baptize" took place upon the apostles. The word "pour" is also a verb. It is active and also takes an object. What is the object of the verb "pour"? Why, the Holy Spirit, of course. The action of the verb took place or terminated upon the Holy Spirit. It was the Spirit that was poured. Then, if the word "pour" means "baptism," it was the Holy Spirit that was baptized. If the action of the verb "pour" took place upon the apostles, then they were poured themselves instead of having something poured upon them. These words cannot be interchanged. "Pour" does not mean "baptize" and "baptize" docs not mean "pour." They are different words in the

English and have different meanings. They are different words in the Greek, and they have different meanings.

2. Baptize with or in the Holy Spirit and with or in Water. The editor says that some immersionists have translated the word "with" by "in" and the Scripture reads: "John indeed baptized i n water; but ye shall be baptized i n the Holy Ghost." Does the editor think that all the revisers who gave to us the American Standard Revised translation were immer- sionists? Doesn't he know that many of them were affu- sionists? There were Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congre- gationalists, and Methodists among those revisers, and yet they translated the word "in" instead of "with." But the editor says we should try using the word "in" in such expressions as "with a kiss," "with a rod," "with an iron," etc. By this the editor hopes to show that the revisers did not know what they were about, and that if they had tried such expressions as he gives us they would have seen the ab- surdity of their translation. But while the editor is using the expression where the preposition "with" is used, why doesn't he say, "She washed the clothes with water?" Does the editor think this was done by sprinkling a few drops upon the clothes? But let him try the expression, "She dyed the garments with dye." Would anyone think this was accomplished by having a few drops of dye sprinkled upon the garment? So, if we repudiate the revisers and retain the word "with" in the text, there is nothing to favor sprinkling or pouring. But as to the word "with" in such expressions as "with a kiss," "with a rod," etc., does not the editor know that the word "with" has many different meanings and is used in many different senses even in English? And does he not know that the word "with" is translated from some half dozen or more different Greek words? But the Greek word in the expression in question is "en" in the Greek, and it is correctly translated "in." "With a kiss" would be a different Greek word. No doubt the editor knows all of this, but what shall we say? If we say he does not know it, we would be accusing him of ignorance, and this would not be good form. But if we say that he docs know it and still tries to mislead his readers, we would be accusing him of deception, and that would not be good taste. Hence, nameless we will let this argument stand.

3. The Purifying of the Jews. The editor argues that John the Baptist knew nothing about baptism except what he had learned from the custom of the Old Testament of purifying. He claims that John's baptism was simply the action of a Mosaic priest purifying the people, and that purifying was always done by sprinkling. The only reply this needs is simply to remind the readers that no persons of the Old Testament ever sprinkled simple water upon the people for any purpose. Their water of purification was a composition of blood, ashes, and living water. (Hebrews 9:13; Numbers 19:9-17.) But John the Baptist used no such mixture as this. He baptized the people in the river Jordan, and the river Jordan was unmixed water. John's baptism in the Jordan and the sprinkling that the priests did for a ceremonial cleansing were as different as day and night.

4. "Pour," "Sprinkle," "Baptize" We can hardly believe our eyes when we read this sentence from the editor: "Pouring and sprinkling come from the same Greek word." Any man who knows the Greek alphabet can take an interlinear New Testament and turn to the passages where "pour" is used and see that the word is "ekcheo," to pour out, or "epicheo," to pour upon. The root word is "cheo," to pour. But the word for sprinkle is "rantizo," and the noun form is "rantizmos." In the Greek, "baptize" is "baptizo," and the noun form is "baptizma." These three words are different in the Greek as in English and have different meanings. If any reader will get his Bible and turn to the fourteenth chapter of Leviticus and the fifteenth and sixteenth verses, he will find the words"pour," "dip," and "sprinkle" all used in these verses. The priest was to pour the oil into the palm of his

hand, dip his finger in the oil, and sprinkle the oil seven times. In the Septuagint, the Greek version of the Old Testament, we have the words "cheo," "baptizo," and "rantizo" used in this passage. The translators rendered one "pour," the other "dip," and the other "sprinkle." The exact forms of the Greek words in this passage are "epicheei" and "bapsei" and "ranei." But they are all from the roots that are given above.

Why would the editor of the Methodist Herald say that the words "sprinkle" and "pour" come from the same Greek word? Does he not know any better?

5. Taking People to the Rivers and Creeks. The editor says we do not read in the Bible of rubber suits, baptisteries, and of the taking of people to the rivers and creeks. Of course we do not read of rubber suits or of baptisteries, for, as the editor says, there were no church buildings in that day: but when we come on in church history, we find that as early as they began to build church buildings they built a fount for a baptistery. But the editor's reference to rubber suits and baptisteries, which are only incidents and conveniences, help him to slip the rest of the sentence by the readers. That is, that we do not read in the Bible of where people were taken to the rivers and creeks. Does the editor think all of his readers are ignorant of the Scripture? Does he not remember that the jailer at Philippi "took" Paul and Silas and washed their stripes and was baptized? Where did he take these preachers? Of course, he "took" them to water, for he washed their stripes, and he was baptized: and we know he took them somewhere outside of the house, for the language shows that he first brought them out of the prison and then "took" them, and was baptized, and then he brought them up into his house. And does the editor imagine that the readers have all forgotten that the record says that John the Baptist was preaching along the Jordan banks, and that there "went out unto him Jerusalem, and all Judaea, and all the region round about the Jordan; and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins"? (Matthew 3:5-6.) These people all went out to a river. The name of that river was "Jordan." And can the readers forget that "then cometh Jesus from Galilee to the Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him"? (Matthew 3:13.) Jesus came to a river to be baptized. And he walked from sixty to one hundred miles to get to that river. Does the editor imagine that all the people are ignorant of the fact that "John also was baptizing in Aenon near to Salim, because there was much water there: and they came, and were baptized"? (John 3:23.) These people came to much water. The editor thinks that people who live on the Sahara Desert or in the frozen North cannot be baptized. How many people does he think live on the Sahara? How many could he sprinkle on that desert, even if they could live there? Who lives in the extreme North? In what do the seals and polar bears swim? It must be a weak cause that will drive an editor to make such an argument. This completely answers the editor's sophistry, and the inexcusable mistakes that he has made in this article ought to lead the readers to distrust anything that he may say on the subject in the future. But we shall watch for his articles, and perhaps may give him further attention on this page.

00B.18 Chapter 11--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No. 3

XI. "Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies"

No. 3

Editor Swift, of the Methodist Herald, is still at it. For several weeks he has been trying to tell his readers "why Methodists baptize by pouring and baptize babies." Fearing that his arguments will not be sufficiently convincing and conclusive, he accompanies each article with a picture of a man pouring water upon the head of another man. He tells his readers that this is a picture of John the Baptist baptizing Jesus. We cannot overcome the temptation to ask the editor how often he thinks his readers will have to see this picture before it will convince them. This may be an impertinent question, but it just keeps coming up in our minds. Perhaps he believes that this picture will have the same psychological effect that the poet Pope said vice has:

Seen too often, familiar with her face, We first endure, then pity, then embrace. In the issue of June 24 of the Herald the editor writes a brief editorial, to accompany the picture, on the "Wrong Emphasis Placed on Water Baptism." But this was only the subheading. The full-page headline above the article and the picture was the one that has been running for many weeks—namely, "Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies." In this issue the editor does not even attempt to assign any reason at all for the practice of Methodists. He uses all his space in trying to show that some people put too much stress upon water baptism. He minimizes the ordinance and again intimates that the apostles were not baptized. This is his answer to the question in his headline. Surely the readers can see the logic of this. It is this: Methodists baptize by pouring and baptize babies because baptism is of no consequence. It is unimportant, a matter of indifference! We are forced to conclude, therefore, that if baptism were shown to be important the Methodists would have to abandon pouring and begin to baptize— immerse—people!

What does the question of the importance or the unimportance of baptism have to do with what that ordinance is? If we should grant that baptism is not important, we would still be left to learn from the Scriptures how this unimportant (?) act was performed in Bible times. The editor knows that even ignorant people who read the Bible will learn that baptism is a burial, an immersion, and he knows that the only way he can keep them from wanting to follow the teaching of the Scripture is to convince them that baptism is not important; that it matters not if they are never baptized in or with water. Then, when they are satisfied to dispense with and forego baptism altogether, they will submit to "pouring" in accordance with the "usage of the Methodist Church."

Why does the editor of the Herald not cite one command or one example for pouring or for infant baptism and stop so much illogical circumlocution? The reason is apparent. In the Herald of July 1 the editor uses as his subhead, "Bible Traditions, Jewish Customs, and Baptism Before Christ." He writes of customs, traditions, the catacombs, relics, and his picture, which again occupies a prominent place in the center of the page. H e does not cite one Bible passage to answer the

question of his full-page headline! In a later issue of the Gospel Advocate we may have something to say about the catacombs and their works of art, but just now we shall confine ourselves to an examination of what Bible arguments the Herald attempts to offer. In the issue of July 8 the editor of the Herald again attempts to prove that baptism was well known among the Jews from the days of Moses down to Christ. He refers to the sprinklings of the law. He says Moses never heard of immersion as a ceremonial rite! He tells us that Paul (Hebrews 9:10) refers to these sprinklings of the Old Testament and calls them "divers baptisms." (The English of Hebrews 9:10 says "divers washings")

Now, what are the facts? There were about twenty different sprinklings in the Old Testament, but in none of these was water only —unmixed water—sprinkled upon anyone or anything. Only eight of these sprinklings have water in them, and then the water was mixed with blood, ashes, etc. None of these sprinklings is ever called "baptism." They are not referred to as "divers baptisms" or "washings."

There were about eighteen washings under the law in which the whole body was washed or bathed in water. These Paul called "divers washings," or, in the Greek, dia- phoros baptismos. But the editor of the Herald reaches the climax of Scripture perversion when he argues that Christ was baptized to induct him into his priestly office. We shall here let our readers see what he says on this point. Read the following:

John the Baptist baptized Christ; so let us examine the Mosaic law, under which he lived that he came to fulfill. What did the law require? It required circumcision. (See Genesis 17:12; Leviticus 12:3.) Christ was circumcised at eight days of age according to the law. (See Luke 2:21.) It required presentation of the child in the temple. He was presented. (See Luke 2:22.) It required becoming subject to the law at twelve years of age. This is why he was found in the temple at twelve with his parents. (See Luke 2:42.) It required priests to be dedicated at thirty years of age and upward. (See Numbers 4:3; Luke 3:23.)

Christ was a priest, but not a Roman Catholic priest. Read Hebrews 3:1 : "Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus." "Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest." "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedeck." Jesus said when he came to John to be dedicated: "Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness."

John the Baptist had been instructed in the law and knew it. He knew that a priest was never immersed. He dedicated Jesus for his priestly work. How was it done? According to the law, by pouring. How could honest reason come to any other conclusion? When Jesus came to John for baptism, he hesitated, but Jesus urged the demands of the law. What were the demands of the law? Priests had to be thirty years of age when dedicated to this office. (See Numbers 4:47.) How was this done? By sprinkling or pouring water. When Jesus cleansed the temple and the Jews asked by what authority he did it, he referred to his baptism by John clothing him with the authority of a priest to minister about the temple.

It was a violation of the law for anyone to assume the office and duties of a high priest until he was dedicated. Do you recall his silent years at Nazareth? Jesus never preached a sermon, chose his disciples, uttered a parable, healed the sick, or did anything else of the kind, until after he was dedicated; for he absolutely tracked the law, that of the Old Testament, Mosaic law. Jesus said to

his blinded disciples: "All things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses and in the prophets and in the psalms concerning me." How anyone can reason out that Christ was immersed, when there was no law for it, is beyond the poor imagination of this writer. Our editor is entirely too modest in speaking of his "poor imagination." He has a marvelous imagination. He imagines "vain things," indeed. Witness this statement: "Priests had to be thirty years of age when dedicated to this office. (See Numbers 4:47.) How was this done? By sprinkling or pouring water." Why did he not cite the reference to show where water was sprinkled or poured upon a priest or any other person to dedicate him, or for any other purpose? Because that was born in the editor's "poor imagination." They poured oil upon the sons of Aaron to sanctify them. But this ruins the editor's argument, for he knows John did not pour oil upon Christ when he baptized him i n the Jordan River, after which Christ, "came u p out of the water."

Again the editor used his "poor imagination" when he said: "When Jesus cleansed the temple and the Jews asked by what authority he did it, he referred to his baptism by John clothing him with the authority of a priest to minister about the temple."

My, what a perversion! If Jesus had claimed to be priest, those Jews could justly have stoned him to death. He did not even belong to the priestly tribe. He was not a Levite. He belonged to the tribe of Judah, and Paul says that he could not be a priest while on earth. (Read Hebrews 7:14; Hebrews 8:4.)

Jesus did not refer to the baptism of John as giving him authority for anything. He emphatically said: "Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things." Editor Swift said he told them that he did it by the authority of a priest, and indicated that John made him a priest when he baptized him! But Christ refused to tell them his authority. He did it by the authority of the Son of God; but had he told them that, they would have accused him of blasphemy. Hence, he put them into a dilemma by asking them a question about John's baptism, and when they would not answer him, he refused to answer them. (Matthew 21:25-27; Mark 11:30.) The editor's points on what particulars Christ fulfilled the law do not help his case. Christ did fulfill the law. All that was written in the law of Moses, in the prophets, and in the Psalms concerning Christ was fulfilled. But—and here is where the editor's playhouse falls down and disappears like chaff from the summer's threshing floor—there was not one syllable in the law or the prophets or the Psalms about Christ becoming or being a priest on earth! He could not be a priest according to the law. He is now our High Priest—yes; but he is not after the order of Aaron, but after the order of Melchizedek. (Hebrews 7:11.)

Let us just see how many plain statements of Scripture the editor contradicts or grossly perverts when he claims that Jesus was made a priest by the baptism of John, and all for the purpose of inferring that, since the priests had oil poured on their heads, John must have poured water on the head of Christ in the Jordan.'

Christ was not a priest after the order of Aaron, but after the order of Melchizedek. (Hebrews 7:11.)

Christ did not belong to the priestly tribe. "For he of whom these things are said belongeth to another tribe, from which no man hath given attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord hath sprung out of Judah; as to which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priests." (Hebrews 7:13-14.) Yet the editor of the Methodist Herald said he was made a priest by John.

Christ could not be a priest on earth. "Now if he were on earth, he would not be a priest at all, seeing there are those who offer the gifts according to the law" (Hebrews 8:4)—the Levites.

Christ was not made a priest by the law or according to the law, which required the pouring of oil, but he was made priest by an eternal oath which was since the law. "And what we say is yet more abundantly evident, if after the likeness of Melchizedek there ariseth another priest, who hath been made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life: for it is witnessed of him, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek. . . . And inasmuch as it is not without the taking of an oath (for they indeed have been made priests without an oath; but he with an oath by him that saith of him, The Lord sware and will not repent himself, Thou art a priest for ever). . . . For the law appointeth men high priests, having infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was after the law, appointeth a Son, perfected for evermore." (Hebrews 7:15-28; read all the chapter.)

Jesus did not begin his public ministry until after his baptism because he was not manifested until then. That was the purpose of John’s baptism — to manifest the Savior. (John 1:31.)

How any man can reason that Jesus was a Levitical priest, when he did not belong to the tribe of Levi; or that he was a priest after the order of Aaron, when the word of inspiration says he was not after the order of Aaron; or that he was made a priest according to the law, when the record says he was not made a priest b y the law, but by an oath; or that he officiated as a priest on earth, when the Book says he could not be a priest o n earth; or that he was made a priest under the law and according to the law, when God says he was made a priest b y the oath after the law was disannulled (Hebrews 7:18; Hebrews 7:28), is "beyond the poor imagination of this writer," especially since he could not show from the law where any priest ever had water sprinkled or poured upon him, even if Christ were a priest under the law. But he was not. The editor has told us that he was once tremendously disturbed on the question of baptism and that he has studied the question for forty years. It would take a man at least forty years to get as badly confused on the word of God as he is. He could have obeyed the will of heaven in fifteen minutes forty years ago when he became disturbed by seeing that the teaching of the Bible and the practice of the Methodists were in conflict. Why will men spend forty years trying to learn so to manipulate the word of God as to teach or justify a false doctrine?

Chapter 34

00B.19 Chapter 12--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No. 4

XII. "Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies"

No. 4 For several weeks past we have reviewed on this page some articles that are appearing in the Methodist Herald on the question of "Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies." This week we will have to have a break in these review articles because of the fact that this editor has been away from home in some meetings. Through some mishandling of the mail the issues of the Methodist Herald that have not been reviewed failed to reach him. But this will give us an opportunity to say some things to our readers about these articles and to urge them to do some teaching work among their Methodist neighbors. We should not fail to try to teach the truth to the whole wide world, and those who need these articles most should be given the opportunity of seeing them. There is no need to say anything harsh or abusive about the Methodist people in order to point out the errors of their doctrine. It shall be the purpose and the prayer of this department to make these reviews convincing and conclusive, but to make them as mild and as kindly in spirit as the truth will allow.

Several times already we have mentioned the picture of John the Baptist pouring water upon the head of Jesus, which picture Editor Swift has been running each week. The picture has already appeared in that paper some eight or ten times, and it is to continue to appear each week as long as the editor writes upon this subject. The editor tells us that these articles are creating a great deal of interest among his readers and that they are handing his paper out to their neighbors who believe in immersion. He also tells us that many of his readers are rejoicing over the picture and that some of them are asking for enlarged copies of this picture to hang in their homes. In the issue of July 8 the following editorial paragraphs appear on the first page of the Herald under the headline, "Wants a Picture for Home." Read what he says: A reader from Memphis writes to know if he could secure a large picture like the one we are running every week with our special articles, John baptizing Jesus. We do not know how to secure such a picture; but these articles can be put into homes through subscriptions to the paper, and they would be a great blessing now and in years to come.

You would be surprised to know about the large amount of information we are receiving as to how young people and others really of our own fold are being proselyted by those who would make them believe they will be lost if not immersed. We believe that Bible proofs sustain the fact that immersion is not the proper mode of baptism and that John the Baptist, or John the "Purifier," did not immerse anyone, not even Jesus; and yet people are being deceived and led astray and turned away from the great purpose of water baptism—that of symbolizing the pouring out of the Holy Ghost upon all people everywhere who will repent of their sins and believe in Christ.

How pleased the devil would be to turn our thoughts away from this soul-searching, saving, and purifying personality! The emblems of the Lord’s Supper turn us to the cross, and the pouring of

water upon the person signifies the baptism of the Holy Ghost.

Now, it is the purpose of the Gospel Advocate to present this picture, which has already been characterized as a forgery, upon this page in a very early issue of our paper. We do this in order that our readers may see the kind of propaganda the Methodist Herald is using. We shall give with this picture an article upon the catacombs and upon the pictures and images that held such a large place in the minds of the Roman Catholic Church during the Dark Ages. We shall show that this picture is false from a half dozen different points of view. It is refuted by the word "baptize." It is refuted by all authentic history concerning the action of baptism in the apostolic age. It is refuted by the river Jordan, which it pictures as a small, insignificant stream. It is refuted by the Bible account of the baptism of our Lord. We are now making announcement of this article and the appearance of the picture so that our readers may prepare to receive it and to send it out where it will accomplish the greatest possible good. As the readers of the Methodist Herald have been securing subscribers for the very purpose of having them read the editor's articles upon pouring, our readers should make a special effort to get subscribers before this picture and the article about it appear. The editor of the Methodist Herald has stated in one issue of his paper that hundreds of thousands of people have left the Methodist Church because they were convinced that sprinkling is not baptism. He states in the notes quoted above that many young people are being proselyted from the Methodist Church because they are made to believe that sprinkling is not baptism. The editor is now preparing to defend the Methodist doctrine and satisfy his readers on this question. This gives us a splendid opportunity of presenting the truth on this question in contrast with the arguments in favor of error. This will make it abundantly easy to show the Methodists that their doctrine cannot be sustained. If we show them that the Bible teaches baptism, in the absence of any argument in favor of their doctrine, they will imagine that if some of their strong men would speak they could show that we are wrong and that sprinkling is right. But when the editor of a paper which is the official organ of six different conferences, and who boasts that he has studied the question for forty years, undertakes to present the Bible proof for their doctrine, they cannot complain that they are not properly represented. Then, if their arguments are shown to be fallacious, many honest souls will be convinced of their error. This is an unusual opportunity, and all of our readers should make the best of it.

If hundreds of thousands of Methodists have quit that church because they were convinced that its teaching on baptism is false, then we certainly have, by the confession of the editor, knowledge of a very vulnerable point in their teaching, and right here is where we should concentrate our attack. This statement by the editor also shows that somebody has been teaching the truth to the Methodists in years gone by. Do we now love the Methodists well enough to wish to correct their errors? Do we have the faith, the loyalty, and the courage to teach what God has revealed on the question of baptism? If we have not grown weak ourselves on this question, and if we are not ready to compromise, let us make the best of this opportunity. On the same page with the fictitious picture which we have promised to print we hope to produce an actual photograph of a brother in Christ immersing a Methodist preacher in the river Jordan. This will also be a complete and graphic refutation of the picture which originated long after the apostasy. Your neighbors and friends will want to see the issue of the paper that carries these two pictures. Why not get them to subscribe now? Why not also write in to the Gospel Advocate office and tell us how many copies of that issue you can use? Where does the inspired word call John the "Purifier"? Did he "purify"

our Lord when, according to the picture, he poured water on his head? Who said baptism symbolizes the Holy Spirit? Where is the passage? Paul says it is a symbol or "likeness" of Christ's death and burial. (Romans 6:3-6.) Peter says it is "for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38), and an answer or an interrogation or a seeking for a good conscience (1 Peter 3:21). But no inspired man ever said that it symbolizes the "pouring out of the Holy Ghost." That is a doctrine of men. "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." (Matthew 15:9.) Next week we shall resume our review of the Methodist editor, and in an early issue the pictures will appear.

Chapter 35

00B.20 Chapter 13--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No. 5

XIII. "Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies"

No. 5

Editor Swift's editorials in the Methodist Herald on the subject which is used as a caption to this article are not very well organized. We would have expected less repetition and more systematic and connected argumentation from a paper which is the official organ of six conferences composed of three hundred and eighty-five thousand Methodists, even if we did not expect either truth or sound reasoning. As there is much repetition of points that we have already replied to, we shall not quote in full the editorials that get our attention in this issue of the Gospel Advocate. In each issue of the Herald the editor continues to argue that John the Baptist was a priest and that his baptism was nothing but the sprinkling of the water of purification upon the people which was prescribed by the law of Moses. But we have previously called attention to the fact that the law never did command, prescribe, or even suggest the sprinkling of water alone, unmixed water, upon any person for any purpose. The water of purification of the law was a mixture of blood, ashes, and water. (See Numbers 19:1-22; Hebrews 9:12.) John baptized in the Jordan River—in water, unmixed with anything. In the Herald of July 15 we have these words:

Moses sprinkled with water to cleanse, purify, sanctify, etc. The words "purge," "cleanse," "wash," and "sanctify" are used interchangeably in the Bible, meaning baptism. The scriptural translation of the word "baptize" in a literal sense means to cleanse ceremonially with water. The writers of the Gospels understood the words "baptize" and "purify" to mean the same. The Jewish law for purifying required sprinkling. New Testament writers call Jewish sprinkling baptism. John the Baptist, who was a Jew, understood Jewish customs of cleansing from physical defilement.

"And for an unclean person they shall take of the ashes of the burnt heifer for purification of sin, and running water shall be put thereto in a vessel: and a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it in the water, and sprinkle it upon him," etc.

Josephus, the most noted Jewish historian, who was born A.D. 38 and died A.D. 100, was well acquainted with the customs of his people, and in his writings ("Antiquities of Jews," book 4, chapter 4), referring to the customs of cleansing from a dead body, says: "Baptizing by this ashes put into spring water, they sprinkle on the third and seventh day."

These paragraphs abound in false assertions and also give us a grossly perverted quotation. Note the false statements.

Moses never did sprinkle water upon anybody or anything for the purpose of cleansing.

Purging, cleansing, etc., came as a result of the washings or baptizings, but were not themselves the baptizings.

An editor ought to be able to distinguish between the result or the consequence of an act and the act itself.

Baptism does not mean to cleanse ceremonially by water, for no one was ever cleansed ceremonially by water. Such cleansing was by blood, ashes, and water. (Hebrews 9:12.)

No New Testament writer ever called any Jewish sprinkling baptism. After a man under the law had the water of purification sprinkled upon him, he had then to wash his clothes and bathe his body in water. (Numbers 19:16-20.) Paul calls this washing and bathing baptism. (Hebrews 10:22.) That cleansing of the flesh by that sprinkled mixture typified the cleansing of our hearts or consciences by the blood of Christ, and that washing typified our baptism in water. "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil [defiled] conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." (Hebrews 10:22.)

The editor miserably misquotes Josephus, as anyone can see who will take the pains to consult that author. (A copy of Josephus can be found in any good library.) He does not say "baptizing by this ashes," etc., but he said baptizing or "dipping a part of these ashes into spring water." The priest should then sprinkle this mixture upon the unclean person. In fact, Josephus says, in English, dipping and not baptizing, and the dipping or baptizing was one thing and the sprinkling was another. The ashes were dipped. That quotation ruins Methodist doctrine.

What will three hundred and eighty-five thousand Methodists think of their editor when they examine this quotation in Josephus? The editor cited the passage. Let them all turn to the place and read. As there is nothing but repetition in the issue of July 22, we pass it by and come to the issue of July 29. We quote from that editorial as follows:

John was a priest in regular order of the same tribe of Levi, Moses, and Aaron. His predecessor, Moses, had baptized a great throng. "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, ... he sprinkled the book and all the people." Read at this juncture 1 Corinthians 10:1-2.

Malachi (Malachi 3:1-3) says that John, the "purifier," would purify (baptize) the sons of Levi. Now read Matthew 3:5-6 : "Then went out unto him Jerusalem, and all Judaea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan." It is estimated that he was in the wilderness from nine to eighteen months baptizing this great multitude of from one to six million people. He was the only baptizer. Some say only six months, but we will give the highest estimate. If he had immersed three hundred a day for eighteen months, there would have been only one hundred sixty-two thousand baptized, with five million eight hundred thirty-eight thousand persons left unbaptized. No man ever made could have stood the physical strain of baptizing three hundred every day for eighteen months to reach even that number, one hundred sixty-two thousand.

He would have been paralyzed or dead before he was half through baptizing that many. John, a regular priest, had to follow the law of Moses. Stephen was stoned to death because his enemies said he spoke against the law. (See Acts 6:11.)

John’s manner of baptizing this great multitude made some of the people believe that he was Christ, because this same book of law and prophecy said Christ would "sprinkle many nations." (Isaiah 52:15.) They even sent Jews, priests, and Levites from Jerusalem down there to ask him if

he was the Christ. (John 1:19.) "Why baptizes! thou then, if thou be not the Christ?" they asked. He answered: "I baptize with water.” So did Moses. How? He took "scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people." Here is God’s command to all the priests (Numbers 8:7): "Sprinkle water of purifying upon them." This is what John, the "purifier." did, using, no doubt, the hyssop weed that held a lot of water. It was a command to use this weed. He could sprinkle the multitudes without any trouble with this weed.

"IN JORDAN"

"In Jordan" has no special significance. Jordan is a country. It has three banks. Go down one bank en route from Jerusalem to Jericho and you are "in Jordan," a half mile or more from the water of the Jordan River. This writer went that way. We went down another bank and we were still "in Jordan." One guide said: "We will get up early tomorrow morning and go down in Jordan." He did not mean to even touch the water. "In the river Jordan" has no more significance than the other phrase. The writer washed his hands "in the river Jordan" and "in the Dead Sea," but he did not go under the water. Jesus "sat in the sea." but not under water. The shin was i n the "midst of the sea." but not under water. We live in Tennessee, but not under dirt. "Paul stood in the midst of Mars’ Hill," but not under that great rock. "John did baptize in the wilderness." but not under the ground. Jesus "abode" at the place "where John at first baptized." (John 10:40.) Did Jesus live under water? The little preposition "in" comes from the Greek word ”en” which means "at" and "by" as well as "in." He was baptizing ”in Bethabara beyond Jordan." Bethabara is not a river. "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness." This was not under the ground. A house is not really located on a street, but in the street. Why? O n would mean obstruction to traffic, etc. I n a street means from the original term "at," "by," or "near." This was debated and settled—agreed to—by two leading daily papers of America.

INACCURATE STATEMENTS

It is not pleasant to have to point out false statements in the writings of a religious editor, but truth demands it, and we beg our readers to examine carefully all that is said, and we take them to witness that there is no bad spirit in our replies. Look at this:

John was not a priest, but a prophet. (Matthew 11:9-10.)

The baptism "unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" referred to by Paul (1 Corinthians 10:1-2), which took place at the sea as they left Egypt, and the sprinkling of the "book, and all the people" with blood by Moses, which took place after the tabernacle was built, are in no way connected and do not remotely resemble each other. But the editor must in some way manage to get the word "baptize" and the word "sprinkle" confused in the minds of his readers, and he juggles Scripture in order to "jingle" them together. What a despicable maneuver!

The editor says: "He answered: ’I baptize with water.’ So did Moses. How? He took ’scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people.’ " But what did Moses sprinkle? Water? No, he did not sprinkle water, and never did baptize anybody in anything.

If the editor’s contention were true (for it is not) about John’s being a regular Levitical priest and that he purified the people with hyssop according to the law, when the priests and Levites asked him, "Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not the Christ?" why did not John say: "You ask me that,

and you are priests according to our law? Why, I am simply one of your number, and I am only doing that which the law commands us all to do, and that which you yourselves practice regularly?" Cannot any reader see that John's baptism was something new and unusual? Reader, you will never find the word "baptize" in the Bible prior to the coming of John.

THAT MATHEMATICAL ARGUMENT The editor estimates that there were six million people in Jerusalem and Judea, and he makes the record say that John baptized them all—every individual. (He should never again say that the thief on the cross had not been baptized. Let all Methodist preachers take notice.) He says John could not in nine months' time have immersed this vast number. He concludes that John, therefore, sprinkled them in great multitudes with a hyssop weed. With that method, how did John avoid throwing water upon the Pharisees and Sadducees whom he refused to baptize? (Matthew 3:7-8.) Mark the fact that the editor estimates that a man could immerse three hundred in a day. Then the twelve apostles could easily have baptized the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, according to that estimate, made by a Methodist editor, and away goes the favorite Methodist quibble! Again let all Methodist preachers take notice. The editor says: "He (John) was the only baptizer." Yet he was only a Levitical priest, doing that which the law commanded all priests to do, according to the editor! Where were all the other priests? What were all those other priests in Jerusalem and Judea doing at this time? Surely, the readers can see that the editor refutes himself at every turn! As to the editor's inference that all the people — six million—the whole population—were baptized, it is sufficient to mention again that John refused to baptize some of them. (Matthew 3:7-8.) Also, just a little later Christ came into this same country and began making and "baptizing more disciples than John." (John 4:1-4.) If John had baptized them all, where did Christ find anybody to baptize? Moreover, after John had baptized the whole population, according to the editor, Christ came into the same region baptizing, and "all men" went out to him. (John 3:26.) Of course an intelligent reader will understand that the expressions, "then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judaea, and all the region round about the Jordan" (Matthew 3:5), and "all men come to him" (John 3:26), are figurative statements. They are hyperbolic. Sincere souls will not be confused by this kind of quibbling.

It should be remembered that the editor's conclusion from this "six-millions" argument is that John baptized this great host by using a hyssop weed and by sprinkling people in wholesale fashion or en masse. But right in the middle of the page where this argument is so triumphantly made the editor displays a picture of John pouring water from a cup upon the head of our Lord.

Thus he proves by a false handling of figures that John sprinkled with a reed, and on the same page he proves by a false picture that John baptized by pouring from a cup! It is now in order for the readers to turn to the Bible and see what it says. The plain statements of God's word will refute any argument a Methodist can make in favor of sprinkling. IN THE JORDAN The editor says: "Jordan is a country." That may be true, but the record does not say that John baptized "in Jordan" and leave us to guess what Jordan is. It says that people were baptized in the "river of Jordan." (Mark 1:5.) It tells us that John baptized "in water." (Mark 1:8; Matthew 3:11, R. V.) It shows that Jesus was baptized "in Jordan" and then came "up straightway out o f the water." (Mark 1:10; Matthew 3:16.) Of course "straightway" means "immediately." The editor refutes the idea that "straightway" means in a perpendicular posture! That provokes us to lapse into slang, and we say: "Atta boy! Knock 'em cold, editor!"

"In Jordan," "down into the water" and "up out of the water," and the like expressions do not necessarily prove that a person has been under the water, and no logical man would make that claim. The Scriptures show clearly that the going "down into the water" and the coming "up out of the water" did not constitute baptism. They went down into the water first. He "baptized him" second. They "came up out of the water" third. The going into water and the coming out of water are only circumstances which are used to prove that the act of baptism requires (1) water, (2) a going down into the water, and (3) a coming up out of the water. Sprinkling and pouring do not require such circumstances. Neither sprinkling nor pouring is baptism.

Chapter 36

00B.21 Chapter 14--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No. 6

XIV. "Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies"

No. 6 In the Methodis tHerald of August 5, the editor uses as the subtitle for his article these words: "Baptism of Jesus in Jordan." He tries to tell us why Jesus was baptized. Here is the way he gets at it:

How and why Jesus was baptized is one of the most puzzling questions to many people found in the Bible. John baptized unto repentance, and water baptism was a sign that the people had repented and were prepared in their hearts for the reception of Jesus.

Jesus had no sin and did not need to repent, neither did he need the sign of repentance—water baptism. Then, again, John's baptism was not Christian baptism. It was not so accepted by Paul. He asked the believers at Ephesus, "Unto what then were ye baptized?" They answered, "John's baptism," and all were baptized again. Jesus was not baptized for our example because he did not apply for baptism until all the people had been baptized. (See Luke 3:21.) And besides, he was thirty years of age at the time of this scene. He would not have us wait until that age to be baptized. Then why was Jesus baptized? He was not baptized in the sense that we are baptized today. Therefore, we have confused the meaning of this scene at the Jordan River. Here is the explanation: he was dedicated to his priestly office as the High Priest of God. When Jewish priests were dedicated, water was poured upon their heads and they were anointed with oil. The Son of God had water poured or sprinkled upon his head by John as a sign or preparatory step for the anointing of the Holy Ghost. God anointed him with the Holy Ghost. This scene at the Jordan would not have taken place had it not been that Christ was fulfilling the law found in Numbers 4:3 : "From thirty years old and upward even until fifty years old, all that enter into the host, to do the work of the tabernacle of the congregation." See, also, 1 Chronicles 23:3.

REMARKS

If the baptism which John was administering to the people was simply the rite by which priests were initiated into office, then it follows that all who were baptized by John were thereby inducted into the priestly office and duly qualified to serve in the sanctuary. And the editor has argued that John baptized the whole population—six million, all told; therefore, the whole population was turned into priests. If the editor will not accept the conclusion of his own reasoning, how will he distinguish between the baptism which John administered to Christ and that which he administered to others? And what authority does he have for making any such distinction? If all whom John baptized were not thereby made priests, how will he limit the number, and how many priests will he allow? He dare not limit the number to the tribe of Levi, for this would leave Jesus out.

We have shown that Christ was of the tribe of Judah and could not, therefore, be a priest on earth. (Hebrews 8:4; Hebrews 7:14.) He was or is a priest after the order of Melchizedek and not after the order of Aaron. He was not made a priest by the law—which the editor says John was fulfilling—but by an oath which was since the law. (Hebrews 7:28.) The law which the editor says Christ complied with at his baptism required a ceremony which lasted seven days, and lambs and calves were offered each day. This did not happen in Christ's case. But in all that ceremony the subject did not have water —simple water—poured or sprinkled upon him. We read all about this ceremony in the eighth chapter of Numbers. There was nothing similar to it at Christ's baptism.

Jesus was baptized to "fulfil all righteousness," or to do all that was right; to obey all of God's commands. John's baptism was from heaven. It was authorized of God. "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John." (John 1:6.) "He that sent me to baptize in water" (John 1:33) is the way John referred to his own commission. Our Savior was manifested as the Son of God at his baptism. That is one of the reasons why John baptized and is a reason why Christ was baptized. (John 1:31.) But our editor is a genius at making out analogies and at leaving out sense and jingling sounds in Bible terminology. Read the following:

Why did he stand in the river Jordan for John to baptize him? Read Joshua 3:8 : "And thou shalt command the priests that bear the ark of the covenant, saying, When ye are come to the brink of the water of Jordan, ye shall stand still in Jordan." Christ bore the ark of God's covenant with man. Joshua 3:17 says: "And the priests that bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord stood Arm on dry ground in the midst of Jordan." They did not have to go under the water to be "in the midst of Jordan." The picture you see here portrays the truth of the Bible, and the people of Bible lands have preserved this truth. The allusion here is to the crossing of the children of Israel into the promised land when God cut the river off and caused the headwaters to stand up in a heap. Then the priests who bore the ark stood in the midst of the river bed till all the people had passed over. This was done to assure the people that the waters would not break upon them. But what analogy, similarity, or likeness is there between this and Christ's baptism? Just none a t all. Christ was not a priest, or of the priestly tribe, and if he had even touched the ark he would have been guilty of a capital offense, according to the law. But the editor showed that the priests stood in the "midst of Jordan" and yet were on dry ground, and what is to hinder the reader from inferring that Christ was on dry ground when he was baptized "in Jordan" and "came up out of the water"? If the editor did not desire his readers to draw that conclusion, what was his purpose here?

We shall give attention to that picture next week. The following is the entire editorial in the Herald of August 12. Read it carefully:

JESUS "WENT UP STRAIGHTWAY OUT OF THE WATER"

It is surprising to know how many people are so unlearned that they do not know that "straightway" means immediately and not straight up—perpendicular. It is shocking to hear people use this word to try to prove that Christ went straight up out from under the water, while it only means that as soon as the dedication was over he came away from the scene.

He "went up straightway out of the water" after the ceremony was performed. The two little words "out of" in Matthew 3:16 are from the Greek word "apo," and every Greek scholar we have read after translates it "from" or "away from." The translators of the English Bible translate it, three

hundred seventy-two or three times, "from" in other Bible phrases. Alexander Campbell translates this word "from" instead of "out of" in his New Testament. The American Bible Union of Baptist persuasion did the same thing. Greek scholars say that "out of" in Matthew 3:16 is an incorrect translation and should have been "from." The Revised Version renders it "from." Doctor Carson, who was one of the strongest immersionists in latter times, says: "The proper translation of ’apo’ is ’from.’ ’He came up from the water.’ " (See "Carson on Baptism," pages 126140.) The simple statement should be that Jesus, when he was dedicated to his priestly office as God’s High Priest, came immediately away from the water. In Luke 4:1 we read: "Jesus returned from Jordan." The word "apo" is translated hundreds of times in the New Testament in phrases like, "Let this cup pass from me," "Depart from me," etc.

"MUCH WATER"

Great play is made upon these two words by immersionists. (John 3:23.) JJ non is a land of springs. You can turn to any good Bible dictionary and you will find that the word " Jnon" means "springs," and the word "much" is from a Greek word meaning "many"—Jnon, a land of many springs. The law required that water for baptizing should be taken from a running stream. J non easily met the requirements for John to baptize. Ask someone to name a river in J non, and see how hard a job he will have. It is interesting to hear the play on these two words by some immersion- ists, and yet the explanation is so simple—J non means "springs," and "much" is from a Greek word always meaning "many." John, a priest under the law of Moses that required sprinkling and pouring as a purifying sign, who never heard of anyone being immersed, was over in J non, where there were "many" "springs" sprinkling water upon the people, a sign of Christ, who would sprinkle "many nations" with his blood.

What a pity that people, through the wrong mode of baptism, have had their minds turned away from the blood of Christ, the one essential thing that God and Christ were trying to point us to through outward signs!

"STRAIGHTWAY" The point the editor refutes on the word "straightway" is new. We never heard that one. But for once the editor scored a point. We congratulate him! He is right— "straightway" means "immediately."

"apo’—from

We are told that when the record says that Christ came up out o f the water it simply means that he came up from the water. The Greek word "apo." which is translated "out of" in the King James Version of Matthew 3:16, means "from." All scholars will admit this. From that word alone, therefore, we cannot determine whether or not Christ had been in the water or only near it. The editor could not say that "from the water" means that he had not been in it. And he has already admitted that Christ stood "in the river Jordan for John to baptize him." What has he gained by the expression "from the water"? The editor quoted both Matthew and Luke on this expression, but did not refer to Mark! Do our readers know why he slighted Mark? Will someone venture a guess? Well, everyone can form his own opinion, but here is a fact: Mark says "coming up straightway out of the water," just as Matthew does; but Mark did not use "apo." (Mark 1:10.) He used "ek" and that word always means "out" or "out of." Therefore, Christ did "come up out of the water" after his baptism, and our editor’s dissertation on "apo" helps his case not one whit.

"MUCH WATER" The word "^non" does mean "springs" and the word for "much" does mean "many," but this word does not modify "^non." It modifies "water" or "waters" (plural in the Greek). The verse might be translated: "And John also was baptizing in Mno n near to Salim, because there were many waters there." But whose cause does that rendering help? As an appropriate reply to all the editor says on this point, let us read what Dr. Adam Clarke, the justly renowned Methodist commentator, says on this passage. The following is taken from his Commentary. The editor says John had never heard of an immersion, but Dr. Clarke says it was a custom of the Jews to "plunge themselves under the water." But here is Clarke's language:

There was much water. And this was equally necessary, where such multitudes were baptized, whether the ceremony was performed either by dipping or sprinkling. But as the Jewish custom required the persons to stand in the water, and having been instructed, and entered into a covenant to renounce all idolatry, and take the God of Israel for their God, then plunge themselves under the water, it is probable that the rite was thus performed at &non. The consideration that they dipped themselves tends to remove the difficulty expressed in the note on Matthew 3:6. See the observations at the end of Mark. (Comments on John 3:23.) In the comments at the end of Mark, Dr. Clarke quotes this language from Dr. Lightfoot: That the baptism of John was by plunging the body (after the same manner as the washing of unclean persons and the baptism of proselytes was) seems to appear from those things which are related to him—namely, that he baptized in Jordan; that he baptized in &non , because there was much water there; and that Christ being baptized came up out of the water, to which that seems to be parallel (Acts 8:38), Philip and the eunuch wentdown into the water.

Therefore that picture does not represent John's baptism correctly, according to these scholars. Both Dr. Clarke and Dr. Lightfoot were affusionists, but they were scholars and honest men. They ruin Editor Swift's arguments.

We shall see the picture next week.

Chapter 37

00B.22 Chapter 15--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No. 7

XV. "Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies"

No. 7 THE FALSE AND THE TRUE IN PICTURES OR CAIN'S WAY AND ABEL'S WAY On this page will be found a picture which has been appearing in the Methodist Herald each week for more than three months. Under the picture in bold type were these words: "John the Baptist Baptizing Jesus." Also this statement from the editor: "This picture was found in Bible lands among the relics of early Christians. This picture so nearly conveys the idea of water baptism throughout the Bible, we are running it each week to keep before the minds of our readers the purpose of the articles, 'Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring.' "

We do not believe that any intelligent reader of either the Methodist Herald or the Gospel Advocate will attach any great importance to this picture, as all know that it was made by some artist long after both John and Christ had gone from the earth. But in order to prevent any wrong conclusion on the part of any unthinking person, we are here giving some facts about the catacombs and about the pictures and images of Christ. If any reader wishes to verify any statement made in this article, let him consult any encyclopedia under the word "catacombs." Also let him examine the McClintock and Strong and the Schaff- Herzog encyclopedias under "Jesus Christ, Pictures and Images of." Furthermore, if he wishes to know what the scholarship of the world says in one voice was the ancient manner of baptizing, let him consult the encyclopedias, Bible dictionaries, and church histories on the word "baptism." There is no reason why anyone should be deceived on this point in this age of knowledge and of easy information. But let us study the Herald's picture under the following headings: Pictures and Images o f Christ.

There are now in the world many famous paintings of Christ and of scenes in his life. These works of art are all well known, and their names and the names of the artists are also familiar to most people. Among these we may mention the many "Madonnas" by as many artists, and also the "Ecce Homo," by Guido Reni; "Christ in Gethsemane," by Hoffmann; "The Crucifixion," by Ittenbach; "The Last Supper," by Da Vinci; "The Veil of Saint Veronica," by Murillo; "The Consoling Christ," by Plockhorst; "The Descent from the Cross," by Rubens; and there are many others. Of course, these artists all lived many centuries this side of Christ, and they painted these pictures from their own imagination of Christ and of the scenes in his life, their information coming, of course, from the Bible and from tradition.

There are many stories, pictures, and images of Christ which are wholly apocryphal, and so recognized by all well- informed people. "The Veil of Saint Veronica" is based on a fantastic story. "Saint Veronica" is said to be the woman whom Christ healed of the "issue of blood." While Christ was on the way to Golgotha, staggering and sweating under the cross, "Saint Veronica" came near and handed him her veil, upon which he wiped his face and returned it to the kind woman. And, lo, the image of his face, the impress of his features, was left upon the veil! This is the story

of that picture.

It was a long time after Christ’s day before men began to draw pictures of him. Some of the earliest relics of "sacred art" are found in the catacombs, and concerning these remnants of early drawings the Encyclopedia Britan- nica says: "Pope Damasus himself displayed great zeal in adapting the catacombs to their new purpose, restoring the works of art on the walls, and renewing the epitaphs over the graves of the martyrs. In this latter work he employed an engraver named Furius Philocalus, the exquisite beauty of whose characters enables the smallest fragment of his work to be recognized at a glance. This gave rise to extensive alterations in their construction and decoration, which has much lessened their value as authentic memorials of the religious art of the second and third centuries. Subsequent popes manifested equal ardor, with the same damaging results, in the repair and adornment of the catacombs, and many of the paintings covering their walls, which have been assigned to the periods of their original construction, are really the work of these later times." The oldest picture of John baptizing Jesus of which the Gospel Advocate has any knowledge was found engraved on the door of a church on the Via Ostiensis, near Rome. This door is dated A.D. 1070. The picture could not be older than the door upon which it is engraved. The encyclopedias tell us that all the early pictures of Christ represented him as very youthful. His face was smooth and girlish. He was neither Jew, Greek, nor Roman. He was an idealized, angelic being.

Then, at a much later period, the artists began representing Christ as having a brown, pointed beard, and long, brown, curly hair. The critics can tell the age of a picture by the way Christ is portrayed. The picture that the Methodist Herald is using shows Christ to have the pointed, chin beard! It is not, therefore, one of the pictures of the earliest age of art. It is a Roman Catholic production. The Picture Has Marks of Modern Origin. A close examination of this picture will reveal marks that prove it to be of an origin much later than the New Testament. It

A FALSEHOOD IN PICTURE This is the picture that the Methodist Herald hats been running for three months. It is Cain’s way. Read this article. is not true to the Scripture record in any point. Look at the raiment of John. He has on the robe of a modern priest, or the tunic that was worn in Christ’s day, but the New Testament tells us that he did not dress as others of his day dressed. It says he had "his raiment of camel’s hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins." (Matthew 3:4.) Notice also that John has a staff in his hand, with a cross at the upper end and some sort of banner or streamer attached to it. Of course, everybody knows that the cross had n o religious meaning at all in the days of John the Baptist. Christ had not then glorified the cross by his death. The cross and the "sign of the cross" did not begin to be regarded with superstitious reverence until after the days of Constantine. After he saw his vision of the cross in the sky and the Latin words, "In hoc signo vinces," the Roman Catholics began to put crosses upon their church buildings, to wear crosses around their necks, and to make the sign of the cross in prayer, etc.

A REAL PHOTOGRAPH This baptizing is in the river Jordan at the place where Christ was baptized. Read this article.

It is not at all surprising that a Roman Catholic who was not allowed to read the Bible would represent baptism according as his church practiced it, and that he would picture John with a cross in his hand. But what shall we say of a Methodist editor who claims that the picture is true to the divine record? The Picture Is Contradicted by the River Jordan. This picture represents Jordan as

a small, shallow stream. It is not more than two or three feet wide. The hands of the people or angels (the Bible says nothing about angels being present) on either side are extended nearly across the stream. At least the wing of the angel on the shore extends out to John. The water is not deep enough to cover Christ's foot. Now, the river is still on the earth and still rushes madly from Huleh to the Dead Sea. It is about sixty miles from its head in the "waters of Merom" to its mouth in the Dead Sea by air line. It has a fall of about thirteen hundred feet in this distance, which makes it very swift. It is from one hundred and fifty feet to one hundred and eighty feet in width, and is from three to thirty-five feet in depth at the place where Christ was baptized. It is a living, concrete contradiction of this picture. In his book, "Out of Doors in the Holy Land," Dr. Henry Van Dyke (Presbyterian) gives us these beautiful words: "No, it was not because the Jordan was beautiful that John the Baptist chose it as the scene of his preaching and ministry, but because it was wild and rude, an emblem of violent and sudden change, of irrevocable parting, of death itself, and because in its one gift of copious and unfailing water he found the necessary element for his deep baptism of repentance, in which the sinful past of the crowd who followed him was to be symbolically immersed and buried and washed away." The Picture Is Contradicted by the Meaning of the Word "Baptize." The word "baptize" means to dip, plunge, immerse, submerge, etc., and it does not, never did, and never will mean either sprinkle or pour. By no manner of torturing can it be made to mean sprinkle or pour.The record says John baptized Jesus. Then any picture that represents John as doing something else is a falsehood in picture, manufactured to sustain a doctrine that came from the Pope. The Picture Is Contradicted b y All Church Histories. All standard or recognized histories in the world tell us that baptism as practiced by the early church was immersion. Let the editor of the Herald cite an exception. Pouring was not practiced until many centuries after Christ. This picture was made after that practice was authorized by the Pope; hence, it is not a true representation of a Bible scene. The Picture Is Contradicted b y Scholars. Bible Dictionaries, and Encyclopedias. What Dr. Van Dyke says about John's baptism is in substance what all scholars say. All authorities that we have agree in saying that John, Christ, and the apostles practiced immersion. The reader may consult these authorities for himself. So Editor Swift's picture is shown to be Biblically, historically, geographically, and topographically a falsehood. On the page opposite this "pouring" picture we give a photograph of a Methodist preacher baptizing his Sunday- school superintendent in the river Jordan at the very place where John baptized Jesus. This Methodist preacher is Mr. U. L. Ennis, and the man he is baptizing is Mr. Jonathan Sleeman. Both these men live (or did in 1923), at Frassburg, Maryland. This baptizing took place on July 23, 1923. It was witnessed by Brother N. B. Hardeman, of Henderson, Tennessee, who "snapped" the picture with a kodak, and Brother Ira A. Douthitt, of Paducah, Kentucky. Brother Douthitt let us have this picture for the Gospel Advocate. He tells all about this baptizing in his book, "My Trip Abroad," which book can be purchased from Brother Douthitt for fifty cents. He lives at 801 North Twenty- Fourth Street, Paducah, Kentucky.

Editor Swift promises to continue his articles, and the picture, indefinitely, but we will probably not give any more attention to his editorials until he begins to tell why he baptizes babies. Then we shall try his strength on that point.

Chapter 38

00B.23 Chapter 16--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No. 8

XVI. "Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies"

No. 8 The editor of the Methodist Herald continues his ravages upon the word of God. It has never before been our lot to see a man in such high position who used such reckless disregard for facts in handling the Scriptures. We had thought that we would not give any further attention to his efforts until he begins to offer reasons for baptizing babies, but some of our readers insist that he should be followed to the end and exposed. We will, therefore, only touch the high points of what he uses in three editorials at this time. In his issue of August 19 he takes up the case of Philip and the eunuch and attempts to show that there was no immersion there. It should be noticed by all readers that the editor has never yet offered any scriptural proof for sprinkling, nor has he endeavored to make an affirmative argument upon the Scriptures that he has introduced. Each time he takes a negative attitude and tries to show that this is not immersion. This does not say thus and so. Suppose he should show that immersion is not authorized, we would still be left to learn what baptism is. He has not shown us. He seems to assume that if he could show that immersion is not baptism, then it would follow, therefore, that sprinkling or pouring is baptism, which, of course, is not true. His efforts to show that the eunuch was not immersed deserve only small notice. First, he says the country through which they passed was a desert. But a little later in the same editorial he says there was a spout spring running out of the side of the mountain. Of course, any reader knows that mountains and spout springs and deserts do not go together. There has been a question among Bible scholars as to whether the word "desert" refers to Gaza or to the road, or way. But there has never been any dispute about what the word "desert" here means. It does not mean barren waste, as there was not and never had been any barren waste between Jerusalem and Gaza. It means "unpopulated." The same word is found in Matthew 14:15-21; Mark 6:35-39; and John 6:10. These references tell us that Jesus went out to a desert place, and yet we find that in that "desert" he had the people sit down upon the green grass. This shows that the word meant unpopulated, and not barren waste. No one knows at just what point on the road the eunuch was baptized; but we know that there were springs along the way, and there have recently been discovered remains of artificial pools, and there was a brook in the valley of Elah through which this road ran, and this brook is the one David crossed when he went out to slay Goliath. (1 Samuel 17:40.) While this was only a brook, we all know that small brooks wear out holes at different points sufficiently large for baptizing. But this same road also crosses a much larger stream in the plain of the Philistines. This stream is called Wady elHasy. The editor’s next effort is to show that Philip and the eunuch did not go down into the water, but only down to the water, and then, instead of coming up out o f the water, came away from the water. This is the way he says it should read. But this is not the way it does read; and if the Greek should be so translated, it is strange that there is not one translation among the many hundreds of English translations extant that renders it as the editor says it should be rendered. The old, old story would be appropriate—viz., if "into" means "near by," then the swine only ran down to the sea. and not into

the sea, and were drowned on dry land; for the same word "into" is used in that case, both in the Greek and in the English.

Again the editor makes the old claim that the eunuch was reading from Isaiah, and that in Isaiah 52:15 it is said that he shall "sprinkle many nations," and he says that the eunuch had learned about sprinkling from the passage he was reading. Anyone who will take the pains to read the Scriptures in question will see that this man was not reading from the fifty-second chapter of Isaiah, but from the fifty-third chapter. But, what is a more complete refutation of the editor's claim, the word "sprinkle" in the passage not only does not refer to baptism, but it does not even mean "sprinkle." The scholarship of the whole world admits that the word in this passage means "startle" or "astonish" and not "sprinkle," and even an English reader who will read the passage can see that that is the meaning. It says: "As many were astonished at thee;" so, or in like manner, shall he "sprinkle" or startle or astonish many nations. "Kings shall shut their mouths at him," etc. The meaning even in the King James translation can easily be seen. Baptism is not in the Old Testament, and the eunuch knew nothing about it, except what Philip had told him in preaching unto him Jesus. In the issue of August 26 the editor attempts to show that "buried with him in baptism" does not mean immersion. Again the editor only makes negative points. He attempts to prove nothing for Methodist practice. In order that our readers may see just how farfetched and absurd are his points on this expression, we quote the following from the editorial: In Romans 6:4 we read: "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death." And in Colossians 2:12 we read again: "Buried with him in baptism." In these passages we find the strongholds of our immersionist friends. Neither passage has a drop of water in it. Paul, the apostle, who wrote these, was not sent to baptize, and though he was baptized in a house in Damascus, the Bible says "he arose and was baptized," or another translation reads, "rising up, he was baptized." It is "buried into death" and not into water. Both passages mean the same. In Colossians 2:12, in the same verse as above, we see that the soul is raised through "the operation of God." It is not that our bodies are raised out of water by the physical strength of a man. These passages signify the deepest work of grace—separation from sin and made alive to God. The central thought of the apostle is sin and salvation, death and life. What a pity that so many see only water in these passages, when it is only the work of grace! These passages are figurative language. They have no more literal meaning of being put under water than the other passages of Scripture, such as "crucified with Christ" means that we are to be nailed to a literal cross of wood or that "resurrection" and "raised up from the dead" in Romans 6:4-5 mean a literal resurrection of the body. Paul says: "We are buried with Christ," not that we were buried in water. The baptism Paul is speaking of here is the same as that spoken of in Luke 12:50, which is the baptism of suffering and death. Jesus had already been baptized by John when he uttered these words.

Again, Christ says: "With the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized." The first quibble that we shall notice in the above editorial is that we are "buried into death" and not in water. As usual, the editor mixes his figurative and literal language, leaves out expressions, and perverts the word in a most unbelievable manner. The Scriptures say not "buried into death,'1 but "buried with him b y baptism into death, " and the same passage says we are planted in the likeness o f his death. The whole thing is simply a picture, or a likeness. In commenting on Colossians 2:12, the editor says that the "soul is raised through the operation of God," and not our bodies raised out of water by the physical strength of a man. Thus he makes the rising from our

burial in baptism an operation of God, and ho intends to show that the whole ceremony of baptism is a mystical, spiritual operation performed by God; but the great trouble with the editor here is that the Bible simply does not say what he says. The Bible does not say that the soul is raised by the operation of God. It says we are buried by baptism, wherein we are also risen with him "through faith i n the working o f God, who raised him from the dead." The operation of God was in raising Christ from the dead. We are both buried and raised in baptism through our faith i n that operation, or because of our faith in the buried and risen Christ. So, baptism is not the operation of God at all, but we are baptized and raised through faith in God's operation in raising Christ from the dead. Can any Methodist who is honest believe that a doctrine or a practice is right when it will lead a preacher, an editor, so miserably to pervert, distort, suppress, and juggle the Scriptures as Editor Swift does? His very efforts to prove his practice ought to drive any sincere soul in the opposite direction, if that soul will only read the passages carefully that the editor tortures each week. The editor says that as we are not literally nailed to the cross, although we are "crucified with Christ," neither are we literally buried and raised in baptism. No one claims that we are literally buried. If we were, we would have to be placed in a tomb and covered up or closed up just as Christ's body was buried. We are not literally buried in a literal grave, but we are buried by baptism in the likeness of Christ's death and burial. John Wesley, the founder of the Methodist Church, and all other scholars of all churches say that this alludes to "the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." But after the editor has made all the other efforts that he can to upset this teaching, he finally declares that this baptism alludes to a baptism of suffering. In this he stands alone. No other man who ever attempted to give an explanation of this passage took that turn. Jesus did refer to the great overwhelming deluge of suffering through which he was to pass as a baptism. He said that some of his apostles would be baptized with the same baptism, and that they would drink the same cup. Some of them did suffer martyrdom and were, therefore, baptized in this figurative sense with a baptism of suffering. But the baptism the apostle Paul referred to in Romans was the baptism that these people had submitted to in becoming Christians. It had no reference to the suffering that they endured because they were Christians: but it did refer to their conversion through obedience to the gospel or to the form of doctrine at which time they were made free from sin, and, as all scholars admit, it was the baptism commanded in the Great Commission. Wesley says this ancient manner of baptism was by immersion. Does Editor Swift repudiate John Wesley? Will the readers of the Methodist Herald repudiate Wesley, who was a sincere Bible student, an excellent scholar, and in some instances a sound, safe Bible exegete, and in his stead take the senseless remarks of Editor Swift? We do not believe intelligent Methodists will accept Swift's explanation or endorse his methods, and our only hope is that many of these intelligent Methodists will be permitted to see what the Gospel Advocate is saying about Swift's efforts. In the Herald of September 2 the editor attempts to show that the three thousand persons could not have been immersed on the day of Pentecost. We remind our readers that when he spoke of John's baptizing such a great number, he himself estimated that one man could baptize three hundred each day. And on that basis the twelve apostles could easily have baptized throe thousand. But again the editor confuses the Scripture and tries to indicate that the pouring of the Holy Spirit was baptism, and that Ezekiel 36:25 was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, and that the people had clean water sprinkled upon them, etc. The passage in Ezekiel has only to be read to be understood by anyone. It alludes to the cleansing of the Jews from their idolatry and other sins by the sprinkling of water of purification upon them, which "clean water," as we have often seen, was a mixture of water, of

blood, and of ashes. This had no reference to baptism, and there is no justification whatever for the claim that this prophecy had any reference to the day of Pentecost.

Those who tremble at the word of God will find themselves under confused emotions of shame, surprise, grief, and pity when they follow the editor through his unreasonable and almost unthinkable perversion of the word of the living God.

Chapter 39

00B.24 Chapter 17--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No. 9

XVII. "Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies"

No. 9 The editor of the Methodist Herald continues to offer arguments which he thinks will show that immersion was not the baptism practiced in the New Testament. He is not yet arguing affirmatively for pouring or sprinkling, but is content to try to find some circumstance that would show that immersion was not possible or practicable. In his issue of September 9 he discussed the baptism of the jailer, and in the issue of September 16 he discusses household baptisms. As he endeavors to prove that the jailer was baptized in a house, the argument in both of these issues of that paper is just the same. He introduces Saul and attempts to show that he was baptized in the house of Judas on the street that was called "Straight" in the city of Damascus. He introduces Cornelius, who. with his house, he assumes, was baptized in a room of his residence. Then he discusses at length the case of the Philippian jailer, and last of all he makes an astounding assertion about the origin of immersion. We shall notice these cases separately, but only briefly. THE CASE OF CORNELIUS In discussing Cornelius, the editor again stressed the fact that the Holy Spirit "fell" upon Cornelius, and he quotes the apostle Peter as saying that this was a fulfillment of the promise made by the Lord that they should be baptized in the Holy Spirit. He tries to prove that this was a case of baptizing by "falling" or by "pouring." This argument has been answered in a previous article, and it is only necessary to state that when these people were baptized in the Holy Spirit they were completely overwhelmed by the Spirit and passed under his control. The Holy Spirit was poured; and if the act of pouring is baptizing, then the Holy Spirit was baptized. That Cornelius was baptized in water or with water is made clear by Peter’s statement: "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized?" The editor correctly says that this means, "Who can object to these being baptized?" There is nothing here to indicate how they were baptized; but we know what the word "baptize" means, and therefore we know that the details or necessary circumstances of an immersion are simply not mentioned as they are in but few cases. They were baptized, and that tells the whole story. THE CASE OF SAUL

Saul was in the house of Judas fasting and praying in blindness. Ananias came to him and entered into the house where he was. Then Ananias commanded him to "arise, and be baptized, . . . calling on the name of the Lord." Editor Swift infers that this simply means, "Stand up, and be baptized in your tracks, right here in this room." But, of course, that inference is not justified. It has no ground at all. If Saul had been baptized right there in that room, and if such a baptism could be performed by pouring or sprinkling, there would have been no need for him to arise. He could have been baptized while lying down or standing on his knees just as easily as he could while standing erect. In fact, Methodist preachers usually have their candidates to kneel down to receive sprinkling. The fact that Saul was commanded to arise indicates that he had to do something that could not be done while in a prostrate or kneeling posture. To assume that after he arose he stood still or did not move out of the house is a groundless assumption. It is a glaring fallacy in

reasoning. To see the absurdity of such an inference, let us take this illustration: Editor Swift ate the meat today which he purchased yesterday. But the meat which he purchased yesterday was raw meat. Therefore, Editor Swift ate raw meat today. Because the details and circumstances of cooking the meat were not narrated in the first statement, we assume that this cooking did not take place at all. This is exactly the same reasoning the editor is guilty of. The word "arise" is used dozens of times in the Scriptures, and it always prefaces some action that would necessitate the getting up from a sitting or kneeling posture. "Arise, and walk"; "Arise, let us go hence"; "Arise, go over this Jordan"; "Arise, and go into Damascus." These are a few samples of the way that word is used. THE CASE OF THE JAILER The editor thinks he has positive proof that the jailer was baptized inside of the prison. This story is found in the sixteenth chapter of Acts. Anyone who will read it carefully will see that the editor again draws an unjustifiable inference. The circumstances forbid such an inference. Paul and Silas were in an inner prison or dungeon before the earthquake came; but after the doors had been thrown open and their stocks had been loosed, no one knows where they were, except that they were somewhere inside the prison building; that they had not come out into the corridors no one can prove. W e might infer that they had. but we do not have to infer anything in order to learn the truth. The thirtieth verse plainly says that the jailer ”brought them out. ” Our editor says he brought them out of the inner prison into the outer prison. But for this statement he has no proof in the world. The natural conclusion from the language would be that he brought them out of the prison. Then the thirty-second verse declares that Paul and Silas spoke unto him the word of the Lord, and to all "that were in his house." Now, if the editor could find this expression, "in his house," connected with baptism, he would shout with a voice like the voice of many waters that the baptism took place inside o f his house. Why shall we not then say that this speaking took place inside of the jailer’s house? But the editor will not have it that way, because that would spoil his picture. For if this speaking was done in his house, then the thirty-third verse says he "took" them and washed their stripes and was baptized. Then the thirty-fourth verse says after this had been done he brought them into his house. So we know if when they spoke to all that were in his house, they were speaking inside of the house, they went out of the house for the baptizing, because after this ordinance they were brought back into the house. Now we see the facts, which are: first, they were brought out of the prison; second, they spoke to all that were in the jailer’s house: third, the jailer then took them and they were baptized: fourth, the jailer brought them into his house. Is it not clear that the baptizing took place somewhere out of the house? But the editor argues that Paul would not go out of the prison the next morning until the magistrates came down and brought him out. He says this shows clearly that Paul would not have gone out of the prison during the night. But here again is a very obvious fallacy. When Paul went out of the prison during the night, he was still a prisoner and still in charge of the jailer. He was not released, nor was he attempting to escape. When the magistrates sent the jailer word to let them go, Paul refused to leave the prison or to go out from under the jailer’s keeping, because by so doing he would have admitted that his imprisonment was just, and that he was glad enough to escape without any manner of apology or redress. When the magistrates came down to let him go, their action was an acquittal and an apology. Paul was not necessarily locked in prison any more after the earthquake. The language does not demand it. All that is demanded by the language is that he was still a prisoner and that he refused to accept liberty without an apology. THE ASTONISHING STATEMENT The following statement is so groundless and astonishing that we give it in full:

Immersion is not in the Bible; it is merely read into it through the imagination of some people. Immersion was never heard of until two hundred years alter Christ was born, when it was introduced by Tertullian (A.D. 215) in the form of triune immersion who believed that washing the body cleansed the soul. Even Baptists baptized by pouring and sprinkling in the beginning of their organization as a church (1609), and not until 1641 did they begin the practice of immersion. Roger Williams, who started the Baptist Church in America, was baptized by pouring. He had been baptized in infancy and came to believe in adult baptism, but the records seem to be clear that he was baptized by pouring. Both Thomas Campbell and his son, Alexander Campbell, founders of the Christian Church, were baptized by affusion before they came to America.

Because Tertullian introduced trine immersion in the second century the editor tries to make it appear that immersion itself had not before been practiced. It has already been stated in these replies that all church histories, Bible dictionaries, and encyclopedias agree in saying that the apostolic baptism was immersion. The Greek word means "immerse," according to the lexicons, and the practice of early Christians was immersion, according to all authorities; and yet, in the face of this. Editor Swift asserts that immersion was not heard of until two hundred years after Christ! This editor must be ambitious to gain the reputation of being the insane man of the Methodist Church.

Smith’s Bible Dictionary says: "The language of the New Testament and of the primitive fathers sufficiently points to immersion as the common mode of baptism."

Fisher’s Church History says that the New Testament baptism was immersion.

Mosheim’s History makes the same statement, and with these all authorities agree.

John Wesley says the ancient manner of baptism was by immersion. John Calvin made the same concession. In their most scholarly work, "The Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul," chapter 13, Conybeare and Howson (Episcopalians) made the following clear statement: "It is needless to add that baptism was (unless in exceptional cases) administered by immersion, the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water to represent his death to the life of sin, and then raised from this momentary burial to represent his resurrection to the life of righteousness. It must be a subject of regret that the general discontinuance of this original form of baptism (though perhaps necessary in our northern climates) has rendered obscure to popular apprehension some very important passages of Scripture."

These are a few of the many authorities that could be quoted to offset the editor’s assertion. His statement about the Baptists is not accurate; and if Roger Williams, Thomas Campbell, and Alexander Campbell were all sprinkled, they later learned better and were immersed. Does Editor Swift want his readers to understand that these men were satisfied with sprinkling for baptism and that they were never immersed? If he did not wish his readers to arrive at this conclusion, why did he refer to the fact that these men were sprinkled? It certainly cannot help his cause to know that these men, who were sprinkled, later repudiated it and regarded it as no baptism at all and were themselves immersed, and preached and wrote and debated against sprinkling as a gross perversion, a Roman Catholic relic, and a sinful substitute for what the Lord required. Will Editor Swift be honest enough to tell his readers that these men repudiated sprinkling and became the leading opponents of that doctrine and the greatest protagonists of immersion that the whole world

has ever known? We shall see.

Chapter 40

00B.25 Chapter 18--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No. 10

XVIII. "Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies"

No. 10 "THE WAY GOD BAPTIZED PEOPLE" In the Methodist Herald of September 23 the editor uses as the subheading for his article on "Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies" the words that serve as a caption for this article. As this must be the last time that we reply to the editor's sophistries until he takes up infant baptism, we give his editorial in full:

Let us turn a moment and see how God baptized people. Christ baptized by pouring; for the Bible says. "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." We know that was done (on the day of Pentecost) by pouring. (See Joel 2:28 and Acts 2:17.) Before Christ was born God baptized the Israelites. Read carefully the following: "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." (1 Corinthians 10:1-2.) What is the difference between "in the sea" and "in the river Jordan"? Who can explain the difference? They were "in the sea" and "were baptized" of the Lord. How was it done? If baptism means immersion, then God immersed the Israelites. Let us have the facts. Put David on the witness stand. Here is what he says about this baptism: "The waters saw thee, O God; the waters saw thee. . . . The clouds poured out water." This baptism, though "in the sea," was performed "on dry land." Read Exodus 14:29 : "But the children of Israel walked on dry land in the midst of the sea." They were "in the sea" and "on dry land" and "the clouds poured out water." The word of God calls this baptism: for it says, "And all passed through the sea, and were all baptized." Does not reason teach us here that God baptized by pouring? Can't a twelve-year-old school child understand this? Do not make a god out of your prejudice. Be fair with your own good judgment. Let truth have her perfect work. The Israelites were "under the cloud" (1 Corinthians 10:2) and "the clouds poured out water" (Psalms 77:17). Paul says: "They were baptized in the sea." Now, the Egyptians who followed them were immersed and died from the effects of this immersion. Our immersionist friends do not talk much about this baptism and some others like that of Paul "standing up was baptized." etc., but they run to "much water," "many springs" in the land of E non—the land of many springs—and "in the river Jordan." Why not try to get immersion out of "in the sea," "on dry land," where "the clouds poured out water" on the Israelites, which was performed by God himself? We would drive fifty miles to hear some preachers, our immersionist brethren, who take up so much time preaching on water baptism, preach on this text, "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel," and in the sermon explain why it was that Christ, John the Baptist, as well as the twelve apostles, never preached a sermon on baptism.'=

REPLY

Each week the editor repeats things he has said in former editorials. He has referred to the baptism of the Holy Spirit perhaps a dozen times. We have replied to that point three or four times.

We shall briefly notice the point once more. (1) The apostles were baptized in the Holy Spirit. (Acts 2:1-47) (2)The Holy Spirit was "poured out"and "fell" upon them, etc. (3) The apostles were therefore baptized by pouring. All this is admitted. But the pouring itself was not baptism; if it were, then the Holy Spirit, and not the apostles, was baptized, for it was the Spirit that was poured. The act of pouring was not baptism, but the baptism was the result of the pouring. The Holy Spirit was poured out upon them to the extent that they were overwhelmed, possessed, covered up, and controlled by the Holy Spirit. If the Holy Spirit had been poured as sparingly upon the apostles as Methodist preachers pour water upon their subjects, it could never have been called a baptism.

"IN THE CLOUD AND IN THE SEA" The editor says the Israelites had water sprinkled or poured upon them from the cloud as they passed through the sea, and this he says was baptism. But he emphasizes the fact that they passed through on "dry land." He does not explain how the land kept dry when the clouds were pouring out water. Now the fact is that this "rain" and "pouring out water" that the psalmist speaks of took place at Mount Sinai and not at the Red Sea. It occurred three months after the people had been "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." And it is never remotely referred to as a baptism. Were the people baptized twice— once at the sea and then again at Sinai? But that our readers may clearly see that the psalmist locates this pouring "out water" at Sinai, we here quote from Psalms 77:1-20, Psalms 68:1-35.

"The waters saw thee, O God; the waters saw thee, they were afraid: the depths also trembled. The clouds poured out water; the skies sent out a sound: thine arrows also went abroad. The voice of thy thunder was in the whirl - wind; the lightnings lightened the world: the earth trembled and shook. Thy way was in the sea, and thy paths in the great waters, and thy footsteps were not known. Thou leddest thy people like a flock, by the hand of Moses and Aaron." (Psalms 77:16-20.) The psalmist describes things that took place in the deliverance of the people and in their journey as they were led by "the hand of Moses and Aaron." Verse 16 may refer to the Red Sea, but it closes with a period and comes to a full stop. Then Psalms 77:17 describes something else. (1) "The skies sent out a sound"—the thunder. (2) "Thine arrows went abroad"—the lightning. (3) "The clouds poured out water"—the rain.(4) "The earth trembled and shook"(verse 18)—the earthquake.

Now compare this description with Paul’s description of the giving of the law at Sinai. Paul says there was a "tempest." Read his language: "For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which voice they that heard entreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more: (for they could not endure that which was commanded, And if so much as a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned, or thrust through with a dart: and so terrible was the sight, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake)." (Hebrews 12:18-21.)

If this does not satisfy the reader that the rain or pouring out of water took place at Sinai and not at the sea, let him read another description of the same event from Psalms 68:7-10. Here it is: "O God, when thou wentest forth before thy people, when thou didst march through the wilderness; (Selah) the earth trembled, the heavens also dropped rain at the presence of God: yon Sinai trembled at the presence of God, the God of Israel. Thou, O God, didst send a plentiful rain, thou didst confirm thine inheritance, when it was weary." Here we have the trembling of the earth—the earthquake—shown to be the trembling of Sinai. The rain fell at the same time. THE BAPTISM AT

THE SEA Let us now consider the facts and details of the baptism at the sea.

They were baptized "in the cloud and in the sea." It took both the cloud and the sea to complete and constitute this baptism. The sea walls—congealed water—were upon either side of them and the cloud was above them. They were engulfed, surrounded, covered up. They did not get wet—no.Christian baptism must take place i n water, because that is the element prescribed by the New Testament; but that does not change the fact that, so far as the meaning of the word baptism goes, one might be baptized in other elements. One might be baptized—not scripturally, but so far as the word goes—in sawdust, in sand, in blood, in fire, or, figuratively, in trouble or in debt or in suffering. The cloud that stood over the people was not a rain cloud. It was a "pillar of fire" by night and a "pillar of cloud" by day. The people were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. It was here that they were released from Pharaoh and passed under the leadership of Moses. He now became the head of the nation, the lawgiver and the mediator. In like manner we are now baptized into Christ.(Galatians 3:27; Romans 6:3-6.) At baptism we come from under the control and service of Satan and pass under the leadership of Christ. He becomes the head of the church to us; he is now our Lawgiver, Advocate, Intercessor, and Mediator.

We are baptized unto or into (eis) Christ. Exactly the same word is used in reference to the children of Israel and Moses. They were baptized unto or into (eis) Moses. How would it do to to say, "They were poured into Moses"? We are poured into Christ? if "baptize" means "pour" and if "pour" means "baptize," why not exchange them and substitute the one for the other in the text? Try it and be convinced of the absurdity of the claim. THE APOSTLES DID NOT PREACH ON BAPTISM The editor again leaves his subject and attempts to show that baptism is of no significance and does not deserve any thought or serious study by citing a statement from Paul and by stating that John the Baptist, Christ, and the apostles did not preach on baptism. But what does this have to do with the editor’s problem? How does that justify pouring for baptism? The Baptist preachers attach as little importance to baptism as do Methodist preachers, but they will debate with the Methodists on the mode or action of baptism. They will use—rather, they wil I misuse —Paul’s statement that Christ sent him not to baptize, but to preach the gospel, till even Editor Swift ought to be ashamed of the perversion, but they will not admit that it offers any excuse whatever for pouring. If the editor could give any authority for his practice, he would not be guilty of this gross fallacy.

Inspired men did not preach on baptism because it was not a controverted point then. They commanded people to be baptized. That was all that was necessary. Those who "gladly received" their word were baptized. There was no question about the ordinance. There was no pope then, and hence no followers of the pope’s decree. There was no Editor Swift then to delude the people with false reasoning, false pictures, and by wresting the Scriptures. But today we have many such "vain talkers and deceivers, . . . whose mouths must be stopped." (Titus 1:10-11.)

What caused Paul to say, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel"? Was it because someone was putting too much stress on baptism? Did Paul mean to disparage or belittle baptism? Did he mean to teach that baptism is a nonessential and might, therefore, be disregarded entirely, or, if submitted to, it might be baptism, sprinkling, or pouring, or anything that might please our fancy? Any honest soul who will read the passage can see that none of these things were in the mind of Paul. (1 Corinthians 1:10-17.) No one was putting too much stress on baptism

itself, but some were attaching too much importance to the administrator—Paul, Cephas, Apollos, etc. Therefore, Paul was glad he had baptized only a few of them, "lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name." Was baptism no part of Paul's commission? Was it not included in the things Christ sent him to do? If not, why did he teach anyone to be baptized? Lydia and the jailer were baptized under his preaching. "Many of the Corinthians hearing Paul preach believed, and were baptized." Paul himself baptized Crispus and Gaius and the household of Stephanas. Did Paul have any authority to do this? If so, where did he get it, if not from Christ? Paul's meaning is that he was sent to enlighten people, to convince them and cause them to believe on Christ. Not everyone could do this as he did, for they were not inspired as he was. They did not have power to do miracles as he did. They had not seen the risen Christ as he had. But after men were made believers, any disciple—any uninspired man—could baptize them. On Paul's first missionary journey he appointed "elders in every church." (Acts 14:23.) But later he left this work undone and moved on to preach the gospel; but he left Titus behind him to set things in order and to appoint elders. (Titus 1:5.) Paul might have added: "For Christ sent me not to appoint elders, but to preach the gospel." Would that prove that appointing elders is not important? When the apostles said, "It is not fit |or, "pleasing"—margin] that we should forsake the word of God and serve tables," did they mean that the serving of tables was not important? Did they mean that it was not the Lord's will and not a part of his plan? If they meant this, why did they appoint men of special qualifications to attend to it? The statement of these apostles is equivalent to Paul's statement. They, in meaning, said: "Christ sent us not to serve tables, but to preach the gospel."

Now let us notice these facts about Paul and the Corinthians. (1) Many of the Corinthians were baptized. (Acts 18:8.) (2) But Paul baptized only a few of them. (1 Corinthians 1:14-15.)

Question: Who baptized the "many," and why did they not baptize all? Why did Paul baptize those special individuals? Answer: (1) When Paul came to Corinth, he was alone. (Acts 18:1-5.) (2) The first convert made at that place was Stephanas and his house. (1 Corinthians 16:15.) These were the ones baptized by Paul. These and Crispus and Gaius were, no doubt, baptized before Paul's companions came to him. (3) Silas and Timothy came to Paul at Corinth. (Acts 18:5.) No doubt they baptized the "many" Corinthians.

Christ himself did not baptize, but he taught it and had his disciples to baptize his subjects. (John 4:1-4.) The teaching of God's word is plain, and if people will read it they will not be led astray by such sophistries and quibbling as Editor Swift employs. When we read the word honestly, carefully, and prayerfully, and accept what it teaches without addition, subtraction, or alteration, and insist that others do the same, Editor Swift thinks we are making "a god out of our prejudice"; but when he makes assertions that are without foundation in fact and that are not sustained by any sort of authority, what is he making of himself? And when he perverts, juggles, and distorts God's word, what is he trying to make of his readers?

We here take leave of our editor for a while. "The Lord reward him according to his works."

00B.26 Chapter 19--Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies--No. 11

XIX. "Why Methodists Baptize by Pouring and Baptize Babies"

No. 11 PASSAGES PERVERTED FOR THE SAKE OF A DOGMA

We have several times resolved to leave Editor Swift to his own devices in his contention for pouring as a substitute for baptism, as he is not making any arguments for his practice that deserve or even need any reply. But our readers insist that his perversions of the Scriptures should be exposed. Even though he does not prove his point by the passages he uses, he so perverts these Scriptures as to leave his readers confused about them. It is thought by many that the passages should be cleared of the rubbish of false interpretation and their language clearly set forth so that all will see the meaning.

Yielding to this suggestion, we shall in this article notice two passages that have been miserably misused by the editor of the Methodist Herald. And this is made the more important since this same false interpretation is often used by others. Let us therefore study the passages prayerfully.

John 3:5 The first of the two passages that we are to study is John 3:5. This is the language of our Savior to Nicodemus. The expression, "born of water and the Spirit," is the whole cause of the trouble. The Methodist Herald disposes of the passage in the following manner:

"BORN OF WATER" The above words are found in John 3:5, when Jesus said to Nicodemus: "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God." This is a stronghold of some of our immersionist friends, and yet there is not a drop of water in it, as far as it concerns water baptism. There are not three births mentioned in this conversation of Jesus—only two. If there had been three births, then the sentence should have read, "Except a man be born twice more," etc. "Born again" means another time. "Born of water" is a delicate phrase for the natural birth. In the birth of a child, when it is not "born of water," otherwise called a "dry birth," it is almost death to a mother. Physicians comprehend the meaning here. Nicodemus asked Jesus two questions: "How can a man be born when he is old?" and "Can he enter the second time into his mother’s womb and be born?" Jesus immediately answered in these words: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Then, to more fully explain what he meant, he added: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." In other words, "that which is born of the flesh," woman or womb, is flesh. Cannot an ordinary reader understand this, and why should it be hard for a theologian? This language may have been used to show the importance or the design of baptism, but we were not aware that it is a favorite text in the pouring-immersion controversy. In fact, there are many immersionists—the Baptists—who pervert this language in the same way that Editor Swift has and make "water" mean something other than hudor, aqua, water. And, on the other hand, there are many affu- sionists who say that this refers to baptism. We shall quote from some of these; but first let us notice the editor’s explanation. He says that "water" means flesh, and that this refers to the

natural birth. Thus he uses the word in both a figurative and a literal sense at the same time. Figuratively, it means the birth of the body, the flesh, from the body or flesh of the natural parents. Literally, it refers to the literal, actual water that is present in the natural birth. This is such an obvious misuse of language, to say nothing of the ludicrous turn it gives the Scripture, that it seems that a thinking man would be ashamed to put it forth. But the editor says that if we do not make this refer to the natural birth we will have three births —one of the flesh, one of water, and one of the Spirit! Christ should have said, "Except a man be born twice more," the editor avows. But this is only one of his characteristic quibbles. The language does not read "of water" and "of the Spirit," as though it were two births of different elements. But it says "of water and the Spirit"—one birth of two elements. There are two births here contrasted. One birth was of the flesh, and it was the body or the flesh part of man that was born then. The second birth is of water and the Spirit, and it is the soul or spirit part of man that is born in this birth. The water is an element in this new birth, the second birth, which is contrasted with the first or natural birth.

If we should eliminate all allusion to baptism in this passage, what would we do with the other passages that clearly show that baptism is connected with regeneration. or the new birth? Paul speaks of the "washing of regeneration." (Titus 3:5.) The word for "regeneration" is the same word that is used for born, or birth, in John 3:5. There is something in this birth called a washing. (See, also, 1 Corinthians 6:11; Ephesians 5:26; Hebrews 10:22; Acts 22:16.) Paul himself had his sins washed away when he was converted, or regenerated, and his washing was done in baptism. The scholarship of the world understands that the water in John 3:5 refers to baptism. John Wesley says: "Except a man b e born o f the water and the Spirit —except he experience that great inward change by the Spirit, and be baptized (wherever baptism can be had) as the outward sign and means of it." ("Wesley's Notes.") In the Methodist ritual the preacher who is about to administer baptism is told to say: "Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin . . . and that our Savior Christ saith, 'Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God'; I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous goodness he will grant to these persons that which by nature they cannot have: that they may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy church, and be lively members of the same." (Methodist "Discipline"—old edition— formula for baptism.) As a Scripture reading for a baptismal service, the "Discipline" gives John 3:1-8. If there is no allusion to baptism in this passage, why read it at a baptismal service? In his "Commentary on the Ritual of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South," which is endorsed and published and distributed by the Methodist Episcopal Church, Dr. Thomas O. Summers says that this passage refers to baptism. The following is his comment: To be born of water is to be baptized with water. Symbolical regeneration by baptism introduces a man into the kingdom of God externally considered, as spiritual regeneration by the Holy Ghost introduces a man into the kingdom of God spiritually considered. The analogy obtained under the old dispensation, in regard to the "circumcision which is outward in the flesh," and the "circumcision of the heart, in the spirit." (Romans 2:28-29.) By not recognizing this distinction, and to escape the absurd and dangerous error of "baptismal regeneration," so called, some have forced another interpretation upon this passage by hendiadys—as if it meant "born of water, even of the Spirit"—the water being the Spirit. But this is harsh, and the structure (literally of "water and Spirit") will not allow it. There is not only no necessity on dogmatic grounds, but no possibility on grammatical and other considerations, of repudiating the common view, which has been held by nearly all interpreters, ancient and modern.

Thus, Dr. Summers not only says that baptism is here alluded to, but he says that this is the view held by nearly all interpreters. He answers the quibble that says "water" means "Spirit." He probably never thought that a Methodist editor would ever contend that the water is the flesh birth and the Spirit is the new birth! But then very little of what Editor Swift says would be endorsed by the scholars of his own church. 1 Peter 3:20-21 The second passage that has been so woefully misused is 1 Peter 3:20-21. The following quotation from the Methodist Herald will show our readers what the editor did for that passage: This to many is a difficult passage, yet it is clear when we get the right viewpoint. How anyone can get immersion out of this statement is strange indeed. The antediluvians (wicked people) were the ones drowned or immersed. The "eight souls were saved" by keeping out of the water. If they got any water on them at all, it must have been rained on them—sprinkled or poured. This is A clear case. "The like figure whereunto," Greek scholars say, should be translated "the antitype to which." The world was wicked, defiled, and steeped in sin, but was cleansed by water. Water was poured on the world. Sinners like those in the Red Sea were immersed and drowned. The antediluvians would not obey the Lord and were drowned. Noah and his family came into the ark and were saved—had a clear conscience. If we repent and do like Noah and his family—come into the ark—the Holy Ghost gives witness to a clear conscience that we are saved. Hebrews 10:22 says: "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water." Water baptism is a sign of Holy Ghost cleansing. How was that done? Read again:"Havingour hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience." Noah and his family were not immersed. Even a child can understand such a thing. Besides, A child can see that water was sprinkled or poured upon them—ark and all. "Were saved by water." By means of an ark being built that floated on water. By this method they were saved, not in A flood or being immersed. Noah believed in God and obeyed God, and on the water and not going under it was saved. If we come into the ark, Christ Jesus, and live true to the sign administered—baptism by pouring, sign of the Holy Ghost cleansing—we shall have a "good conscience toward God." "The like figure"—"baptism doth also now save us." The Old Testament starts with sprinkling and pouring as a sign of the Holy Ghost cleansing from sin, and the New Testament ends with the same figure. No one ever claimed that Noah and his family were baptized by any method or mode. The Bible does not say that they were baptized. The passage says that their salvation —not their baptism—was a figure or type of our salvation. They were saved b y water —not by being sprinkled with it or by being immersed in it, but by being borne up by it and by floating on it. In true antitype we are saved by baptism, says Peter. The water of the flood by which they were saved is analogous to baptism, by which we are saved. Of course Noah’s faith and obedience is what saved him; the water was only an element in the salvation which his faith obtained. In like manner we are saved by faith and obedience, and baptism is only an act that expresses our faith and submission. Water is only an element in this obedience of faith. This passage in Peter certainly cannot give any comfort to affusionists. Peter says that baptism is not an ablution, not a bath for cleansing the body, or, as he expresses it, "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh." Peter was afraid some uninformed persons might think that baptism was intended as a bath or a cleansing of the body instead of affecting the conscience, soul or spirit, and he made the point clear that baptism has a spiritual and not a physical significance. Now, if baptism in Peter’s day had been performed by sprinkling a few drops of water upon a person’s head, no heathen would ever have imagined that it was done for a washing or a cleansing of the body! The nature of baptism might have caused some heathen to suppose that it was intended as an ablution. This accounts for the

apostle’s parenthetical explanation. Neither sprinkling nor pouring is or ever was baptism. Scholars could be quoted on this passage, but we deem not necessary.

00B.27 Chapter 20--Review of a Baptist Exegete

XX. A Review of a Baptist Exegete The following article was clipped from the Baptist and Reflector by a Baptist reader and sent to a disciple of Christ for the purpose of convincing him. This disciple sent the clipping to me with the request that I review it. The Baptist and Reflector had copied the article from the Baptist Standard. W. T. Rouse is the author of the article.

There is nothing at all unusual about this article except that the writer is honest enough to admit that the ordinary meaning of the preposition eis is "in order to." This is not unusual for Baptist scholars, such as Wilmarth, Hackett, and others, who give it the meaning of "in order to" even in Acts 2:38, but it is very unusual for a Baptist controversialist to make this admission. But the Baptists evidently think this a very strong article, as it was published in two of their leading papers. We therefore give space to a review of this article, and quote the article in full. AN EXPLANATION OF Acts 2:38

Perhaps there is not another verse of Scripture which has occasioned more controversy than this one verse. Beginning in the second century, in the passing centuries, many books have been written as the controversy lias been in progress. Dr. B. H. Carroll, in his volume on "The Acts," devotes seven chapters to a discussion of the second chapter, and two of these chapters are given over to the discussion of this one verse. The reader can well see my difficulty in compressing into one brief article a proper explanation of this much- controverted portion of Scripture. As we proceed with the study several things will be involved. I mention the following:

Two SYSTEMS OF THEOLOGY So significant are the truths involved in this discussion that two systems of theology, differing fundamentally in their import, emerge from the discussion. For the purpose of this study, I will divide them into what we may call the first and the second system. The first system holds to the following summary of principles: the plan of salvation has been, is, and shall remain, one; the requirements of salvation are spiritual; they are repentance toward God, faith in or toward the Lord Jesus Christ; salvation before the church; the blood before the water. The second theory contends that salvation is by ordinances; that it is spiritual; that it is sacerdotal; that consequently baptismal regeneration is true; that baptism, like repentance and faith, are conditions of salvation and remission of sins. A CORRECT TRANSLATION A correct translation is an important part of a proper understanding of the Scriptures. It is unfortunate that the preposition eis in the verse is translated "for" in the King James Version of the Bible. Without any further comment in this immediate connection, I offer the following translation of Acts 2:38 : "Repent ye and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ with reference to the remission of sins."

SOMETHING TO REMEMBER

It is well for us to remember that words in all languages have what is known as a common or ordinary meaning; that they also have what is known as a frequent meaning; and, last of all, they have what is known as a rare meaning. Applying this principle to the Greek preposition eis

involved in this exegesis, it is freely admitted that the ordinary meaning of the word is "in order to"; but it has also a frequent meaning of "unto," "with reference to," "in token of," "concerning"; and, last of all, it has a rare meaning of "because of." We do well to keep these three very evident meanings in mind as we proceed.

SOME RULES OF INTERPRETATION

Before going on to establish our contention as to the proper meaning of this verse, let me call attention to some rules of interpretation. These will enable us to determine when to give a word its frequent or rare meaning instead of its ordinary meaning. Here are the principles: first, the bearing of the local context; second, the bearing of the general context (by which I mean the tenor of the entire canon of Scripture); third, the nature of congruity of things. Keeping in mind all that has gone before, we are now ready to proceed with our problem. THE MILK IN THE COCONUT

It will be seen from what has gone before that our problem is to determine the proper meaning of the preposition eis in the verse of Scripture under consideration. Our problem, therefore, involves a consideration of the entire New Testament usage of the verb baptizo and its noun, when followed by the preposition eis, with the accusative for its object.

Let us consider a few of the Scriptures where the verb baptizo is followed by the preposition eis with the accusative. First of all, we come to Matthew 3:11 : "I indeed baptize you in water eis repentance." Now, shall we translate it, "I baptize you ... in order to repentance"? Here it is very evident that the preposition eis has not its ordinary, common meaning, "in order to," nor its rare meaning, "because of," but its frequent meaning, "with reference to," "with respect to." Tyndale translated it, "in token of repentance." The context shows that John not only required repentance, but the fruits of repentance, before he would baptize anyone.

Certainly Matthew 3:11 has an important bearing upon Acts 2:38. But let us consider Matthew 12:41 : "They repented eis the preaching of Jonah." Evidently the Ninevites did not repent "in order to the preaching" of Jonah, the ordinary meaning of the word, nor "with reference to" his preaching (the frequent meaning), but because of the preaching of Jonah (the real meaning of the word).

Passing by Mark 1:4 and Luke 3:3, where eis assuredly has its frequent meaning, "unto," "with reference to," we have in the second chapter of the Acts itself a most convincing argument in regard to the proper meaning of eis in this thirty-eighth verse. Peter is preaching and says in Acts 2:25, "For David saith eis him" —that is, Christ. Now, we must give the preposition eis in this connection, not its common, ordinary meaning, "in order to," nor its rare meaning, "because of," but its frequent meaning, "concerning," "with respect to," "with reference to." What is to hinder us, therefore, from giving eis the same meaning in verse 38? It is inescapable that the proper translation should be, "Repent ye and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ with reference to, or with respect to, the remission of sins." We have seen that you cannot always translate eis with its common or ordinary meaning of "in order to," and certainly in this case the general context, which is the general tenor of the canon of the Scriptures, requires that we give it the frequent meaning of "with reference to."

I am conscious of the fact that I have compassed a great deal of material in this brief article; but those who are inclined to go more fully into the discussion or study will find plenty of material at hand for further investigation. The author complained that he could not give a complete exegesis

of Acts 2:38 in one article; but if he had given all his space to that text or even to the texts in which eis occurs instead of using it for irrelevant matter, he would have had more space. His two systems of theology have nothing to do with what a passage of Scripture means unless he is afraid his readers would see the real import of the passage, and he hoped to frighten them away from it by presenting a specter or erecting a scarecrow right in the beginning. Such methods are not worthy of a scholar or of any man who assumes to be a commentator or an exegete. Moreover, he misrepresents thousands of good people and fearfully distorts the truth when he makes the contention that "baptism, like repentance and faith, are conditions of salvation and remission of sins," equal to "baptismal regeneration," "salvation by ordinances," etc. In this he handles the truth more carelessly than he does his grammar, and this is saying a great deal. Notice the clause just quoted. Leave out the expression "like repentance and faith," and we have "baptism ... are conditions of salvation." But we could overlook his errors in grammar if he had manifested a spirit of fairness in dealing with his opponents and with the text that he claimed to explain. The Roman Catholic Church may teach "baptismal regeneration," "salvation by ordinances," "by ritual," "that it is sacerdotal," etc., but no Protestants believe any of those things. But there are many Protestants, among them some Baptists, who believe that baptism is one of the conditions upon which the Lord promises remission of sins. Salvation is of the Lord; it is by grace through faith; but faith is not faith—is dead—until it is expressed by an overt act. Thus we are made free from sin by obeying the form of doctrine (Romans 6:17), by obeying the truth (1 Peter 1:22). And baptism is the one physical act in the whole process of becoming a Christian. It expresses the inward decision and desire. It evinces the submission and surrender of the soul. It symbolizes the death to sin by its form, a burial. The author of the article under review defines the Greek preposition eis, giving us its ordinary meaning, its frequent meaning, and its rare meaning. He is right in all of this, except his "rare meaning" is just so rare that it does not exist. Eis does not mean "because of." It is never used in that sense. It always looks forward and not backward. It expresses motion forward and is most frequently translated by "to," "toward," "unto," or "into." Its radical meaning is movement from a place without to a place within. Hence, into is its primary and its ordinary meaning. When we translate it by the words "in order to," the idea is "in order to" get into a place or state. Then the word has such rare meanings as "concerning," "with reference to," etc. It is also sometimes translated by "at," "on," "upon," "among," "in," and "for." But it never means "because of." Our author, however, cites one passage where he says the word has the meaning of "because of'; and having told us that this is a rare meaning, he now contradicts himself and tells us in a parenthesis that this is "the real meaning o f the word." The passage he cites says that the people "repented at [eis] the preaching of Jonah." He thinks this must mean that they repented because of the preaching of Jonah. But it means that they repented into the preaching of Jonah —that is, into that state or condition required by the preaching of Jonah. Our author says: "Let us consider a few of the Scriptures where the verb baptizo is followed by the preposition eis with the accusative." He then refers to only one such Scripture, and that one stands alone. As this is an unusual passage—no other like it—he prefers to cite it to illustrate the use of eis instead of citing the dozens of passages where eis is used in its ordinary, undeniable sense of "into," "in order to." But even the passage he cites does not help his cause. Even there eis means "in order to." Before we examine that passage, let us do just what he proposed to do, but he did not do—namely, consider a few Scriptures where baptizo and eis are used together.

"John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for [eis] the remission of sins." (Mark 1:4.)

"And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for [eis] the remission of sins." (Luke 3:3.)

"When they heard this, they were baptized in [eis] the name of the Lord Jesus." (Acts 19:5.)

"Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into [eis] Jesus Christ were baptized into [eis] his death?" (Romans 6:3.)

"For by one Spirit are we all baptized into [eis] one body." (1 Corinthians 12:13.)

"For as many of you as have been baptized into [eis] Christ have put on Christ." (Galatians 3:27.)

Now, in the light of these passages, his second rule of interpretation, let us turn back and examine the one passage cited by our author—Matthew 3:11. John said: "I indeed baptized you in water unto [eis J repentance." He says that eis in this passage does not mean either "in order to" or "because of," but "with reference to" or "with respect to." But any reader who thinks at all will see that such a translation would be very doubtful and indefinite. Did John baptize "with reference to" a repentance that had already taken place or "with reference to" a repentance yet to take place? If the former, then "with reference to" has the meaning of "because of"; and if the latter, it has the meaning of "in order to." It is certain John required repentance before he would baptize anyone. Then how did he baptize unto (eis) repentance?

Weymouth translates it thus: "I indeed am baptizing you in water on a profession of repentance." And then he adds this footnote: "Literally 'into' (that changed state or condition), or 'unto' (to teach the absolute necessity of)." The Twentieth Century New Testament renders it: "I indeed baptize you ... to teach repentance." So these scholars tell us that eis has the meaning of "into" or "in order to" even in this passage. We do not have to give it a meaning here that it never has in order to understand this passage.

We have followed our author through all this circumlocution, and we are now ready to take up the passage he was endeavoring to explain, the passage that haunts and terrifies him—Acts 2:38. He says that we find eis used in the twenty-fifth verse of Acts 2, and there it is translated "concerning." "For David speaketh eis him." Here he says it cannot mean "in order to" and must mean "with reference to." Why not, then, say it means "with reference to" in verse 38? But if he will read his Greek Testament he will find that eis is used some nine or ten times in this chapter, and it means "concerning" only one time. In verse 20, Peter says: "The sun shall be turned into [eis] darkness, and the moon into [eis] blood." Then in verse 34 (this is much nearer verse 38 than the one our author cited), Peter says: "David is not ascended into [eis[the heavens." Now, if the use of the word in the context has anything to do with its meaning in the text, we will have to translate it "into" in verse 38. His first rule applies here. But suppose we allow our author to give eis the meaning "with reference to" in verse 38, and then what does the passage mean? "Repent ye, and be baptized with reference to remission of sins." Who can tell what that means? Does it mean "with reference to" remission that they would receive after being baptized, or does it mean "with reference to" remission that they had already received? Any man who knows anything at all about grammar knows that they were to repent and be baptized both for the same purpose. The two

verbs are connected and both are looking to the same end. Therefore, if they were to be baptized "with reference to" remission already obtained, they were also to repent with reference to remission already received. Hence they were saved before they repented. Our author is very careless in both his logic and his language. His effort is a failure even from a Baptist viewpoint. Dr. Hackett, a Baptist scholar, wrote a commentary on the Acts which is well known and has been widely used. He translates the phrase in question, i n order t o the forgiveness of sins. He refers to Matthew 26:28 (blood shed for [eis] remission) and also to Luke 3:3 (the baptism of repentance for |eis| remission) as passages illustrating the meaning and construction here. He adds: "We connect naturally the words for remission of sins with both the preceding verbs (repent and be baptized). This clause states the motive or object which should induce them to repent and be baptized. It enforces the entire exhortation, and not one part of it to the exclusion of the other."

Many other Baptist scholars could be quoted, but this will suffice for the present purpose. If the Baptist papers would give their readers what their own scholars have said in explanation of these troublesome texts instead of what some quibbler says, the trouble would soon all be gone— but so would many of the Baptists. According to our author’s first rule of interpretation, the context, he loses his contention. According to his second rule, the entire canon of Scripture, he most certainly loses his argument on this passage. If we allow him his translation, no one could tell whether it favors his contention or the one he is opposing. And if we allow his own scholars to speak, they not only refute his claim, but they do not even consider it worthy of notice. It must be exasperating to have a doctrine that so rudely clashes with the plain statements of God’s word.

00B.28 Chapter 21. Denominational Baptism--No. 1

XXI. Denominational Baptism No. 1 A letter of inquiry brings before us a question that has often confronted every gospel preacher and has at times been the cause of controversy between good brethren. The author of the letter wishes to know our position on the question. Our position and practice on any vital question is not a secret, and we would not hesitate to state it, if there were a need for such a statement, even if we knew that the statement would immediately involve us in a controversy. But in this case we believe that a fair examination of the issue involved will, instead of provoking a controversy, show that there is no room for controversy among those of us who endeavor to teach exactly what the Scriptures teach on this and all other questions. It is our firm conviction that the controversies on this point in times past have been caused by a misunderstanding among brethren. In that conviction we take up the case in the hope that what we say may clarify the matter and prove helpful to the author of the letter and to all the rest who may read this. The following excerpt from the letter will state the case:

We are confronted here from time to time with the question of whether or not we should accept Baptists or other denominational people on their denominational baptism. My stand has been, and is, that we should not unless (contrary to denominational teachings) they were baptized with the understanding that it was "unto the remission of sins." The mere fact that they were satisfied with what they did, it seems to me, is not sufficient. That same thing is true of every erroneous action in religion. The command of Acts 2:38 is not simply to be baptized, but to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. Jesus had said: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." If a person, then, is baptized and does not know that it is for the remission of sins, it seems clear to me that he does not know the truth, and his baptism is not for the purpose as stated by the apostle when he delivered the truth in Acts 2:38.

We shall discuss the points here raised under the following questions:

Is there any room for controversy on this point?

In what sense do we accept or reject people on their baptism or on any other condition?

Does the fact that people are satisfied with their baptism have any weight in determining the scripturalness or unscripturalness of their baptism?

Is the expression "for the remission of sins" a part of the command to be baptized? Docs one have to understand that baptism is for the remission of sins before one can be baptized scripturally?

A first reading of these questions may arouse the fear that we are starting out to revive a dead issue and to rekindle a flickering flame, but a careful reading of our answers will convince the readers that there is no such purpose in this discussion, even if we do not convince them that there is no room for controversy—no issue between gospel preachers. If any brother insists upon misunderstanding us and in forcing an issue, he will have to do his debating alone. We will not wrangle with anyone.

We shall take up the questions in the order stated above and continue until each one is answered.

First: Is there any room for controversy on this question? We believe that none of us differ or can differ in our practice, even if we should differ slightly in theory. Let us take our bearings and see what there is to dispute about, if anything, on this point.

We all agree that the denominations in general and Baptists in particular do not teach the whole truth on baptism; but, on the contrary, the denominations in general and the Baptists in particular teach some things about baptism that are the reverse of the truth.

We all agree, therefore, that anyone who is baptized with the denominational view of the action and design of baptism is not scripturally baptized.

We all agree also that the New Testament teaching on baptism is perfectly plain, and that any responsible person might by reading the Bible alone learn for himself the truth on the subject.

We all know, and should therefore agree, that many people who belong to the denominations do not know what the denominations teach, or what their own denomination teaches, on baptism, except that it is generally known who practices sprinkling and who practices immersion. But even many who know about this difference do not know why the difference.

We all know, and should agree, that on account of the lack of doctrinal preaching at some places among the denominations of today a member of a denomination with a New Testament in his hand can more easily learn what it teaches on baptism than he can learn what his denomination teaches.

Now, with these points stated, and we hope settled, we are prepared to say that from the mere statement that a man was baptized by a denomination we cannot say whether he was or was not baptized scripturally. But the fact that the denomination teaches error on baptism—teaches unscriptural baptism—justifies the presumption that his baptism was not scriptural. While that presumption exists it is necessary for every gospel preacher to set forth in the plainest possible terms what the Scriptures teach on baptism, and he should, when one who has been baptized by a denominational preacher comes forward indicating that he wishes to quit denominationalism and be a Christian only, show what the denomination teaches on baptism, and thus clearly draw the contrast between the teaching of the denomination and the teaching of the New Testament. When that has been well and thoroughly done, if the person in question insists that he knew and understood the New Testament teaching at the time he was baptized, and that he obeyed the teaching of the New Testament and not the teaching of the denomination, then there is nothing left for a gospel preacher or a gospel church to do but to approve his step in leaving denominationalism and to offer him encouragement and fellowship. To require more in reference to baptism would be to make a sectarian or denominational requirement of our own. If the man submitted, he would not be Quitting denominationalism at all. He would instead be quitting one denomination and joining another—quitting "his" church and joining "ours."

Having shown that the presumption is that one who was baptized by a denomination was baptized according to and in obedience to that denomination’s teaching, and was not therefore scripturally baptized, we must now say that while that is always the presumption i t is not always the fact. According to the points which we put down above as settled, we saw that it is at least a possibility

for one to be baptized at the hands of a denomination with an understanding of what the New Testament teaches and without a knowledge of what the denomination teaches. The whole point, then, turns upon the individual's attitude—his motive, his faith, his repentance, his obedience. It. is not a question of whether what the denomination teaches is true or untrue; it is a question of what the individual did, and no one can say what he did but the individual himself. He must determine the matter in the light of what he now knows God's word to teach and with a clear memory of what he did. This being, then, a question that must be asked and answered anew every time anyone quits denominationalism, there is no such thing as settling it by controversy. And since what one individual understood and did cannot stand for what some other individual understood and did, there is no way for a preacher or an editor to say what is true or not true in any specific case, except his own. A brother cannot sit in an editor's chair in Nashville, Tennessee, and say that a man in San Antonio, Texas, who wished to quit denominationalism and who "came forward" under the preaching of Jesse P. Sewell, had been baptized scripturally and did not therefore need to be rebaptized. Neither can a man sit in an editor's chair in Atlanta, Georgia, and say that a man in Detroit, Michigan, who wished to quit denomina- tionalism and who "came forward" under the preaching of H. H. Adamson, had not been baptized scripturally and therefore should have been rebaptized. We will have to trust Brother Sewell and Brother Adamson to teach the word of God faithfully and to apply it according to the need of each individual case. No man can say that all who have been baptized by the Baptists or by the Adventists or by the Mormons even— for they teach that baptism is for the remission of sins— have been baptized scripturally, for that would certainly not be true.

Neither can any man say that n o one who has been baptized by the Baptists or by the Adventists or by the Mormons or by the Methodists, etc., has been baptized scripturally, for that would very probably not be true. The question must be settled each time upon the merit of that particular case. Then where is there any room for controversy? Can a man say what is true or not true in a case about which he knows nothing at all?

We should all always teach the whole truth and insist that people obey it. There will then be very few cases where a denominationalist will even claim to be "satisfied" with his baptism.

00B.29 Chapter 22. Denominational Baptism--No. 2

XXII. Denominational Baptism No. 2 The second question that was raised in the letter we published last week was: In what sense do we accept or reject people on their baptism or any other condition? Brethren frequently ask whether or not we should "accept people on their baptism." We should first ask: What part do we have in accepting or rejecting people on any condition? If we accept people on their baptism, who does the accepting? Does the preacher alone do this, or does the congregation join with him in this act of "accepting" somebody? If the congregation participates in this, in what way do the people make known their willingness to accept the person? Would it not be necessary to state the case and take a vote? The denominations all have methods of accepting or receiving members. These methods differ somewhat with the different denominations, each sect having its own peculiar manner of receiving people "into the church." They open the doors only at stated times. But the door to Christ's own church has never been closed since the day of Pentecost. People enter that church, which is the house, household, or family of God (1 Timothy 3:15; Hebrews 3:3-6; Ephesians 2:19-21; Galatians 6:10), by a spiritual birth (John 3:3-5). Under another figure this church is spoken of as the body of Christ (Ephesians 1:23; Colossians 1:18), and people enter into Christ, into his body, by a faith that is perfected and actualized in baptism (Galatians 3:26-27; 1 Corinthians 12:13; Romans 6:3-6). The same fact is presented in still another form when it is shown that people are convicted of sin by the Holy Spirit through the gospel, comply with the conditions of pardon, and are then saved, and God adds them to the church without any further choice or act or ceremony on the part of man. (Acts 2.) This being true, we see then that human beings have nothing to do in making Christians—members of the Lord's body, which is his church—but to teach, preach, and then baptize those who believe—those who are subjects for baptism. (Matthew 28:18-20; Mark 16:15-16; Luke 24:46-49.) But who is a subject for baptism? Any responsible person who has heard the gospel and believed it and who is willing to repent of all sin and obey Christ from now henceforth forevermore. But who is to decide whether a man believes and is willing to repent and obey? Each man must decide this for himself, and he will tell of his decision to the preacher, to the church, and to the world by his public confession of his faith and then by his public act of obedience and always thereafter by his righteous life. (Romans 10:9-10; Php 2:9-11; Romans 6.) But suppose a man who hears the gospel does not believe it? Then he will of his own accord go his way and claim no part or lot with us in this matter. We can do nothing for him unless we can by some manner of presenting the truth make a believer out of him. But suppose, again, some man believes the gospel, but is not willing to repent? Then the preacher cannot baptize him. He will have to go with Felix, Agrippa, and the devil. (Acts 24, 2 G; James 2.) But suppose, still again, a man believes, repents of his sins, begins living a righteous, prayerful life, but will not be baptized? Well, of course, the preacher cannot baptize him against his will. He can only teach him what the Lord says about baptism, and this will be to tell him plainly that the Lord has not promised to forgive his sins until he is baptized; that he is not in Christ until he is baptized "into him." He must show him that those who love Christ will do what he commands, and that those who claim to love him, but will not obey him, are called liars in the Scriptures. (John 14:23; 1 John 2:4; 1 John 5:3.)

But suppose after a man has been taught all this he still refuses to be baptized and continues to meet with the brethren and participate in the religious services, even partaking of the Lord's Supper? Is there anything we can do then? It is hardly supposable that anyone would do this after having been shown that he has not become a Christian; is not in Christ, in his body, which is the church: and does not, therefore, have any scriptural right to anything that belongs only to those who are in Christ. But if such a case should exist, there is nothing that Christians can do beyond teaching the points already mentioned. But let us suppose that some man hears the gospel, understands it, and tells us that he long ago believed this same gospel, repented of his sins, and was baptized for the remission of sins or in order to obtain the blessings of God, one of which is forgiveness of sin, but that he has since been worshiping with denominational people, wearing a denominational name, supporting a denominational institution, all of which he now believes to be wrong and desires to quit. What shall we say to him? As in a former article, we should show him clearly what scriptural baptism is, what the particular denomination that baptized him teaches on the subject of baptism; and then if he says he has obeyed the Lord in this respect, we can no more question his word about the scripturalness of his baptism than we can about the scripturalness of his faith or of his repentance. We shall have to take his word and encourage him to be faithful in the Lord's service as a Christian only. From all of these supposed examples and from the Scriptures that have been cited we see clearly that we as Christians have no rule, no law, no requirement of our own to which any person must submit in order to have our fellowship; and yet it is clearly shown that we do have a great deal to do in teaching the Lord's will, the Lord's law, and helping people to understand and obey it. So we have something to do in making Christians or bringing people into the church, after all. This is what brethren refer to when they speak of our accepting persons on their baptism. They mean: should we approve the man's baptism and sanction his act in that respect? The third question is: Does the fact that people are satisfied with their baptism have any weight in determining the scripturalness or unscripturalness of their baptism? Sometimes this question is alluded to as if some preachers among us make no higher requirement in reference to baptism than that the individual himself be satisfied; or that these brethren make no effort to ascertain what sort of baptism the man who presents himself has had; that they only ask the man if he is satisfied with his baptism, and if he answers in the affirmative they ask no further questions and give the matter no further consideration. I think this is a wrong impression; but if there are such preachers among us, they are entirely too indifferent or lax about teaching the will of the Lord. All informed persons know that the mere fact that a man is satisfied with his attempt to obey the Lord docs not prove that his obedience has been acceptable to the Lord. Methodists are satisfied with sprinkling. Holy Rollers are satisfied with what they take to be Holy Spirit baptism. Quakers are satisfied with no baptism at all. So on ad infinitum.

We do not receive members into the church by asking them to conform to some laws of our own. We do, nevertheless, have something to do in bringing men into the church of the Lord. It has already been shown that we are to teach the word of the Lord in reference to baptism in the plainest possible terms and point out the errors of any denomination that may concern the baptism in question, and that we must insist that persons who are baptized scripturally must have been baptized according to the teaching of the Scriptures, and not according to the teaching of any denomination. When we have done this, there is nothing more we can do. Then it is that the individual himself must make the decision. He must say what he did when he was baptized, what his motive was. In this respect he is the man to be satisfied—that is, satisfied in his own

conscience as to whether or not he has obeyed the Lord.

Experience shows us that the number of cases of this kind are vastly in the minority. Only in rare instances do we find men who even claim to be satisfied with their baptism after the teaching of the New Testament has been clearly set before them in contrast with the teaching of the denomination in which they have held membership.

00B.30 Chapter 23. Denomnational Baptism—No. 3

XXIII. Denominational Baptism No. 3 BAPTISM FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS In discussing the points that were suggested in a letter that was recently published on this page, we have come now to the fourth question, which is as follows: 7s the expression, "for the remission of sins," a part of the command to be baptized? As we begin to discuss the point, let us allay any fears that may be aroused by saying that whatever may be the answer to this question, it will not in the least minimize the importance of baptism. Baptism is a condition of salvation; a step that must be taken before one enters into Christ, where forgiveness of sins is and where all spiritual blessings are. (Ephesians 1:3; Ephesians 1:7; Galatians 3:27.) Sins are not remitted until the believing penitent is baptized. The question, therefore, is important only as a scriptural exegesis. The expression eis ("for, unto remission of sins") is clearly the purpose for which persons are to obey the command. The command is to be baptized, and the reason for being baptized is that you may receive the remission of sins.

If this is a part of the command, then everywhere the command is given this expression would have to be found. Either that or else the command is not completely stated. It is a well-known fact that baptism is taught in the Great Commission, in the preaching of the apostles, and in the Epistles. And yet we know that at no place this side of the giving of the commission is the expression, "for the remission of sins," found with the term "baptism" except in Acts 2:38. Moreover, we have the plain statement that Peter commanded the Gentiles to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. (Acts 10:48.) But the expression, "for the remission of sins," is not here found. John’s baptism was also for the remission of sins, but in only one place do we have that expression and the term "baptism" found together in reference to his baptism. (Mark 1:4.)

If "for the remission of sins" is a part of the command to be baptized, it is also clearly a part of the command to repent. Any grammatical analysis of Acts 2:38 will show that repentance and baptism are connected, and that "for the remission of sins" follows both of them and is the purpose for which each verb in the command is to be obeyed. Moreover, in Mark 1:4, where it is said that John preached the baptism of repentance for remission of sins, it is clearly seen that both baptism and repentance are for the same purpose. Again, in Luke 24:47, where Jesus said that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name, beginning at Jerusalem, the word "and" in this passage is from the Greek preposition eis, which is "unto" or "for the remission of sins"—the same preposition that is used in Acts 2:38; Mark 1:4, etc. Thus, Jesus clearly says that the apostles were to preach repentance for the remission of sins among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. Repentance is for the remission of sins in the same sense that baptism is for the remission of sins; and, therefore, if this expression, "for the remission of sins," is a part of the command to be baptized, it is also a part of the command to repent. And yet, in all of the many places that repentance is mentioned, we do not find the expression, "for the remission of sins," connected with it, except in the verses that have just been cited. The command is one thing and the blessing promised to those who obey the command is another thing. Remission of sins is the blessing promised to those who repent and are baptized. Does one have to understand that baptism is for

the remission of sins in order to be scripturally baptized? It is easy to see that if one understands that baptism is a condition of salvation or a necessary step that must be taken in order to enter into Christ and to enjoy spiritual blessings, such a one will certainly have the right conception of baptism, whether that one ever read Acts 2:38 or not. Acts 2:38 only expresses this same truth in reference to baptism in different language. But suppose someone does not know that baptism is a condition of salvation, but, nevertheless, is baptized, would such a baptism be valid? It is difficult to see how anyone could learn enough about baptism to attempt to obey the command at all without learning the purpose of the command. If such a person has learned that baptism is required in the word of God, it is certain that that person would have learned at the same time something of the blessing promised to those who are baptized, had he not been misled by denominational teaching. Furthermore, if anyone learns that the Lord has required him to be baptized, and is therefore baptized in order to meet the Lord's requirements, he certainly must have learned from the same Scriptures that salvation, remission of sins, and spiritual blessings were promised to those who obey the command, and to those only. It is hard, therefore, to see how anyone could be scripturally baptized without knowing what baptism is for. If he has learned about baptism from the Scriptures, he has certainly learned its purpose, unless he has been misled by false teaching. If he has been misled by false teaching, then he evidently has not obeyed the truth. If he did not learn about baptism from the Scriptures, but learned about it through the teaching of some denomination, the chances are very few that he learned the truth, and therefore obeyed the truth. Our conclusion is, therefore, that anyone who is baptized as the Scriptures teach that he should be baptized must have known that baptism was unto the remission of sins or was a condition ofsalvation. I fh e did not know this, there has been some misreading or some misleading somewhere.

One extreme follows another. The Roman Church has for many centuries taught baptismal regeneration. It has taught that persons who can neither believe, repent, understand, nor obey can be saved by going through a process called "baptism." This puts merit in baptism, magic in a ceremony, a miracle in an ordinance. It teaches that a soul is regenerated by an external ordinance in which that soul in an unconscious and passive way participated. In combating this error people have gone to the extreme of saying that baptism is an absolute nonessential—that it is not necessary to submit to this ordinance at all. Then when we teach them that baptism is essential—that baptism is for the remission of sins—some honest souls have thought that we mean that baptism merits the remission of sins; that it secures the remission of sins in the sense of deserving such a blessing. Because of this very grievous and very general idea, some people, who have believed the Scriptures to teach that baptism is a command of the Lord which no one can refuse to obey and be saved, have at the same time denied that baptism is "for the remission of sins" when they hear us preach it. This seems like a paradoxical position for any man to occupy, but it is explained by the false idea that some people have about what we intend to convey when we teach that baptism is essential, or that it is for the remission of sins. In fact, some denominations put a good deal more stress on baptism and attach a good deal more importance to it when they are trying to teach those who do not believe in baptism at all than they do when they are in controversy with us. We should keep well in mind the Catholic error about baptism when we are fighting against the Baptist error about baptism. We should never allow our opponents to make any honest soul believe we are trying to teach what the Catholics teach on baptism. This explains how it is possible for some people to believe that baptism is a command of

the Lord that must be obeyed and at the same time say they do not believe that baptism is for the remission of sins. They misunderstand the expression "for remission of sins."

00B.31 Chapter 24. Denominational Baptism—No. 4

XXIV. Denominational Baptism No. 4 BAPTISM FOR ("EiS") REMISSION OF SINS In the book called "Sweeney's Sermons," which gives a series of sermons by John S. Sweeney, we have one sermon on the subject, "Baptism for Remission of Sins." The first paragraph of that sermon is as follows:

We should endeavor to avoid extremes. There is a manifest proneness among men, and especially men of earnest natures, to go to extremes upon all subjects. This has been quite conspicuously developed in the different theories of the importance of baptism. My brethren are supposed to hold an extreme position on this question; at least, they are frequently so represented, and this should admonish them to be cautious.

If we would all follow Brother Sweeney's advice, we would not only do much more good among the people who do not know the truth, but we would also avoid many occasions of controversy among ourselves. Extremes work in what the doctors call a "vicious circle." Extremes cause controversies, and controversies sometimes cause extremes; but those who wish to teach the word of the Lord in the most effective way will always prayerfully endeavor to avoid all extreme positions, and also to avoid all useless controversies. The only way we can correct the error of any man is to see the error from his viewpoint. Some people oppose the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins because of a misunderstanding of the use of the word for. Here we give some attention to that word.

1. "For." An unabridged, English dictionary shows that the word for is used as a preposition, as a conjunction, and also as a noun. This last-mentioned use is very rare, and may not be in best of taste, but it is sometimes so used as when we say: "Thefors far outnumbered those who were against the position." But the same authority shows that the word for, when used as a preposition, has as many as thirty different meanings, and the first meaning is given as: "A substitute or an equivalent, noting equal value or satisfactory compensation, whether in barter and sale, in contract, or in punishment, as: 'Joseph gave them bread in exchange for horses and for flocks and for the cattle of the herds.' "

Since this is one meaning that the word for has, and since some people never know but one meaning of a word and do not even seem to realize that it can have more than one meaning, we readily see why such people would repudiate the idea that baptism is for the remission of sins. They do not believe that baptism deserves such a reward.

They do not believe that baptism is equivalent to, or a fair price to pay for, remission of sins. In this, of course, they are correct. They have the wrong idea of the meaning of the preposition for when used by the apostle Peter in Acts 2:38. When people who hold this idea of the meaning offor are compelled to face the plain statement of the Holy Scriptures, they begin to see that their idea must be wrong, and they will cast about to find some explanation of this passage. Then they discover that for must have a different meaning from the one just given, and soon they learn that

the word sometimes has the meaning of "because of," and they can find many examples of such a use of the word for. We ask a child, "What are you crying for?" and the answer is, "Because I hurt my foot." "What did you strike Johnny for?" "Because he got my top." This explanation satisfies these inquirers. They just know that baptism does not merit salvation or remission of sins. Therefore, for could not mean equal in value when used in this passage, and now they see that for sometimes means "because of," and they think at once this clears up the trouble. Baptism is because of the remission of sins. Of course, an analytical study of the passage will show that repentance and baptism are connected by a coordinate conjunction, and that both are for the same purpose. If baptism is because of remission of sins, so also is repentance; and, therefore, a man is saved before he repents or is baptized. And since some of the denominations, the Baptists in particular, teach that repentance precedes faith, and since the definition "because of" as the meaning of for here would force the conclusion that the man is saved before he repents, of course he is, therefore, saved before he believes. This is a sufficient refutation of the claim that is made here, but it is not always a sufficient explanation for the nuzzled minds of those who first hear this theory exploded. The following explanation should relieve their trouble:

2. "Unto. " When we consult the Greek, we discover that there are at least three words in the Greek language that mean for, or that are translated for in the English. These words are peri, gar, and eis. When the word for has either of the two meanings given in the above paragraphs, it is not from the Greek word eis. but from one of the others. In Acts 2:38 the word that is translated for in the King James Version is eis in the Greek, and it is translated unto by the Revised Version. This is a better translation, because it removes the trouble that we got into by consulting the English dictionary for the meaning of the word for.

Unto shows that the purpose of the command is to receive or to obtain remission of sins. It shows that the action is progressive, leading forward and not looking backward. When we consult a Greek lexicon for the meaning of the preposition eis, we will find that it has more meanings than the English word for has. In that respect it is entirely different. For does sometimes mean "because of," on account of, or looks back and states a conclusion from something that has preceded. Eis- never looks back; it always looks forward or points to something that is to follow an action. Therefore, it leads to, toward, unto, into, etc. When we read, therefore, that baptism is unto the remission of sins, there is no possibility for the conclusion that baptism looks back to sins already forgiven. We are forced to see that it looks forward to sins forgiven at the end of the obedience. When the Bible says that baptism is unto the remission of sins, and the Baptists say that baptism is because o f remission of sins, we can all see that they point in opposite directions. The Baptists teach that baptism points backward, and the Bible teaches that baptism points forward; and, therefore, the Baptist arrow points toward the west and the Bible arrow points toward the east. You would better take the Bible direction. Which way were you looking when you were baptized, brother?

00B.32 Chapter 25. Denominational Baptism—No. 5

XXV. Denominational Baptism No. 5 A DIAGRAM OF Acts 2:38

Because of different senses in which the word "for" is used, people become confused as to the meaning of Acts 2:38. Especially does this word give false teachers an opportunity to confuse the minds of people. The correct translation of the passage puts the word "unto" in the place of the word "for." This translation will not admit of the idea that baptism is equivalent in value to the remission of sins, or that baptism is a meritorious service. Neither will it admit of the idea that baptism is because of the remission of sins. It clearly shows that baptism leads unto or into the remission of sins. The following diagram is given in order to meet the quibble that is made by Baptists and others on this passage. Diagraming is not taught in our schools of today; in fact, it seems that grammar is not taught, at least in some schools. Diagraming was not taught when I went to school, at least not in the school I attended. But in debates in which I have had part the demand for a diagram of certain sentences has frequently been made. To meet this demand, I procured an old copy of Holbrook’s Grammar, and learned something of the method of analyzing language and showing the relation of the different parts of the sentence. I am here reproducing a diagram that was published in the Gospel Advocate in 1909, with a part of the article that accompanied the diagram. This analysis was given and diagram drawn by W. H. Johns, and it was published in the issue of April 29, 1909. I reproduce it here in the hope that it may do some of the young preachers as much good as it has done me, that it may be remembered and used by them as long as it has been used by me, and that they may pass it on to another generation as it is now being passed on by me:

J. D. Webster of Moscow, Kentucky, has handed me the following by J. B. Mahan (Baptist) of Moscow: "Please give the subject of each verb, and tell which verbs are plural and which are singular, which verbs are active and which are passive." Brother Webster desires that I answer the query and give a complete analysis of the first member of the sentence. Before answering I quote from Holbrook’s English Grammar (page 122, article 621): "Verbs have in reality no number and person, but chiefly for the sake of euphony assume different forms to agree with their subjects rather, to agree with the ear." (See "Conjugation," page 132.)

Answer: "Repent" is said to be active and plural; "be baptized" is said to be passive and singular. The position is sometimes taken that an active plural verb and a passive singular verb cannot have the same subject, neither can they be connected by the copulative conjunction "and." To take such a position is to deny the Bible, and one shows his ignorance of the English language, or else shows that he has a theory to defend, and must try to defend said theory regardless of the rules of our language of the Bible.

Analysis: The sentence as a whole is an imperative compound sentence. The first member is an imperative simple sentence. "Ye" is the subject, "repent and be baptized" is the compound predicate. "Ye" is modified by "person" (understood); "person" (understood) you," adjectival element of the second class. "Repent" and be "baptized" are modified by the phrases "in name"

and "for remission," both adverbial elements of the second class. "Name" is modified by "the," adjectival element of the first class, and the phrase ”OF Jesus Christ," an adj ectival element of the second class. "Remission" is modified by "the," adjectival element of the first class, and by the phrase "of sins," adjectival element of the second class. "Sins" is modified by "your," a pronoun in the possessive case.

It is strange that some people seemingly cannot understand the analysis of Acts 2:38. I have an article before me in which the writer says that "one" is the subject of "be baptized," and that "one" is modified by "every." This cannot be because "every" and "one" are both pronominal adjectives. "One" is never used as a noun. (See Holbrook’s Grammar, page 87, article 448, and pages 88 and 91, articles 455-493.) As I have said above, "one" modifies "person" (understood), and "person" (understood) is in apposition with "ye." (See Holbrook’s Grammar, page 176, articles 970, 971, and remarks; also see Rigdon’s Grammar, pages 73, 74, articles 262 and 267, and be convinced.) That "ye" cannot be the subject OF both verbs, "repent" and "be baptized," cannot be sustained. (See Gospel Advocate of April 1, 1909, page 392.)

00B.33 Chapter 26. The Baptist Arrow and the Bible Arrow

XXVI. The Baptist Arrow and the Bible Arrow The pastor of the Baptist Church of Cookeville, Tennessee, who, we believe, is called "Judge Edwards" in his home community, thinks that a correct analysis of the language of Acts 2:38 will show that the Baptist arrow and the Bible arrow point in the same direction. He undertakes to do what the best scholars among the Baptists long ago said could not be done. The only way the Baptist arrow can ever be made to point in the same direction that is indicated by the Bible arrow is to turn it around. But we are glad to let the judge be heard through our pages, and he did not need to apologize for the criticism of our analysis. An honest, a fair, and a brotherly investigation of any position is a mark of a sincerity and of an interest in the truth that must not be despised.

Here we give in full the criticism offered by our Baptist brother, but we shall reserve the beginning of our reply till next week. Read carefully what he says: Your "Denominational Baptism (No. 4)" in the Gospel Advocate of March 1 attempts to show that in water baptism "the Baptist arrow points . . . west, the Bible arrow points . . . east." In the course of your remarks you say: "Of course an analytical study of the passage (Acts 2:38) will show that repentance and baptism are connected by a coordinate conjunction, and that both are for the same purpose."

I rather think you take too much for granted in your analysis. As a matter "of course," a correct analysis might show that the Baptist arrow and the Bible arrow both point in the same direction. True, if your analysis were correct, in water baptism the arrow might point ahead to remission; but if it can be demonstrated that your analysis is wrong, then will you not have to turn the arrow around and let it point backward to remission, or find a better argument for making it point forward to remission? Your analysis is wrong in that you attempt to make the conjunction "and" join the verbs "repent" and "be baptized" together as a compound predicate of a simple sentence; whereas the conjunction "and" here connects two independent clauses, thereby making a compound sentence.

Now let me demonstrate the truth of this analysis. By referring to the Greek you will discover that the verb "repent" (Greek, "metanoesate") is in the plural number, second person, while the verb "be baptized" (Greek, "baptistheto") is in the singular number, third person. Thus you see they do not agree in number and person. But the universal rule is: "A verb agrees with its subject nominative in number and person." ("Composition and Grammar," by Sanford, Brown, and Smith, p. 157.) Goodwin’s Greek Grammar gives the rule as follows: "A verb agrees with its subject nominative in number and person." (Section 899.) You can see that these two verbs could not take the same subject without violating this universal rule of grammar, both in English and in Greek. Certainly a subject that would agree with "repent" in person and number would necessarily isagree with "be baptized" in person and number. Therefore, the two verbs, "repent" and "be baptized," must each have an independent subject. But what is the subject of the verb "repent"? The Greek makes it plain that the subject of "repent" is "ye" (understood), pronoun in plural number, second person. But what is the subject of the verb "be baptized"? The subject of "be baptized" is the word

"one," indefinite pronoun, singular number, third person. Thus we have two independent clauses—first clause, "repent (ye)"; second clause, "be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." These two independent clauses are connected by the coordinate conjunction "and," thus making a compound sentence, instead of a single sentence with a compound predicate, according to your analysis. But to go a little further with the analysis, the subject "one" of the second independent clause is modified by the adjective "every" and by the prepositional phrase "of you"; while the verb "be baptized" is modified by the double prepositional phrase "in the name of Jesus Christ" and by the double prepositional phrase "for the remission of sins." Thus you may readily see that since these prepositional phrases modify the verb "be baptized" of the second independent clause, and do not modify the verb "repent" of the first independent clause, your conclusion that "both are for the same purpose" is bound to be wrong. But since writing the foregoing, I have received your "Denominational Baptism (No. 5)," in which you present a diagram of Acts 2:38. I am sure you have never taken the trouble of scrutinizing this diagram, or you would not have presented it as you have. Here you have the very inconsistent and rather ludicrous setup of the adjective "every" modifying the plural pronoun "ye," and using "one" as an adjective you have "one" modifying "ye." For example, "every ye of you"; or, still worse, "every one ye of you." Both of these words used as adjectives always modify a singular noun or pronoun, never a plural noun or pronoun. For example, you would not say "every men," or "every persons," or "every houses." Neither would you say "one men," or "one persons," or "one houses." But that is not all. You have a plural subject of a compound predicate, one part of which is plural, the other part singular. To make it perfectly clear, you would not say "men repent and is baptized." Why? Because the subject is plural, and the second part of the compound predicate is singular. Now, that is exactly the error you have made in your diagram—that is, you have a plural subject of a compound predicate, with the second part of the predicate in the singular number. In the face of these plain inconsistencies of analysis, I think you will want to take back your diagram and suggest to your young preacher brethren something better because any theory or practice that depends upon such an incorrect analysis of the Scripture is a "good" theory or practice to discard. But since I have gone thus far, may I suggest still another exercise in analysis? For example, suppose you analyze and compare the following:

Acts 2:38 : "be baptized . . . eis . . . remission."

Matthew 3:11 : "baptize . . . eis repentance."

Now, unless the Holy Spirit was wholly off in grammar, a correct analysis or comparison of these two verses of Scripture will reveal beyond a doubt that the Baptist and the Bible arrows point in the same direction in water baptism—that is, backward to remission of sins already received before baptism.

You will note that the verbs of these two statements, "be baptized" and "baptize," are derivatives of the same word, "baptidzo." Hence, they both refer to the same act or rite. You will also note that these two verbs are each modified with a prepositional phrase having identically the same preposition, "eis." A preposition is a word that shows the relation between the word or words modified and the object of the preposition. The only real difference between the expression in Acts 2:38 and the expression in Matthew 3:11 is not in the verbs modified and not in the prepositions, but in the objects of the prepositional phrases. The object of the phrase in Acts 2:38 is "remission,"

while the object of the phrase in Matthew 3:11 is "repentance." But since the preposition which shows the relation is identically the same in both, it necessarily follows that the relation between the act of baptism and remission is the same as the relation between baptism and repentance. But what is the relation between baptism and repentance? You yourself say—in fact, we are agreed—that repentance precedes or goes before the act of water baptism, and that in baptism the arrow points backward to repentance. Is that not true? But if true, then remission must also precede or go before the act of baptism, and in the act of baptism the arrow must point backward to remission. Why? Simply because it is very plain that the relation between baptism and repentance is exactly the same as the relation between baptism and remission. Hence, the Baptist and the Bible arrows point in the same direction in baptism.

I have written with the utmost good feeling, and with no purpose other than a friendly exchange of thought for truth's sake. I always enjoy reading after you. In fact, on the strength of your very fine review of K. C. Moser's book, "The Way of Salvation," I bought the book and enjoyed it very much indeed.

Sincerely yours, The Baptist Arrow and the Bible Arrow REPLY TO LAST WEEK'S BAPTIST LETTER The first error our Baptist brother makes is in going into the Greek to show that an analysis of an English sentence is wrong. He will surely know that this is not correct when it is brought to his attention. The analysis which he criticizes was of the English sentence as it is found in the American Standard Revised Version. It reads thus: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins." Now, he says, "ye"—pronoun, second person plural—is the subject of "repent," and that "one"—pronoun, third person singular—is the subject of "be baptized." How does he argue for this? Oh, he says the verb "repent" is plural, and must, therefore, of course, have a plural subject. The verb "be baptized" is singular, and must have a singular subject. But how did he learn that these verbs are plural and singular? Is there any difference in the English verb "repent" when the subject is plural and when it is singular? Of course not. You may say: "the man repented," "the men repented." The verb is the same. Likewise the English verb "baptize" is the same when the subject is singular and when it is plural. Thus, "he will be baptized today," "they will be baptized tomorrow." The verb is the same in both sentences. When we use an auxiliary verb with "baptize," a difference is noted; as, "he was baptized," "they were baptized." But in the passage we are studying this tense is not used, and the form of the verb, either verb, may be either singular or plural.

But, our brother will say, in the Greek the verbs have different forms or endings when singular and when plural. Very true, but we were analyzing and diagraming an English sentence. Our brother must know that in the Greek there is no "ye" and no "one" in the sentence. They are pulled out of the verbs by the translators, but they do not inhere in the English verbs, for we have seen that both "repent" and "be baptized" may be either singular or plural. Does this not show the error in going into the Greek to criticize an English sentence? In the judge's criticism of the diagram which was published in our issue of March 8, 1934, he shows even more confusion. He says we there made the words "every" and "one" modify "ye," but one glance at the diagram will show anyone that he is in error there. The diagram made those words modify "person" (understood). Then he continues his singular and plural verb refrain, which he had to leam from the Greek, since the English verbs may be either singular or plural. But we may leave out all the technicalities of grammar and the grams and scruples of philology, and the sentence is so plain that a person who docs not know the

parts of speech cannot misunderstand it. Our analysis was not intended to make the meaning clear, for nothing could make it any clearer than it is in just the language the Holy Spirit uttered. The analysis was used to show the error of the Baptists' attempted explanation. It takes an expert Baptist quibbler to enable even an illiterate man to misunderstand this passage.

Peter has charged this multitude with the crime of crucifying an innocent man, and tells them that God has now made that "same Jesus . . . both Lord and Christ." What effect did this have upon them? They were "pricked in their heart," and cried out to Peter and the others: "Brethren, what shall we do?" Do for what? Why, to escape this guilt, to be released from this sin, of course. What did Peter tell them to do to escape this sin? He told them to do two things. What were they? (1) Repent and (2) be baptized. What for? Why were they told to do anything? To be released or forgiven or to escape their sins, we repeat. Hence, the apostle told them, "Repent ye, and be baptized . . . unto the remission of your sins." But were the same persons told to be baptized who were told to repent? Of course. Then the same individuals were to do both these things, and they were the subjects of repentance and baptism, regardless of what words stand as the grammatical subject. But how many of them were told to repent? All of them—"ye," plural, says our brother. Well, how many were told to be baptized? "One," singular, says the judge. What? Will he say that Peter told all of them to repent and only one of them to be baptized? No, he says, "every" modifies "one"; hence, he told "every one" of them to be baptized. Every one of whom? Why, every one of those who had asked what to do. Then if all of them were told to repent and every one o f them was told to be baptized, what is the difference in the subjects of repentance and baptism? In fact, none at all. Considering the grammar, they are collectively told to repent, then they are distributed by the words "every one of you" and told to be baptized, which makes this all the more emphatic.

Since the judge has read one book on our recommendation, we should like to recommend a few more to him. Let him read what his own scholars say on Acts 2:38. He should read Hackett, Hovey, Harkness, Broadus, and Wilmarth. If he will send twenty-five cents to the Gospel Advocate office and get what Doctor Wilmarth said in the Baptist Quarterly of 1877, which was put into tract form by J. W. Shepherd in 1908, he will have one of the best treatments of this subject that was ever written. In his "Commentary on Acts," Hackett says:

Eis aphesin hamartion, in order to the forgiveness of sins (Matthew 26:28; Luke 3:3), we connect naturally with both the preceding verbs. This clause states the motive or object which should induce them to repent and be baptized. It enforces the entire exhortation, not one part of it to the exclusion of the other.

Wilmarth says: This interpretation compels us either to do violence to the construction or to throw the argument or course of thought in the context into complete confusion. Indeed, we can hardly escape the latter alternative, even if we choose the former.

(a) For those who contended for the interpretation "on account of remission" will hardly be willing to admit that Peter said "repent" as well as "be baptized on account of remission of sins." This is too great an inversion of natural sequence. Yet to escape it we must violently dissever "repent" and "be baptized," and deny that eis expresses the relation of metanoesate as well as of baptistheto to aphesin hamartion. But the natural construction connects the latter with both the preceding verbs. It "enforces the entire exhortation, not one part of it to the exclusion of the other," as Hackett says. But Judge Edwards "violently dissevers" the verbs not only in his analysis, but in

his supposed parallel of Matthew 3:11 and Acts 2:38. He has: Be baptized . . . eis . . . remission.

Baptize . . . eis repentance.

Why does he tear the language of the Holy Spirit apart? Why did he not put both the verbs in his first member of the parallel? Thus:

Repent ye, and be baptized . . . eis . . . remission.

Baptize . . . eis repentance. But we will give attention to this argument next week. The Baptist Arrow and the Bible Arrow In the letter from Judge Edwards, which we published on June 14, he gives us what he thinks is a parallel between Matthew 3:11 and Acts 2:38. He states it in the following manner:

Acts 2:38 : "be baptized . . . eis . . . remission."

Matthew 3:11 : "baptize . . . eis repentance."

He says that the preposition eis here used in both sentences shows that baptism has the same relationship to remission that it has to repentance; and since we are agreed that repentance must precede baptism, eis here points back to that repentance. It should read, therefore, "I indeed baptize you because of, or on account of, repentance." Then, since remission sustains the same relation to baptism that repentance does, baptism is because of remission of sins! And the arrows are going in the same direction, says the judge, with an air of finality. But we showed last week that in attempting to make this parallel he used only one part of the sentence in Acts. He ignores the rules of grammar and "violently dissevers" two verbs that are joined by a coordinate conjunction, and also defies the decision of all scholars—including Baptist scholars—who say that "repent ye, and be baptized . . . unto the remission of your sins" means that both verbs "repent" and "be baptized" sustain the same relation to remission. Hence, if baptism is "on account of" remission, so also is repentance. This is more than any Baptist can admit. That is why men of good intelligence and of fair learning will stultify their intelligence, sacrifice their learning, and make a handmaiden of ignorance when they come to deal with Acts 2:38. That passage ruins Baptist doctrine world without end. Better turn your arrow around. Brother Baptist. The Greek preposition eis never has the meaning of because of.It never looks backward; it always looks forward. It denotes primarily into the space within, and its general English equivalent is into. It signifies the purpose or end in view. In Matthew 3:11 it does seem to have the meaning of because of. but scholars say it cannot have that meaning even there. We shall take up that passage later.

If Judge Edwards wanted to cite a real parallel, why did he not take the two passages that contain exactly the same prepositional phrase? Thus:

Matthew 26:28 : "This is my blood . . . shed . . . eis the remission of sins."

Acts 2:38 : "Repent ye, and be baptized . . . eis . . . remission of your sins." The phraseology is not only precisely the same in English, but it is also exactly verbatim in the Greek—eis aphesin hamartion. Will any Baptist claim that Christ shed his blood because o f remission of sins—because sins had already been remitted—and, therefore, the arrow in this case points back to a fact already accomplished? No, even Baptists let the arrow point in the right direction here. Then why do they turn it around in the parallel passage— Acts 2:38? They have it to do or give up

their doctrine on the purpose of baptism, and—"great is Diana," you know. But since eis always points forward or indicates purpose or end in view, how can baptism be unto (eis) repentance, as in Matthew 3:11? Were people baptized in order to repentance? No, but they were baptized into repentance—that is, into a condition or state of life required by repentance— into a new life, here by metonymy called "repentance."

Before we leave this passage we will let Judge Edward's own brother, J. W. Wilmarth, tell us what eis means here. Here is his comment:

John also said (Matthew 3:11): "I indeed baptize you in water unto [eis] repentance." This has been misunderstood. Eis does not here change its ground meaning, is not equivalent to on account of. John's baptism looked to the future, to the near approach of Messiah, whose people must be prepared for him. Those baptized by John were indeed required to repent, but also to stand pledged unto repentance, thenceforward to have a changed heart and life, so as to be in a state of readiness for Messiah's coming. So, Olshausen says that John's baptism "aimed at awakening repentance"; only his remark is too unqualified, present as well as prospective repentance being required. (Matthew 3:2; Matthew 3:7-8.) This explains the phrase eis metanoian—unto repentance. In harmony with this also was John's teaching of faith. "John indeed baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying to the people that they should believe on him who should come after him; that is, on Jesus." (Acts 19:4.) After Christ's ascension we meet no more with the phrase baptized unto repentance, because baptism now acknowledges the Messiah already come, and faith and repentance, as conditions of remission, are conceived of as wholly in the present. But the phrase baptized unto remission remains—is used by Peter, Acts 2:38. Those who render eis in Matthew 3:11 on account of furnish a notable instance of missing an important idea through failure to understand the force of the Greek preposition.

If all Baptists would read what their real scholars say, they would never attempt to make eis mean because of or in consequence of.The preposition dia has that meaning; and if the inspired writer had intended to convey that idea, he would have used dia instead of eis in Matthew 3:11; Matthew 12:41. But suppose we should grant for the sake of argument that eis does sometimes point backward—does sometimes mean because of or on account of—and that Matthew 3:11; Matthew 12:41 are examples of that use or meaning of the word, then what have the Baptists gained? No living man will say that it always means because of; then how would we determine when it means because o f and when it means into, in order to, and for the purpose of? Clearly we would have to determine this by each text in which the preposition occurs and the context. Then if it does mean because of in Matthew 3:11, that does not come within a million miles of proving that it means that in Acts 2:38 and Matthew 26:28. And that is the point Baptists try to make! Surely any sane person can see their failure here. As it has been repeatedly shown, eis could not mean because of in Acts 2:38, for that would make Peter tell the people to repent because o f remission of sins when they were crying out to know what to do in order to escape the guilt of their sins. If a hundred passages could be cited where eis has the meaning of because of, that would still not prove it has that meaning in Acts 2:38. As a plain matter of honesty and scholarship, we are always glad to show what eis means in Matthew 3:11; Matthew 12:41, or any other passage; but we are not under any obligation, and much less any necessity, to do so in order to defend the teaching of Acts 2:38. We may let it mean anything our opponents want it to mean in those passages, and still they must come to Acts 2:38 and deal with it as an individual text. Eis is used nine times in the second

chapter of Acts, and each time it points forward. The context as well as the text, therefore, shows its meaning in the passage that is the nightmare to Baptists.

Remember, beloved, eis never means because of —never points backward. Such an idea is foreign to the word. The Baptist arrow and the Bible arrow still point in opposite directions on baptism despite Judge Edwards' protest.

00B.34 Chapter 27. Premillenialism

XXVII. Premillenarianism At the time this book goes to press the premillenarian theory is receiving more emphasis and causing more controversy than any other issue among professed Christians. It seems proper, therefore, that a chapter on the issue should be included in a book that Contends for the Faith.

It is a sad commentary upon the weakness of the human nature when intelligent and sincere men will allow any ideas concerning the millennium to become an issue between them; to cause controversy and strife and division. No sin is more emphatically or more repeatedly condemned in the New Testament than strife and division, whatever may be the cause. Then when the cause is as nebulous as is the millennium, such a sinful and lamentable condition is pathetic in the extreme. If men must differ in their ideas about the millennium—a question that is entirely academic and touches no essential point of doctrine or item of practice in any Christian's life—what sane reason can anyone give for making his idea a tenet of his creed or a test of fellowship or a barrier to brotherly relationships or to active and hearty cooperation in essential Christian service? This question has been often asked and it has also been often answered—but the "sane reason' was not seen in the answers. It seems to be a characteristic of this question that men cannot enter into a discussion of it and remain entirely balanced and serene and sane. And as to practical points, it seems that a thoroughgoing premillenarian cannot be practical anyway. He is exceedingly visionary and impractical. He has no hope for the world; no confidence in the success of any of our efforts and no interest in any subject that does not in some way relate to his imminent rapture and his thousand years' reign with Christ on earth. Any gospel preaching that does not somewhere and in some way bring this in with heavy emphasis has no value in his sight. (This is true, however, of any other hobbyist— whatever his hobby may be. In our time it is admittedly true of those who are making a hobby of opposing premillenarianism.) But the ecstatic joy of believing that he is about to be delivered from the tragic conditions that prevail in the earth gives the premillenarian a decided distaste for the prosaic duties of a workaday world. But the sane reason for strife and division over such a question is still wanting.

WHAT IS IT ALL ABOUT?

Let us study some of the words that are so often heard in our present-day prating about premillenarianism:

Millenarianism.

Premillenarianism.

Postmillenarianism.

Amillenarianism.

It will be clear to everyone that all these long words are based upon and are in some way connected with the millennium. This word is made up of two Latin words. Mille means a thousand,

and annus means year—hence, millennium means a thousand years. This word is not found in the Bible, but its English equivalent is there five times—all in one passage, Revelation 20:1-6.

If the reader will open his Bible and read that passage, he will then know all about the millennium that any other living man knows. Here is your chance, reader, to have Bible knowledge unexcelled! Read six verses and you will have arrived. Oh, but there are questions you want someone to answer! Exactly. That is what everyone else wants. The usual questions are: When will this thousand years' reign begin? Where will that reign be—on earth, in heaven, or in the air? If on earth, where will the throne or seat of government be? Who will be in that reign with Christ— only those who have been beheaded or all saints? If all saints, over whom will they reign? Over wicked men? Is this to be an exact thousand years of three hundred sixty-five days each or is it just an indefinite period of time?

Now the effort on the part of men to answer these questions is where all our trouble comes from. Each man's answer is, of course, that man's interpretation of the passage. And since it is not a matter of simple exegesis, but necessarily implies the making out of a program for the Lord and his saints, for the devil and his forces, and for the nations of men on the earth, each man's answer, therefore, becomes that man's theory concerning all future affairs! This is a most excellent subject to let alone. That is exactly what the author of this book has attempted to do for many years. In answer to all the above questions he has said orally and in writing: "7 do not know, and I will not put forth a theory." The following is a statement of his views which the author has repeatedly published concerning the millennium, not concerning premillennialism or any other theory:

I do not know anything at all about the millennium. I do not know what Revelation 20:1-6 means and I will not venture a guess or spin a theory. All my thinking and believing is independent of this passage. With me it is not a pivotal point at all. My view on this point is expressed completely by Doctor Robertson. I published this a year or two ago in the Gospel Advocate and I still say that it expresses better than I can express it myself my attitude toward the millennium. Here is what he says. Dr. A. T. Robertson, in his book called "New Testament History," page 116:

"The millennium plays a really unimportant part in the book itself (only in chapter 20), and yet it has been made to dominate the interpretation of the book by premillennial or postmillennial theories. As for myself, it is by no means clear what the millennium is, nor how long it lasts, nor what is its precise relation to the second coming of Christ and the end of the world. So I leave the millennium to one side in my own thinking, and grasp firmly and clearly the promise of the personal second coming of Christ as a glorious hope and have no program of events in my mind for that great event."

I have no program of events in my mind in reference to the second coming of Christ except that he is coming to judge the world, make up his jewels and take his children home, and when that judgment is completed and death has been defeated, he will surrender the kingdom to God, the Father, and we will live with him forever and ever. That is all I know. About the millennium, I know nothing in the world. But in these dark days of world distress premillenarians have become so certain in their conclusions and so persistent in pressing them that we are forced either to agree with them and accept their views or else oppose them and give reasons for rejecting their views. We shall give some attention now to the terms used above.

Millenarian.—Anyone who believes in the millennium is a millenarian, regardless of what his idea is about when it comes or what the nature of the reign will be. He believes that there will be a thousand years' reign of righteousness. That is enough to make him a millenarian or a ehiliast. (Chiliast and chiliasm are Greek terms.)

Amillenarian.—This means one who does not believe in the millennium. This word is formed by adding "a" as a prefix to millenarian. This prefix "a" is the Greek "Alpha privative" which gives a negative sense to a word. "Amoral" means not moral and may be applied to something that is not positively immoral, but it has no moral value and is not a protest against the immoral. An amillenarian does not believe that there is any thousand years to be reckoned with. He may be an unbeliever who does not care what the Bible teaches, or he may be a modernist who does not believe in the coming of Christ or accept any statement of God's word that does not suit him. Or he may be a Bible-believing Christian who thinks that the book of Revelation has all been fulfilled: that this was a figurative representation of something that occurred under the Roman Empire. Whatever his explanation, the amillenarian just does not believe in the millennium. There is, therefore, no further discussion with him.

Millenarians may be of a number of varieties, but the two most well-known groups are postmillenarians and pre- millenarians. A postmillenarian is one who believes that Christ will not come until after the millennium has passed. The first postmillenarians believed that Christ will conquer sin and Satan through the gospel; that the world will be converted; and then there will be a period of peace and righteousness on earth of a thousand years' duration. After that Christ will come and time will be no more. This puts the coming of Christ so far into the future that it has no meaning in our lives. But any person who believes that the millennium must be over before Christ comes is a postmillenarian. Those who think that the millennium is now going on are post-millenarians, for they believe that Christ will bring the millennium to a close at his coming.

Premillenarians believe that Christ will come before the millennium; that he will at his coming inaugurate the millennium. And they have a very definite schedule of events made out for the Lord and for men. That schedule is about as follows:

The coming of the Antichrist.

The return of all living Jews to Palestine.

The resurrection of the just.

A period of time called the "Rapture."

A period of unequalled tribulation to the world.

The return to earth of Christ in visible form.

Christ to sit on David's literal throne in Jerusalem.

Christ to reign one thousand years.

At this time his kingdom will be established, which continues only one thousand years.

This kingdom they call the millennial kingdom.

OBJECTIONS TO THIS THEORY

Every passage of Scripture in the New Testament that says anything about the coming of Christ, the resurrection, and the judgment represents all of these things as taking place at the same time or in immediate consecution—unless we except Revelation 19, 20. If those highly figurative chapters allude to the second coming, the general resurrection and the final judgment (about which there is a question) they certainly must not be made to contradict the plain unfigurative declarations of all the other New Testament books.

Yet all millenarian theories are based wholly upon the one passage. (Revelation 20:1-6.) It is true that many passages are used to corroborate and sustain the theories—especially are passages in Old Testament prophecy made to render- service in this cause—but if Revelation 20 were not already in the mind of the interpreter he would never see in these other passages what he now thinks he sees. He finds things in the prophecies that have never yet been literally fulfilled —at least so he thinks—and he clasps his hands in joy and exclaims, "Ah, ha! See? That will take place during the millennium!" It is a good deal safer and better to say, "I don’t know," in reference to these future things than it is to formulate a theory about when and how they will take place. For even if the theory does not contravene any plain Scriptures, and regardless of how plausible and beautiful it might be, you still do not know! You only have a theory.

POINTS UPON WHICH THE PREMILLENNIAL THEORYCONTRADICTS THE SCRIPTURES

It is clearly shown that when Christ comes he will judge both the living and the dead and that following this judgment both the righteous and the wicked will enter into their eternal state —the righteous into life eternal (to be forever with the Lord—not to enter upon an associate reign to be brought to an end in a thousand years) and the wicked into eternal punishment. (Matthew 25:31-46; 1 Thessalonians 4:13-17; 2 Thessalonians 1:7-10; 2 Timothy 4:1-2; John 5:28-29.) Of course, if the dead are to be judged then, as these passages state, they will have to be raised from the graves then, and this is also clearly stated: the resurrection will take place at the coming of the Lord—"the last day" (John 6:39-40; John 6:44; John 6:54), at the last "trump" (1 Corinthians 15:52; 1 Thessalonians 4:13-17), a resurrection of both the just and the unjust (Acts 24:15), "all that are in the tombs" (John 5:28-29). Whereas premil- lennialism has several "second comings" of Christ (the number depending on the group of premillennialists), two or three resurrections, and three or four judgments.

The Scriptures teach that when all the righteous are raised they will be sons of God and equal with the angels, hence no more marrying, no births, and no deaths (Luke 20:35-36); the wicked will be sent away—off the earth, away from the presence of the Lord and into a place prepared for the devil and his angels, hence they will be no longer marrying and having births and death.

Whereas premillennialism claims that when Christ comes he will set up his kingdom on this earth and that he and the risen saints will reign over earthly beings while they sin and suffer, marry and die, as they do now. Immortal beings reigning over mortal beings!

The Scriptures clearly teach that when Christ comes the heavens will pass away with a great noise and that the earth shall be burned up with all the works that are therein; that the earth wherein sin dwells will exist no more (2 Peter 3:2-14; notice the "promise of his coming," verse 4, is the thing under discussion; this coming is called the "day of the Lord," verse 10).

Whereas premillennialism preaches that when Christ comes he will take up his abode on this mundane sphere, become an earth dweller, and rule over suffering, sinning, dying men and women for a thousand years!

SOME PREMILLENNIAL ARGUMENTS EXAMINEDAND REFUTED But we are reminded that some of the passages that we have cited to refute the premillennial conclusions are used by those who hold these conclusions to support them. We shall notice two of those arguments in order to make the refutation as complete as time will allow.

They say that 2 Timothy 4:1 and Matthew 25:31 show that when Christ comes he will appear in "his kingdom"—is not in it before; and that "then shall he sit on the throne of his glory"—not on his throne until "then" (Greek tote, at that time). These passages simply show that then Christ's glory will be manifested or displayed. His power will be asserted and those who have formerly disbelieved in him and those who have rejected him will see his power, kneel before his majesty, and confess his Lordship. (Php 2:9-10.)

We are told that Paul in 1 Corinthians 15:23-24 separates those who are to be raised from the dead into groups or bands and puts a thousand or two thousand years between the different groups. (1) Christ. (2) Then, next (Greek eita-ita), they that are Christ's at his coming —which we know will put group (2) some two thousand years after group (1).(3)Then,next (same Greek word), cometh the end.

Sometimes those who undertake to answer the premillen- nialist say it this way: "They that are Christ's at his coming. Then, at that time, cometh the end. Therefore, the end will come when Christ comes and there will be no thousand years following his coming. This conclusion is pre-eminently correct, but the argument based on "then" is fallacious and the scholarly premillennialist will gain a point by exposing the fallacy, though it proves nothing for his contention. He will point out that the Greek word for "then" here is not tote, but eita. And eita does not mean "at that time," but next, afterward, and how soon afterward or how long afterward will have to be determined by something other than the word itself.

It denotes the sequence of things enumerated with no regard for how near they are to each other or how far they are from each other. As if we should say, Napoleon undertook to invade England, and then came Hitler. Hitler was the next man after Napoleon to entertain that ambition. But Hitler came more than a hundred years after Napoleon. Oh, says the premillennial brother, you have admitted my contention that eita may include a thousand years! But you are wrong. Eita does not include any time. It may designate a thing that happened in time years after some formerly designated thing happened. It denotes the order in which things occur and has nothing to do with the length of time between their occurrence. They may follow each other immediately or they may be thousands of years apart. To be of any benefit to the premillennialist eita would have to require a thousand years between the things mentioned. But it does no such thing. There is, therefore, no argument in eita for either side, and a discussion of it is only to confuse the minds of the people.

We may leave out any reference to eita and still see that 1 Corinthians 15 teaches unmistakably that Christ will give up his reign when h e comes instead of beginning his reign. Let us construct two or three syllogisms on the statements of Paul as follows:

The abolition of death is equivalent to the end of all enemies. (1 Corinthians 15:26.)

But the swallowing up of death is equivalent to the abolition of death. (1 Corinthians 15:54)

Therefore, the swallowing up of death is equivalent to the end of all enemies.

But the swallowing up of death will take place at the last trump—at the coming of Christ. (1 Corinthians 15:50-52; 1 Thessalonians 4:13-17.)

The swallowing up of death is equivalent to the end of all enemies.

Therefore, the end of all enemies will take place at the coming of Christ.

But at the end of all his enemies Christ will give up his reign. (1 Corinthians 15:25.) The end of all enemies will take place at the coming of Christ.

Therefore, Christ will give up his reign at the coming of Christ.

Chapter 50

00B.35 Chapter 28. About Organizations--Christian Colleges, Orphan--Homes, and Missionary Soc.

XXVIII. About Organizations: Christian Colleges, Orphan Homes, and Missionary Societies

No. 1 AN HONEST STUDY

If we are afraid to study, something is wrong. If we are unwilling to study, something is wrong. If we are wrong, we ought to want to know it. If we are right in heart, we will want to correct any wrong.

We agree that individual work is right.

We agree that it is right to have a congregation. If the congregation with its elders and deacons is an organization, then we may have an organization.

May we have any other religious organization?

Is it generally agreed that we can have no organization of a number of congregations?

Is it agreed that each congregation is independent of any larger organization?

May we have an organization in or under the congregation which is not the congregation?

May we have a manner of a "wheel-inside-of-wheel" organization?

May we have a religious organization apart from the "local" congregation?

If so, what manner and how many?

Are organizations in all things always entirely analogous?

If not, why not let each stand or fall on its own merits?

REMARKS AND REPLIES Our brother wants us all honestly to study these points. He does not care who answers his questions. He is calling for "an honest study." The task of replying to these questions has fallen to me first. Others may later have something to say on the points here raised. Very probably they will, and my efforts at reply will, no doubt, get all the criticisms if not all the attention, and our brother’s questions, since they do not commit him to any position, could easily be forgotten in a discussion of any position taken by me or any other man who undertakes to engage in this honest study. But it must be obvious to all our readers that in the midst of problems, questions, and confusion, somebody must offer us something definite and constructive.

Somebody must give us a solution to our problems and an answer to our questions if we are going to do anything worthy of our name and of our claims. It is easy to do nothing at all and to find fault with what others are doing. A preacher or a paper can make a big reputation for loyalty by preaching against everything that is done in the name of religion as unscriptural and by persistently and urgently insisting that we be scriptural i n all things. And it is easy for us to make

ourselves believe that we are scriptural in doing nothing simply because we can show that what others are doing is done in an unscriptural manner or by an unscriptural method. In fact, some of us seem to think that all we need to do in order to be scriptural is to take the negative on every proposition that is presented to us—to criticize everything that others do.

Shakespeare said, "There is small choice in rotten apples"; and if we go to perdition at all, it probably docs not matter at all what caused us to go there; but I believe I would have more respect for myself even in hell if I went there for doing a good work in the wrong way than I would if I went there for doing nothing at all. And some tremendous changes are going to have to take place in the attitude that some of us who claim that we are entirely scriptural sustain toward each other if we are going to be congenial in heaven.

Discretion or diplomacy would probably counsel us to publish our brother's questions and say nothing in reply, and let any contributor who might have the temerity to tackle these problems express his ideas in our columns. Then if that contributor's position should be assailed, we could easily disclaim responsibility. Or we could publish these questions and simply say: "Hurrah for this brother! It is time for us to call a halt and study these things. We are certainly drifting. The churches are fast getting away from the New Testament simplicity. Any preacher who is either afraid or ashamed to preach the plain, unvarnished word of God is a traitor to the cause of Christ, and the sooner he goes the way of Judas, the better it will be for the churches. These kid-gloved soft-soapers who fraternize with the sects and pastorize on the big city churches are a disgrace to the cause of Christ. And these religious promoters who want to organize something, found some unscriptural institution to rival the church and give them an official position, with the worldly honor and the emoluments of such a position, should be corraled, branded, and sent over to the digressives or the sects in a body. There is no place for them in the New Testament scheme of things. Our fathers contended for a 'thus saith the Lord' in all they preached and practiced. 'Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent,' was their motto, and to it they adhered at the price of persecutions and ridicule. They bared their bosoms to the shafts of satire and the darts of the devil, and rushed forward over the fields of battle conquering and to conquer, with their consistent and unanswerable plea for the ancient order. Ours is a noble heritage. Shall we prove worthy of it, or shall we exchange the truth for popularity and become like the sectarians by forming organizations that the Bible knows nothing about? Thank God for a few faithful men like Brother Blank! They do us good. We are fast drifting into digression. Take warning, brethren."

Such an editorial as that would bring us high praise from some brethren, and it would probably be copied and commended in all the "apostolic" papers. It would sound loyal, strong, and mighty! But how many questions did it answer? How much honest study did it give to any problem? Simply none a t all. But that is what we are accustomed to get from some of our "apostolic" contenders and from some of our editorial snipers who hide under a pseudonym and fire upon the soldiers of the cross while they are engaged in battle with the enemy.

If this is to be an honest study of questions that vitally concern the whole brotherhood, and that must materially affect the whole future of our work, and is not to be turned into an attack upon some individual or some paper and colored with sectional strife, personal animus, party rancor, or business competition, then I am happy to express my own conviction on the points raised. In endeavoring to solve these difficult problems in the interest of harmony and of progressive

righteousness, I should have the sympathy of every lover of truth, whether he agrees with all my conclusions or not. What I say cannot, of course, be taken as a decree for the brotherhood.

About Organizations: Christian Colleges, OrphanHomes, and Missionary Societies

No. 2

QUESTIONS

We agree that it is right to have a congregation. If the congregation, with its elders and deacons, is an organization, then we may have an organization.

1. May we have any other religious organization?

2. Is it generally agreed that we can have no organization of a number of congregations?

3. Is it agreed that each congregation is independent of any larger organization?

4. May we have an organization in or under the congregation, which is not the congregation?

5. May we have a manner of a "wheel-inside-of-wheel" organization?

6. May we have a religious organization apart from the "local" congregation?

7. If so, what manner and how many?

8. Are organizations in all things always entirely analogous?

9. If not, why not let each stand or fall on its own merits?

REPLIES We will answer by number and not repeat the question:

This depends upon what you understand the word organization to mean. We cannot scripturally have any organization that rivals the church, or usurps the functions of the church, or assumes control of the church. But with that understood, I answer the question in the affirmative— we may have other organizations. If we may not, then our Bible schools (Sunday schools) and our Christian colleges, our orphan homes, and our religious papers are gone. Let him deny who can.

I think there is general agreement on this point. There certainly should be—that is, if you mean the combining of the congregations into a superorganization that would interfere with the absolute autonomy of each several church. We should not confuse cooperation with corporation. We may have cooperation of individuals or of independent congregations, but we cannot tie the congregations together in a way that destroys their independence and puts them under the control of a supergovernment.

It should be so agreed, if by larger organization you mean an organization that includes and combines several congregations. If they are thus combined, each congregation becomes a unit of a larger organization, and has, therefore, lost its individual independence.

This again depends on what you understand the word organization to mean. I answer in the affirmative. If the organization is in, or under, the church, then, of course, it does not control or displace the church. The answer to the seventh question tells the kind of organization that may be scripturally had.

This was answered in number four. It is the same question. I say we may have such a "wheel within a wheel." This will be illustrated later.

If by "apartfrom" you mean one that is not in all respects identical with the "local" congregation—not essential to the existence of the congregation—then I say yes.

We may have a Bible school (Sunday school), a singing school, a Christian college, a religious paper, an orphans' home, an old people's home, etc. We may have as many as we are able to support. If the principle is allowed, the number is not limited, except by our own discretion or business judgment. You would as well ask how many congregations we may have in any city or county. Even in this our business judgment has often been very poor.

Absolutely no.

That is exactly what we must do, if we wish to keep within the bounds of sanity.

ORGANIZATION: INSTITUTIONS In answering the above questions, I have several times indicated that the word organization might be used with different ideas as to its meaning. Some people get frightened out of their senses at the words organization and institution. It now seems appropriate to give some thought to the meaning of these words. First, let us see a few examples of the uses to which the words may be put:

The discriminative powers shown in those questions indicate a fine organization of the brain.

The brother preached a good sermon, but it was not very well organized.

The song leader had the congregation well organized and trained for singing.

The Bible school organization should be under the supervision of the elders like all the rest of the church and its work.

We had enough ushers, but they were not well organized and did not take care of the audience. Trained ushers are a very essential organization in a revival.

That kindergarten and day home at Central Church is an organization that will certainly attract favorable attention to the church.

That band of women who have been sewing, making clothing for the poor at the expense of the church, and visiting the slums and distributing these garments and bringing children into the Bible classes is an organization that has increased our attendance and our influence more than all our other efforts combined.

It depends upon the nature, the size, the purpose, and the use of an organization as to whether it is scriptural or unscriptural.

The home is a divine institution.

Marriage is a holy institution.

Dinner is an institution that the stomach of even an "apostolic" editor will approve.

Four-o'clock "tea" is an English institution.

The songbook is an institution of which the apostles said nothing.

A church building or a meetinghouse owned by the congregation is an institution that was unknown in the New Testament day.

The religious paper is an institution that the apostles did not have. The printing press made it possible. It is an institution that is greatly abused. Pestiferous cranks use this institution to preach against institutionalism.

Christ instituted the Lord’s Supper the night he was betrayed. It is an institution of divine origin.

Baptism is a sacred institution.

Singing is an institution that seems to be unknown among some religionists.

Christian Scientists and Quakers charge that we have institutionalized the church because we practice singing, partaking of the Lord’s Supper, and baptizing people. They do not believe in external ordinances.

Therefore, when our own critics, apostolics, pseudonymous and pseudepigraphic writers wail that the church is now becoming institutionalized, they should, if they have any regard for either righteousness or reason, tell us what they mean. They should specify. They should define their terms. Do they allude to the Lord’s-day Bible school? Are they striking at the Christian colleges? Are they warning us against orphan homes? They should not spurn without specifying. They should not damn without designating.

About Organizations: Christian Colleges, Orphan Homes, and Missionary Societies

No. 3 In answering these questions I have taken the position that we may have organizations in or under the congregation, a "wheel-within-a-wheel" system. Also I stated that we may have organizations apart from the congregation-- that is, organizations that are not identical with the congregation, although they may be dependent upon the congregation. In giving examples of the uses of the words organization and institution, I have already indicated the kind of organizations I had in mind, but this point will be further elaborated and illustrated here. I shall begin in the most primary and simple manner in order that the position be put beyond the possibility of a misunderstanding. When the idea of an organization in religious work is suggested, many people think of an ecclesiasticism —of the binding together of churches and individuals in a society that has its by-laws and constitution, its rules and regulations by which its leaders and officials are elected, and by which members are received into the society and remain in good standing, etc. They think of such a society as selling stocks and shares, and as governed by a directorate composed of stockholders, and each director given votes according to the number of shares he holds. This is the kind of organization that the missionary society is, and this w e all oppose. Let there be no misunderstanding on this point. But we should oppose this intelligently, understanding what the missionary society is and why we oppose it, and not ignorantly compare every effort that is made for the advancement of the cause of Christ with the missionary society.

Religious denominations are human societies or organizations, and they started or were formed for the purpose of emphasizing or advancing some special religious idea or doctrine, usually some doctrine that was either neglected or perverted by others. Such denominations and societies we all

oppose; let there be no misunderstanding on that point. But because there are organizations and institutions that are unscriptural, shall we conclude that there could be no organization or institution that is scriptural? Such a conclusion would not only be absurd; it would be ruinous. The local church is an organization; however, some brethren have gone to the extreme of denying this, and have opposed elders and deacons, a church, roll, "taking membership," or "putting in membership," etc. This represents the extreme anarchistic spirit that some men get in their opposition to things that we all agree are wrong—human institutions to do the work of the divine institution. But someone may suggest that the human denominations and the missionary societies all had small and innocent beginnings, but they grew into what they now are. This is not true of all of them, but may be true of some. Some were never scriptural even in their beginning. For argument's sake, however, we will grant that it is true of all of them. What, then, is the point? What shall be our conclusion? Because something that was scriptural, good, and innocent degenerated into something monstrous and bad, shall we conclude that we should never start anything good? That would be strange logic, but it is the exact logic that many writers on "institutionalism" and "society- ism" are now using. On that principle a young married couple might reason that because some other couple had had children born pure and innocent, but who turned out to be criminals, we will prevent any such thing from happening to us by preventing the birth of children. That would prevent it all right, but in so doing the married pair themselves may become sinners. On that principle, by doing nothing at all, we can prevent our efforts from going awry, but we have thereby gone crooked ourselves.

Moreover, it should be remembered that the church which was started by Christ through the Holy Spirit and the apostles degenerated and apostatized into the Roman Catholic Church. It was not the fault of the church or of the principles that governed it. It all came about by gradual departures from these.

Therefore, says someone, we should not brook the least departure. Amen! We all agree there, but something scriptural, good, and innocent is not a departure. We must learn to distinguish between custom and law. and cease to brand everything that is new to us, an innovation according to our habits and practices, as new in fact, and as an innovation upon the Lord's plan. If we do not learn this, then the habits and practices of the most crude and ignorant congregation, with no leadership and no program, become the standard of loyalty for all the members of that church, and for all who are reared under its influence. Any church that does not do just as it does is digressive in their eyes. But if we are all agreed on these points, and if we see that there are some organizations that are condemned by us all as unscriptural, we may now consider what organizations and institutions are not unscriptural. In this study let us first remember that the word organize means to "arrange, systematize, coordinate dependent parts." etc.

Let us also know that the word order is a synonym of the word organization. Then let us remember that the inspired apostle enjoins us to "do all things decently and in order"; therefore, with system or organization. Let us remember, too, that before a man is qualified to be an elder of a church he must be orderly. (1 Timothy 3:2, Revised Version.) This shows that God wants his work done with system, organization, or order. "For God is not the author of confusion [Gr., disorder, tumult, unquietness|, but of peace." (1 Corinthians 14:33.) The word confusion, used in contrast with the word peace here, shows that it means disorder, lack of understanding and agreement, a lack of orderly arrangement and systematic proceedings. God is not the author of this, nor is he pleased

with it. He wants order, system, organization, and peace. Paul told Titus to set things in order. A congregation that is full grown, and measures up to the standard laid down in the New Testament for an organized congregation, will have elders, deacons, and members. To fit the divine pattern, these elders and deacons must possess all the scriptural qualifications, must be scripturally appointed, and scripturally functioning. Then if the members are doing their part, this will be a scriptural church, a divine organization. But the very work that this church is required and ordained to do makes necessary some arranging, systematizing, and an agreement among the members and the workers. This means organizing the workers, all of which is done by and under the elders. This is the kind of organization that we may scripturally have. In order that the singing may be done "decently and in order," the elders will, with the help and sanction of the congregation, appoint or employ a song leader. This leader then becomes the singing superintendent. It is his work to arrange the congregation, train them, and lead and teach them in the singing. H e may organize the congregation for singing, putting the soprano singers together, the alto singers together, the tenor singers together, and the bass singers together. (If he docs this, he should call it organizing the congregation, and not organizing the singers, as if some members are singers and some are not. That is inconsistent with congregational singing. When a leader stands up and says, "Now let all the singers come down to the front," he contradicts his claim and divides his congregation into singers and nonsingers. "Let all the people sing.") Thus we may have systematized or organized singing, with a teacher and leader, who is in reality the superintendent of the singing, whether he is called that or not.

Oh, but an objector might say: "Singing is a duty of the church, the very thing God ordained the church t o do, and now you have another organization, with a superintendent usurping the function and doing the work of the church! The superintendent has displaced the elders and is bossing the singing!" But surely a child can see the fallacy here. This is the church itself doing the work in a systematic, organized way, the elders sanctioning it, having arranged for it themselves. The song superintendent is no more a church official than is the janitor. If one of the elders can act as singing superintendent, well and good. If no elder is qualified for this, then let them appoint some man who is qualified.

If the congregation is large and they have need of ushers, and some one man, be he deacon or elder or some other man appointed by the elders, sees to appointing and training and supervising the ushers, then we have an order of ushers with a superintendent. This is another organization within the church. It is workers in the church systematized for service.

If the church has a Bible school divided into classes, with a teacher for each class, and someone to see that the teachers are present, that the visitors and newcomers are shown to the proper classes, that the literature is distributed, and who sees that the whole school is going in a systematic and orderly way, then that church has a systematized, hence an organized, Bible school. The one who is charged with supervising it is a superintendent, whether we call him that or not. If he is one of the elders, well and good. He does not have to be one of the elders any more than the song superintendent or the janitor has to be an elder. He is under the elders, and they assigned him his work. They oversee him and his work, as they do all else connected with the church.

But, someone says, this Bible school does need a secretary who reads reports, etc. It is only a systematized work in the church, or of the members of the church, and whatever is essential in thus systematizing this work, or of perfecting and making more efficient the system, may be used. There is no sense in endorsing a half or imperfect system, and then rejecting an efficient system. But that is a habit with some of us. We think a thing is scriptural if it is done in a disorderly, disjointed, destructive way; but if the same thing is done in a systematized, efficient way, i t is digressive. And the only evidence that such men need to convince them that a thing is wrong is that it succeeds.

About Organizations: Christian Colleges, Orphan Homes, and Missionary Societies

No. 4

We have seen that any systematizing of the work of the congregation is nothing less than organizing the workers for the duties assigned them. All such work is done in the name of the church and under the supervision of the elders, although the elders may have assigned the work to those who are especially fitted for it. In this sense we may, and should, often have a "wheel-within-a-wheel" manner of organization.

We may continue our study by considering what kind of organization we may have "apart from the church." When a congregation owns property, there must be some deed or legal record made of this fact. The deed cannot be made to the congregation. It must be made to trustees— men who hold the property in trust for the church. These trustees control the property in a legal way; and if any court proceedings should ever occur in reference to it, they would act for the church. They would be held by the court as the ones to act. These trustees constitute an organization. They are not the congregation, although they may be a part of it. As a band or company of men with special function, legally responsible and legally qualified to act as such a band, company, or committee, they certainly are an organization. They do not comprise the congregation.

These trustees may or may not be elders of the church. Often they are not. Even if they are elders, they may not include all the elders, as elders may be appointed after the deed was made. This appointment will not make them trustees unless they are the successors of those named in the deed. Even in that case there should be a record made of the fact that these men have been b y the congregation chosen to succeed those whom the deed names as trustees of the property. But someone may say that this organization does not in any way do the work of the church. Certainly not. We cannot have any organization that does, if we wish to please God. We have used this as a premise. It illustrates the principle of an organization acting for the church that is not coequal or coextensive with the church.

"Where is the scriptural authority for this?" someone may inquire. It is the same chapter and verse that authorize a congregation to build or to own a meetinghouse. The command to meet requires an understood or appointed meeting place. Such a place of meeting, with the necessary conveniences and comforts, must be had either by grant or permission or by hire or by purchase. The last-named method is the most satisfactory, therefore the most common in our day. We thus have an illustration of the fact that the thing the church is authorized to do sometimes makes necessary an organization, legally recognized, that is not in fact the church.

Again, it will be admitted by all that it is a part of the work of the church to care for orphan children unless some radically "apostolic" brother wants to contend that this is wholly an individual matter, and that the church as such is exempt from practicing pure and undefiled religion. Such an argument from such a brother would not surprise us, but we believe that such brothers are vastly in the minority, and shall assume, therefore, that it is generally admitted that the church of the Lord should care for, support, teach, and rear dependent orphan children. Now, in doing this work, some organization, some institution other than the organization of the congregation, consisting only of elders, deacons, and members, is necessary. The children must have a home in which to eat and sleep and bathe and play. Someone must manage the home. Someone must "mother" the children. Someone must teach them. Either these children must be distributed in private homes or there must be a home created for them where they will be cared for and trained. Either "home" is an institution apart from the church. If the children are placed in private homes, which would be ideal, then either the work is done by individuals, and the church as such has no part in it, or the church must support the children in the private homes. If the first plan is used, the church—the congregation or local church—has no responsibility. If the second is used, the church contributes to a private institution and does its work through an institution that is not the church —the private home or family. But if the children are taken care of in private homes without expense to the church, which is the best possible way, the church will still have a responsibility in finding such homes for the children that are cast upon it. Such homes are not open on every corner and waiting for children to be assigned to them by the elders of the church. There are many more orphan children than there are homes to adopt them. Then if a congregation creates and maintains a home in which to keep and care for these children until they can be put in private homes, which is exactly what orphan homes are established to do, it has an orphan home—an institution owned and operated by the congregation which is not the congregation. This institution is "apartfrom" the congregation in that it does not comprise all the members of the congregation and does contain some individuals who are not in the congregation. Many of the inmates of the institution are not members of the church. Is it right for a church—single congregation—to own and to operate such an institution? If not, will the objector kindly tell us how a church as such can take care of orphan children or dependent old people? Please give us one workable, constructive suggestion.

If a congregation owns and supports such an institution to do the work the church is ordained to do, is it guilty of institutionalism? If so, how can it do this work without the institution? we ask again. If not, then what sort of an institution will it have to build and support in order to be guilty of institutionalism? If some institutions may be scripturally operated by the church and other institutions degrade and displace the church and render those who support them guilty of institutionalism, then do not consistency, logic, and honesty demand that those who write against institutions and institutionalism tell us what they mean; that they draw a distinction between the institutions that are scriptural and those that are unscriptural? If they object to any and all institutions except the congregation itself, are they not in honor bound to tell us how we can do the work outlined above—care for orphans and old people? Would they not also be forced to abandon and abolish all religious papers or publishing houses? If not, why not?

If it is right for a congregation—a single, local, independent church—to maintain an orphan home, would it also be right for a local church to maintain a school in which these orphan children may be educated? Would the church be forced to send the children to the public schools, or could it

provide teachers, books, etc., and conduct a school in connection with the home? If the church rears children, is it not under as much obligation to educate them as are parents? If the school is added to the home, then would it be right to teach the Bible in that school and endeavor to make Christians of the children, or would that be digression —to try to make Christians out of the children? If we should, or if a local church should, operate such a school, would it not be a Bible school? Would it not be a church school?

Suppose a church that does not have an orphan home decides to maintain a school where the members of the congregation can send their children and know that they are protected from bad associations and infidel teaching, would that be wrong? What sort of an institution would this be? Would it be any different in principle from the school conducted for the orphans? Or is it all right to educate orphans, but sinful to educate our own children? But someone may say that all this is right because it is done by a single congregation. It would be wrong for a number of congregations to unite and establish and maintain such institutions. Why? It could not be because the institutions themselves are wrong, for if they are wrong per se, then a single church could not support them. Why cannot many churches cooperate in doing anything that is right? But we must not tie them together and destroy their independence, you say. Agreed, but does cooperation do this?

About Organizations: Christian Colleges, Orphan Homes, and Missionary Societies

No. 5

We have considered such institutions as orphan homes, old people's homes, and schools in connection with or as owned by a local church—a single congregation. Whether all will admit that it is scriptural for a local church to operate such an institution remains to be seen. But he who does not admit that is challenged to tell how a church can care for such dependents. We are going to proceed, however, upon the assumption that we are all agreed that it is right for a local church to do such work as caring for orphan children and dependent old people. We are now ready to discuss such institutions when owned and operated by a greater number of disciples than those who compose a local church.

Such institutions may be established, owned, and controlled by one of three ways:

They may be established and controlled by a local church, whose elders form or compose the board of trustees and directors, but receive support from other churches, from individuals, and from the public in general. They also get their inmates or students from all quarters.

They may be established by individuals who get the money to establish them and to operate them from individual donors—people who believe in their purpose and their integrity and are willing to contribute to them. The property in such cases is deeded to a board of trustees— worthy, Christian men who will hold the property in trust for the purpose set out in the deed. Who owns this property is a question that will be discussed when this second method of operation is considered. These trustees do not all have to be members of the same congregation, and do not all have to live in the same town, city, or even the same state. These trustees also compose a board of directors who manage the institution.

These institutions may be established and operated through a cooperation of churches, and at the same time receive individual or general donations. The property in this case should be deeded and

secured as in method number two. The institution will likewise be managed by a board of directors as in method number two. The only difference in method number three and number two is that number three brings in the question of the right of churches as such to contribute to such institutions, or of the scripturalness of churches as such cooperating in establishing and maintaining such institutions.

Now, with these suggested methods before us, the question is cleared and the discussion opened. If we agree that such institutions are ever right in any circumstance, then it is not the institutions, per se, that are in the discussion. They are allowed; they are right if only we can find that circumstance in which they are right. The discussion, therefore, concerns only methods of control, operation, and ownership. The three methods just mentioned are the only ones in use among us, or that are ever suggested among us. In fact, they are the only ones possible among independent churches. To use other methods we would have to combine the churches into a "church" or a denomination, establish headquarters, elect officials, arrange a legislative assembly or convention and provide revenue, and then vote an appropriation out of denominational funds for the establishing of such institutions. Then the institutions would belong to the denomination. The boards of directors would be elected or appointed by the convention and would be amenable to the convention or to the denominational directors or officials. That is what is meant by "church institutions" in the denominational sense. Surely every reader can see that neither of the three methods of operation mentioned above is analogous to or even comparable with this denominational system. We cannot have denominational institutions until we create a denomination.

If, then, all the three methods suggested are not scriptural, which one is scriptural? If they are all scriptural, then which one is best? Let us discuss them in the order given:

All who agree that it is right to have such institutions at all agree that this method of ownership and control is scriptural. The scripturalness of this method is not here questioned, but the wisdom and the propriety of it is here questioned. If a local church puts up all the money that goes into the establishing of the institution, and if the ministrations or benefits of the institution are confined to the needs of the local church and its vicinity, then it is entirely proper that the local church should exercise complete ownership and control of the institution. But if the money that builds and supports the institution comes from churches and individuals scattered over a wide field; if those who enter the institution come from widely scattered places and are committed by localities, churches, or individuals who have a responsibility in their care, then the institution becomes a general public servant. It is an institution of common interest, of common benefit. It serves the needs of many people, of many churches. It is, therefore, in every sense a cooperative institution, except in ownership and management. It was cooperatively built; it is cooperatively supported; but i t must not b e cooperatively managed! On what principle are people expected to put money into an enterprise and to hold other interests in it, and yet not be permitted to have a voice in its management? Is "taxation without representation" a fair principle? Would not a board of directors consisting of worthy, capable, and interested men from different churches that support the institution, and from different parts of the territory that it serves, be a wiser and more equitable way to manage it? But, says an objector, that would bind these churches together, or it would be an organization larger than a local church. (That objection will get plenty of attention in the discussion of the next method.) At present we shall reply to that only by saying that these churches and

individuals that support the institution are already bound together by a common interest. They share mutually in the responsibilities and the benefits of the institution. They all together built it, and they all alike support it; but it would be unscriptural for them to manage it together! Yet all must be responsible for any mismanagement, and rally with their money to meet any deficit or overcome any loss! Oh, we can do things together, but w e must not say that we do them together! Brethren, some of us reason as if we thought hypocrisy were heroic, camouflage praiseworthy, evasion a virtue, and nonsense angelic! But some brother may say that a board of directors consisting of the elders of a local church should be just as capable, wise, and trustworthy as a board composed of men from different churches. That is a possibility, but where you have a greater number to select from you have more opportunities to select the right men. And the fact that a man is an elder of a church is no evidence that he is a financier or good business executive. Often those who are called elders do not possess the qualifications of an elder. There are cases where men were appointed elders of a church, not for the sake of the church, but for the purpose of having a board for an orphan home! That was occasioned by the ideas of some technical quibbler who thought it would be unscriptural to have any board except the elders of a local church—some equivocator who thought that if you have the form or semblance of a thing it does not matter whether you have the real thing or not. Call men elders and thus have a scriptural form and scriptural names, and let scriptural principles go hang! Why not sprinkle a man and say that you have baptized him? But even if all elders were scriptural, there are other good reasons why an institution in which different churches share should be managed by men from different churches. An institution of more than local interests and more than local importance should never be made to suffer by any local disputes or divisions.

We have in our former articles seen that schools do not usurp the function of the church. We have seen that if a local church—a single congregation—wants to conduct a school, it will have to have a corps of teachers or a faculty and systematized classes, and this means organization. The school is an organization apart from the church, though not independent of the church, and certainly not a rival of the church. The organization extends no further than the walls of the institution. It is only the organizing of the workers to do a task assigned them by the church. The faculty of such a school is no more in rivalry with the church than the faculty of a state university is in rivalry with the state. These teachers no more displace the elders and deacons than the teachers in the university displace the legislators and the governor of the state.

We have seen also that a school that is founded and conducted through the cooperative efforts of individual Christians scattered over the globe has no more organization than a school conducted by a local church—that is, the organization extends no further than the walls of the institution. It includes only those who are doing the actual work. It does not include the donors. They are not in the organization, and sustain no organic connection to the institution or to each other. They are related only by a common interest, and not by any organic union or legal connection.

We have shown that even the trustees are not bound together except by a common trust. The staff writers of a religious paper are scattered over some six or eight states. They are united in a common effort. They have a common interest and a common trust. They may at times meet and consult together, but there i s not one o n the staff that belongs t o the corporation that publishes the paper. They in one sense constitute an organization, and yet they are no part of the corporation. This is the same sense in which the trustees of a school are organized.

About Organizations: Christian Colleges, Orphan Homes, and Missionary Societies

No. 6 The kind of organizations that we are now considering are orphan homes, old people's homes, missionary schools, and other schools—such schools as those that were founded and presided over by Alexander Campbell, Tolbert Fanning, T. B. Larimore, and David Lipscomb; such schools as are now being conducted by faithful brethren in Tennessee, Texas, Arkansas, etc.; schools that meet the requirements of the educational standards of our day, but are conducted by Christians for the purpose of giving young people the opportunities to receive an education without being exposed to evil influences and to atheistic teaching.

Such schools are a necessity in our day, if we value the souls of our children, whether these schools teach the Bible or not. Of course, Bible teaching is the most important branch of learning, if we have regard for the development of character and the salvation of souls; but if any man thinks that it would make a school unscriptural to teach the word of God in it, then we could eliminate the Scriptures in order to make the school scriptural, and still have a crying, desperate need for Christian schools. But we have considered such organizations as mentioned above when owned—that is, the necessary property, building, etc., owned—and operated by a local church, these institutions being necessary instruments in the hands of the church for the doing of the work of caring for orphans, for dependent old people, and for teaching or educating the young. These organizations extend no further than the walls of the institutions—that is, they include only those who manage and operate each institution—just the working forces. The work is being done by the church, and these workers are only the employees or agents of the church.

We have now come to the question of whether or not it is scriptural for a number of individual Christians to cooperate in building and operating such institutions. Let us ask a few questions in order to clarify the point:

If it is not scriptural, why is it not? Is it because the work done by the institutions is an unscriptural work? No one will say that; if he did, he would have to oppose the work itself, regardless of by whom or by what or how it is done.

Are the institutions for the doing of this work wrong per se? If so, then they are wrong when operated by a local church—a single congregation.

If they are not wrong when used or operated by a local church, why are they wrong when built and supported by Christians as individuals?

Someone may offer an answer to the effect that for individuals to build and to support such institutions would be to bind these individuals together in an organization that is not the church, but that is doing the work of the church. The institution becomes parallel with the missionary society. In replying to this, let us first examine that supposed parallel. This is as good time as any to put that to rest. A school or an orphan home is not any nearer parallel to the missionary society than it is parallel to the government of the United States. This should be seen in the fact that the missionary society builds and supports schools itself. Surely schools that are built by, dependent upon, and agents of the society are not equal to and parallel with the society. The society does the work the church was established to do. It employs, sends out, and supports teachers, preachers, and missionaries. These employees of the society when on the field doing the work the society sent them to do find it necessary to systematize and arrange, hence to organize, their forces. This

systematized work becomes a school, an institution belonging to and supported by the society. The most zealous and the most jealous official of the society will never be heard complaining that these institutions usurp the function and steal the glory of the society. The churches, doing the work God ordained them to do, select, send out, and support teachers, preachers, and missionaries. These workers, when on the field doing the work the churches sent them to do, accomplish this work by conducting a school. (Witness Brother McCaleb's school in Japan and Brother Benson's school in China.) These schools that are conducted by the missionaries of the independent churches are, so far as organization goes, parallel to the schools of the society, but they are not parallel to the society that founds and supports the schools. The parallelism is between the churches and the society, not between the schools and the society, or between the schools and the churches. The schools are parallel to the schools. The society is parallel to the churches in this work —not in everything, of course. That is why the society is wrong, while the schools are not wrong. If the schools of the society do not usurp the function and steal the glory from the society, why should the schools that are supported by the churches be thought of as usurping the function and stealing the glory of the churches?

There are other reasons why schools are not parallel to the missionary society, but this should be enough here.

We may now consider the objection that schools or orphan homes that are cooperatively built and supported and cooperatively managed—that is, having a board of trustees or directors composed of men from different congregations—combine those supporting them in an organization larger than a local church. A little thought ought to convince even those who make this charge that it is not true. So far as the organization of such an institution is concerned, it is limited to the walls of the institution. It applies only to those who are doing the actual work, and does not include those who contribute to it. Such contributors to, or supporters of, the institution sustain no organic connection to each other or to the institution. They are not tied together by any organizational law. They do not join, or in any other way become members of, any fraternity, society, association, or company, except that to which they already belong—the church of the Lord. They are under no society rules or regulations, for the reason that they are not members of any society. To refer to whatever deed, charter, or other legal document that is used to secure the property for the purpose for which it was purchased, as the rules and regulations of a society, is equal to saying that a deed to a meetinghouse is the creed of the congregation. In fact, the "creed in the deed" charge has far more truth in it than the charge that the deed and charter of a school include and combine or tie together all the donors to the school. That charge is simply absurd. But someone may suggest that the trustees from different churches are bound together in one body—a body not the church.

They are only bound together by a common trust. They are not fellow members of a society. They and all other contributors are bound together by a common spiritual interest. Did Paul and his company, and especially the brother who was chosen by the churches, form a charity society because they were by the churches entrusted with money, and because they "administered" this "abundance" (American Version) or "ministered" this "grace" (Revised Version)? (See 2 Corinthians 8:17-20.) The churches were cooperating in relieving the poor, and Paul and his company were trustees of the funds. They were servants of the churches. The churches were in a cooperative or united effort, and were, therefore, bound together by a common interest, and Paul

and his company, "messengers of the churches," at least one of whom was chosen by the churches (whose "job, ” emoluments and all, was created b y this united effort), were bound together by a common trust. But neither Paul’s company of trustees, or messengers, nor the churches whose messengers they were, were bound together by any kind of organizational law. They were not members of any society. They were doing their work simply and only as Christians. This work done by Paul and the New Testament churches was very similar to the work done by our orphan homes today. It was also parallel in principle to the work that is done by our schools—not the work done by the schools themselves, but the united efforts which create and operate the schools. But someone may say that it is no part of the work of the church to teach secular subjects—to educate the young in anything except the Bible. If we grant that it is not the work of the church, we must admit that i t i s the duty o f parents, and any philanthropic citizen as an individual may help parents in this good work. If educating people is not strictly a part of the work of the church, it certainly is a noble work for individual Christians to engage in. The state regards it as a part of its duty and spends millions each year in that work. All good citizens are supposed to favor education and to do what they can to promote it. Philanthropists have given many millions to the cause of education. Religious people have been the pioneers in this field. The first colleges in America were church schools. Education has been the handmaiden of Christianity. It takes some degree of education to enable a person to understand enough of God’s will to be a Christian. It takes education to prepare a man to teach his fellow men the will of God. It takes education to prepare men to meet the sophistries and the assaults of infidels. Certainly no Christian whose opinion or whose objection is worthy of notice will in this age oppose education. The question, then, is whether we will educate our children under Christian influence or under infidel influence. Christians who regard the souls of young people certainly have a right to build schools where true education, character development, may be had. And it is the duty of individual Christians, as well as of churches, to teach the word of God. Then, why may not Christian teachers as individuals teach the word of God to their students? On what sane ground could such work be opposed? But someone may inquire about the ownership of these schools: To whom do they belong? Do they belong to the trustees? No, the trustees only hold this property in trust. Does it—the property—belong to the donors? If so, in what sense did they donate? How was it a gift? Did they buy shares? If so, could not all the shareholders get together and vote a sale of the property and each claim his percentage per share of the sale price as in liquidating any other business? Would not these contributors or shareholders in that case clearly form a company or a society? They would. But that is not the case. The contributors are not shareholders. Their money was a gift for a purpose, and they have no further hold upon it. They do not own the property of the schools. Does the church, therefore, own these schools? No. Even if we consider them "church schools," they would belong to the churches that have contributed to them and not to the Church. (The big "C" denotes a denomination, which we would have to have if we have church schools in the denominational sense.) When we come to consider the question of the churches as such contributing to the schools, if we find that it is scriptural for them to do this, will they not own the schools? No, they will not. Why should the churches own that to which they contribute any more than individuals should own that to which they contribute? The money given by a church is a gift and not an investment. No, the churches do not own the schools.

Then, who does own them? They are created for a purpose, for a work, for an ideal. They exist for a purpose, and they belong to that purpose and to those who engage in the work and fulfill the

purpose. To illustrate: To whom does a house of worship—a meetinghouse—belong? You say it belongs to the congregation that built it. Yes and no. It belongs to them as a house of worship, the purpose for which it was erected, but it does not belong to them to sell and to use the money for some other purpose. The deed will name trustees who will hold that property for the purpose set out in the deed. It exists for a purpose and belongs to that purpose. If a congregation ceases to exist there, the property will have to be disposed of as the deed directs. No one can claim that property or its sale price as his own personal property. Other congregations may have helped to build that house, but they do not own it and cannot control it. It exists as a house of worship and belongs to those who use it for that purpose, and as long as they use it for that purpose. If the time ever comes when there is no congregation at that place, and the house is not being used at all, it might be possible for those who worship at other places in the same manner as those who built the abandoned house, who wear the same name, etc., to establish a legal right to sell the property and to turn the money into a house at some other place that will be used exactly as the old house was originally used. The ownership of property is always a matter of legal record, and the record should, and usually does, tell how the property should be disposed of in any emergency that is at all probable. The same principles that apply in the ownership of the property of a local church, which property may have been purchased by contributions from many other churches, apply in the ownership of the property of Christian schools. This property has been purchased for a special purpose. It is dedicated to that purpose. It is deeded to that purpose. It is held by legal document and by such trustees as are named in the legal document for that purpose. Does that not settle the ownership question? Should churches, as such, contribute to the schools? This is to be answered in the next number.

About Organizations: Christian Colleges, OrphanHomes, and Missionary Societies

No. 7

We now take an advance step in our study. We are ready to ask: Is it right for the churches as such to contribute to the Christian schools and colleges? If it is not right, why is it not? Is it because the institutions are wrong within themselves? If so, then it is wrong for individuals to support them. If you say it is wrong because it would tie the churches together and cause them to lose their congregational independence, we ask: Then, why does not the fact that individuals contribute to these schools tie them together in an organization and cause them to lose their individual independence? But we shall wait until next week to argue this question. We wish now to show that it has been the practice of the churches from the days of Alexander Campbell down until today to contribute as churches to the schools. This is no new idea, as we shall see. The following reports, found in the Millennial Harbinger and the Gospel Advocate, will show that this has been the custom of the churches and the schools all along through their history. In 1853 Alexander Campbell made a tour through Illinois and Missouri in behalf of Bethany College. He gives us the following report under the heading, "Notes of Incidents of a Tour Through Illinois and Missouri": The church of Hannibal pledged itself to raise five hundred dollars toward the endowment of a chair in Bethany College. Considering their expenditures on a substantial and commodious meetinghouse, and their other contributions to evangelical purposes, besides their ordinary charities, we regard this, in their case, as a liberal expression of their interest in the great work of raising up men to meet our own wants and the wants of the age. The church at Paris will do her part in this great work, and gave an earnest of it before we left. We expect from the churches of

Paris and Palmyra (which we could not visit) their full share in this endowment. We rank them with Hannibal, who guarantees her five hundred dollars. From the church at DeKalb one hundred twenty-five dollars, also from Bethel, in Buchanan County, two hundred ten dollars.

We delivered two lectures in Liberty to large and interested auditories. The pecuniary result was a subscription of fourteen hundred eighty-six dollars to Bethany College. The church called Mount Gilead, some miles distant, did not participate in this contribution, as she, through her representatives, promised one thousand dollars.

Then in 1858 appeals were again being made for Bethany College, and D. Bates made the following appeal in the Millennial Harbinger:

If the entire brotherhood unite in the matter (which we believe will be the case), it will be but a trifle to each one. We, therefore, suggest that the elders throughout the country lay the case before their respective congregations, and take up contributions forthwith. Let each member contribute according to what he has not grudgingly, nor ostentatiously, but freely, and in the spirit of Christianity; and let said contribution be forwarded to the treasurer of the college or whomsoever the trustees may designate. The following editorial note by A. Campbell introduces the article from which the foregoing paragraph has been taken:

We take great pleasure in subjoining the following communication (furnished us in advance) from D. Bates, one of the editors of the Christian-Evangelist, published at Fort Madison, Iowa. We thank him for his words of cheer, and trust that the course of action therein suggested will be approved by the brotherhood. (Millennial Harbinger, 1858.) This is sufficient to show how Alexander Campbell and the other writers and preachers of that period looked upon the question of churches contributing to schools. And yet our anticollege brethren, in their efforts to discourage contributions to schools from either churches or individuals, often quote Campbell as saying: "In their church capacity alone they moved." He may have said that, but he did not say it to discourage or discredit schools.

Although the foregoing excerpts were written long before the division had come, some brethren may still think that the men who wrote the above were digressive. For this reason we shall now bring to the attention of our readers something from men who were the stanchest opponents of digression that have ever lived. The Nashville Bible School, founded by David Lipscomb, and which is now known as David Lipscomb College, was the first school ever established among loyal disciples after the division. It is also said to be the first school that ever in the history of the world required all students to recite at least one lesson daily in the Bible. This school is now generally referred to as the mother of all our schools. In the years 1907, 1908, and 1909, E. A. Elam made appeals for financial help for this school in almost every issue of the Gospel Advocate. His appeals were headed "Help the Nashville Bible School." David Lipscomb joined with Brother Elam in these appeals, and submitted a complete financial report for the school. Also some of the contributions were sent to Brother Lipscomb. Brother Elam reported contributions received and published letters from some of the donors in an effort to stir others to liberality. Most of Brother Elam’s appeals and reports are found upon the first page of the Gospel Advocate of the years mentioned. On December 19, 1907, Brother Elam says:

Other students have responded readily to this cause. O. T. Craig of Ennis, Texas, has sent two contributions from different congregations, and R. L. Whiteside handed me a dollar for the school when he was in Tennessee.

Here we have two congregational contributions and an individual contribution. On April 30, 1908, Brother Elam published a letter from E. Stephens of Woodbury, Tennessee, from which I quote the following:

Brother Elam: Enclosed find ten dollars for the Bible School, which the church at Woodbury freely gives. It seems to me that the brethren and the churches throughout the South, and Tennessee especially, should be generous in aiding the Nashville Bible School. I have visited the school and know of the good and wholesome work.

Brother Elam commended this letter, endorsed its sentiment, and used it to induce others to contribute. Then, again on October 29, 1908, Brother Elam published and commended the following letter:

Ennis, Texas, September 29, 1908.—Brother Elam: I enclose ten

O. T. CRAIG.

dollars for the Nashville Bible School from the few Christians meeting here in a private house. We hope you will succeed in enlisting the interest of enough brethren to enable you to make all the needed improvements, and that the school may continue to grow in usefulness.

Fraternally, Then in the issue of November 26 of the same year, Brother Elam published and commended the following letter:

Watertown, Tennessee, November 2,1908.—Brother Elam: En closed find check for ten dollars for the benefit of the Bible School. This is the best we can do for you at this time, but we hope to be able to help more in the future. This is donated by the church. I hope the school is progressing all right. We are all well.

J. L. BRYAN.

If we should search through these reports diligently, we doubt not that many other congregational contributions could be found, but what has been submitted is certainly sufficient to show that the churches did contribute, and that Brother Elam and Brother Lipscomb, with the other trustees of the school, accepted the contributions and commended the churches that donated. It will be freely admitted that the reports show more individual contributions than church gifts, but a great many of the individual contributors gave only one dollar; a few gave one hundred dollars each. It is easy to see why so few churches contributed when we consider the conditions that then prevailed among the churches. Not a dozen churches in the land at that time supported a preacher for full time. It was a rare thing that any church had the money ready for a protracted meeting, even at the close of the meeting. What the preacher received was then made up by soliciting individual contributions among the members. Many churches in that day did not even have a treasurer, and such a thing as a financial report was unknown to even the majority of the churches. Brother Elam himself makes mention of these very things and contends for systematic giving. He says that often what a preacher received for a meeting depended upon the last service of the meeting. If this service

happened to be hindered by rain or other weather conditions, the preacher would be the loser. Brother Elam published a letter from J. R. Tubb of Sparta, Tennessee, in which Brother Tubb said that, due to Brother Elam's teaching, their congregation was contributing regularly, and the average contribution was about ten dollars each Lord's day! Brother Elam published this as an example for all to follow. And it took the writers of the Gospel Advocate more than two years to quit talking about the Sparta church and its marvelous work. Brother Elam published many letters written to Brother Tubb asking how on earth they did this, and they also asked how many members Sparta had and what amount of wealth the membership represented. The curiosity of the people in reference to this great church was so great that finally Brother Tubb submitted a report of the money that had been contributed by that church, as such, from the year 1883 up to the year 1906. The first year reported the contribution was thirty-seven dollars; the last year it was a little above a thousand dollars, which shows the tremendous growth of that church! The church had about one hundred nineteen members, and represented some one hundred twenty-five thousand dollars of wealth in 1906.

Now, since we have been teaching the people on giving —systematic giving, giving through the church, giving liberally each Lord's day—and since the churches have grown in numerical and financial strength, is it any wonder at all that more churches, as such, contribute to the schools today than did a quarter of a century ago? The only difference is a difference in the times and the state of development among the churches, and not a difference i n principle. Brother Elam and Brother Lipscomb and the other trustees —Brother Elam always spoke for the trustees in acknowledging the receipt of money—would have accepted money from five hundred congregations if they could have got it. And yet those who are now trying to create the impression that, in asking the churches to contribute to the schools, we are going in the way of the missionary society compare themselves in protesting against such contributions to Brother Lipscomb, who was caricatured as an old woman trying to sweep back the waves of the sea! In the very same issue of the paper in which Brother Elam made his appeals and reported money received for the school, both he and Brother Lipscomb exposed the society's machinations mercilessly. Those good brethren had intelligence enough to distinguish between things that differ.

If we have now found that it has been the practice of the churches to contribute to the schools, and if we have sufficiently satisfied our readers that this is not a new idea which is being introduced to disturb the peace, we shall next week consider whether or not this is a scriptural method. We shall see whether or not this would make the schools "church schools," etc. Please wait patiently for the next article.

About Organizations: Christian Colleges, Orphan Homes, and Missionary Societies

No. 8

Last week we saw that it has been the custom of the churches to contribute to Christian schools ever since the Restoration Movement started. Now we wish to consider some objections to this practice and see if these objections are valid. Just a little thoughtful study is all we need on this point. A few simple illustrations will make the matter clear. Hear the objections:

It is said that the colleges are individually owned and operated, and, therefore, churches, as such, should not contribute to them. But we have seen in a former article that individuals do not own the

colleges in the absolute sense. The colleges were built for a purpose. They exist for a purpose—for an ideal. Those who are interested in that ideal may, therefore, support the schools. David Lipscomb left all of his property to the school he founded. What individuals now own that property? Who could dispose of that property and use the money for some other purpose? If it was scriptural for Brother Lipscomb, as a Christian, to give all of his earthly possessions to this purpose, would it now be unscriptural for a band of Christians to contribute to the perpetuation of that purpose?

Let us grant, however, that the schools are individual enterprises. Will any thoughtful man contend that a church cannot contribute to an individual effort? Cannot a church help to support a good work that is being done by an individual or by individuals? Cannot a church help parents clothe and feed and rear their children if there is a need for such help? If a preacher on his own responsibility should buy and equip a tent or buy a house and begin preaching the gospel in some destitute field, and then if some church or some half dozen churches should learn of his work, duly investigate, and find both the man and his work in every sense worthy and begin to contribute to him, would that make these churches the owners of the tent or house? Would that constitute these churches a missionary society or organization? Would that take away the preacher's right of individual judgment about the management of his work and put him under the direction and control of the churches? Would not the preacher still be free to work and preach as he pleases as an individual and an independent laborer, and would not the churches, all or any one of them, be free to cease to contribute to him whenever for any reason they should decide to do so?

Surely all informed men will answer these questions in the affirmative. But some brother might suggest that this preacher would have no right to begin such a work unadvised, and buy his equipment on credit, and then demand that the churches pay the debt and support him. This is conceded. However, he does have the right to begin such a work and then present its claims on their own merits in the belief that churches will help him. No church is obligated except as all are obligated to "preach the word." Every scriptural church will already be actively engaged in that work, and each one will be free to decide for itself whether or not it can, in addition to its other work, contribute to the independent preacher; and, if so, whether only one time or whether occasionally or whether regularly. The same principle applies in every detail to the colleges.

Some objector may say that this illustration is not apt; that the cases are not parallel. The preacher was preaching the gospel, which is the exact work of the church, but the colleges allow their students to engage in athletic sports at recess or on holidays. Well, suppose the preacher goes fishing or hunting or plays golf betimes, would that make it unscriptural for the churches to support him? When students spend their whole time, day and night, for weeks and months at the college—live there—they are compelled to eat and drink and sleep and take exercise, and do the other things that are essential to living and to mental and physical health. But the colleges teach athletics, you say. Certainly, and somebody teaches the preacher to play golf. Is it not better that the athletic exercise of young people be supervised and directed by Christian men than by profane men and blasphemers? On account of the age of the students, the colleges are really helping to rear our children. They are developing lives in physical, mental, moral, and spiritual aspects. The students are in the developing period, and they would at that age be developing in some manner in all these aspects wherever they were. The colleges try to help them develop in the right manner.

Therefore, says one, the colleges are an adjunct of the home, and the church is forbidden to help them.

Think a little deeper, brother. Is it wrong for a church to help parents? Is it wrong to help rear and train the children that have no home?

Suppose another case: A good brother, on his own responsibility and judgment, takes two or three dependent orphan children into his own home and feeds and clothes and trains them. He is poor, his house is not paid for, and he makes many sacrifices in order to give these children this home and training. A church or two churches would like to give this good man aid in his noble work. What shall we say? Can those churches do that thing scripturally? Would they own the man's home if they helped him?

Yes, that will be all right, says the objector, but they could not form an organization to care for and educate those children. The home is an organization; and if it had fifty children, it would be a bigger organization. And if children are trained at all, they must have a place to eat and sleep and bathe and play, and they must be supervised in all this by somebody. That sort of organization is not unscriptural, and it is not different i n principle from the schools. The plain truth is that the parents who patronize the Christian schools have all that they can do to keep their children in school and have no money to contribute to the school. The patrons of the school are not the ones who built them or who maintain them. A large number o f them are preachers, whose children get free tuition. But some of these preachers have never done anything for the schools, except to criticize and hinder them.

David Lipscomb, who founded the Nashville Bible School and gave his farm and his home for the site, and then taught in the school from the day it opened until his death, without one penny of remuneration, never had any children. In Brother Elam's campaign to raise money for the school he reports that C. M. Southall, of Florence Alabama, gave two hundred dollars—one hundred at two different times. To my certain knowledge, Brother Southall has never had a child or a relative in the school. But an objector says that individuals should build and support the schools, and churches should touch them not. Why should individuals do it? On what consideration should they act? What sort of requirement or duty is it? Is it a Christian duty? Or is it the duty of a citizen? When teachers teach on starvation salary, in order that preachers' children may have free tuition, while the preachers fight and quibble about who should contribute, are they doing this as a Christian duty? What else could cause them to take the thankless task? Do they teach, and do the contributors give, because they love the cause of Christ, or is it for some other purpose? What is the motive back of all this, and on what basis are these sacrifices made? If this is done as a Christian duty, and for the good of the cause of Christianity, should it not be done in the name of the Lord? Should it not be done in and through the church? If not, why not? If this work is not done as a Christian duty, on what other consideration are Christians allowed to use so much of their time and money? Should they not use this money in something that will b e for the glory of Christ and for the good of his cause? Does not Paul tell us to do all that we do, in word and deed, in the name of the Lord? Just what duties and how many duties are Christians, as such, to perform as individuals, and what and how many are they to perform through the church? Will some objector enlighten us?

Furthermore, do not Christians compose the church? What Christians do as Christians, is that not the church doing it? If ten thousand Christians contribute to the schools, would they not constitute a pretty good-sized church? If three hundred of these Christians lived in the same town, would they not compose a local church? If all the three hundred wanted to contribute to a school, could they put their money into one sum and send it by one check, or would they have to send three hundred individual checks? Would it be necessary for them either to quit contributing or to move to three hundred different towns? But our objector says that if five hundred churches, as such, contribute to a school, it would tie them together in a way that would destroy their congregational independence. Shades of Aristotle! Why does not the fact that ten thousand individuals contribute to a school tie them together and destroy their individual independence? What is there to tie them together except a common interest, by which all churches are already tied together? They certainly would not be tied by any organic or organizational law, by any bylaws or constitution. They have not entered into any corporation. They have not bought shares and been given votes. They have only donated to a good work from which all churches now in existence will be benefited, and many others brought into existence. Is a church "tied" to everything it may contribute to?

Oh, but the objector says that if five hundred or more churches contribute to a school, it will be equal to the missionary society, and to urge them to do so would be to overthrow all arguments against the society. But a man who cannot see that for five hundred or ten thousand churches to make one donation to a school, which would ever afterward function as a self-supporting, independent institution, with no further demand upon the churches, and with no supervision over, and no influence, except moral influence, over the churches, is different from churches entering into organic union, by a perpetual connection with an institution that sells memberships at so much per, and is under a directorate, with votes distributed according to stocks held, and that will exercise lordship over the churches thenceforth—I say a man who cannot see the difference in these two things is certainly afflicted with a malignant case of myopia. It is difficult to believe that a man who cannot see that, after it is pointed out, could make a convincing argument against the society. He does not know the ground of objection.

Furthermore, if it is wrong for churches to contribute to schools and orphan homes because these institutions are equal to or similar to the missionary society, then why is it right for individuals to contribute to these institutions? May individuals as such contribute to the missionary society? If not, why not on this premise? The contention is thus seen to be absurd.

If a school, any one of them, could ever get completely builded, equipped, and endowed, it would then need no further contributions from either churches or individuals. If we could only get enough churches to make the original donation, the work would go gloriously on. There would be nothing in this that is even similar to "Church" schools— nothing like a denomination building a denominational school. No tax would be levied upon the churches. No appropriation by church officials would be made out of denominational funds. No demand would be made on a denominational treasury. (All these things take place when "Church schools" are built.) It would only be free, independent churches of Christ (not bound together, not units of a combine or corporation) voluntarily giving one liberal donation to a work that would honor God by keeping, through the teaching of his word, churches free and independent and unsectarian through generations yet to come. Would to God we could get the vision.

About Organizations: Christian Colleges, OrphanHomes, and Missionary Societies

No. 9 In this series of articles, "About Organizations," we have not made any special attempt to answer any charges that are made by those brethren that are usually referred to as "anticollege" brethren. In fact, we have not written with them in mind at all. We have endeavored to set clearly before our readers the grounds upon which such organizations as schools and orphan homes rest, and what is the relationship of the churches to these institutions. We have done this for the sake of an understanding among those of us who support the schools, and in order that we might have a thoroughly thought-out and convinced attitude on the question. But in this, the concluding article of the series, we shall make some reference to those charges made by the opponents of the colleges, in the hope that certain fallacies may be seen. There will be a repetition in this of some points that have been made in former articles, but we think the different reasons for bringing them in will explain the repetition. Let this, too, be a continuation of "an honest study."

1. Are the Schools and Colleges That Are Now Supported and Operated by Members of the Body of Christ Church Schools? Those brethren who oppose the schools vehemently insist that they are "Church schools"; that they are owned, operated, and controlled by the "Church." They undertake to prove this charge by quoting from the charters of the schools, and by citing certain utterances of brethren, picked up at random, that are susceptible of that implication. We cannot admit the charge that the schools are "Church schools," for it is simply not true. Neither can we admit that even the independent churches that contribute to the schools own and control them, for this is not true. But there is a common interest that exists in the schools and in the churches. There is a relationship that exists between them that we should recognize and understand. When we do this, the controversy will be greatly simplified if not closed.

Suppose we should admit that the schools are owned and controlled by the churches, what then? Why, that would be to admit the very thing that is charged by our opponents, you say. Very well, if that is the point in dispute, will the disputing cease if we concede the point? No, a thousand times no, you say. But why not? Oh, because our opponents would then have us convicted of digression, of sectarianism, you say. Sectarianism? Brother, you ought to learn what sectarianism is before you use that term. But your error here is a common error. Many brethren use that term in the same way. Merely because some sects do a thing we must not conclude that that thing itself is sectarian. If we do, we shall have to say that it is sectarian to build meetinghouses, to sing hymns, to use hymnbooks, to publish papers, and to hold protracted meetings. And as for digression, you are wrong on that point too. Instead of having us convicted, our opponents would be just at the beginning of their task. If we should concede that the schools are owned and operated by independent churches of Christ in a cooperative educational effort, and then call upon our opponents to show wherein this is unscriptural, we would rob them of their choicest quibbles and force them to meet an issue that really does need to be threshed out. If such a cooperative effort is wrong, why is it wrong? Wherein is it wrong?

We have seen that the churches of Paul’s day cooperated in relieving the poor. They had a fund, and entrusted it to Paul and his company. They were messengers of the churches. One man had been selected by the churches to travel with those who collected and disbursed the money. (2 Corinthians 8:17-20.) This was not a society functioning in competition with the churches. It was the churches themselves cooperating in a time of distress. These messengers were agents of the

churches, and the only organization that existed among them was an agreed arrangement as to the work each was to do—the duty and responsibility that each was to have. Those who were doing the actual work that the churches were interested in were to that extent organized. The organization did not embrace the churches, or those helped by the churches. That is, it did not combine or tie them together. I t was only the workers doing their work. The faculty and trustees of an orphan home, or a school owned and operated by a single congregation, form an organization that is not the church. Again it is only the workers doing their work. Then, if we should have schools and orphanages that are built and supported by gifts from hundreds of churches, the trustees and the faculties of these institutions would form an organization that is not the churches, but those who compose the organization would be agents or employees of the churches. The organization would not in any way embrace or combine the churches. The churches would be independent of each other, and the schools and orphanages would all be independent of each other, though there were a thousand of them. They would not each one be a unit of a superorganization. There would be no organization except the necessary assigning of the workers to their tasks at each school. The organization would extend no further than the walls of the institution. Again it would only be the workers doing their work. But these schools would be doing the work God ordained the church to do, says an objector. Well, if they belong to the churches, are under the control of the churches, and are agents of the churches, and through them the churches are doing the work God ordained the churches to do, where is your complaint? It seems that you cross yourself up in your paroxysms of objections, brother. You rail at the schools as "Church institutions," and claim that the churches own them, control them, and could dissolve them, etc. If that be true, then the schools are agents of the churches, and the work that is done by the schools is, therefore, of course, done by the churches through the schools, just as the work that is done by our missionaries in the foreign field is done by the churches that send out and support the missionaries. Yet you turn a logical somersault and argue next that the schools as independent organizations—independent of the churches and as rivals of the churches—are doing the work that the churches ought to do! Now, which position do you want to take, brother? Do you want to contend that the schools are "Church schools," and that the churches are doing their work through them, or do you prefer to argue that the schools are independent and rival organizations to the churches? We can’t let you have both claims.

Oh, but you say the school is an organization that is not the church. So is a Wednesday-afternoon Bible class taught in a meetinghouse. So is a "Bible-reading" class taught for six weeks. So is a protracted meeting. So is an orphan home that is owned by a local church. But these are only members of the church doing a work with the sanction and by the support of the church. They have no more organization than is necessary for the actual doing of the work. The same is true of the schools.

But, says our objector, this same argument is made for the missionary society. They say that the church is doing its work through the society. Let them say. The fool says there is no God, but we do not, therefore, turn atheists. It will be easy to show that instead of the churches doing their work through the societies, the reverse is true. The society does its work through the churches. It is over the churches —controls them. But our objector has already charged that the churches own and control the schools. According to his charge, the schools and the society are not at all alike. As shown in a former article, the society builds and supports schools itself. When John T. Brown

wrote his history of the "Churches of Christ" (Digressives) in 1904, the Christian Woman's Board of Missions—C. W. B. M.—owned twenty-nine schools and four orphan homes. Brethren of Tennessee can never forget that the C. W. B. M. led the church at Livingston into digression by promising to build a school in that town. This board—or missionary society— did build and operate a school at Livingston, Tennessee. No one ever supposed that that school was a rival institution of the C. W. B. M. But our opponents say that the schools and orphan homes rob the church of its glory. How can they do this if they are church institutions, as you charge? Do the schools and orphan homes that are built by the society rob the society of its glory? Do the schools and orphan homes that belong to the Roman Catholic Church rob it of its glory? Who has not heard that church praised for the good work it does in this line? Who does not know that through this work the Catholic Church has increased its power and influence? Do the schools and orphan homes that are built and supported by the Masonic Lodge rob that lodge of its glory? Who has not heard this fraternity praised for its benevolent institutions, and the church condemned for not doing as much good work? Yet, according to the argument, if the churches should build such benevolent institutions, the churches would be thereby superseded, overshadowed, eclipsed, and destroyed. Again, we call upon our opponents to say which position they want to take. Do they want to contend that the schools and orphan homes are "Church institutions," and oppose them on that ground, or do they want to contend that they are independent organizations and rivals of the church?

2. The Schools and Orphan Homes Are Not Church Institutions, Nor Are They Rivals o f the Churches. Before we could have "Church institutions" we would have to have a Church —an organization, an ecclesiasticism. It is correct to speak of the church of Christ in a general sense, meaning that spiritual body that includes all Christians, and hence, of course, all congregations of Christians. But the church in the general sense is not an organization. A local church is an organization, but it is only local—does not include any but those who worship at that place. All local churches are independent of each other. To have a church in the denominational sense we would have to form the local churches into an organization with a governing head— either an individual or a legislative body. We would then establish headquarters, whence all governing decrees would come. This head, or these governing officials, would arrange for revenue. Then, out of these denominational funds the officials could vote an appropriation to build a school. That school would belong to the denomination, and would be under the control of the governing officials of the denomination.

Years ago Vanderbilt University was under the control of the bishops of the Southern Methodist Church. A controversy arose about a large donation that was to be given to the university. Some question about whether the Board of Regents or the bishops should control the school was to be decided. The matter got into the civil courts. The bishops lost. Then the Southern Methodist Church relinquished its hold upon Vanderbilt. It is no longer a church school. But then the bishops of the M. E. Church, South, voted to build two universities, one in Atlanta and one in Dallas. They did build the universities, which are now well-known Church schools. Of course, every tolerably informed man knows that the churches of Christ do not form a denomination. They have no organic relationship to each other. They have no earthly head, no legislative body, no revenue and no general treasury, no common funds, and, of course, no church institutions. As to expressions that are sometimes used by brethren that seem to imply that the schools are church institutions,

that argument amounts to nothing. By the same proof we can show that the church is a denomination. In the same way we can show that the religious papers are church papers. In the Christian Leader of April 4, 1933, on page 7, under the heading, "Threatens to Publish Him," F. L. Rowe writes this sentence: "Our church papers are not looking for trouble, and take no pleasure in telling about it." Now, if our antireligious-college brethren were also antireligious-paper men, they could collect a few such utterance as that and write a book to sustain their charge that these papers are church papers. But a whole volume of such sentences could not make these papers denominational organs—established and controlled by denominational officials in legislative session assembled. They are just not that, whatever language may be used about them.

Some years ago M. C. Kurfees, who was then an editor of the Gospel Advocate, spoke of the "constituency" of the Gospel Advocate. The Christian Standard thought it found in that word proof of a charge that was often made against "Dave Lipscomb's paper" in the hectic days of early digression. The Standard said that a "constituency is a body of people with a common representative." Eureka! It had found it! The editor of the Gospel Advocate had admitted that the paper was the head and representative or official organ of a body of people! Brother Kurfees defended himself successfully, but he never used "constituency" any more in referring to the readers of the paper.

But, in positive fact, the papers come much nearer being church papers than the schools come to being church institutions. This is true when we study the matter from either end of the proposition. If we consider the control that the papers have over that section of the brotherhood that reads them, we would have much more reason to call them "denominational organs" than anyone can have for calling the Christian schools "Church schools."

All the subscribers to an anticollege paper are anticollege brethren. Either the paper fixed their faith or their faith fixed the policy of the paper. From either viewpoint the paper exists to represent a definitely fixed opinion. But when we consider the control that the readers exercise over a paper, we will see that they often speak as members of a "constituency," surely enough. An anticollege paper a few months ago issued what its editor called "a rough draft" under the heading, "Can't We Agree on Something?" The effort manifested an earnest solicitude for an end of factions, and for at least a working agreement and fellowship. It did great credit to the heart of that editor. Even if his terms were not all just what they should have been, his spirit was very commendable. But from all indications this effort was not at all acceptable to his "constituency," and the editor has been defending himself for months. It would look as if this representative of a "constituency" did not properly represent its "constituency," and the "constituency" roared. In solemn fact, if the principles of the "rough draft" were adopted and applied, it would have been the end of that faction or "constituency," and the spirit of party preservation asserted itself. And yet some of these brethren try to prove that the schools are "Church schools." Surely our logic would not be so faulty if our hearts were right.

00B.36 Chapter 29. Some Controversies of Christ

XXIX. Some Controversies of Christ

No. 1 Our Lord Jesus Christ was the most persistent, alert, resourceful, and masterful controversialist that ever lived. He lived at a time when controversy was the order of the day. The Pharisees and Sadducees were the leading sects among the Jews, and they were constantly in disputes among themselves. The Sadducees were cool and calculating, rationalistic and philosophical. The Pharisees were technical, carping, and captious. They were past masters in the tricks of sophistry, caviling, and casuistry. But Jesus met the combined efforts of these masters of debate and quibbling and put them to silence. His quick analysis, his penetrating, powerful, and unsparing logic, and his unanswerable and embarrassing a d hominem replies to their assaults have never been equaled among men. They, therefore, prove him to have been something more than a man. A complete study of the forensic methods of Jesus would be a very profitable course of study for all students of the science of argumentation. It would also be helpful to all students of the Scriptures, as many passages in the Gospels cannot be fully understood unless we take into account what was the occasion for their utterance and what the point in dispute. But when we do this we are able to determine what conclusion our Lord meant for us to draw from his language. We should never be so illogical as to draw a general conclusion from a particular premise, or to apply our Lord’s language to any points except those that were at issue in the controversy in which he was engaged. As an example of our Lord’s masterly methods in controversy, let us examine his reply to the Pharisees when they accused him of being in league with Satan when he cast the demon out of the man who was so grievously possessed that he was dumb and blind. (See Matt. 12: 22-30; Mark 3: 22-27: Luke 11: 14-23.) This was a stupendous miracle, and it caused the honest-hearted people to exult and wonder. In admiration and astonishment they cried, "Is not this the Son of David?" meaning, "Can this be any other than our long-looked-for King and Messiah?" The Pharisees saw that they must in some way counteract the influence of this miracle. The people would look to them to acknowledge this unusual manifestation of divine power and accept this man on his own claim or else explain this miracle. The Pharisees were fully sensible of their situation and accepted it at once. There are only two ways of evading the force of a miracle. One is to deny the reality of the miracle, and the other is to attribute the effect to some other cause than the power of God. The Pharisees knew they could not deny the reality of this miracle, and they were shrewd enough to resort to their only alternative. They knew that all the people understood that demons were under the command of Satan, and they at once charged that Christ was in league with Satan and had by the power of Satan cast out these subordinate devils. This was a very ingenious answer, as it would leave the people in a position where they could not decide. Both the divine power and the satanic power were invisible, and the people believed that demons were subject to both powers, and they were now called upon to decide that which they had no means of determining. They would, therefore, be perplexed, and perhaps filled with a suspicious fear of Jesus. That Jesus recognized the cunning plausibility as well as the cruel injustice and appalling blasphemy of their argument is seen in the fact that he made a fourfold, detailed reply to

this charge and then drove upon their consciences the heinousness and unforgivableness of their sin.

Here is the analysis of his reply:

"You admit that in the kingdom of evil Satan is ruler, and that demons are his subjects and his agents in carrying out his purposes. Now, if it is Satan in me that cast out this demon, then Satan is making war upon himself; his kingdom is divided against itself, and, of course, it will be overthrown and brought to desolation."

The people could see the truth of this statement, and they would be slow to believe that Satan is foolish enough to overthrow himself. Hence, they must look to some other source for the power that cast out this demon. Whence this power?

"You all believe and claim that some people can cast out demons. Your own sons claim this power and practice exorcism." (Jesus did not mean that these "sons" did actually cast out demons, but he was simply making an argument on their own claim—refuting them by the ad hominem process.) "Are you ready to say that your sons get their power from Satan? If not, you then admit the possibility of this being done by divine power and actually claim such power for your sons. Then with what consistency can you deny it to me? If you sanction the casting out of demons by divine power as an ordinary thing among your sons, why do you attribute this miracle to satanic power, as though such a thing never happened by divine power? Your own friends, your sons, prove your allegation against me in this instance false."

The people were compelled to see that point, and the Pharisees felt it to their utter undoing. The people could see that it was prejudice against Jesus that would cause the Pharisees to deny to him that which they claimed for others.

"You cannot say that I did this by natural, human power; for Satan is stronger than man, as you know. A man cannot enter into a strong man’s house and spoil his goods unless he first binds or overpowers the strong man. To do that, he would, of course, have to be stronger than the strong man. This I have done. In this case Satan is the strong man, the afflicted man is his house, and the evil spirits within the man were his goods. I have shown myself stronger than Satan, for I entered in, bound him, and spoiled his goods. What power is superior to Satan? The divine power only. Therefore, I did this by the Spirit of God." (Jesus had not the remotest reference here to the final binding of Satan mentioned in Revelation. He meant only to illustrate the one point now in question: By what power was Satan here dispossessed? The "house" here was not the world, but the man’s body.)

"Since I have shown that I did this miracle by the Spirit of God, you must admit that I have divine sanction, and, of course, my claim is true. Instead of being in league with Satan, I am in communion with God. Therefore, the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you—it is at hand, just as I have been telling you in my preaching."

Jesus has now completed his argument, and he drives home the conclusion: "Here is a manifestation of divine power, and you have not been able successfully to deny it. It is the Spirit of God in me that did this. You must, therefore, accept me and believe what I preach, or else reject me and blaspheme the Holy Spirit." But Jesus knew that some among the bystanders might say:

"Well, we are not on either side. We are not joining in with the Pharisees and repudiating this man. But neither are we ready to accept his claim and follow him. He is a great man—he has shown that. But the Pharisees are very strong and popular; and no one can deny that they are a strict people, though they may be wrong in reference to this man. We do not know. We will just waive the question and be friends to both sides." But Jesus—or any other worthy exponent of truth—never gave his sanction to any such spineless, political, double-play equivocating and currying of favor as that. Hence, Jesus put it up to them straight: "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad." Now, "be a pig or a puppy; be a man or a mouse." "You have seen this miracle, and you cannot deny it or explain it except to refer it to the Holy Spirit. Therefore, you must accept it for full value, or else reject it entirely and thus blaspheme against the Holy Spirit as the Pharisees have done." Then follow his solemn and soul- alarming words about the unforgivableness of the sin against the Holy Spirit.

Some Controversies of Christ

No. 2 The opponents of our Lord sought by every possible method to find ground for an accusation against him. They endeavored at different times to find a conflict between his teaching or claims and the Roman law. If they had succeeded in these efforts, they would have accused him in the Roman courts and had the satisfaction of seeing him sentenced to death by the civil authorities. But they were also always alert and suspicious of some slight infraction of the Mosaic law or of the tradition of the elders. Many times they made charges against him that were based upon a technical quibble about the Jewish laws and customs. Our Lord always met these charges in a way that not only defeated the purpose of his accusers, but that also convicted them of ignorance and bad faith. He did this usually by what is called in logic the ad hominem process of reasoning. That we may know fully what this form of argumentation is and that we may not attempt to get more out of our Lord’s ad hominem replies than he intended them to contain, we will do well to consider a good definition of this form of reasoning.

Noah K. Davis, in his textbook, "Elements of Deductive Logic," defines this form of reasoning as follows: "The argu- mentum a d hominem is arguing from the premise of an opponent merely to defeat him. We accept his principles on which to base a counterargument, even if believing them false, our argument being directed against him personally, ad hominem. It aims to convict him of ignorance, bad faith, inconsistency, or illogical reasoning, and so to put him ex curia. Usually it attempts no more. Our Lord often used this method to silence his adversaries."

If we will keep this in mind as we study the controversies of Christ, we shall be kept from misunderstandings and false conclusions. In a former article we saw that Jesus based an argument upon the Pharisees’ claim that their sons could cast out devils, but he did not himself thereby concede the truthfulness of their claim. In the argument examined in this present article we see him basing a reply upon what David once did. He does not in this sanction David’s deed; but the Pharisees regarded David’s conduct as a justifiable violation of the law, and Christ accepted their view of this act of David simply as a basis for an argument which would offset their charge against him. The Jews frequently accused our Lord of desecrating the Sabbath in his deeds of mercy. In the twelfth chapter of Matthew (verses 1-8) and in the second chapter of Mark (verses 23-28) we find them making the accusation against the disciples of Christ when they went through the grainfields on the Sabbath and plucked and ate the grain. Of course, Jesus was held to be

responsible for what these disciples did, as he was with them and sanctioned their conduct. When the Pharisees complained about the disciples eating with unwashed hands, they brought the complaint to the Lord. The implication was that he should require his disciples to walk according to the traditions. Jesus defended the disciples and convicted the Pharisees of hypocrisy in each case. On the occasion that we are now studying the charge was stated thus: "Behold, thy disciples do that which it is not lawful to do upon the sabbath." This charge was false, for the law contained no such proscription, and Jesus expressly declared that these disciples were guiltless. But the answer of Jesus contained the following five points:

"David and his comrades entered into the tabernacle and ate the showbread, which we all know was a violation of the law, yet you justify them; but you condemn my disciples for doing that which the law does not forbid."

If the Pharisees had not held that what David did was justifiable, they could have replied: "Two wrongs do not make a right. David sinned, and so do you. You have said that David did an unlawful thing, and by putting the conduct of your disciples on the same ground you admit that their act was unlawful." But Jesus did not make the act of his disciples equal to that of David.

He said David did an unlawful deed, and yet the Pharisees excused him. The disciples had done nothing unlawful, and the Pharisees condemned them. Thus their inconsistency and hypocrisy were exposed.

But since some of the bystanders might suppose that the Sabbath law prohibited all manual labor, Jesus next shows by the law that some work could be done on the Sabbath day. The priests, in the discharge of their duties in the temple on the Sabbath, perform manual labor, and yet their work is not unlawful. Why? Because the general law against labor on the Sabbath was modified by the specific law concerning the temple service. Both were commands of God, one forbidding labor and the other requiring this labor in the temple. Therefore, the prohibition of labor on the Sabbath was not universal and did not include what the disciples had just done.

"One greater than the temple is here. If the greatness and importance of the temple justify the priests in their work on the Sabbath, even to the extent that a special law was made requiring this service, then, when a greater service than the temple service is being performed, it certainly cannot be considered a violation of the Sabbath law. The service my disciples are rendering me is greater than the service the priests perform in the temple."

Because of their constant attendance upon the Lord the disciples had not been able to provide and eat food. Therefore, they were at this time hungry.

"You Pharisees should go and learn the meaning of what God said through Hosea: ’I desired mercy, and not sacrifice.’ A feeling of sympathy toward my hungry disciples and mercy to them is far more acceptable to God than any such narrow, legalistic, hairsplitting contentions about the Sabbath as you are guilty of. The literalistic and ironclad interpretation which you put upon the law will not allow you to do acts of kindness or mercy, whereas God desires mercy rather than such slavish punctiliousness as to forms." (A little later Christ showed that these hypocrites could interpret the law as flexible enough to allow deeds of kindness to an ox or a sheep. But that was not mercy on their part; it was a desire to save their property.)

"The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath. Since, therefore, the Sabbath was made for man's comfort and benefit—given as an act of mercy to toiling and suffering man—a deed done for man's benefit, an act of mercy to relieve suffering, is not a violation of the spirit and intent of the Sabbath law. Therefore, or for this reason, since the Son of man came on a mission of mercy, he is Lord of the Sabbath day also. And if in his ministrations of mercy he sees proper to modify or even to set aside the Sabbath law, he has the authority to do so."

This completes the argument which our Lord made in reply to the charge that was alleged against the disciples. It seems that all the points should be perfectly plain, but sometimes we find people who overlook the point in dispute and take an expression and apply it to something that was not in the mind of the Lord when the expression was used. In a former article we analyzed the Lord's argument in reply to the charge that he cast out demons by the power of Satan. He argued that Satan is not overthrowing himself; therefore, Satan did not cast out Satan. Next, he proves that a being that is inferior to Satan could not cast out Satan, for he must first overpower Satan. This he showed by an illustration about entering into a strong man's house. Christ had entered into a strong man's (Satan's) house and spoiled his goods. Therefore, he was stronger than Satan, hence divine. But now comes a theorist who has read in Revelation that Satan will be bound for one thousand years, and he concludes that Christ had bound Satan when he cast the demon out of the afflicted man, and that the thousand years, or the millennium, had been begun, and that we are still living in that thousand years, notwithstanding nearly two thousand years—two millenniums—have come and gone since he says the one thousand years began! Theorists always have a convenient way of manipulating language and of stretching figures to suit their purpose. This brother certainly has gone wild in his interpretation of Scripture. I do not profess to know what the twentieth chapter of Revelation means, but i t says that Satan was seen by the writer to be bound for a thousand years and cast into a pit, and it was then shut and sealed up over him so that he could not go about and deceive the nations any more until the thousand years were finished. Our theorist says that Satan was thus bound and confined when Christ was here on earth, and that he has from that time even until now been bound and imprisoned. But long after the gospel dispensation had begun Peter said Satan was walking about, seeking whom he might devour. (1 Pet. 5:8.) Surely our brother forgot this passage. The brother makes the earth Satan's house and all men his goods, and because Christ has come into the earth and wrested some souls from Satan's control he concludes that Christ has bound Satan. This does prove that Christ is superior to Satan, hence divine, and that was the only point intended in the illustration about the strong man. That was the point in dispute. But in that illustration the man's body—not the earth—was the strong man's (Satan's) house; and the evil spirits within the man—not wicked men—were his goods. Let us not extend a figure of speech too far.

Another expression about which there has been a great deal of controversy is this: "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath." We have seen that the only point in this is that the Sabbath was made for man's benefit. The purpose of the Sabbath is here told, and there is no thought of announcing the universality of the Sabbath. The Jews gave no thought to that phase of the question, and our Lord was only replying to them. The only idea as to the limit of the Sabbath contained in this passage is found in the statement that the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath. Being Lord of the Sabbath, he could modify the law or abrogate the institution, if in his judgment it was best to do so. He did later abrogate it. But there are those who contend that

Christ’s statement that the Sabbath was made for man proves that the Sabbath was made for all men—for the whole human race. They claim that the Greek word with the article ("ho anthropos") is generic, and therefore includes all mankind.

It should not cause us any surprise to hear those who insist that Christians should observe the Jewish Sabbath make this argument, but that those who claim that Christ removed the Sabbath with the rest of the Mosaic code should make this same argument is an occasion for astonishment; for, if the Sabbath was made for all men, the abrogation of a system of laws that belonged to and included only one small nation of men could not in any way affect a universal law. A statute that included all men long before that narrow national system was given could not be changed simply by the taking away of this system. The argument is fallacious. It makes a point that was not in any way included in the controversy. The English word "man" may be either generic or specific. It may include only one individual—a single male person—or it may include the whole human race, both male and female. The same is true of the Greek word "anthropos." It may include one man or it may include all men. We must determine from its use—from the context—which meaning the writer or speaker intended it to convey. In the passage we are studying, the extent of the Sabbath law was not in question. The Sabbath was made for man’s welfare. That was the purpose of the Sabbath. Now, whether it was made for all or only for some men cannot be determined by this passage. This passage affirms that the Sabbath was made for the benefit of all those who come under the Sabbath law, but how many are under that law this text does not tell us.

Crutches are made for man—that is, for man’s benefit; but crutches are made for only those men who need them. Spectacles are made for man; but they are for only those who need them.

We can go back to the time when the Sabbath was made (Ex. 16) and find out for whom it was made, to whom it was given, and whom it included (Ex. 35: 1, 2). Then we will know how many men the word "man" includes in Mark 2: 27. Those who try to find the extent of the Sabbath law from this passage instead of from the law itself must be dissatisfied with the law as it was given by Jehovah to the Jews; and those who try to interpret the law by this text instead of understanding this text in the light of the law have reversed the telescope.

Let us never put more into our Lord’s arguments than he put into them.

Some Controversies of Christ

No. 3 ANOTHER ARGUMENT MISUSED

We have seen that our Lord frequently used the ad hominem process of reasoning in meeting his adversaries. But we must also notice that he often made use of very apt and striking illustrations in setting forth the principle upon which he acted and teaching the truth that he had come to bear witness to. We have also observed that these illustrations or parables should not be made to teach something that was not in the mind of our Lord at the time he uttered them. We should always carefully ascertain what was the question at issue and then trace the relationship of the illustration to the question. What bearing does it have upon the question at issue? In what way does it answer the question propounded or refute the charge alleged? These are questions that should always be in the mind of the student. In this article we are going to analyze an answer to a question that was put to our Lord by some of the disciples of John. It was, therefore, not a captious objection, but an honest inquiry. The answer, as usual, was plain and conclusive, and was illustrated by things and

incidents with which they were well acquainted. The Question Was About Fasting. (Matt. 9: 14-17; Mark 2: 18-22; Luke 5: 33-39.) Matthew had just been called from the receipt of customs to the companionship of our Lord. He was ready to give up his position, leave his home, and follow the Lord. But the abruptness of the narrative does not mean that Matthew failed to settle the accounts of his office and leave it in an orderly manner to his successor. He no doubt took leave in a businesslike and satisfactory way. And we see from this incident that he prepared a farewell feast in his house for Jesus—that is, it was given in honor of Jesus, but was a farewell to Matthew's friends and business associates. Publicans—men of Matthew's own profession—and sinners were the only persons who would attend, except Jesus and his disciples. This brought a severe criticism from the Pharisees; but Jesus answered this criticism and vindicated himself by an argument that we cannot now analyze. But the Pharisees were not the only persons who thought Jesus was at fault here. Jesus was not only eating with sinners, but this feast fell on a fast day. John's disciples and the Pharisees were all fasting that very day. John came neither eating nor drinking: he was particularly and continually abstemious. His disciples would therefore not be expected not to fast at least as often as did the Pharisees. They fasted twice each week. The Pharisees did things mechanically or by rote. It was generally observed that Jesus paid little attention to their formalities and customs, and that his disciples ate and drank as they chose. This caused John's disciples to propound this question: "Why do we and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy disciples fast not?" To this question our Lord made the following reply:

It is not customary for people who are assembled at a wedding to fast. That is a time of feasting and rejoicing. A person who is either fasting or mourning would not attend such a banquet. It would be very inconsistent for a guest of such a gathering to fast and mourn. The association of my disciples with me is analogous to such an occasion. My presence with them is analogous to the presence of a bridegroom at the celebration of his nuptials. The time is coming when I shall be taken from my disciples. That will occasion them great sorrow, and then they will fast and mourn.

Men are not foolish enough to mend an old garment by sewing on a piece of new. unshrunken cloth. If they did, the new piece would shrink the first time it gets wet and tear the old garment, and the rent would be larger than it was before it was mended.

Nor is it the custom to put new wine into old wineskins, for, having no elasticity, they will soon be broken open by the force of fermentation. So you see that in these things men exercise their minds and show good judgment as to consistency and propriety. Likewise we should use judgment in the matter of fasting. Fasting is proper when it is required by conditions and circumstances, and, therefore, comes as a spontaneous result in the heart from such circumstances. But fasting as a purely mechanical observance of a custom is worthless.

There is but one point here made, and it is illustrated in three ways. This one point thus illustrated was the answer to the question propounded. The whole meaning of the answer and the three illustrations may be stated in these brief words: "It is inappropriate for my disciples to fast while I am with them."

How often have we heard our Lord's language here misapplied! It has not been used to teach an untruth, but it has been misused to teach a truth. The truth was taught, but this passage does not relate to that particular lesson of truth. The old garment has been made to represent the old Jewish law, and the new piece or patch to represent the gospel. Also, the old wineskins or bottles

were thought to typify the Mosaic law; and the new wine, the new Christian system. Therefore, Jesus was understood to illustrate the fact that he did not intend to piece out or patch up the Jewish covenant, but that he would make an entirely new covenant. This application of this passage has been made by preachers of the gospel for decades. One of our pioneer preachers, Elijah Goodwin, in a very excellent sermon on "The Middle Wall," states this point in the following rhetorical form:

"On one occasion Jesus said, ’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’ (Matt. 9: 16); thus intimating that he had not come to mend and patch up that old garment, or Jewish church, but that he intended to make a new garment, an entirely new church.

"Again, he said: ’Neither do men put new wine into old bottles: else the bottles break, and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish: but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved.’ (Matt. 9: 17.) By this parable the Lord teaches that he did not intend to pour the Holy Spirit, with all its quickening, sanctifying, and miraculous power, into that old, moldy, leathern bottle, or national church, but that he was about to make a new vessel entirely—a new church—into which he would put the new wine of the kingdom, the Holy Spirit, with all its divine influences." The point made is entirely true, but it was not the point our Lord intended to illustrate. His point has already been clearly stated and emphasized. To state it again, it was about the propriety of fasting on certain occasions. In Luke’s account of this answer we have this statement from our Lord: "No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new: for he saith, The old is better." (Luke 5:39) Then, if we carry out the interpretation of Brother Goodwin and those who follow him, we will have Jesus arguing that the old dispensation is better than the new.

00B.37 Chapter 30. Fugitive Pieces

XXX. Fugitive Pieces

(1) An Interview; (2) Spending an Hour; (3) Youth and Atheism; (4) Clarence Darrow, the Newspapers, and Civilization; (5) Biteth Like a Serpent and Stingeth Like an Adder; (6) Agnosticism; (7) Retrospections and Resolutions; (8) The Criterion of Life and Religion; (9) Illustration and Perversion. AN INTERVIEW

[While Brother G. C. Brewer was in a meeting at Springfield, Missouri, recently, one of the daily papers of that city sent a young lady reporter to interview him on topics of the day. The reporter asked for his views on companionate marriage, on evolution, on prohibition, on the tendency in present-day education, and on women smoking. The paper did not publish all Brother Brewer said in just the way he said it, but the editor did give liberal space to his remarks. Some of the questions as propounded by the reporter and as answered by Brother Brewer are here given.]

1

Question: "Do you think companionate marriage is now a dead issue, or do you think it still has a hold on a considerable number of people?"

Answer: "Companionate marriage, as such, is now a dead issue; but the influence of the propaganda still lives and has worked great harm, in that it has caused our people lightly to regard the marriage vows, and it has made divorce respectable in the eyes of the people, and, therefore, easy to obtain. We have had a great increase in the number of divorces in the last few years."

Question: "Why is companionate marriage dead? Is it because the young people decided to reject it on their own judgment and responsibility, or did they listen to the counsel of their elders?"

Answer: "Well, companionate marriage was never legalized in this country. Most of our young people have too much sound sense, I think, to demand such a radical change in our established institutions. Some people still believe that marriage is a sacred institution, and our young people are not all ready, absolutely, to disregard and reject God’s laws. But the laws of our land and the voice of the pulpit and the teaching of sound social principles killed companionate marriage."

Question: "What has caused the great increase in the number of divorces?"

Answer: "Divorces have increased with the general increase of iniquity, the general breaking down of moral standards and the general indifference to, and disbelief of, divine law."

Question: "Do you think the economic independence of women has played any part?"

Answer: "Yes; that is an element. It has had its bearings."

Question: "Do you think the women used to stick it out because they were dependent and helpless, but now being independent they refuse to tolerate it, and, therefore, throw off the yoke?"

Answer: "No; that is not what I think. But that is what they taught you in college, isn't it? That is what the propagandists say. They thus imply that marriage is an intolerable bond or state, and that only those endure it who cannot help themselves; that formerly men held their wives as captives and slaves. This is a very insidious method of spreading a false idea. Marriage is not an intolerable state—not something that women had to 'endure' because they were dependent, except in rare cases. There were not so many unhappy marriages when people were stricter in their morals and more conscientious in their vows and more scrupulous in their regard for the laws of the Lord.

"The economic independence of women has increased divorce in that it has made many women prefer outside work to the work of homekeeping. It has, in a way, unfitted them for wifehood and motherhood. Where there is no home life and no family, marriage itself does not seem so tremendously important. Both its purpose and its sacredness have largely been destroyed. It is hard to make people believe that marriage has a sacred purpose, when they know that the only purpose that prompted them was a selfish purpose. When people are actuated solely by a selfish motive in getting married, it is no wonder that they discard and dissolve that marriage when some self-interest or sentimentality demands or even suggests it. They married to gratify a sentiment, or a passion; and when that object is attained, why should they not dissolve the marriage to gratify a similar passion?

"We have to endure some hardships, disappointments, and heartaches in life, whether we are married or unmarried. But under the influence of the wrong teaching, some people refuse to endure these things in the marriage relation, because they believe that in so doing they would be surrendering their independence and making themselves martyrs to 'outworn traditional ideas.' This foolish and hurtful propaganda has taken all of the sportsmanship, as well as all the sense, out of all those who heed it in reference to marriage problems. Problems that would have been solved under the idea of the permanence of marriage are now magnified and made an excuse for divorce. Hurts that would have soon healed are aggravated and made incurable.

"Under our loose ideas of marriage and under the influence of these rotten social theories, many of our people marry with no idea of making it a lifetime union.

"We need to impress upon all young people the idea that when they take the marriage vows they cannot break them without breaking divine law and thus jeopardizing their soul's salvation."

Question: "What do you think of women smoking cigarettes? Is that wrong?"

Answer: "Yes; I think it is wrong. If it is not actually sinful, it is a hurtful habit—it hurts physically and morally, too. In my eyes it is also coarse and vulgar. It cheapens a woman."

Question: "Why does it not have the same effect upon men? Why is it worse for girls to smoke cigarettes than it is for boys?"

Answer: "That is the usual stock argument, and I am glad to answer it. First, I must say that I do not claim that it is right for men and boys to smoke. We used to teach all boys the harmful effects of smoking cigarettes and try to keep them from forming the habit. We should do more of that sort of teaching now.

"With that made clear, let us next observe that there is a difference between boys and girls, or men and women. There is a fundamental difference; a biological difference—a difference in their

psychological and physical make-up. That being true, why should we be so averse to believe that a habit can have different effects upon them? With these natural and unchangeable differences existing, what sound sense is there in girls trying to be like boys in habits and appearance? Do girls show their intellectual and moral strength and independence by trying to ape boys?

"Suppose it is no worse for girls to smoke than it is for boys, does that make it proper? It is no worse for women to commit murder than it is for men. Shall we argue, therefore, that women should begin murdering those who displease them?"

Question: "Do you think that this difference between the sexes that you allude to justifies a double standard of morals?"

Answer: "No; there should not be a double standard. But the logic of the contention that girls have as much right to smoke as do boys is that girls should do wrong because boys do. All this clamor against a double standard is not intended to lift the standard for men up to that which has always been set for women, but it is a concerted and almost a universal effort to break down the standard of morals for women and put them on a level—not with man's standard, but with the class of men who never had a standard. As a result of this sort of propaganda we now have no universally-accepted standard of morals for either men or women. We are in moral and intellectual confusion. Every man and woman is allowed to be a law unto himself or herself."

Question: "I would like to ask you some questions on the evolution controversy. Do you think that question is now dead?"

Answer: "Well, those who oppose evolution have ceased to agitate the question as much as they did a few years ago, but the question is by no means dead, and those who favor evolution have never ceased to teach it. It is found in our textbooks and taught in all of our schools, and many newspaper articles, magazine stories, and other literature are based upon the assumption that evolution is true. The opponents of the theory cannot now get the attention that they did when Mr. Bryan was living and when he was leading in the fight. Those who favor the theory will not come out into the open and fight for it, or even attempt to prove it. They assume that it is a settled fact, and they ridicule those who oppose it."

Question: "Don't you think the great majority of the people believe the theory now?"

Answer: "The majority of the people do not know anything about it, and are not, therefore, able intelligently to express an opinion; but they do not believe the theory as a whole—that is, the common people do not accept it. The scientists themselves admit that it is only a theory, has never been proved, and some of them say it is not susceptible of proof. These are the real scientists. They accept the theory as a theory, or as a working hypothesis. There is a great difference between real scientists and the ordinary teacher of science in our schools. These teachers think that evolution is a fact, and teach it as such, or many of them do; but it is not a fact, and, as said, the real scientists admit that it is not."

Question: "You admit that there is truth in the theory, do you not?"

Answer: "That depends on what you understand by the theory. If you mean that it is true that we have made progress in many lines, have developed many of our latent powers to a marvelous extent, that we have made many scientific discoveries and marvelous mechanical inventions—if

this is what you mean—of course, none of us denies this, but that is not evolution. When I speak of the theory of evolution, I mean the theory of descent—the theory that claims that man descended from the lower forms of life. That theory is not true."

Question: "The scientists do not claim that man descended from a monkey. This is only the idea that ignorant people have concerning the claim, is it not?"

Answer: "The people who have that idea are not so ignorant after all, and the claim that the scientists do not say that man descended from a monkey is only a dodge, and it is intended to bewilder the people and make them think the theory is not what it really is, and to leave them perplexed about the teaching of these propagandists. What the scientists say about man and monkey is that man did not descend from any known species of monkey—that none of the monkeys that we now see or know are our ancestors; but they claim that these monkeys and man had a common ancestor—that the monkeys went up one branch of the tree and man went up another, and we severally developed into different and distinct types; but that involves the claim that man passed through the monkey stage in his development, and that man was once a monkey or something similar to the monkey."

Question: "The scientists do not teach that, do they? Did Darwin teach that?"

Answer: "The scientists most certainly do teach that, and Darwin taught it. You know they claim that all life sprang from a single cell, and that all the animals of earth have developed from that tiny speck of life known as the primordial protoplasmic germ. Life existed first in the fish form, then came the amphibian, then the reptiles, then birds, then mammals, and next man; and man was a product of this growth and development and came through these lower forms. That is the theory. Don’t allow anyone to try to hide the ugliness of this by saying that man did not descend from a monkey."

Question: "Well, don’t you think that this is the chief objection that the common people have to the theory? They just don’t like the idea that they sprang from the monkey."

Answer: "No; this is not the chief objection that the common people have to the theory. Their chief objection is that the theory is not true, and it destroys all faith in God and all hope of heaven."

Question: "Then the common people do not know whether the theory is or is not true, do they?"

Answer: "They know that the theory has not been proved, because they have been told this by all who oppose the theory, and we have all quoted the real scientists, such as Dr. Robert Milligan, who say that the theory is not proved and never can be."

Question: "But is it a fact that the theory destroys faith in God? Did not Darwin believe in God?"

Answer: "Darwin believed in God when he was a young man, but his materialistic views destroyed his faith. He was not an atheist, or one who positively denies that there is a God, but his faith was nothing but a doubt, and all others who believe the theory of evolution find that they have no room for faith in a personal God who created life by miracle, and who knows and loves his children and hears and answers their prayers."

Question: "You think, then, that evolution conflicts with the creation story? Do not many Bible scholars claim that the seven days of creation week were long periods? Would that not leave room for evolution?"

Answer: "Yes; some Bible scholars think that those days were cycles or epochs. But it is no use trying to make an easy miracle out of creation. If God performed a miracle, he could perform a great miracle as easily as he could perform a small one. What good sense is there, then, in admitting that life started by miracle and then trying to devise a scheme by which it would be only an easy miracle? Evolution denies all miracle and accounts for the origin of life by natural law. Ernst Haeckel said: 'Evolution is the nonmiraculous origin of the universe.' Joseph Le Conte said: 'Evolution is (1) a continuous progressive change, (2) according to certain laws, (3) by means of resident forces.' Edward Drinker Cope said: 'The doctrine of evolution may be defined as the teaching which holds that creation has been and is accomplished by the agency of the energies which are intrinsic in the evolving matter, and without the interference of agencies which are external to it. It holds this to be true of combinations and forms of inorganic nature, and those of organic nature as well. . . . The science of evolution is the science of creation.' You see, this leaves no room for a creator; it allows no touch of a divine hand or any other force that is external to the evolving matter. This is the chief objection of evolution. Aside from the fact that it is not true, it takes away from us the only account that we have of creation that can be accepted while we have faith in God. It also assumes that man has developed and climbed upward through all the ages. It, therefore, contradicts and destroys the story of man's fall. If man did not fall, then he needs no Redeemer. Christianity is a remedial system. We do not need a remedy where there has been no ruin. Evolution denies that such a fall has ever taken place and that such a ruined state now exists; therefore, it denies the need of a Redeemer and makes useless and void the story of Christ, man's Redeemer."

Question: "According to that, you think that one could not be both an evolutionist and a Christian?"

Answer: "That is what I think. One might be a theist and an evolutionist, but there is a wide difference between a theist and a Christian. My conception of a Christian is one who believes in Christ as the Son of the living God, born of the virgin, who died a vicarious death, and was raised from the dead and now lives at God's right hand, and is coming back again to judge the earth and take his children home. No one can believe these facts and believe in evolution. Some people who claim to be Christians simply mean that they accept the ideals of Christ and the moral teaching that he gave to the world. But that kind of a 'Christian' is no better than a Buddhist or a Confucianist."

SPENDING AN HOUR

While waiting in a bus station with an hour of precious time on my hands, I began to look about for some profitable way of engaging my mind. The first thought was to find something to read. On one side of the room there was a newsstand with its colorful display of magazines and papers. One glance at the flaming headline announcements and the flamboyant covers and one could see that here was a conglomeration of exciting cowboy tales, wild adventures, shallow sentiment, sickly romance, coarse humor, and the erotic dreams and sloppy sentimentality of "silly women laden with sins" paraded as "True Stories" and "Confessions." Suggestiveness, salaciousness, morbidity, and sex psychosis fairly screamed from that newsstand and proclaimed the depravity of

the reading public of our age.

Turning away in disgust from this exhibition of modern mental pabulum, I walked across the room to the "free literature" rack. Here were the inevitable Christian Science tracts and papers. Some copies of the current issue of the Christian Science Sentinel were there, and I took one and sat down to read it. It was modest in color, clean in appearance, and artistic in mechanical make-up. After looking at some of the vulgar magazines on the newsstand, the Christian Science Sentinel breathes refinement, culture, and intellect. So I spent my hour in examining that journal. Some of the things I observed about this journal may be of interest to others. In that hope they are here given.

I shall speak first of—

Some Things to Be Remembered. The paper was founded in 1898 by Mary Baker Eddy. This is Volume 32, Number 45. The quality of the paper is good—"book stock"— and the type is clear and the printing faultless. There are sixteen pages and the covers. There is not a picture, a cartoon, or an advertisement on those sixteen pages. Bible and Christian Science literature are advertised on the inside of the front cover and on both sides of the back cover. Nothing else is advertised, and these only on the cover pages. There is not a misspelled word, a grammatical error, or a typographical error in the journal, that I can find. There is not a coarse word or a slang expression in any article in the paper. There is no controversy, no wrangling, and no harsh and dogmatic assertions. Yet the claims of Christian Science are presented and earnestly contended for. Its merits are proclaimed. Its ministry of healing is declared. Its soul-refining, peace-giving, and happiness-bringing power is affirmed and exalted by all the writers. If the publishers intend for this paper to "sell" Christian Science, I do not see how they could improve on their effort. Only those who closely examine the merits of these claims will fail to be convinced. The spirit and manner of their presentation are convincing. But next let me speak of—

Some Things Hard to Be Understood. After commending this magazine for its lack of controversy and its freedom from harsh criticisms it would not be either consistent or becoming for me to let loose a barrage of criticism against the paper. But perhaps I can without harshness point out some errors. It must be kept in mind that Christian Science says there is no sin, no suffering, no death. Hence there is nothing for Christian Science to condemn. What seems to be sin, suffering, and death is error, the "Scientists" say. This paper repeatedly speaks of error. It does it in a spirit of sympathy and kindness, however. Since I am convinced that Christian Science is error, I should not incur the displeasure of its adherents by endeavoring to correct error. This paper speaks with reverence of the Bible. Its writers seem to believe the Bible, but they must have it unlocked by Mrs. Eddy’s "Key to the Scriptures." Do they think God could not speak so as to be understood? God gave his complete will to man eighteen centuries before Mrs. Eddy lived. Do these followers of Mrs. Eddy think God’s effort was futile and men could not understand him until Mrs. Eddy came to unlock the Scriptures? Every article in this Sentinel quotes Mrs. Eddy as authority for its claim, and her book and page are always given. O n every page she is quoted. The writers refer to her as "our beloved Leader" and "our revered Leader," always spelling "Leader" with a capital L. The covers not only advertise all her books, but they also offer her photographs for sale. The prices run from seventy-five cents to ten dollars per picture.

We have long criticized the Catholics for worshiping the Virgin Mary and for selling charmed relics and blest candles, but these "Scientists" seem to be guilty of the same sort of idolatry and superstition. It is hard to understand how people who are intelligent as the Christian Scientists are can believe such things.

Here is another anomaly. In advertising Mrs. Eddy's books for sale, this magazine announces that some of her books are printed in Braille type for the blind. It repeatedly tells us that we can secure the Textbook (and "Textbook" is always spelled with a capital T) for the blind. Yet times without number the writers in this magazine claim that they —the Christian Scientists—can do the works that Jesus did! Pray, why do they not give sight to the blind? Did any poor blind person who ever bought with good money a Braille Textbook later receive his sight and discard the Braille edition and read the marvelous Textbook by the sight of his eyes instead of by touch of his fingers?

Another strange thing is seen in the fact that these writers all speak of our Lord as "Christ, Truth." Christ is equal to Truth, which is correct; but these "Scientists" seem to think of him not as a reality, but as an abstraction; not as God with us or as divinity manifested in the flesh, but as a principle, an ideal. But notwithstanding this stripping Christ of all materiality, all reality, they speak of Jehovah as our "Father-Mother, God." Of course God is the sole Author of our being, the source of our life; but these religionists seem to be unable to think of him as our Creator without in some way associating natural, physical law with the process. They are psychical, spiritual, and metaphysical in their philosophy, and yet behold this inconsistency! They associate the idea of male and female, of father and mother—the physical law of procreation—with God. I wonder if the fact that the founder of this faith was a woman and that many of its leaders and writers are women has had anything to do with this habit of putting the mother idea in the God concept? Truly, There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, Than are dreamt of in your philosophy.

It is hard to understand these things. But my hour was soon gone and my heart was not corrupted by the offerings of the newsstand. But I sigh for the confusion that exists in the world in reference to the teaching of God's word.

YOUTH AND ATHEISM In the May 2, 1931, issue of The Scholastic, "a national classroom magazine," is announced the names of the prize winners among the high-school students of the nation in a contest which that magazine has conducted in short stories, essays, poetry, art, etc. Also the stories, essays, poetry, etc., that were adjudged to be the best are published in this number of The Scholastic, together with the pictures of the student authors. The names of the judges and their pictures are also given. The title of the essay that was awarded first prize is so blasphemous that we with great reluctance give it to the readers of the Gospel Advocate. It seems almost a desecration of the page of a religious journal even to repeat it, but the purpose of this article makes necessary its announcement. The title was the two words, "God Dies." The author of this article is Frances Farmer, a high-school student of Seattle, Washington. Her picture shows her to be an immature, sweet, baby-faced little girl about sixteen years old. In the essay the girl tells how she had outgrown the childish idea of praying to God. She has now found out that God is a myth; that there is no God. She congratulates herself on her great discovery and boasts at the beginning and at the end of the essay that she learned this all by herself, and she is perplexed and puzzled because others cannot overcome the foolish idea that there is a God! With apologies to our readers again for repeating such irreverent language, we here give the first and the last

paragraphs of the winning essay:

"No one ever came to me and said: 'You are a fool. There isn't such a thing as God. Somebody's been stuffing you.' It wasn't a murder. I think God just died of old age; and when I realized that he wasn't any more, it didn't shock me. It seemed natural and right."

"I felt rather proud to think that I had found the truth myself, without help from anyone. It puzzled me that other people hadn't found out, too. God was gone. We were younger; we had reached past him. Why couldn't they see it? It still puzzles me." This whole case is pathetic, and it is with a sad heart that we make the following observations:

1. "You Are a Fool. There isn't such a thing as God." This sentence from the child author is remarkably similar to a sentence in the Old Testament. She says that no one ever told her that she was a fool for believing in God. She just found it out herself. She probably does not know that a wiser man than any of her teachers or any of the judges who awarded her first prize, a man whose name and whose writings will be celebrated in literature long after her name, her essay, and the names and the writing of her judges shall have perished from the earth, is now emphatically telling her that she is a fool when she says there is no God. The writer of some beautiful poetry, some profound philosophies, and some sublime prophecies that have been accorded first place in the literature of all time said: "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God." (Psalms 53:1.)

2. What Caused This Child t o Reach Such a Dire Conclusion? Although the girl repeatedly asserts that she reached her conclusion without the aid of anyone, we are not entirely without suspicions on this point. No doubt she thinks she states the truth, and perhaps no one ever had spoken directly to her about her faith; but she would hardly have been so bold as to write the essay she did write in a contest if she had not, in some way, sensed the fact that she was in congenial company, and that irreverence would not be counted a demerit by the judges. There can be little doubt but that the girl believed that a pronounced atheism would be considered a mark of independent thinking and of superior ability; and she was evidently not mistaken on that point.

Furthermore, the title that the child used is not at all new. "The Death of the Deity," "Jehovah's Funeral," etc., have been favorite themes and often-repeated "wisecracks" by blasphemers for many years and decades. Naturally we just wonder if this girl had not read some of the leaflets and tracts that are being sown broadcast among the youth by the Four-A Society. At least we know that these atheists realize that the only way they can turn us into a nation of atheists is to destroy the faith of the young, and in this they are busily engaged, while parents, preachers, and Bible-school teachers are sleeping or ignoring and even denying the danger.

3. The Attitude of the Modern Youth. The attitude that this girl expresses in the last paragraph of her essay is a very general attitude among the youth. They have "reached past" God; they are far too sophisticated and enlightened to believe in God. When we begin to talk to them about God and Christ and the Bible, they look at us with the same expression of mingled amusement, resentment, and disgust that a ten-year-old boy shows when we talk to him about Santa Claus, as though he believed that myth. They are puzzled when they see anybody of intelligence who professes to believe in God. They do not know just how to classify such a man. They do not know whether to reckon him an arrant hypocrite or just a plain "nut." Have these children ever considered the pros and cons of religion? Have they studied the question? Have they had a course in evidences? Have

they read any of the many books that have been written by scholars—historians, linguists, archaeologists—in favor of the authenticity of the Scriptures? Of course, the answer to all of these questions is negative. They have not had time to study these things if they had the inclination; yet they assume to know more about these great questions than learned men who have spent their entire lives in research and investigation. They take a definite stand against something about which they know nothing; yet they will never be told by their teachers that this is the height of intolerance, bigotry, and prejudice, which things are always characteristic of ignorance and of little minds; that those things never belong to an educated man or an independent thinker.

Atheists and atheistic teachers do not want them to hear evidence, to be unbiased, or even to lend an ear to the voice of inner consciousness. They want them to hear only banter and sarcasm and ridicule instead of reason. They want them to hear only "verbal subtleties" and "endless negations." They want them to listen only to the voice of their fleshly passions that cry out against restraints and demand indulgence and deny that such is sinful and that they shall have to account for their conduct at any bar of judgment.

4. The Attitude of the Teachers and of the Judges. What shall we say of the attitude of the teachers of this girl and of the judges who awarded her the first prize? And also of the "classroom magazine" that published her irreverent essay? At least we can say with all confidence that none of them were shocked or grieved or felt that the essay was anything to be astonished at or concerned about. They did not feel that it called for any sort of reprimand or even correction. They gave it praise, publicity, honor, and first prize.

These teachers, judges, and editors will, no doubt, claim that they decided the question solely upon the literary merits of the essay and with no regard for the truth or falsity of the question discussed or as to the correctness or the error of the student’s position. But shall we credit their claim fully? And, even if we do, is that the right attitude for persons in such a responsible position to take? Suppose some student had written a very clever paper—clever in composition, correct in spelling, grammar, punctuation, etc.— denying the Copernican theory of astronomy or the Einstein theory of relativity or the Darwinian theory of evolution, would the judges award that paper first prize? Let them answer that question and then we will know whether or not to credit their claim. We will also know whether or not they regard it their duty to correct a student when he is in error according to their beliefs and theories. Can we get an expression from the Scholastic and its judges on this point? Will not other religious papers take up this question and force the Scholastic to make some reply? Will not Christian teachers take this matter up and demand that the Scholastic tell why this essay went uncriticized?

Furthermore, has the time come when irreverence is a literary merit—rather, when it is not a demerit? Reverence has always been considered an evidence of refinement, an element of culture. Coarseness, slang, profanity, and irreverence in speech or writing were always looked upon as an evidence of ill breeding, a lack of culture, and a manifestation of bad taste, if not of a bad heart. Has all this changed? Is there any cultural side to our present-day education? Has the word "refinement" been left out of our lexicons? Does education now consist only in frankness and in a wanton exhibition of every impulse and desire? If culture still exists, is reverence no part of it?

5. The Attitude of Religious Teachers. It has already been suggested that this girl would not have written as she did if she had not believed that her title and essay would at least not be

objectionable. The youth of our land would not be so outspoken in their doubts and unbelief if they did not know that they would be approved and even praised in this by many of their elders. In this, as in other things, they are a product of the times. It is popular to doubt and disbelieve and deny. Even many religious teachers—all modernists—have no settled conviction on anything. They have no firm foundation for their faith; in fact, they have no faith. They are not teaching the youth anything as definite truth. They are asking the youth questions and praising and applauding the youth for their frank opinions. In the Baptist, a modernistic Baptist paper, published in Chicago, there is a department devoted to youth. In that department have appeared the reports of some interviews that the editor has had with some high-school students on the subject of religion. These students were asked for their opinions about religion and about the future of "the church," etc. These students told the editor that religion is out of date; it is "done for"; it is useless, and it must go.

We are not so much interested in the opinions of these students as we are in the editors of the paper. Why would they publish such opinions? Why would they ask for them? Is it not because they have nothing to teach the young people? They are in hopeless confusion themselves. They are in doubt themselves about the future of Christianity. They really do not believe it will survive, and they are doing their part to accomplish its destruction. Do astronomers go to high-school students and ask for their opinion concerning astronomy? Do medical men go to them for their opinions about preventive medicine or about the various serums? Do economists, bankers, or businessmen go to these students and ask them for their opinions about great economic questions? Why not? You answer: "Because they are not insane." That is it exactly. They know these students have never studied these questions. They know that their minds are not yet matured. Moreover, they have some definite ideas and principles to teach these young people. But modernistic religious teachers have nothing to teach. They believe nothing. They only deny something. They talk endlessly about "broad-mindedness," "modern thinking," our new development, our broad tolerance, and our great brotherly love that promises salvation to men of all faiths and of no faith at all. With them it is not necessary to believe anything in order to be saved.

6. The Attitude of Parents. How do parents feel about their sons and daughters going into atheism? They are indifferent. They are too busy with their clubs and social and business affairs to be concerned about their children. They are not grieved over the lost souls of their own sons and daughters. They shed no tears over them. They hold no prayer service with them. They do not provide good religious literature for them and urge them to read it. They are not deeply and sincerely religious themselves. Their children cannot see that religion has ever done anything for them, then why should they adopt such a useless theory?

Even some parents who read the Gospel Advocate and commend our fight against infidelity and immorality allow their own children to associate with infidels and scoffers and people of ultramodern views on moral questions. If their children get through high school unscathed, they will send them off to some school where atheism is taught and Christianity is ridiculed, where the social life is rotten, and where immorality is the order of the day.

What hope is there for the world? There isn’t any? W e must come out of the world and be separate, if we wish to be saved. We must teach and safeguard our children, if we do not wish to

rear them for eternal perdition.

Note.—Some four years after this article was written the Scholastic was investigated by a congressional committee and found to be red or communistic, which, of course, means atheistic and un-American. Harold Rugg, its editor, is the author of several textbooks widely used. As this book goes to press the American Legion is making a fight against his books and has succeeded in getting them banned in some states. Communism in our schools has caused much of the immorality and crime that curses our land today. When it was recognized only as un-Christian and atheistic, we could not get any support in fighting it; but when it was seen to have economic implications many people rose up against it. For that we thank God.

CLARENCE DARROW, THE NEWSPAPERS, AND CIVILIZATION

Some few days ago Mr. Clarence Darrow came through Memphis (Tenn.), and stopped here for about two days. He spent the time in the home of a Memphis lawyer who was associated with him in the Scopes trial at Dayton in 1925. A reporter for one of the newspapers at Memphis interviewed Mr. Darrow and then wrote a lengthy article for his paper based on some things Darrow said. This article was given prominence in the paper, which also carried one or two pictures of Darrow. The reporter referred to Darrow as an atheist and also said he desecrated the Sabbath because he spent Sunday in social conversation and a discussion of things in general with those who were invited into the home in which he was a guest.

After Mr. Darrow was gone from our city, the editor of the Memphis Commercial Appeal wrote an editorial on

Darrow, in which he defended him of the charges made against him by the reporter of a rival newspaper. This incident and this editorial give us a fine opportunity for some observations that ought to be helpful to all who think. Below the editorial is given in full:

MR. DARROW BREAKS THE SABBATH

Clarence Darrow spent Sunday at Memphis in the home of Mr. and Mrs. R. S. Keebler. A few friends were invited in to meet him. A newspaper reporter was courteously received. Mr. Darrow was described as an atheist and a Sabbath breaker.

While Mr. Darrow was breaking the Sabbath in the drawing room conversing with local intellectuals, hundreds of good Christians were playing golf, enjoying a picture show at their club, having a bridge party, a few cocktails, or otherwise observing the Sabbath as it should be observed.

Furthermore, Mr. Darrow is not an atheist, but an agnostic. He does not deny anything. He simply says he does not know about the hereafter and has grave doubts about anyone else possessing inside information.

Mr. Darrow is a quiet man of simple tastes. He has done a lot of good and perhaps some harm. He is unique. He has devoted his great talent to the downtrodden and the unfortunate. He has not overlooked any good clients, but money has never been his objective. The importance of his failure to accept a religious creed has been exaggerated. His interest in humanity has not been sufficiently stressed. He is more interested in the here than the hereafter. While some people are

striving to be saved, solely on their faith, he may be saved, despite himself, by his works. The following points in the editorial afford opportunity for comment:

’Darrow Breaks the Sabbath." Neither the reporter nor the editor knows the difference between the Lord’s day and the Sabbath; between the first day of the week and the seventh day of the week. If they would read carefully the Ten Commandments, they would learn that the seventh day is the Sabbath that Jehovah commanded the ancient Jews to keep holy. Then, if they would only take one glance at the calendar, they would see that Saturday is the seventh day of the week and Sunday is the first day. If that simple fact could ever register upon their mental apparatus, they might then read a few chapters in the New Testament and learn that Christ, our Lord, arose from the dead on the first day of the week (Mark 16:9), and that Christians, therefore, meet for worship upon that day (Acts 20:7; 1 Corinthians 16:1-2), and that an inspired apostle admonished them to "let no man . . . judge" them with respect to the Sabbath (Colossians 2:16). A little acquaintance with the New Testament and with the writings of the so-called "church fathers" of the second century would teach them that the first day of the week— the day on which Christians worship—is called "the Lord’s day." ’(Revelation 1:10.)

Whatever, therefore, Mr. Darrow did on Sunday was not a desecration of the Sabbath. He may have shown disrespect for the Lord’s day and even for the Lord himself, but he could not break the Jewish Sabbath on the first day of the week. There was no way to learn from the newspapers how much, if any, irreverence and blasphemy there was in Darrow’s talk before the reporter. The editor’s point on the fact that Darrow’s conduct was no more a desecration of a sacred day than that of many professed Christians is well taken and deserves to be commended. But the editor was in error when he called such people "good Christians." If the New Testament is to be taken as our standard and if the lives of the early disciples are to be our examples, those who were engaged in the things the editor described are not Christians at all, to say nothing of "good" Christians. There is a shade of redundancy in the expression, "good Christians," anyway; but in this case it added poignancy to the editor’s sarcasm.

"Darrow an Agnostic." The editor defends Darrow against the charge of being an atheist and tells us that he is an agnostic—that he does not deny anything. The statement that Darrow "does not deny anything" was the editor’s effort to explain the difference between Darrow and an atheist. An atheist denies the existence of God; denies the immortality of the soul; denies the divinity of Christ and the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. It would be interesting to have the editor tell us how many of these postulates Darrow accepts, or which one of them Darrow does not deny in his public utterances. This statement in defense of Darrow must be seen to evince a good deal of temerity on the part of our editor when we remember that the newspapers had informed the public that Darrow was here on his way to Little Rock to engage in a debate with a Jewish rabbi on the question of immortality, the rabbi affirming the proposition and Darrow denying it. This debate began on the night of the day the editorial appeared saying that Darrow "does not deny anything."

Darrow lectures and debates all over the country, and he is always on the negative side of every question—religious, moral, sociological, or governmental. He is against practically all our established institutions. He would overthrow our present order of civilization. Those who are acquainted with his numerous tracts and essays—published by Halderman-Julius—must know that this is true. In his essay on "Resist Not Evil" he not only borrows a scriptural title, but he runs close

to the Christian ideal in declaiming against war, but he even goes so far as to denounce police power to maintain law and order. He defends anarchy and crime and seems to deny that any organized government has any right to interfere with a man's conduct, it matters not what he does. It is not denied that Darrow is intellectual or that those who conversed with him in Memphis (no doubt our editor was in the group) were "local intellectuals," but many people who would not presume to ask admission into this exalted company of the intellectually elect can see that Darrow and those who agree with his negations are in the most helpless and chaotic intellectual confusion. The editor applies Huxley's term to Darrow, but it will not disguise Darrow. His cars are too long and his voice is unmistakable. Huxley invented the word "agnostic" to apply to himself because he disliked atheism. He did not want to be an atheist, yet he knew he was not a believer. He did not deny the postulates of the Christian religion. He admitted that they are as reasonable as some scientific truths. He said he had no means of disproving them. In a letter to Charles Kingsley, written September 23, 1860, Huxley said:

I neither affirm nor deny the immortality of man. I see no reason for believing it, but, on the other hand, I have no means of disproving it. I have no a priori objections to the doctrine. Give me such evidence as would justify me in believing anything else and I will believe that. Why should I not? It is not half so wonderful as the conservation of force or the indestructibility of matter. In another letter, dated May 5, 1863, he said:

I have never had the least sympathy with the a priori reasons against orthodoxy, and I have by nature and disposition the greatest possible antipathy to all the atheistic and infidel schools. Nevertheless, I know that I am, in spite of myself, exactly what the Christian would call, and so far as I can see is justified in calling, atheist and infidel. I cannot see one shadow or tittle of evidence that the great unknown underlying the phenomenon of the universe stands to us in the relation of a Father—loves us and cares for us as Christianity asserts. So, with regard to the other Christian dogmas, immortality of soul and future stale, of rewards and punishment, what possible objection can I—who am compelled perforce to believe in the immortality of what we call matter and force, and in a very unmistakable present state of rewards and punishment for our deeds— have to these doctrines? But Clarence Darrow will debate these issues and undertake to disprove these doctrines in public debate. He is proud of his unbelief and is blatant and boisterous in his attacks upon the Christian faith. The word "agnostic" is only a euphemism, anyway. Those who call themselves "agnostics" are in plain terms infidels or atheists. Huxley took the word from Paul's agnosto theo —unknown god—of Acts 17:23. He and his kind claim that Jehovah is unknown and unknowable. He would be both had he not revealed himself unto man. We accept this revelation, and therefore know Jehovah only by faith. But these so-called "agnostics" reject this revelation and attempt to learn of God through physical research. They cannot find him, and they will not seek by faith. Hence they are atheists.

3. Darrow a Quiet Man. The editor tells us that Darrow "is a quiet man of simple tastes." This will be a startling revelation to the public. Darrow may have simple tastes and he may be soft-voiced and mild in his parlor manners. Perhaps that is what the editor meant. He surely cannot mean that Darrow is reticent; that he has not voiced his sentiments on every question now before the public. The editor must know that Darrow is going up and down through the country lecturing and debating all the time. He lectures to negroes and tries to stir them up against the white people. He writes and speaks and debates against Christianity and tries to destroy the only hope the human

race has of life and salvation. Yet the editor says he is "a quiet man."

Some few years ago when that great-hearted statesman and peerless orator, William J. Bryan, was touring the country and speaking on questions of peace and good will, social sanity, sober living, and religious faith and hope, the newspapers ridiculed and satirized him both in news columns and in editorials and by cartoons as a publicity hunter; as a sensationalist, a seeker after front-page space, and as an incessant talker. But when Clarence Darrow, who is not equal to Mr. Bryan in intellect, in personality, in oratorical ability, in attainments, or in any other sense, goes over the country broadcasting his infidelity, debating against prohibition and the hope of a future life, defending criminals, justifying crime, and fighting against everything upon which civilization rests, the newspapers lionize him and speak of him editorially as "a quiet man"! Still there are some people who think that newspapers are a factor in civilization. Perhaps they were long ago.

4. "Darrow May B e Saved b y His Works. ” Of course, we do not expect a newspaper editor of this age to be theologically sound or even scripturally sane, and we shall not, therefore, take him to task for contradicting Paul by putting salvation on a basis of works, or for making useless the cross of Christ by saving a man independent of the atonement, or for disrespecting the Lord’s word when he said, "He that believeth not shall be damned"; but we would certainly not be unreasonable if we should call upon the editor to point out the good works that Darrow has done that would entitle him to even honorable mention among the worthy of earth. Can he be enrolled as a great author? No! Is he an educator? No! Does he deserve mention as a social worker? No! What are his good works? O, he has defended strikers and anarchistic rioters. He defended the men who blew up a public building—a newspaper plant. He defended the men who murdered an ex-governor. He defended the young perverts who had committed numerous unmentionable crimes, but who were detected in blackmail, kidnaping, and murder. He has helped the downtrodden, we are told. Yes, those who are downtrodden by the laws which they have flouted and defied. He said in Memphis that he does not know what a good citizen is.

If Darrow should even get to heaven, Jehovah would have to work a stupendous miracle on him in order to get him reconciled to a reign of righteousness and make him submissive to the will of the Lord. And Darrow does not believe in miracles of that kind. Nor do we.

"BITETH LIKE A SERPENT, AND STINGETH LIKE AN ADDER"

Any person who has ever seen a drunken man and heard him talk knows that Solomon’s description is accurate. Read Proverbs, twenty-third chapter, verses 29 to 35. The drunkard has woe and distress and sorrow. H e has contentions. He is quarrelsome and ready to fight; often goes armed. H e has babbling —he babbles and blathers in unintelligible tones. H e has wound s without cause. He hurts himself by falling. He is wounded by other drunken men with whom he fights when there was no cause for a fight—except they were drunken. H e has redness o f eyes and also of nose. H e sees strange women —he is lascivious and lustful and imagines himself in carnal embrace when he is not actually in such connection with sinful women. His heart utters perverse things —he utters vile and obscene language. He talks of the most perverted and unnatural deeds and often commits them. H e is like one who lieth down i n the midst o f the sea. He utterly disregards danger. He often actually does lie down on a railroad track and in other places where his life is endangered. He sobers up and discovers that he was beaten and bruised, but he knew not when it happened. He is such a victim of the drink habit that he resolves to get

drunk again at the first opportunity.

These symptoms are all too familiar; but all of us may not know that Solomon’s description is also scientifically accurate. A medical authority says: "Under the influence of alcohol our animal tendencies, which are normally under the control and restraint of the highest brain centers—those through which our will, our self-control, our judgment, our reasoning, etc., are exerted—are depressed, and there results a certain freedom from restraint, with consequent failure of judgment, inability to appreciate or to weigh consequences of one’s acts, marked overconfidence in one’s powers, both mental and physical, careless, freer speech, and other evidences of profound intellectual depression. It is obvious, too, that those who desire to cultivate chastity of thought and feeling should avoid alcohol altogether, or to use it in its weakest forms and in careful moderation." The serpent-and-adder simile is also found to be remarkably accurate from a scientific standpoint. We know that both of these words designate what we commonly call "snakes"—poisonous snakes. However, we do not ordinarily think of a snake as stinging; but this will be found to be true when we enter into a study of the nature and habits of these venomous snakes. Our poisonous snakes—and those of the Bible—are in two classes both as to the matter of biting and as to the nature of the venom. These are the serpents and the vipers. (The word "adder" in our text means cockatrice or viper.) The serpents, with the cobra of India and the cottonmouth moccasin of America as examples, must bite their victims— that is, they insert the fangs and macerate or chew the tissue as the venom is being injected. Hence the expression, "biteth like a serpent." The venom of these serpents is exceedingly death-dealing. Death may ensue within twenty minutes. This depends upon the amount of dosage, and that, in turn, depends upon the size of the serpent, upon how long it had been since he had bitten something else, etc. There may be no local evidence of the bite, except a small puncture or torn place in the flesh. No discoloration or swelling. But the patient begins to have difficulty in breathing and soon expires. The venom of this class of snakes is predominantly a poison of the nerve tissue, and is, therefore, scientifically classed as a neurotoxin. The viper class of snakes docs not bite. They strike and drive their fangs into the victim like the sting of a wasp, inject the venom, and withdraw the fangs in a fraction of a second. Hence "stingeth like a n adder" —viper. The rattlesnake is an example of the viper class. The fangs of the viper fold back, like the blade of a pocketknife, against the snake’s upper jaw when he is quiescent; but when he strikes, they spring out to right angles with the jaw and are driven into the flesh of the victim like a hypodermic needle. The venom is in a sac or pouch at the root of the fang, and by the pressure of the upper jaw this venom is shot through the fang into the blood of the victim. The venom of the viper class of snakes is a poison of the blood and blood vessels. It is therefore classed as a hema- toxin—a poison of the blood. It destroys the blood cells and alters the blood-vessel walls, therefore poisons all the tissues of the body. The area around the sting of the victim swells, turns dark or black, and is very painful. The unfortunate victim may die in a short time or may linger two or three days and then die. The analogy between the biting of a serpent and the stinging of an adder and alcoholic poison is perfect. The serpent bites and the adder stings. Alcohol does both. The venom of the serpent is a neurotoxin and that of the adder is a hematoxin. Alcohol is both.

"At the last"—as a final result of drinking wine, whisky, or any other alcoholic drink—"it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder." The drunkard is a mental or nervous wreck. Alcohol as a neurotoxin has ruined his nerves. He sees imaginary reptiles and other vile images. He raves in

wild delirium and fights a million devils that haunt his couch.

He suffers a physical breakdown. Alcohol as a hema- toxin has wrecked his whole body. It has brought on cirrhosis, or ruined the liver. It has caused chronic nephritis, or ruined the kidneys. It has produced stomach ulcers and subsequent malignancy, cancer of the stomach. It has superinduced high blood pressure and may cause apoplexy. A very reliable medical authority classes sixty diseases as directly or indirectly traceable to alcohol.

Jonathan Swift, in his "Thoughts on Various Subjects," said: "Elephants are always drawn smaller than life, but a flea always larger." This would have to be true. What could you do with the picture of an elephant as large as the elephant really is? Just so it is in drawing the pictures of the evils of alcohol. We cannot draw the picture full size. It is impossible to reckon the ruin wrought by strong drink. And yet it looks as if our country is going to let the manufacturers of alcoholic liquors have a legal right to feed and fatten off the souls of our youth! Those who favor this hellish business make the plea of revenue to the state: We must balance our budget and build up our institutions, etc.! As if in direct answer to this foolish argument, God says: "Woe to him that buildeth a town with blood, and established a city by iniquity!" (Habakkuk 2:12.)

Those who plead for this legalization of poison on the ground that they want to drink it are also described by an ancient prophet of God: They "have given a boy for a harlot, and sold a girl for wine, that they may drink." (Joel 3:3.) But whatever the state may or may not do, those who believe the Bible, love life, and regard decency will touch not the "unclean thing."

AGNOSTICISM

Agnosticism is a form of skepticism or of disbelief. As we begin to study this "ism," it seems wise for us to consider some of these forms of unbelief and to see what distinction is made between them. Other writers in this issue of our paper will discuss some other of these forms, especially atheism. There may be, therefore, an overlapping on some points. This, however, should not be at all surprising, since it is all disbelief—by whatever name it is called—and destructive of faith.

Some disbelievers are more blatant and bold than others. These do not hesitate to announce themselves as atheists and to openly avow the fact that they are set for the overthrow of all religion. The other type is less aggressive in their purposes and more mild in their language. They seek for some euphemistic and complimentary term by which to designate themselves. Some of this group are clandestine and two-faced in their dealing. At heart they are just as bitter against faith in God, Christ, and the Bible as the most blasphemous atheist. Even some modernistic preachers have been reported to have contributed money to the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism. All modernistic preachers and all "liberal" and "agnostic" college professors of our day habitually praise, pet, and coddle Russia. Why? Because Russia is vehemently atheistic. It is blind, bitter, and blasphemous against all religion. These preachers and professors blandly smile over and wink at the murders, robberies, bastardies, barbarities, and brutalities of the Bolsheviks because of their blasphemies against God. Every disbeliever, regardless of what he calls himself, rejoices to see faith attacked by any foe. If this has not always been true, it is certainly true in our age. We may see that conditions have been different in other times as we review the history of these forms. We shall now proceed with that study.

I. FORMS OF UNBELIEF

Skepticism originated with Pyrrho of Elis (360-270 B.C.). The word is from the Greek word skeptomai, which means I consider. A skeptic is supposed to be one who has not yet arrived at a conclusion, but who is carefully weighing the evidence. This is seen, therefore, to be a complimentary term which ancient unbelievers modestly applied to themselves. The skeptics claimed to attain undisturbed tranquility of mind by a constant balancing of opposing arguments, thus reducing everything to a state of uncertainty and doubt. A boastful skeptic would, therefore, consider it inconsistent with his wisdom and dignity to believe anything. But through the ages skepticism has assumed the following forms:

Pantheism, or antisupernaturalism. Spinoza (16321677), the leader of this class, talks of nothing less than demonstration, and of being infallibly led to each conclusion by arguments which admit of no reply. He demanded a geometrical method of demonstration. This is what materialists of our day demand. They are against all supernaturalism.

The academic farm originated with the Sophists, but was revived in the seventeenth century by Bayle (1647-1706). The method of this form is to oppose all systems of belief to each other. Academic doubt is ever seeking, for the avowed purpose of never finding, and perpetually reasoning in order that it may never come to any conclusion.

The absolute form, which strikes at the root of all opinions, and seeks to form a system of universal doubt in the human understanding itself. Of this type of skepticism the writings of Hume (1711-1776) furnish an unrivaled example.

Ridicule. This contains no philosophy, but is a mere series of doubting and jesting, of flouting and burlesquing. This was the method used by Voltaire (1694-1778), and it is still a popular method.

The historical form. This is contained in a narrative relating to the times and circumstances with which Christianity is chiefly concerned, and, while preserving an outward regard for morals, misrepresents with irony the miraculous history of the Bible, and takes care, without absolutely falsifying facts, to place it in an absurd and an improbable point of view.

The history of Gibbon (1737-1794) is one of the most dangerous examples of this form of unbelief that has ever appeared. It is dangerous because it admits of no reply; for, as Paley (1743-1805) observed, who "can refute a sneer"?

Sentimental infidelity. This is the type that rejects anything that is taught in the Bible, or that has been believed in the past—that is "orthodox" or "traditional"—and yet its representatives have some sort of poetical and shadowy god to worship and some dreamy sentiments about immortality. They always picture their deceased friends as living after death and as contending even more valiantly against orthodox ideas.

Rousseau (1712-1778) was an example of this type. So was Elbert Hubbard in our own age.

Rationalism. This form teaches that we should reject everything that does not seem reasonable to us. It repudiates everything that is not in harmony with natural law and not plain to human understanding. It laughs at miracles.

The latest form is agnosticism. This form does not merely say, "I do not know," as is often claimed for it; it says God is unknowable, and must, therefore, always remain unknown.

The mere definition of these forms should help students, as it will enable them to classify their infidel teachers. Some of the definitions also show the fallacy and the unfairness of the form.

AGNOSTICISM FURTHER DEFINED: THE STORY OF ITS ORIGIN The term "agnostic" is much misused. It is supposed to designate a man who is neutral on all religious questions. He does not have even a well-fixed opinion. H e does not know. He takes neither side. He is noncommittal. This is the way the agnostic wants to represent himself, and he thinks he compliments himself. He is not gullible. He does not believe orthodox views. They have not been scientifically demonstrated. Yet he is not prejudiced or narrow, and he would not deign to be dogmatic. H e just does not know. This is what agnosticism means to many people, but this is a false impression. We have pointed out the fact that these supposed-to-be neutrals are not at all neutral in their sympathies and inclinations. We shall see also that the term was not invented to designate a neutral. It is true that it carries the idea of something that is unknown, but it also announces unbelief. The true agnostic is not one who merely does not know because he has not studied the question or heard the evidence. He is not one who is yet willing to hear and then decide—one who has deferred decision for further investigation. No indeed. An agnostic is a very different person from that. He is one who claims to have heard all the evidence and found none of it worth his attention. He has weighed all the proof and repudiated it. He now says there is no proof. There is not one scintilla of evidence according to his dictum. And he even goes further. He says no proof can ever be found. God is not only unknown; he is unknowable. When man studies a question of that nature, his intellect has floundered out of its depths, according to the agnostic. This attitude of mind has existed from the days of the Greeks down, but the term "agnostic" was first applied to Thomas Henry Huxley (1825-1895). Some writers have said that he took the term from Paul’s agnosto theo —the unknown god—of Acts 17:23. But he himself gives a different account of its origin. From his own words we learn of the origin of the word and also the attitude that it describes. The following is taken from the Encyclopedia Britannica and found under the term "Agnosticism":

Though Huxley only began to use the term "agnostic" in 1869, his opinion had taken shape some time before that date. In a letter to Charles Kingsley (September 23, 1860) he wrote very fully concerning his beliefs:

"I neither affirm nor deny the immortality of man. I see no reason for believing, but, on the other hand, I have no means of disproving it. I have no a priori objections to the doctrine. No man who has to deal daily and hourly with nature can trouble himself about a priori difficulties. Give me such evidence as would justify me in believing in anything else, and I will believe that. Why should I not? It is not half so wonderful as the conservation of force or the indestructibility of matter. . . .

"It is no use to talk to me of analogies and probabilities. I know what I mean when I say I believe the law of the inverse squares, and I will not rest my life and my hopes upon weaker convictions. . . .

"That my personality is the surest thing I know may be true. But the attempt to conceive what it is leads me into mere verbal subtleties. I have champed up all that chaff about the ego and the nonego, noumena and phenomena, and all the rest of it, too often not to know that in attempting even to think of these questions the human intellect flounders at once out of its depth." And again, to the same correspondent, the fifth of May, 1863:

"I have never had the least sympathy with the a priori reasons against orthodoxy, and I have by nature and disposition the greatest possible antipathy to all the atheistic and infidel school. Nevertheless, I know that I am, in spite of myself, exactly what the Christian would call, and so far as I can see is justified in calling, atheist and infidel. I cannot see one shadow or tittle of evidence that the great unknown underlying the phenomenon of the universe stands to us in the relation of a Father—loves us and cares for us as Christianity asserts. So with regard to the other great Christian dogmas, immortality of soul and future state of rewards and punishments, what possible objection can I—who am compelled perforce to believe in the immortality of what we call matter and force, and in a very unmistakable present state of rewards and punishments for our deeds —have to these doctrines? Give me a scintilla of evidence, and I am ready to jump at them." Of the origin of the name "agnostic" to cover the attitude, Huxley gave (Coll. Ess. v. pp. 237-239) the following account:

"When I reached intellectual maturity, and began to ask myself whether I was an atheist, a theist or a pantheist, a materialist or an idealist, a Christian or a freethinker, I found that the more I learned and reflected the less ready was the answer. The one thing on which most of these good people were agreed was the one thing in which I differed from them. They were quite sure they had attained a certain ’gnosis—had more or less successfully solved the problem of existence, while I was quite sure that I had not, and had a pretty strong conviction that the problem was insoluble. This was my situation when I had the good fortune to find a place among the members of that remarkable confraternity of antagonists, the Metaphysical Society. Every variety of philosophical and theological opinion was represented there; most of my colleagues were -ists of one sort or another; and I, the man without a rag of a belief to cover himself with, could not fail to have some of the uneasy feelings which must have beset the historical fox when, after leaving the trap in which his tail remained, he presented himself to his normally elongated companions. So I took thought, and invented what I conceived to be the appropriate title of ’agnostic’ It came into my head as suggestively antithetic to the ’gnostic of church history who professed to know so much about the very things of which I was ignorant. To my great satisfaction the term took." THE ANSWER TO AGNOSTICISM

There can be no argument with agnosticism unless it will consent to come into the domain of Christian evidence. The kind of evidence that it demands is impossible. And it is unreasonable to ask for evidence on a question that is entirely out of character with the question. Such a demand may be illustrated thus: A man shuts himself up in a dark dungeon, where no ray of sunlight can penetrate. He denies that the sun is shining, or he questions whether there is a sun or any such thing as sunlight. His friends insist that the sun is now shining, and although you cannot look directly into the face of the sun, you can see its light, feel its warmth, and bask in its beauty. But the dungeon dweller declares that he has heard such tales all of his life, but no proof has ever been given. His friends urge him to come out and enjoy the sunlight. But he sneers that there is no sunlight, and demands that if there is a handful of it, it should be brought in to him so that he could take it into his hands and test it; he could hold it to his nose and smell it and put it into his mouth and taste it. His friends cannot meet his demand. He then says: "Ah, ha, I told you so! There is no proof, not one scintilla of evidence." And he settles down to a confirmed state of agnosticism.

WE WALK BY FAITH AND NOT BY SIGHT

Christians have never claimed scientific proof for their position. Spiritual things cannot be demonstrated by physical research. God cannot be found with either the telescope or the microscope or by any other physical means. Christianity is a revealed religion. We learn its great facts from the word of God—given to us by inspired men. "Canst thou b y searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" (Job 11:7.) No. Why? Because God in his wisdom shut himself off from man so that man by his wisdom could not find God. Then God used a method to make himself known that is "foolishness" to those who look only for scientific demonstration—viz., by inspired preaching—revelation. "For seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God, it was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe"—believe the preaching. (1 Corinthians 1:21.) THE GROUND OF FAITH

Countless volumes have been written on the evidences of Christianity. The ground for theistic and Christian belief has been thoroughly canvassed and hotly contested. But the arguments have never been answered or even fairly considered by the opponents. They evade the issue, shift the fight to irrelevant things, and hide behind verbal subtleties and endless negations. Some of Mr. Huxley's contemporaries wrote unanswerable books on Christian evidence. Two names are here given: George Park Fisher (1827-1909) and Canon Farrar (1831-1903). The works of these men are still extant, and they have never been excelled.

We close this article with the following eloquent words from Farrar:

We may freely concede that, of the separate existence of the immaterial soul, and our survival beyond "the intolerable indignities of dust to dust," we have no mathematical demonstration to offer. But this fact does not in the slightest degree trouble us, because neither is there any such proof of the existence of a God. It is perfectly easy for a man to say, if he will: " I do not believe in a God. I do not care to offer up any worship, even of the silent sort, even at the altar of 'the unknown and the unknowable.' I do not even think it worth while to pray that wild prayer once uttered by a criminal upon the scaffold: 'O God, if there be a God, save my soul, if I have a soul.' " A man may say all this, and plume himself on this melancholy abnegation of man's fairest hopes; on this deliberate suicide of the spiritual faculty; and if he considers such opinions to be a sign of intellectual emancipation, we can offer to him no proof that will necessarily convince him. When Vanini lay in prison on a charge of atheism, he touched with his foot a straw which lay on his dungeon floor, and said that from that straw he could prove the existence of God. We can pluck the meanest flower of the hedgerow, and point to the exquisite perfection of its structure, the tender delicacy of its loveliness; we may pick up the tiniest shell out of myriads upon the shore, so delicate that a touch would crush it, and yet a miracle of rose and pearl, of lustrous iridescence and fairy arabesque, and ask the atheist if he feels seriously certain that these things are but the accidental outcome of self-evolving laws. We can take him under the canopy of night and show him the stars of heaven and ask him whether he really holds them to be nothing more than "shining illusions of the night, eternal images of deception in an imaginary heaven, golden lies in dark-blue nothingness." Or we may bid him watch with us the flow of the vast stream of history, and see how the great laws of it are as mighty currents "that make for righteousness." Or we may appeal to the inner voices of the being, and ask whether they have indeed no message to tell him. But if he deny or reject such arguments as these; if he treat with arrogant scorn that evidence of the things unseen which has been enough in all ages for the millions of humanity— which was

enough in past times for Dante, and Shakespeare, and Milton, and Newton—which was enough till yesterday for Brewster, and Whewell, and Herschel, and Faraday—if he demand a kind of proof which is impossible, and which God has withheld, seeing that it is a law that spiritual things can only be spiritually discerned, and that we walk by faith and not by sight—if, in short, a man will not see God because clouds and darkness are round about him, although righteousness and judgments are the habituation of his seat, then we can do no more. He must bear or must forbear, as seems him best. We cannot argue about color to the blind. We cannot prove the glory of music to the deaf. If a man shuts his eyes hard, we cannot make him see the sun. That the blush of morning is fair, that the quietude of grief is sacred, that the heroism of conscience is noble, who will undertake to prove to one who does not see it? So wisdom, beauty, holiness are immeasurable things, appreciable by pure perception, but which no rule can gauge, no argument demonstrate. My brethren, if you know God, or rather are known of him, you will need no proof that he is, and that he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him; and you will not be much troubled by the skepticism of philosophers. Oh, let us get near to God by faith and prayer, and we shall break with one of our fingers through the brain-spun meshes of these impotent negations. Prove to us that by the word of God we ought only to mean "vortices of atoms," or "streams of tendency," and at the end of such triumphant demonstrations we shall but kneel down before him who made us, and not we ourselves, and with bowed head, and sad yet kindling heart, shall pray, if possible, with yet deeper conviction, "Our Father which art in heaven." And when we thus believe in him whom we have not seen, all else follows. We believe that he did not befool with irresistible longings, that he did not deceive with imaginary hopes, the man whom he had made. We believe that the breath of life which came from him shall not pass away. We believe that he sent his Son to die for us and to save us. We believe that because he lives we shall live also. We believe; we are content; we do not even ask for further proof. In this belief which we believe that he inspireth, we shall console ourselves amid all the emptiness and sorrow of life; we shall advance, calm and happy, to the very grave and gate of death.

RETROSPECTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS The beginning of a new year is always a time for reflection, retrospection, and resolution. We are all inclined to be meditative and perhaps more or less melancholy, because as the old year dies out and the new year dawns upon us we are made cognizant, for a few hours at least, of the rapidity with which the years race by us. Also at such a time we seem disposed to recall the experiences of the year that is passing out, and, while in the mood for looking back, we often turn the pages of memory back to the very first chapter of life and read again the story that we ourselves have written. And what a variety of conflicting emotions swells our bosoms as the scenes of our lives reappear before us! We experience feelings of shame and chagrin as we pass over deeds that were unworthy and sinful, and in vain we try to blot them from the pages of life’s story. But that is impossible; they are there, and there they must stay. Like Pilate, what we have written we have written, and it is impossible to make a single correction. We can never undo any deed that was done. Some deeds may be counteracted and their influence in a measure corrected, but undone —never. Life is made up of daily deeds, and what we are is the sum of what we have done. The time taken up in a sinful act is as much a part of life as the same length of time employed in the noblest deeds of service or in the most solemn devotions. It matters not how much we may regret the waste of time or how genuinely we may repent of the misconduct, we can never recall the time or reverse the conduct. If our bitter, briny tears of remorse and repentance could flow forever, they could not wash one sinful stain from life’s

escutcheon. If we should never waste another moment of time, the days that are already lost could not be regained. There is no such thing as "redeeming the time," and the translators showed by their marginal reading that Paul meant to convey a different idea in that Ephesian passage. As the philosophical but pessimistic poet, the unbelieving Omar Khayyam, sadly said:

The moving finger writes; and having writ, Moves on; nor all your piety nor wit Shall lure it back to cancel half a line, Nor all your tears wash out a word of it. When such thoughts as these intrude into our meditations, or rather when this awful truth stares us in the face, how sweet it is to hear Jehovah tenderly saying concerning the wicked man who turns from his sins to obey the Lord, "None of his transgressions that he hath committed shall be remembered against him" (Ezekiel 18:22); and concerning those under the new covenant who have been washed in the blood of the Lamb, "And their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more" (Hebrews 10:17)! But even Jehovah does not promise to avert a man’s record—that is impossible with Omnipotence; but in his mercy our Father forgives and forgets. What a gracious provision this is for us! And how grateful we should be, as we see our utter helplessness before our own failures in life, to know that when all of our years have come and gone and all our deeds have been recorded, Infinite Love will spread the mantle of oblivion over our sins and we shall pass through grace into glory forever!

If we err in human blindness, And forget that we are dust:

If we miss the law of kindness In our struggle to be just, Snowy wings of love shall cover All the faults that cloud our way, When the weary watch is over, And the mists have cleared away. But as we re-read life’s story we do not find it all unpleasant. On the contrary, we come upon scenes that thrill us and upon which we delight to dwell. In memory we live again the days that are forever gone and enjoy associations that can never again exist in reality. And here it is strangely true that "distance lends enchantment," for the days and experiences that are farthest away seem the sweetest. Our early days—how often back We turn on life’s bewild’ring track To where o’er hill and valley plays The sunlight of our early days!

Things that seemed trivial as we passed them on life’s highway now loom large in the distance, and we return in memory to bestow upon them the consideration that was perhaps their due. It is unfortunate that we cannot properly value things that are present. We are so much inclined to look for some "better day" and to aspire to do some "great thing" that we undervalue the present moment and overlook the opportunities for noble deeds that every day brings to us. Then soon life is over, and that better day never dawned and that great thing was never done. Life is not made up of great things. It is given to only a very few men to do that which the world calls great, and even in their lives that which made them famous—the great thing they did—occupied only a few days or, at most, a few years of their allotted time on earth. Perhaps threescore years of their whole threescore and ten were spent in toil and sacrifice. Those years were filled with little things, commonplace things, prosy things; but it would be safe to say, if those men were truly great, that all those little duties had been faithfully discharged. Neither man nor God will make a man lord over many things who has not been faithful over a few things. A person who is not punctual, diligent, and loyal in the ongoings of daily life will not rise to the opportunity for a great deed when the opportunity comes. Should we not, therefore, guard against our disposition to stand between a dream of the future and vision of the past and let the precious present moments pass unheeded? It was Shelley who said:

We look before and after And pine for what is not; Our sincerest laughter With some plain is fraught; Our sweetest songs are those That tell of saddest thought. When we pause to review our lives and when we see our mistakes; when we consider the somewhat trite but ever true philosophy that life is made up of little things, it is but natural that we should form resolutions for the future. It is a bad indication for a person to reach the point where he never reviews, regrets, repents, and resolves. Only the fatted, fatuous person is satisfied with himself and his achievements. And a purposeless, aimless life is worthless. Nothing worth while ever comes through accident. A man who is unintentionally good is good for nothing. Unless we purpose in our hearts to be better than we have ever been, it is certain that we will be no better. We should form a definite plan for work and service for God and humanity, and then use all our energies in the prosecution of that plan. The past cannot be recalled. The present is ours and its demands are great.

Let us, then, be up and doing, With a heart for any fate;

Still achieving, still pursuing, Learn to labor and to wait. THE CRITERION OF LIFE AND RELIGION

Every man is governed in his life and religious practice by some standard. It may be that his rule is a legacy received from his ancestors, and he, unconscious of its influence, may boast of his freedom and originality; or it may be that early environment so firmly fixed his habits that he cannot get away from them, yet he is often not aware that he has any established rule of life or settled convictions in religious matters. But however ignorant we may be of the fact, we all have our ideas of things, and by these ideas we measure every new thought or practice that comes under our observation. Too often we make these our criteria. This is the cause of the opposition with which every step of progression meets. But is this unfortunate or is it legitimate? Shall we meekly accept the ideas of every would-be progressionist or fall victims to the doctrine of every religious fanatic? Emphatically, no. By what, then, shall we decide the merits of their claims? Shall we appeal to the bias for inherited customs or pander to the dictates of native prejudices? No one, I presume, would contend for such a standard of authority. Hence we are forced to the conclusion that a criterion is a necessity. That some standard of authority other than our taste and preferences is a necessity is further evident from the mutability of circumstances and the fallibility of the human nature. Man is to some extent a creature of circumstances. When circumstances are favorable to his views and his practice is popular and it requires no sacrifice to maintain his conviction, then there is not much likelihood of his changing; but if contrary and adverse conditions obtain, he is not so strong in his claims. Let no one think that this applies only to the giddy and gullible. Even the strongest minds may be influenced by the press of circumstances. How often do we see men who once held a pronounced conviction upon an issue changing and persistently fighting the thing to which they once tenaciously held! Whether the change be from truth to error or from error to truth matters not, the illustration is the same. Nor should anyone think that all who thus change are prompted by mercenary motives. Man is so constituted that in the hours of despondency and gloom he sometimes doubts the correctness of his favorite dogma. Points that at times seem clear and indisputable, under different conditions, become misty and uncertain. John the Baptist, who had seen Jesus and had borne witness to his Messiahship, after he was cast into prison, sent to Jesus to know if he was the Christ.

Man’s views are as certainly and as obviously colored by his surrounding circumstances as vegetation is colored by different shades of light. A plant kept in the dark is pale and feeble, but one of the same variety growing in the sunlight is verdant and vigorous. Man is fallible. He cannot know certainly that he is right on any subject incapable of being dealt with by physical research. In all matters of a metaphysical nature he is An infant crying in the night, An infant crying for the light, And with no language but a cry.

What then? Shall man be left to find his only consolation from conjecture and speculation in matters of the soul? And for rules of moral and religious conduct, shall he look to his own feeble and fallible self? Shall his own unsustained judgment and vacillating opinions be his law of life? Or shall he be governed by a code made by beings who he realizes are as imperfect as he? From these considerations, we are again driven to the conclusion that man must have a standard in which he has faith, and to which he can appeal all questions of dispute, and in which he may find a refuge from doubts. Such a standard we have in the Bible. This Book of God has proved to be worthy of such faith by its victory over the bitter opposition it has received from countless foes in ages past. Every standard men may endeavor to bind on their fellows soon passes out of date and sinks into oblivion; but the Bible marches on, calm and undisturbed, and the battles of each succeeding century only demonstrate its divinity. Skeptics may dispute its claims and higher critics may deny its miracles, but they cannot improve its principles or substitute its promises. An article in the Progress Magazine, under the caption, "The Life Worth While," by Professor George Burham Foster, of the University of Chicago, begins:

"How is one to find out what it is that makes life worth while? Like all questions of the moral life, this was formerly decided, when the old view of the world and life prevailed, by men who were esteemed as bearers of divine authority—that is, it was decided by an appeal to divine wisdom and commandments somehow and somewhere and sometime dictated to divine plenipotentiaries."

Thus in the outset, without telling to what authority he is going to appeal, he makes us understand to what he is not going to appeal and discredits the Bible and classes it with the "old view of the world." In his haste to announce himself as a new and independent thinker and in his desire to make his readers understand that he is no adherent to old views, he rejects the Book of God, ignoring its claims, not considering the evidence of its divinity or accounting for its influences. In another paragraph he says:

"Upon this great question our only rational recourse is to find out what human nature itself has to say, and to rely upon her deliverance as fundamental and final. And this attitude is in accord with the spirit of our new age. Modern morality will no longer acknowledge offhand criteria and commandments from external source. We want to know their inner reason and inner right. If, for example, we even say on authority that the greatest commandment of morality is love to God and love to man, doubt would arise in the heart of a modern man as to whether this be true or not, as to the source of such a judgment."

Having thus completely rejected the authority of God’s word, he proceeds to set up his own standard and to decide by it what it is that makes life worth while. And, strange as it may seem, he adopts the oldest and best-known principle of the Bible and preaches it as the governing principle of life. He says: "Considered from this point of view, the greatest question of our time is as to whether man by nature is an individual or a social being—in other words, whether egoism or love

is the basic law of life." He decides in favor of love, and says: "I call this the new, the social spirit of our day." Again: "This social spirit has declared war against its foe who says that the individual may 'live unto himself and be made the center of life."

I call this the old and Christian spirit of Paul's day and the sum of the law and the essence of the commandments of Moses' day. But it would not have been progressive and philosophical enough for a Chicago professor to quote these principles and emphasize them as the laws of life. Nevertheless, he preaches the truths of the Bible, and therein I rejoice. He may discard the old Book and open his mouth to utter a new philosophy, but like Balaam of old, he was filled with divine truth and pronounced the precepts of God.

(Published in Gospel Advocate November 30, 1911.) ILLUSTRATION AND PERVERSION In recent issues of the Gospel Advocate several of our writers have referred to the use that our Lord made of parables and illustrations. We discussed also his frequent use of the a d hominem method of reply to his opponents (which means to base the reply upon the opponents' own premise or basis of reasoning, but does not mean that he who uses the ad hominem accepts the premise as true; he only uses it for argument). We, therefore, discussed the fallacy of supposing that Jesus endorsed the whole character of a person whose performance on some particular occasion is commended, or of imagining that every circumstance in a parable or every incidental in a figure of speech is endorsed and set forth as an example for us to follow. We pointed to instances in our Lord's teaching where such a course would be so obviously absurd that any honest person would know better than to make such a use of the great Teacher's language. Examples are not lacking, however, to prove that persons who are animated by prejudice or who are actuated by motives of personal envy and hatred can wrest and pervert any language of any teacher or writer into meaning anything that the perverter wishes it to mean. In our former articles, however, we did not have in mind so much this dishonest, malicious, and malevolent wrester of sentences and circumstances and perverter of language as the unthinking literalist who tries to force figures of speech to go upon their all fours, so to speak. This sort of mistake is rarely to be expected in an educated person; and when it is found in such a person, it cannot be excused on the ground of ignorance and must be accounted for on the ground of prejudice or of something even worse—if anything can be worse. A person who is really educated will not be actuated by prejudice; such things have always been considered as characteristics of ignorance. Education is supposed to lift the soul above narrowness, bias, unfairness, malevolence, and dishonesty. The fruit of a real education will be seen in the behavior of the man when under fire, when in controversy, when contending for his convictions. If he cannot stand this test, his education is deficient, it matters not what degrees he may hold or what academic position he may occupy. The evidence of his education will be seen in an open-mindedness, a fair and judicial treatment of any issue, in a kindly spirit and a courteous consideration of an opponent. This, however, does not in the least militate against a positive conviction or a firm stand. It would of course and of necessity prevent and prohibit any wresting of words, or perversion of language, or any misrepresentation and unfairness of any kind. Truth, however, cannot be refuted by fair means; and when a man runs counter to truth in any field or in any contest, he may be expected to resort to devices that are unworthy and to use methods that are low and sinister.

Unfortunately, too, much that passes for education today is nothing more nor less than propaganda for something or against something, especially against something. And that

"something" is not nebulous and indefinable. It is definitely against Christianity, or faith in God, and the whole social order built upon Christianity. The only evidence that some college men can show of their education is a fin e contempt for God and the Bible, and the biggest difference you will note in your son after he has had four years in college is that h e left home a Christian and returned a pagan. The methods used to overthrow the young man's faith and to destroy his morals were not logical, ethical, fair, or honest. The day of weighing honestly the evidences of Christianity has long ago faded into night. Modern education consists in a complete blackout of Christianity. As an example of just the kind of misuse of our Lord's parables and illustrations that we have been discussing, we cite the following from the highest source:

"Christendom," "A Quarterly Review," is a journal that issues from the University o f Chicago Press and sells for one dollar a copy or four dollars a year. At the time of the appearance of the article here quoted, Charles Clayton Morrison, of the "Disciples of Christ," was its editor pro tempore. The article appeared in the autumn number of 1936, which we have preserved for the sole purpose of using the article here quoted, and we have used it in the pulpit often. The title of the essay declares its nature. It is, "The Aversion o f Men o f Taste t o Evangelical Religion." The author is Nathaniel Micklem, who is one of the high priests of modernism—so high that he is sometimes quoted with approval by such men as J. J. Walker and C. C. Kling- man. As the title shows, the author argues throughout that "evangelical religion" is distasteful and wholly unacceptable to men of taste and culture. It originated with the ignorant and was intended for the base, he avers. The doctrine of the cross is especially repulsive to men of taste, the author claims. On this point he says: The ultimate scandal of evangelical religion (which in this connection includes both historic Protestantism and the Church of Rome, but excludes much of modern Protestantism) lies not in dogmas and symbolism, but in its intolerable offense to human pride.

"Nothing in my hand I bring;

Simply to the cross I cling" — it is that which the man of taste and culture cannot bring himself to say; he feels no need of so utter a salvation; to him, therefore, it is nonsense or mere mythology that the majesty of God should take a servant's form.

Thus Christ is repudiated and the cross is spurned and resented. That the majesty of God should take a servant's form is nonsense. If it had taken the form of king or ruler or philosopher and had complimented the human race for its wisdom and goodness and for its great achievements, then Christ would have been acceptable to men of taste; and in the University of Chicago and "Christendom" he would probably have been treated as an equal with Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud, or Bertrand Russell—probably! But the point that serves as an example of the fallacy pointed out above follows. Just immediately following the quotation just given about the cross and the servant's form the author gives us these lines of poetry and closes his essay with the one sentence that follows. Thus:

"Perish virtue, as it ought, abhorred, And the tool with it who insults the Lord. The atonement a Redeemer's love hath wrought Is not for you—the righteous need it not.

Seest thou yon harlot wooing all she meets, The worn-out nuisance of the public streets, Herself from morn till night, from night till morn, Her own abhorrence and as much your scorn; The gracious shower, unlimited and free, Shall fall on her when heaven denies it thee; Of all that

wisdom dictates, this the drift: That man is dead in sin and life a gift." That is what the Master said, "The publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you"; that is the reason for the aversion of men of taste to evangelical religion.

It would be difficult to imagine a more gross perversion of our Savior's language than is here made by this scholar and theologian and Bible teacher, Nathaniel Micklem. The idea that our Lord offered divine mercy to harlots and denied i t to men of taste and good character, or to anyone else, would be inexcusable in an ignorant man who can read; and when we find it put forth by a scholar as the teaching of Christ, we are at a loss to know how to characterize it. No one who reads this statement from our Lord in its connection can honestly deduce the conclusion that the Lord desires that harlots enter the kingdom in preference t o others, or that he denies others the right. The determining factor was not in the Lord's desire, nor in his offer, but in the desire and the will of the individual. The publicans and harlots and the common people heard him gladly, and they repented of their sins and entered joyfully into the kingdom, but the chief priests and elders of the people—the men of taste of that day—would not repent. They would not acknowledge themselves sinners. They felt "no need of so utter a salvation." Since Dr. Micklem and the poet he quotes put themselves and their compeers of the literati not only in company with, but squarely upon, the same basis of the scribes and Pharisees, they must not blame us if we accept their own evaluation of themselves. Those ancient "men of taste" did not enter the kingdom for exactly the same reason that Nathaniel Micklem assigns for his repudiation of the cross. It was an intolerable insult to their pride to call upon them to repent! And they criticized our Lord for the same thing that our "men of taste" find fault with: He received sinners! But that this misrepresentation of our Lord's teaching may be seen in all of its inexcusable ugliness, and that the blasphemous imputation that our Lord put a premium upon harlotry and sin may be exposed, let us here read and examine the entire passage of Scripture which has been so grossly misused. In the twenty-first chapter of his record, Matthew tells of "The Triumphal Entry," "The Traders Cast Out of the Temple," "Jesus' Authority Questioned," "The Parable of the Two Sons," and "The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen." It is clear that these critics of Christ—these men of taste—were represented by the false son (who pretended to do something he did not) and the wicked husbandmen (who the chief priests themselves said should be miserably destroyed). But the paragraph between verse 22 and verse 33 gives us the language and the incident that have been misused. When these men questioned the authority of Christ, he in reply asked them about the baptism of John which they had rejected. They refused to answer his question, and he likewise refused to give them his authority. Then, beginning with verse 28, we have this language: But what think ye? A man had two sons; and he came to the first, and said, Son, go work to-day in the vineyard. And he answered and said, I will not: but afterward he repented himself, and went. And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he answered and said, I go, sir: and went not. Which of the two did the will of his father? They say, The first. Jesus saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you. For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not; but the publicans and the harlots believed him: and ye, when ye saw it, did not even repent yourselves afterward, that ye might believe him.

"Which o f the two did the will o f his father?" Neither of these boys did the will of his father fully. The first one gave an improper and a disrespectful answer, which must have grieved the father deeply, but he afterward repented— changed his attitude toward his father and his father's com-

mand—and went into the vineyard and worked. They, therefore, correctly answered that he did the father's will. The second son gave his father a very proper and a respectful answer, which would evince an obedient and dutiful son. But his suave answer was a base hypocrisy; he did not obey his father. This first son represented the publicans and harlots, whose former conduct had been in defiance of, and displeasing to, the heavenly Father, but who were now ready to repent and to go into the vineyard and do the Father's will. The second son represented the chief priests and elders (verse 23), who made loud claims and pious protestations of loyalty to God, but refused to obey his word or to reverence his Son (verse 37).

Brother McGarvey sets forth this same idea in a better way. Here is his comment: The assertion that they "go into the kingdom of God before you" does not mean that either party had already gone into the kingdom of God, but it declares the direction in which they were moving and points to the result soon to be attained. The publicans and harlots had made one step in that direction by believing in John (verse 32), while the priests and elders had not gone so far as that. The rebuke was a stinging one on account of the contempt with which publicans and harlots were regarded by the priests and elders, and the great disparity which had formerly existed between the two classes.

32. For John Came. The precedence declared in favor of the publicans and harlots had reference, not to their reception of Jesus, but to their regard for John. Previous to John's coming these wicked characters had been like the first son, saying, " I will not," making no pretense of obedience to God, while the priests and elders had been like the second son, saying, "I go, sir," making great professions of respect and obedience. But when John came and by his preaching put both parties to the test, the latter "believed him not," made no change in conduct; but the former "believed him," giving up their evil practices, confessing their sins, and being baptized for the remission of sins (3: 6; Mark 1:4).

How manifestly fair, sane, and true to the text is this language of McGarvey, the believer and the reverent student of God's word! How different the language of Micklem, who, although he is at the head of a leading theological college, is an unbeliever, a scoffer, and a blasphemer, "denying our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ" (Jude 1:4), and wresting the language of a parable to make his argument seem plausible and philosophical!

(Published in Gospel Advocate January 2, 1941.)

00B.38 Chapter 31. The Bible An Authority On In Catholic Hands

XXXI. "The Bible an Authority Only in Catholic Hands" A brother who has been endeavoring to teach his Catholic neighbor the word of the Lord has run into a difficulty. He has found that the Catholic claims that the Bible is not the Bible until it has been "declared to be the Bible" by the Roman Church, and that the church has not so declared in reference to the Protestant Bible. Furthermore, the Bible must be "officially interpreted" before it can be understood. "The church"—meaning the priests—must interpret the Scriptures for the "layman." Of course, these claims are not new to us, as this has been the boast of the Roman Church for more than a thousand years, and it was against this arrogant assumption that the Protestants protested in the beginning of the Reformation. But the Catholic neighbors of our brother are well supplied with printed propaganda and literature of a controversial nature. Our brother has sent some of these tracts to the Gospel Advocate office, with the request that we reply to them. These have been turned over to this department for attention. One of the tracts bears the title that is used as a heading for this article. It issues from Our Sunday Visitor Press, and is in the form of a dialogue between a Catholic and a Protestant, and the Catholic drives the Protestant to silence on every argument! Of course, this is an imaginary discussion, for all the eloquence of all the orators of earth could not persuade a Catholic to enter a real discussion with an informed Protestant. There is an ever-standing challenge to the Catholics on this point. They will not accept. If the editor of Our Sunday Visitor were personally willing to engage in such a discussion, his bishop would not allow him to do it. The Catholic Church does not believe in a fair, honorable, open investigation of the points discussed in these tracts. It, however, pronounces a papal benediction upon the supposed debates in which the Protestant’s answers are written by a Catholic. This point should be brought to the attention of our Catholic neighbors who have been distributing these pamphlets, for they, no doubt, are sincere, and they think that the Protestants are really vanquished and silenced by the Catholic arguments. In order that our readers may see the arrogance of this Catholic disputer, and also get the full force of his arguments, we here give the first division of the dialogue verbatim. This brings us down to the first pathetic silence of the poor Protestant. This will fill our space for this week, and we shall have to wait till next week for our replies to the Catholic’s contention. We, therefore, number each point, and we shall reply next week by number without repeating the argument. This will make it necessary for our readers to keep this copy of the paper, and to have it in hand when they read the next issue. We shall not reply to the entire tract after this manner, but on the claim in reference to the Bible we believe that our readers need to be thoroughly informed. When the Bible is cleared of the slander cast upon it and is accepted as a standard, then any Protestant who knows his Bible can rout the whole Romish hierarchy. But here is our dialogue in the exact language of the tract:

(This is still put out by Our Sunday Visitor). Quote—

Let us suppose an oral debate were to take place. To be logical, it would start something like this:

Catholic: Before launching into this discussion, it seems to me that we must first determine what will be the authority mutually recognized whereby we shall each endeavor to prove our claims.

Protestant: Agreed; and, it goes without saying, that this authority will be the Bible.

Catholic: But the Bible can be reliable authority only for me.

Protestant: What impertinence! Every Protestant recognizes the Bible as authority—in fact, the only authority in religious matters.

Catholic: But most inconsistently; and surely it cannot be so regarded by these judges, who are to decide the merits of our arguments in this debate.

Protestant: Why, I do not understand you; and I doubt whether the judges, or anyone else here present, understand you.

Catholic: Then I will explain: neither you nor the judges are sure that the Bible contains God's revelation, pure and unadulterated, whilst I am. If you are not sure of this, how can you appeal to it as decisive authority?

Protestant: But I am sure of it.

Catholic: I would be pleased to hear your proofs. And you surely will concede that the reliability of the Bible, as undisputed authority, must be settled before we can presume to prove anything from it.

Protestant: Why, where is there a Protestant Christian who hesitates to accept the Bible as a book containing God's revelation? And since the judges are not unbelievers, why try to prove what is accepted as a fact?

Catholic: Our audience will probably comprise some unbelievers; and even if it did not, since our arguments are to be supported by the Bible, the solidity of this foundation is the first point to prove.

Protestant: It is a recognized fact both by yourself and me, and that should be sufficient.

Catholic: It is a fact accepted solely on my church's word, which you claim may err, and, therefore, might have erred when she declared the Bible's authenticity and inspiration. Moreover, there are many in this audience, possibly some of our judges, who are not sure that the Holy Book is what we claim for it.

Protestant: Anyone familiar with the Bible must be convinced that it was written at the instigation of God.

Catholic: Some parts of the Old Testament bear contrary earmarks. The Mohammedans say about the Koran, and the Mormons about Joe Smith's revelations, what you say about the Bible; yet you and I, and millions of others, fail to see it that way. No book or written document proves its own authenticity. A last will or other important document is accepted as genuine only when proved to be so by credible living witnesses. Moreover, none of the apostolic writings, unless it be Revelation, whose authenticity many Protestants deny, assert their own inspiration. St. Paul tells us that "all scripture divinely inspired is profitable," but he nowhere tells us what portion or books

are inspired. The present Bible omits many writings which were long reputed to be inspired.

Protestant: There were such witnesses as you demand.

Catholic: Do you know this from the Bible?

Protestant: No.

Catholic: Then even your first act of faith is not based on the Bible, is not supported by the Bible; yet you say the Bible is the sole foundation of the faith which you profess. If you cannot prove the first fundamental of your creed by the Bible, how can you say that the Bible is your only rule of faith? Moreover, consistency is the first requisite which judges must require of a disputant. If the "Bible-and-Bible-only" theory and the "private-judgment" theory are the boasts of Protestants, people must needs expect that they are provable.

Protestant: I have said that we have witnesses to prove the genuineness of the Bible, but you do not admit them.

Catholic: Because that is tantamount to an admission of tradition as a "rule of faith" which you reject. However, tell me who those witnesses are.

Protestant: The early Christian writers.

Catholic: Not very early, because the New Testament writings were not gathered together and declared to be divinely inspired until the fourth century. Moreover, these witnesses were Catholics, and accepted the Scriptures as divinely inspired because their church declared them to be so. Was their church infallible then?

Protestant: I am not prepared to grant that it was.

Catholic: Then how can you hold as an infallible truth that the writings, known as the sacred Scriptures, for whose reliability you have the Catholic Church’s word alone, are inspired? It is, as I foreknew, you simply take for granted, and most inconsistently (because you say you accept nothing in religion unless it is supported by the Bible), that the Bible contains God’s revelation. You take more than this for granted—viz., that followers of the Catholic Church transcribed and translated the original writings without making any errors, that they never altered a line, that they preserved them until the sixteenth century in their original purity and sameness. Unless you grant all this, while believing that the Catholic Church fell into gross errors otherwise, you cannot appeal to the Scriptures, as they now exist, as divine authority.

Protestant: . . . (silent).

ANOTHER PROTESTANT SPEAKS Dear Brother Catholic:

Last week we published the first division of your controversy with an unnamed Protestant, in which, we must admit, the Protestant made a very poor showing. He seemed to be not only very poorly informed, but also very timid and, at times, even speechless. In this division of the discussion, which was published on this page last week, you used by actual count ten times as many words as your Protestant opponent used. So it seems that we will have to concede you a ten-to-one victory in your fictitious fight with that imaginary Protestant.

But, Brother Catholic, since you were the winner in that fight, you will naturally expect to be challenged by others. A champion always has to defend his title, you know. We would not put ourself up as a representative of the Protestants in a fight with such a formidable foe—in fact, we never entered any polemical battle without being first selected by our brethren and asked to uphold our side of the question; but even now we are writing to you at the request of the editor of this paper and others, and we are sure that if you do not like what is said in reply to your arguments on this page, we can arrange to divide time in an oral debate, or space in a written debate with an opponent who will not be merely self-appointed, and we shall have a fair, honorable, and earnest investigation of this issue. Let us not "suppose an oral debate" between two shadow disputants, but let us have a real debate between two living, visible, audible contenders who have both hearts and habitations. What do you say, Brother Catholic? Is your "infallible church" afraid to have its claims tested in a fair, sincere study, but willing to deceive its members as to the strength of those claims by pretending to rout its Protestant opponents in sham battles?

While we wait for you to answer that question, Brother Catholic, we shall examine, in a brotherly manner, some of the points that we published from you last week and see if we can convince you that the Protestants have something to say on these points. Do you have a copy of last week's paper before you? Very well; we shall proceed.

You first say that in the debate there must be some "authority mutually recognized whereby we shall each endeavor to prove our claims." To this the Protestant agreed, and suggested that the Bible be that authority. Whereupon you ostensibly agreed to accept the Bible as authority, but in reality you refused this outright and made the church— the Roman Catholic Church—the authority. The Bible, you say, is accepted as inspired and authentic only because the church has declared it to be so. And you refused to let the Protestant offer any proof that the Bible is inspired and authentic. Is not your logic a little lame here? You reject that which the Protestant suggests as a "mutual' authority and immediately set up in an arbitrary way that which you alone recognize as authority, and thus propose to prove your claims by this authority, when, in fact, this itself is the most colossal claim that you make and the one we challenge with the greatest emphasis. Thus you attempt to prove your minor claims by your major claim. It is as if you tried to prove a little falsehood true by telling a bigger one. W e deny that your church is infallible, and that it has any authority to declare anything in reference to the Bible, or anything else that pertains t o salvation. We challenge you to prove that our Lord ever delegated any such authority to his church, or that he has any vicegerent or vicar on earth. When you undertake to meet this challenge, as you do in this sham debate, what do you appeal to as authority, Brother Catholic? Why, you immediately have recourse to the Bible, and you cite Matthew 16:13-19; Matthew 18:15-21; John 20:23. So you reason in a circle. You prove your church authentic by the Bible, and you prove the Bible authentic by your church! If an unbeliever denies the authority and credibility of the Bible, you prove it by the decree of your church. Then if he denies the authority of your church, you prove it by the Bible!

It is not surprising that your church can make you believe whatever she pleases to tell you, for you start with the assumption that she is infallible. Then she decrees and declares that the Bible i s inspired. Next she decrees the language in which the Bible must be read, if read at all— the Latin. Then if the Bible must be translated into English, she authorizes or decrees the translation that you must read —a translation made from the "decreed" Latin version, not from the original Greek in

which the inspired men wrote. Then if in reading this decreed version you come upon some teaching that contradicts the claims of your church, you are taught to come to your church for instruction, whereupon your church decrees that the Scriptures do not mean what they say, and that you have no right to try to understand the Scriptures for yourself, but that you must come to the church for an "official interpretation"! So you see. Brother Catholic, your church has shut off every way of escape from you and made you her helpless, irresponsible subject. The only thing you can do, dear Brother Catholic, is to protest against the assumptions of your church, and then your church will excommunicate you and you will be like the rest of us—an anathematized Protestant. But there is another fallacy in your reasoning on your first point that we must bring to your attention, Brother Catholic. You say that we cannot claim to rest our faith on the testimony of the Scriptures and then prove the reliability of the Scriptures by recourse to other sources, such as history, the writings of uninspired men, both the friends and the enemies of the Bible. In order that you may see your error here, take this illustration: Mr. A is charged with murder, and is being tried in the courts for this crime. The state has in Mr. B an eyewitness of the crime. B testifies on oath that he saw A shoot and kill X. If the jury believes B's testimony, it cannot do otherwise than convict A. But to establish the fact that B is worthy of full credence, the state introduces as character witnesses C, D, E, and F. These witnesses—C, D, E, and F—know nothing at all about the crime—the very point on which B is testifying—but they show that B is a truthful man; and when that is established, his testimony concerning the crime must be believed. Do you see the point? Our faith in God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, heaven, eternal life, and all that pertains to the service of God, is based upon the testimony of the Scriptures; but our faith in the reliability of the Scriptures is based upon the testimony of many witnesses, and upon evidence of every nature in which evidence is ever allowed in any trial. We can prove that we have the Bible as it was written by inspired men, and our arguments will not be in a class with the monstrous absurdities adduced in favor of the Koran or the Book of Mormons. Do you want to try this statement, Brother Catholic?

You state (No. 15) that an "important document is accepted as genuine only when proved to be so by credible living witnesses." What an assertion! What living witnesses do the Catholics have by whom to prove the credibility of the Bible? Have you been made to believe that some of your priests who are now living were living when Christ was here and when Peter and Paul lived? We Protestants have just as many living witnesses as you have. But you claim that your pope is a successor of Peter, and as such has received knowledge from person to person of Christ, and that he is also infallible in his utterances concerning the Bible. But you must not forget that this is the claim we deny most positively and challenge you to prove it. By what authority will you prove this? Shall we set you down as "silent," Brother Catholic?

Next week we shall show you that we did not and do not get our Bible through your church. Wait with us.

BROTHER CATHOLIC FURTHER ADDRESSED Dear Brother Catholic:

While we are still waiting for you to tell us what you intend to do about a fair discussion of the questions which you raised in your hypothetical debate, we shall continue to examine some of the things you said in vanquishing your opponent. Of course you have kept your copy of the Gospel Advocate, and you will now please read your speech No. 15. You say there that "none of the apostolic writings assert their own inspiration," and you, therefore, conclude that they were not

inspired until your church declared them to be inspired! This shows that you are not well acquainted with the apostolic writings, Brother Catholic. They all assert their own inspiration and recognize each other's writings as inspired. Why did Peter and Paul announce themselves as apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ in the beginning of their Epistles if they did not expect their writings to be recognized as authoritative? John said that he wrote that we might believe (John 20:31), and he further asserted that what he had written was true (John 21:24). He said he announced in his Epistles what he had received from God and what also he had seen and heard. (1 John 1:1-5) Paul called upon all to "acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." (1 Corinthians 14:37) Peter told us that he had made known unto us that of which he was an eyewitness. (2 Peter 1:16-17) Peter also spoke of Paul as writing according to the "wisdom given unto him," and said that some wrested Paul's writings as they do also the "other scriptures." Paul's writings are thus called "scriptures" by Peter. (2 Peter 3:15-17) Is not Peter's declaration as authoritative as the declaration of 3'our pretended successor of Peter, Brother Catholic? And then you misquoted Paul. That apostle said that "all scripture i s given by inspiration" (A. V.), or that "every scripture is given by inspiration" (R. V., margin). (2 Timothy 3:16)

These are only a few suggestions of what could be cited to show you that the writers of the New Testament announced their inspiration.

But, Brother Catholic, you "do err, not knowing the Scriptures," more grievously than ever when you say (No. 23): "The New Testament writings were not gathered together and declared to be divinely inspired until the fourth century." You are just astoundingly ignorant of the history of the Bible, Brother Catholic. The statement just quoted, and your often-repeated statement that we got the Bible only through the medium of your church, is at sad variance with the facts, which we shall now show you, if you will give candid attention to what we tell you. You say the writings were not "declared to be divinely inspired" until the fourth century! The writings were all made in the first century, and all the apostles except John sealed their testimony by their martyrdom before that century closed; but you think these writings were uninspired and nonauthoritative for about three hundred years, and then your church declared them to be divinely inspired! Even you ought to be ashamed of that statement, Brother Catholic. We have already shown you that these writers asserted their own inspiration. But you say these writings were not compiled until the fourth century. Why, Brother Catholic, it is an undisputed fact that these writings were not only gathered together, but were translated from the Greek into the Syriac and the Coptic in the second century, and before the third century closed there were many translations into the Latin language. We have today hundreds of Greek manuscript copies of the New Testament in the great libraries of earth. Some of these were made before the fourth century. The three oldest manuscripts now known are: (1) The Vatican manuscript, which is held by your church, but which is accessible to Protestants, and which Protestant scholars consult in their study and in making their translations, but which your scholars do not use because of your foolish idea that your Vulgate or Latin version has been declared to be perfect, infallible, and, therefore, not susceptible to, or possible of, improvement. This Vatican manuscript is not quite complete. (2) The Sinaitic manuscript, which is complete—the entire New Testament—and which is not and never was in the hands of your church. This manuscript is written in beautiful Greek, on the skins of a hundred antelopes, and it was made before the fourth century. The whole New Testament is there, and you said these writings were not gathered together until the fourth century. You also said we got our Bible through your church, but

here is the oldest complete manuscript on earth, and your church never had it! A Protestant scholar, Dr. Tischendorf, found this manuscript and gave the world the benefit of it, and our Revised Version is made from it; but your scholars cannot avail themselves of this wonderful Greek text, because your church will not allow them to go behind its declared perfect version—the Latin Vulgate, and the English translation made from this old Latin version, known as the Rheims-Douay translation. (3) The Alexandrian manuscript, which belongs to a Protestant church and is in the great British Museum at London, accessible to all scholars, your scholars included, but their church will not allow them to use it. Your church never held this manuscript. So you see we get our Bible entirely independent of your church, and we have Greek manuscript copies, and Syriac, Coptic, and Latin translations that were made before the fourth century. It was the Vulgate that was made in the fourth century.

Here are the facts about that version and that declared compilation: In the fourth century there were so many Latin versions of the Scriptures in circulation, these translations having been made by any individual scholar who chose to undertake the task, and they differed so widely in their readings that Damasus, Bishop of Rome (your church. Brother Catholic, catalogues Damasus as a pope, one in the line of succession back to Peter, but there was no pope of Rome until the year 606, when Boniface III induced the emperor, Phocas, who had murdered Maurice, his prede cessor, to take from John the Faster of Constantinople the title of Universal Bishop o f the Church and confer it upon him. When John assumed this title, Gregory the Great, whom your church lists as a pope, and also as a saint, denounced the assumption as diabolical, and the one who wore that title as antichrist. Yet, all your popes from Boniface down have worn it!), commissioned a monk of Dalmatia, named Eusebius Hieronymus, but better known to us as Jerome, and in your church as Saint Jerome, to revise the old Latin versions. Jerome was a man who had traveled widely and studied deeply, and was the best scholar of his day. During Jerome’s long and tedious labor in searching for manuscripts and in comparing Latin translations and other versions, he found a Greek Bible that had belonged to Origen in the second century. (Yet you said the books of the Bible had not been gathered together until the fourth century.) Jerome recognized only the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament which the Protestant Bible now contains, and which were recognized by the Jews of Palestine, including our Lord and his apostles. Jerome was the first man to apply the word "Apocrypha" to those books which your church has added to the Old Testament. When Jerome had finished his translation, which has ever since been called the Vulgate, it was accepted by the bishops assembled in the Council of Carthage and declared to be the authentic Bible and infallible as to translation even. But the African bishops, led by Augustine—Saint Augustine in your church—opposed Jerome on the "Apocrypha"; hence, the council voted to include those books in your Bible— your Bible now by this council declared to be inspired and authentic. Thus the council at once voted that Jerome was infallibly guided in his translation and could not make a mistake, and that he did at the same time make a mistake in the rejection of certain books! Hence, you have some Old Testament books included in your Bible and declared to be inspired which are manifestly not inspired, and which you yourself say (No. 15) do not bear the "earmarks" of inspiration! But we shall tell you more about your Bible with its apocryphal books in our next letter. Are you still silent, Brother Catholic?

ANOTHER LETTER TO BROTHER CATHOLIC Dear Brother Catholic: In my last letter I showed you that your church has declared some books—the Apocrypha—to be inspired which your own

scholars say are not inspired. Your New Testament contains not only the same number of books, but exactly the same books that compose the Protestant New Testament. So the books in dispute are Old Testament books. This is fortunate, since we have the example of Christ and the apostles to follow in our decision. There are in the New Testament about two hundred sixty-three direct quotations from, and about three hundred seventy allusions to, passages in the Old Testament; yet among all of these there is not a single reference, either by Christ or by any inspired man, to the apocryphal writings. They have not the remotest recognition from any New Testament writer. Furthermore, we know that the Jews, from the time that the Septuagint translation was made—277 B.C.— until long after the days of Christ, recognized only the thirty-nine books which our Old Testament now contains, although they were so grouped as to be twenty-two in number. They made the number work out this way to correspond with the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet. In order to do this they grouped all the minor prophets —twelve books—and counted them as one book. They counted the two books of Samuel as one book, and did likewise with Kings and Chronicles. But how would they ever have managed to get the fourteen extra books which your church has declared to belong to the Old Testament into their canon of twenty-two books? Your Old Testament has more than fifty books. Joseph us, who was born in the year A.D. 37, and was, therefore, a contemporary of the apostles, wrote in his book, "Against Apion," Book 1, Section 8, as follows: For we have not an innumerable multitude of books among us, disagreeing from and contradicting one another (as the Greeks have), but only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all the past times, which are justly believed to be divine; and of them, five belong to Moses, which contain his law and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death. This interval of time was little short of three thousand years; but as to the time from the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes, king of Persia, who reigned after Xerxes, the prophets, who were after Moses, wrote down what was done in their times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God and precepts for the conduct of human life. It is true, our history hath been written since Artaxerxes very particularly, but hath not been esteemed of the like authority with the former by our forefathers, because there hath not been an exact succession of prophets since that time; and how firmly we have given credit to these books of our own nation is evident by what we do; for during so many ages as have already passed, no one has been so bold as either to add anything to them, to take anything from them, or to make any change in them.

Then, to add to this testimony from Josephus, we quote from Cyril, of Jerusalem, who was born about A.D. 315, and whom your church has catalogued as Saint Cyril. He said: "Read the divine Scriptures—namely, the twenty-two books of the Old Testament which the seventy-two interpreters translated" (i.e., the Septuagint translation). This clearly shows that even at that date the apocryphal books were not included in the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament. So you see, Brother Catholic, that neither the Jews nor Christ and his apostles nor any of the early Christians ever recognized these apocryphal books which your church now recognizes. What your church recognizes and declares on any question depends upon the caprice or whims of the men who control your church at the time, and not upon facts or truth or Scripture. This point is further illustrated, and your statement to the effect that your church has been divinely protected from error in giving you your Bible is completely refuted, by the contradictory infallible (?) declarations made by your popes in reference to your infallible (?) translations. In the sixteenth century there was much controversy among your church officials about what version was to be the "authentic" version among Catholics, for many editions of the Latin Bible were being put out. In the year 1585

a man who was interested in Bible revision became pope as Sixtus V. He soon published a fine edition of the Greek Bible; then one of the Old Latin, a mosaic of quotations from the early Latin writers; and in 1590 completed his work by a three- volume edition of the common Latin version, printed from early copies carefully corrected by quotations. He prefaced it by a bull, approving it by his apostolic authority transmitted from the Lord, and announcing that this was to be used "as true, legitimate, authentic, and undoubted in all public and private debates, readings, preachings, and explanations; and that anyone who ventured to change it without papal authority would incur the wrath of God Almighty and of the blessed apostles, Peter and Paul." He reserved copyright for ten years, and ordered that after that period all further editions should be conformed to it, all existing copies—even missiles and breviaries—should be corrected by it and should be officially certified by inquisitor or bishop. He forbade any marginal notes, whether of various readings or explanation. This might seem final; but Sixtus died that year, leaving behind the revisers whose work he had personally corrected, including the famous Jesuit cardinal, Bellarmine, whom he had offended by the suppression of one of his books. The next pope died in ten days. His successor was induced to disown this legitimate and authorized version. And though he, too, died soon, and the next within a few months, Bellar- mine was appointed to buy up this official edition and issue another. Clement VIII appointed Cardinal Allen, of Oxford, and Douay, together with an Italian prelate, to revise the text of his predecessor. Allen had studied the principles of textual criticism, as is shown in the preface to the Rheims Testament. Instead of relying chiefly on early quotations, he referred to the original languages. This resulted in more than three thousand alterations from the text of Sixtus— whole passages being omitted or introduced, and the verses being divided differently. Bellarmine, however, saved appearances by saying in the preface that Sixtus himself had intended to do this, owing to the misprints and other errors. This second edition had a new bull by Clement, which specified among other things that, as before, no word of the text might be altered, that no various readings might be registered in the margin, and that all copies were to be conformed to it. So you see, Brother Catholic, one of your popes declares a version to be "authentic and undoubted," and pronounces a curse upon anyone who makes any change in it, and then another pope comes along and corrects his errors and puts out another infallible (?) version!

What do you say to this, Brother Catholic? Oh, you are still silent! Well, I am going to write you one more letter, anyway, and next week we will study that private-interpretation idea at which you scoff.

LETTER TO BROTHER CATHOLIC Dear Brother Catholic: In your controversy with Protestant you insist that the Bible speaks plainly against what you call the "private- judgment" theory. By "private-judgment" theory you refer to our claim that every man has the right to read and to understand the Scriptures for himself. You and your church deny the people this right and privilege. In fact, you deny that the people have the ability to understand the Scriptures. You claim that the Scriptures must be officially interpreted for the people. You think that while the Bible is a revelation from God, it yet does not reveal anything except to those who are inspired, or given divine power to understand it. Why was the Bible given at all? Would it not be just as easy to give the message by inspiration each time a message is due as it is to inspire some man to find and ferret out a message from an unintelligible book which was written long ago? Your priests adopted this theory, Brother Catholic, to deprive you of your liberty and to keep you under their power. You

cannot learn the will of God except through them, according to your theory, and they can tell you anything that they choose to tell you, as they have always done. But you think that the New Testament itself speaks against the "private-judgment" idea and you cite 2 Peter 1:19-21. Why did you cite this reference, Brother Catholic, unless you expected us to read it and understand it? Can we understand this passage, or will we have to get your church officials to tell us what it means? If we cannot understand it, why did you cite it? If we can understand it, then our claim of ability to read and understand the Scriptures is established, and your assumption of "authority to interpret" is false. Do you see your absurd predicament, Brother Catholic, in asking us to read and understand from a book, which we cannot understand, that we should never attempt to read and understand this book? Or do you think we can understand this passage to tell us that we cannot understand this passage? The trouble with you, Brother Catholic, is that you have listened to "authority" so long you have become incapable of correct thinking. The passage you cite refutes your claim absolutely. It does not say that the prophecies of Scripture cannot be privately or individually understood. It says that they are not "privately interpreted." and that is exactly what your church officials claim to do. They claim the special and private power and right to interpret the Scriptures for the whole world! They say the Scriptures are not for public understanding and use, but that they must be privately interpreted by themselves, the priests, as special agents!

If we understand the word "interpret" in the sense in which you use it—to explain or understand—this passage ruins your claim forever. Or if we give the word its true meaning here—its contextual meaning—it ruins you, world without end. You used the passage to teach something that it does not teach at all. It has no reference at all to those who read the Scriptures, but refers clearly to those who wrote the Scriptures. You quote the passage thus:" "No prophecy of Scripture is made by private interpretation." That is a good rendering of the text, for it refers to the way the Scriptures came or were made. Another good rendering is: "No prophecy of Scripture is of the prophet’s own invention. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." The Greek word epilusis, which is here translated interpret, means primarily to loose, untie, release. No prophecy of Scripture was, therefore, ever released, loosed, or given out by the prophets’ own promptings or inventions, but those prophets were carried along by the Holy Spirit. But just let us take the whole passage as it reads in the King James Version, and it ruins your claim. Peter tells us that we d o well t o take heed unto the prophecy of Scripture "as unto a light that shinetli in a dark place." But you say that the common people should not attempt t o give heed to the Scriptures, as they could not understand them, and would have to appeal to special, private agents to interpret them, for the Scriptures are not "a light that shineth in a dark place," but a dark cloud and a lowering fog that confuseth in any place! There is a great difference in what the apostle Peter said and in what your church says, you see.

You are all wrong, Brother Catholic. The Scriptures were written for all the people and not for a few presumptuous officials. We are admonished to (1) read (1 Timothy 4:13); (2) to study (2 Timothy 2:15); (3) "let the word of Christ dwell in you richly" (Colossians 3:16): (4) to "desire the sincere milk of the word" (1 Peter 2:2). The Scriptures were written for our learning (Romans 15:4), for our admonition (1 Corinthians 10:11), and as a standard for us to measure religious claims by (1 Corinthians 14:37).

Paul was afraid that some of the leaders at Thessalonica might arrogate to themselves such authority as your priests claim, and appoint themselves to read Paul's Epistle and to tell the brethren what he said and what it meant, and he, therefore, strictly charged them in the sight of the Lord that his Epistle be read to all the holy brethren. (1 Thessalonians 5:27)

Diotrephes got some small amount of the spirit which dwells in your hierarchy in him, and he would not let the church—this means the people, for it says he loved the preeminence among them—see the letter which the apostle John wrote. (3 John 1:9) He forbade the brethren even to receive those who brought the letter. Yes, indeed, he assumed the power of interdiction, and also issued the bull of excommunication. He was a miniature pope as surely as you live. But, Brother Catholic, do you like his reputation in the Scriptures? Do you think the beloved apostle John endorsed him? Did he approve this impudent assumption of power? You know he did not, but that he condemned Diotrephes. Then, what do you think John would have said of your pope, if there had been any such pope, in John's day? Are you still silent, Brother Catholic?

You were so vocal and so valiant in your fight with Brother Protestant that your silence now surprises us, Brother Catholic. Can you speak up just once and let us know that you are not suffering from loss of speech? Your taciturnity is becoming touching, Brother Catholic, and we are afraid the sympathy of the people will turn to you. We will, therefore, hold up a while and wait for an answer from you.

BROTHER CATHOLIC SPEAKS

Some months ago we had something to say in this department in reply to some controversial tracts that are being distributed by the Catholics. We called upon these Catholic controversialists to come to the defense of their claims, and offered to give them space for a fair discussion. Of course, this call and offer had in mind the authors of the tracts that we were reviewing or any other official representative of that church. The tracts were official publications, put out with papal benedictions. So far no recognition whatever has been given our offer by these officials. They are as silent as the tomb of Moses so far as our strictures were concerned, but they still carry on their one-sided controversies through the press, by radio, and by private and public teaching.

Below we have the effort of a private individual, a layman among the Catholics, to defend their claims. He shows courage and sincerity, and we naturally wonder why a man like this brother would not be disappointed that his priests or bishops will not meet a fair offer to study—investigate—examine their claims. We here give in full all that this Catholic brother says in reference to the Gospel Advocate, and then offer a few remarks that, we trust, will be helpful to him and to others. Read his replies first, as follows:

I have read the Gospel Advocate, and am far from being silent at the so-called revelations of the finding of new copies of the Bible or New Testament. On the contrary, a dozen answers come to my mind. I am not a master at interpreting the Bible, but no matter how many new copies are found, they would not change the situation. No copy can contain every word Christ uttered while he was preaching; and although the four evangelists did their best, they certainly missed part of it, which may have come to us through the preaching of the apostles and early Christians. That is why I say with the Catholic Church: "The Bible without tradition is not an authority." But let us take your way of reasoning: Christ took three years to instruct his apostles for the job he had ready for

them—to teach the world and preach his gospel. After his death, the apostles scattered and started preaching; and when they died, the power that had been given them by the Master died also. (Page 1114.) What became, then, of Christ's promise, "I am with you until the end of time?"

Criticizing the Catholic Church, you claim the priests, or bishops, or the pope falsified the Bible, and they have been preaching the wrong things ever since. You must admit that with leaders full of malice and the wrong kind of Bible, the Catholic Church has accomplished wonderful things in civilization, conversions to Christ, etc., producing great leaders and holding millions of members all over the world.

Why should the pope and the bishops do a thing like that at a time when the name of Christian meant persecution and death? Mistakes have been made, and even some of the popes have led a bad life; but does a bad president make a bad United States, or does it annul the Constitution?

In the matter of private interpretation of the Bible, how can you expect anyone to do so correctly when leaders of your denomination and others cannot agree to the teaching of the New Testament in regard to the use of instrumental music in church service? Is it not a fact that the private interpretation of the Scriptures and the absence of church authority are the cause of the continuous division of the Christian denominations? The Catholic Church rules in all cases where the meaning is not clear, and we Catholics like it, and we hear much less about those rulings inside the flock than you seem to imagine. During my more than forty years in the Catholic Church here and in Europe, I have known hundreds of priests, and I have been able to judge their life and their teachings and their sincerity, devotion to Christ, and abnegation in the service of the Lord, and it would take you more than forty years to prove your contention that they are false preachers.

EDWARD GOFFAUX.

11 Park Avenue, Charleston, West Virginia.

REMARKS

Brother Catholic, you insist that no New Testament can contain "every word that Christ uttered," and although the inspired evangelists did their best, "they certainly missed part of it"; and, therefore, we must have tradition in order to have authority! You think, no doubt, that tradition will supply "every word that Christ uttered while he was preaching"! Do you not see that this is absurd, since one of the evangelists, in "doing his best," tells us that if all the things which Jesus did were "written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written"? (John 21:25)

Do you not see also that this claim about tradition clearly shows that your "authority"—therefore, your church—rests upon tradition and not upon the Bible alone? But now, as to the evangelists failing to record some things that Christ taught which are essential for us to know, you "do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God." This is not a question of interpreting the Scriptures, yBrother Catholic; it is a question of believing what our Lord said. He charged and commissioned his apostles to teach "all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matthew 28:18-20) Did they do this, or did they just do their best and fail, Brother Catholic? And the Lord promised that the Holy Spirit would "bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." (John 14:26) You had never read that promise, had you, Brother Catholic? If you had, you surely would

have been ashamed to say that these writers who were thus guided by the Holy Spirit forgot some of the things Christ "uttered while he was preaching," and that we will have to learn these from uninspired tradition! You did not know that the Holy Spirit was to teach "all things" to these writers and to guide them "into all the truth," either, did you, Brother Catholic? That is just what our Lord promised. (John 14:26; John 16:13) The Lord's promise to be with us always, even to the end of the world, is true. He is still with us. But we are not confirming the things he spoke, for we did not hear him. Those who heard him "confirmed unto us" the great salvation, and God bore them witness with signs, etc. (Hebrews 2:1-4) We did not hear, we cannot as they did confirm the word, and, therefore, do not need the signs. What we must do is to "contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints"—viz., those who heard him, etc. (Jude 1:3) "These are written, that ye might believe" (John 20:31), Brother Catholic.

You think that the pope, bishops, and priests are all charged with being full of malice, etc. No, we do not make that charge, the Gospel Advocate does not. We think they sincerely believe what they are taught, because they never think of questioning the "authority" that taught these things. You admit that there have been some bad men among these officials. Yes, and these bad men, with political purposes and selfish interests to serve, are the ones who arrogated to themselves such authority and built up the ecclesiastical machine that we know as the Roman Catholic Church. Many sincere men have taken this authority from their predecessors, believing that it came from the Lord. There is the pity of it, Brother Catholic.

You think your church has produced great leaders and done great good. We may grant that, but it could not prove that you are right in your religious claims. The Jews have done the same. Are they right in rejecting Christ? The Protestants have done greater things for civilization than the Roman Church has ever done. Will you allow that to prove our claims? Your argument is exceedingly disingenuous, Brother Catholic.

The time of persecution had long passed before we ever had any pope or bishops (like yours) on earth, Brother Catholic. They came after the religio-polilical machine was built. The next persecution came when your church began putting men to death for daring to read and believe the Holy Scriptures.

Your point about men failing to understand what God's word teaches on instrumental music, etc., is a transparent fallacy so far as overthrowing our claim is concerned, but it does convict Protestants of a serious inconsistency. The trouble does not come about by our inability to understand what the New Testament says, and we all know what the New Testament churches practiced. There is no room for dispute there. The trouble is that some Protestants, like you, Brother Catholic, think that while the inspired writers did the best they could, they left out some things they should have told us! Some Protestants will not abide within and submit to the authority of the Holy Scriptures as willingly, as loyally, and as implicitly as you do the authority of your "church." They want to do as they please, and they want to go back to tradition and to the practices that came from your pope and not from Christ and the apostles. You should taunt them with that, Brother Catholic, till you make them hang their heads in shame. But the "firm foundation of God standeth," and "all scripture is given by inspiration" and furnishes us "unto every good work" (2 Timothy 2:19; 2 Timothy 3:16-17), whether we can convince you in forty years or not. Do not judge yourself unworthy of eternal life, Brother Catholic. (Acts 13:46)

00B.39 Chapter 32. The Lord's Supper

32. The Lord’s Supper LET A MAN EXAMINE HIMSELF The following letter presents a question which gives us an opportunity to study a much-abused passage of Scripture. The letter speaks for itself:

Dawson, Texas, December 18, 1931.—My dear Brother Brewer: I want you to know that when you say a thing, I stop and consider; and in your comment on the Lord’s Supper in this week’s Gospel Advocate, I heartily concur with what you said. But you further said, in part, in the communion we are commanded to "refuse to eat with an ungodly person." (1 Corinthians 5:11) Now, if I eat (this eating, whatever it is) with such a one knowingly, I disobey God, and therefore sin.

Suppose a brother that is known to be ungodly partakes before the emblems are passed to me, what am I to do? If I eat, I sin; and if I eat not, I fail to commune with the body and blood of Christ. (1 Corinthians 10:16.)

If the eating in both 1 Corinthians 5:1-13 and 1 Corinthians 11:1-34 is the same (Lord’s Supper), how can I obey both? In 1 Corinthians 5:11. I am not to eat with him, and in 1 Corinthians 11:28 I am to let him examine (prove) himself, and so let him eat. Will you please help me out of this difficulty? If 1 Corinthians 5:11, refers to a common meal, as is taught in "Queries and Answers," by Lipscomb and Sewell, page 193, I can understand; but as you seem to think it refers to the Lord’s Supper, I am puzzled.

We are well and busy. We are to have a meeting here during the holidays. I fear for the work at Jonesboro; but we could not do any good just now, so we came on here. Fisher Street congregation in Jonesboro is moving onward.

Brotherly,

H. D. JEFFCOAT. In meeting this brother’s difficulty we shall give some attention to both the passages involved—1 Corinthians 5:11; 1 Corinthians 11:28.

1. ”No, Not to Eat." In 1 Corinthians 5:11, Paul says: "I wrote unto you not to keep company, if any man that is named a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a reviler, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such a one no, not to eat." Our brother says that Brethren Lipscomb and Sewell said that this passage refers to eating a common meal with the kind of "brother" Paul describes and that I made it refer to the Lord’s Supper. I cited this passage to show that we are not to have fellowship with, or to commune with, a so-called "brother" who is guilty of the sins Paul names. At no place do we manifest our fellowship for one another more than in the Lord’s Supper, which is the communion or the joint participation in the Lord’s body and blood. (1 Corinthians 10:16-17.) To say that the language of this text does not include the Lord’s Supper would be to ignore the teaching of the whole chapter—the one point o f the chapter. A man at Corinth—a brother—had been guilty of fornication. The apostle in this chapter very emphatically commands the brethren to deliver this man to Satan, to "purge out the old leaven," and closes the chapter,

after his vigorous statement that with such a one they should not even eat, with the charge, "Put away the wicked man from among yourselves." Can anyone suppose that after this man had been "purged out," "put away" from among disciples and delivered to Satan, with such a complete and stern decision that the disciples would not even eat a common meal with him, they would still eat the Lord's Supper with him? Would a common meal show more friendship, equality, and fellowship than the Lord's Supper? If not, then, if the passage forbids the eating of a common meal with such a person, it certainly does forbid our allowing such a one to partake of the Lord's Supper with our sanction and fellowship. The passage does refer to a common meal, but the whole context shows that such a man is to be put out of Christian fellowship, and of course this would debar him from the Lord's Supper. There is no conflict at all between this and the twenty-eighth verse of the eleventh chapter when that verse is properly understood. That verse now demands our attention.

2. "Let a Man Examine Himself." This passage has been greatly abused. It has often been quoted in such a way and at such a time as to make the hearers understand it to teach that the question of whether or not a man is to commune with the saints, be a joint participant with them in the worship of God and in the privileges of a child of God, is left entirely with the individual; that the saints have no right and can claim no authority to say to any man that he is not a child of God or that his life is such that he has no "part nor lot in this matter" of eating the Lord's Supper. To make the passage mean this is to make it contradict what is taught in the fifth chapter and at all other places where discipline is commanded. It would relieve every Christian of all responsibility for his brother's conduct and make every man's manner of life "nobody's business." I t is his own affair; let him examine himself, and let others keep hands off. Every passage that teaches us to "admonish the disorderly" (1 Thessalonians 5:14), to pray for those whom we "see sin" (1 John 5:15), to "restore" those who are overtaken in a trespass (Galatians 6:1), to convert a brother "from the error of his way" (James 5:20), and to watch concerning the souls (Hebrews 13:17) of our brethren, refutes this interpretation of 1 Corinthians 11:28. These passages certainly teach that we are to "examine" one another, and the verse we are studying must not be made to contradict them.

Again, the passage is abused when it is quoted to make those who have never obeyed the gospel think that we do not know whether or not they are Christians, and that if they consider themselves as Christians they should join with us in eating the sacred supper.

We have often heard a brother come to the Lord's table with the remarks (when any "talk" was inappropriate and his remarks especially inconsistent and detracting) that "we neither invite nor debar anybody from this table. The question of partaking of these emblems is left with the individual. The communion is so 'open' that we exclude no one, and so 'close' that we invite no one. Paul says, 'Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat'; and that is our doctrine. We do not presume to say who is a child of God and who is not a child of God." And so on ad nauseam. When, perhaps, just preceding this talk, the preacher had shown from the Scriptures that no one is a child of God who has not obeyed the gospel; that in obeying the gospel one must, in true faith and genuine repentance, be baptized into Christ, buried with him by baptism into death, and raised with him unto a newness of life; and had driven home the point that one who has not thus obeyed the gospel is not in Christ, is not a child of God, has no right to the privileges of God's children and no reason to hope for salvation. Thus the preacher "presumed" to show a good many of the audience that they were not God's children, but the brother reassured them in his "table talk." We do not hear things like this so often now, but we used to hear them often in the days when brethren

did not have any better judgment or taste or respect for the Lord’s Supper than to use it to compliment some visiting brother who had a propensity to talk by asking him to "wait on the table." We used to have even in the home congregation, often, that kind of "vain talker," who would use the Lord’s table to get himself before the public and display his eloquence, his knowledge of the Scriptures, and his power in argumentation. The passage we are studying has been used by those who favor "open membership" among the "digressives." They argue that we have no right to demand baptism before we extend fellowship to any person, and gravely quote: "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat." Their use of the passage is the same use that some of us have been making of it all through the years. But it is a gross perversion.

3. The Passage Examined. By putting the emphasis where it belongs in reading this verse we will see its meaning. We usually read it, "Let a man examine himself,” putting heavy emphasis upon "himself," which means that this is an individual matter and that no one has any right to think of any other than himself. But if we will read it, "Let a man examine himself," with proper emphasis upon the word "examine," we will get the correct idea. Instead of teaching that each disciple should disregard all others and think only of himself, the apostles teach the very reverse. Some of the brethren at Corinth were disregarding, despising, and putting others to shame, and Paul condemned them for this. (Verse 22.) Certainly the apostle did not mean that the Corinthians should overlook the presence in their assembly of any heathen or person who was not in the body of Christ and either directly or indirectly tell them that it would probably be all right for them to eat the Lord’s Supper with the saints! That each one should examine himself, etc.! Everyone to whom Paul said, "Let a man examine himself," was a disciple, a member of the body of Christ, a part of the "church of God which is at Corinth." (1 Corinthians 1:2.)

Only a casual consideration of the context should enable anyone to see the meaning of our text. The people at Corinth had corrupted the Lord’s Supper. Their manner of celebrating this supper was outrageous. There were divisions or factions among them; hence, feelings of envy and jealousy were manifest in their worshiping assembly. They showed partiality, favoritism, and a partisan spirit. They were also guilty of gormandizing and drunkenness. The apostle condemned all this and admonished them to approach the Lord’s Supper in a grateful, reverent spirit; in a spirit of equality, humility, and brotherly love; to commune together, and not to be divided into groups or factions. Each one was to examine himself to see if these feelings were in his bosom, and see that no wrong feeling or attitude possessed him at that moment—not to see ifhe was a child of God or ifhe had ever obeyed the gospel. The examining had to do only with the condition of heart at the time of partaking of the emblems. It had reference only to the manner in which each disciple approached the Lord’s table. Since no one can know the condition of another person’s heart, of course this is a personal, individual matter. "Let a man examine himself." Since also it is easy for one to be deceived in one’s own motives and feelings, this examination is necessary each time one comes to participate in this solemn service. The word "unworthily" in verses 27 and 29 clearly illustrates the point of the whole passage. It refers to the manner in which we eat the supper. It requires order, system, solemnity, and reverence in the manner of handling the whole service. It has long been pointed out by my brethren that "unworthily" indicates the manner of partaking, and yet they did not seem to realize that this is the whole point in the admonition, "Let a man examine himself." Neither did they in many instances seem to know that in order to keep from eating "unworthily" they must have the service orderly, quiet, solemn, and that each one should enter into

it with concentrated thoughts and humility of heart, remembering, thinking o f the Lord. Yet if we do not engage in this service in that frame of mind, we eat and drink damnation to our souls! How fearful! It is high time for us to quit using 1 Corinthians 11:28 as a proof text against the Baptist error of close communion and learn its teaching and apply it to ourselves. It applies against Baptists—the whole passage does—but that is not why Paul wrote it. There were no Baptists in Paul's day. Paul wrote to instruct and to regulate the church of God. Of course we cannot think of others and examine others while we are eating the Lord's Supper, but that does not mean that we may not do so at any time. "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." We are to keep the church free from ungodliness as far as possible, and then there will be no unworthy person to partake with us. If such a person is present, we do no wrong in partaking of the emblems at the same time he does, unless we do so in full knowledge and acquiescence of his sin, thus fellowshiping his sin.

"NOT FORSAKING OUR OWN ASSEMBLINGTOGETHER"

Since we have recently been considering some things connected with the Lord's Supper and the assembling of the saints, it seems appropriate to discuss at this time another passage of Scripture which has been misunderstood and misused in many instances. This text is Hebrews 10:25. We should notice first that Hebrews 10:19-25 are all one sentence. There is not a period until we come to the close of Hebrews 10:25. The whole passage is an exhortation. Three times he says "let us" in this sentence, and each time it is something special that they were admonished to do. It reads: "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus, by the way which he dedicated for us, a new and living way, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having a great priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience: and having our body washed with pure water, let us hold fast the confession of our hope that it waver not; for he is faithful that promised: and let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works; not forsaking our own assembling together, as the custom of some is, but exhorting one another; and so much the more, as ye see the day drawing nigh." In studying this passage let us consider:

1. The Revised Version, from which we have quoted the text, has the words "our own" before the word "assembling." This indicated that the assembling referred to belonged distinctly and peculiarly to the Christians. This is in contrast with the meetings or assemblings of the Jews, in which some of the Jewish Christians still participated. The Greek word (episunago- gee) that is here used is. Our Own Assembling found at only one other place in the New Testament. It is used in 2 Thessalonians 2:1, and refers to the gathering together of the redeemed to meet the Lord, but in our text it refers to the regular established meeting of the saints for the purpose of worship and exhortation. This meeting the Hebrew Christians were strictly admonished not to neglect or forsake. This is the true import of the passage. But incidentally we learn from it that even though some of the early Christians kept the Sabbath and met with the Jews in the temple for prayer and worship, they did this as Jews and not as Christians. They could not honor the name of Christ in such worship. They had their own assembling, in which they did honor Christ and partake of the emblems that represent his body and blood.

2. The Day Approaching. It can easily be established from the New Testament record and also from church history that the apostles and all disciples in the age immediately following the days of

the apostles met for worship upon the first day of the week, which they called the "Lord's day." But the day approaching referred to in our text is not the Lord's day. A close study of the meaning of the text and even of the wording of the entire passage will preclude the possibility of the conclusion that the day referred to is the Lord's day. (1) The day that was approaching gave a solemn meaning to the apostle's exhortation. It is given as an incentive for their meeting for mutual exhortations. It was a time of test and suffering and of judgment that was coming upon them, and made all the more imperative their encouraging and helping each other in the Christian life. (2) The near approach of the day should cause them to be the more insistent and fervent in their exhortations. To say that the day means the first day of the week and that the exhortation was for attendance upon the Lord's-day meeting would make the apostle mean that the disciples should exhort one another a little on Monday, a little more on Tuesday, and still a little more on Wednesday, and then on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday they should become desperate in exhorting each other to come to the assembly on the first day of the week. This would seem to show conclusively that the Lord's day is not the day here mentioned. (3) To make this refer to the Lord's day is exactly to reverse the apostle's meaning. It would make him call upon the disciples to exhort one another to meet on the Lord's day, whereas he was commanding them to meet on the Lord's day to exhort one another. The meeting was for the purpose of mutual exhortation, admonitions, and helpfulness, and they were in such need of this helpfulness that the apostle strictly admonishes them not to forsake the assembling where they would receive the needed encouragement. The whole passage stresses the fact that the Christians should "consider one another," "provoke unto love and good works," exhort "one another," and not to forsake their assembling where they had the greatest opportunity of exhorting one another. Because some of us have understood the day of this passage to mean the Lord's day, and the exhorting that we are to do to mean that we are to exhort one another to meet on the Lord's day, we have confined our exhortation to that one point. We have stressed the importance of the Lord's-day meeting and neglected to admonish each other to proper living during all the days of the week. Some weak souls have, as a result of this, concluded that the whole duty of a Christian is to meet on the Lord's day. When that is over, they think they are at liberty to give the rest of the day and all the rest of the week to serving self and seeking pleasure. Even the meetings have in some instances been formal, spiritless, and insipid. It has not been an hour of devotion, of inspirational singing, and of fervent exhortation. It has failed of the very purpose for which our text says the saints should assemble. Christians today, perhaps as much as in the days of Paul, need to consider one another, to provoke one another to love and good works, to exhort one another, and they should not now forsake "our own assembling," where such exhorting should be done.

3. To What Day Did the Apostle Refer? The day approaching has occasioned some difference of opinions among Bible scholars and commentators. Some scholars have thought that it refers to the final judgment day; others have concluded that it refers to the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews. No scholar has ever taken the position that the day means the Lord's day, or the first day of the week. Doctors Clarke and Macknight understand the day to mean the day of Jerusalem's overthrow. Brethren Lipscomb and Sewell, Milligan and Mc- Garvey, agreed with this conclusion. The following quotation from Brother Milligan on this point will make an appropriate conclusion to this article: To what does our author here refer? To the day of judgment, say Delitzsch, Alford, Moll, and others; when Christ will come in person to raise the dead and reward every man according to his works. But this interpretation is manifestly erroneous. To me, at least, it

seems perfectly obvious that the apostle refers here to a day which both he and his brethren were looking for as a day that was then very near at hand, a day that was about to come on that generation, and try the faith of many. And hence, I am constrained to think with Macknight, Scott, Stuart, and others, that the reference is most likely to the day of Jerusalem's overthrow. Christ had himself foretold the near approach of that event (Matthew 24:34); he had also spoken of the signs of its coming and of the great calamities that would accompany it (Matthew 24:4-41). No doubt, therefore, the Christians in Palestine were all looking forward with much anxiety to the time when this prophecy would be fulfilled. They would naturally speak of it as "the day": the day of trial; the day when, seeing Jerusalem encompassed with armies, they would themselves have to flee to the mountains. (Luke 21:20-22.)

If this is not the meaning of the apostle, I would then understand him as referring simply to the day when Christ comes in his providence to call on each individual to give an account of his stewardship. In this general sense the passage may be regarded like the parable of the ten virgins (Matthew 25:1-13), as an admonition and warning to all Christians in all ages and in all nations. But to refer it exclusively to the day when Christ will come in person to judge the world is clearly inadmissible.

"SHOULD THE EMBLEMS OF THE LORD'S BODY AND BLOOD BE TAKEN OUT OF THE ASSEMBLY AND CARRIED TO THOSE WHO ARE SICK AND NOT ABLE TO ASSEMBLE WITH THE CONGREGATION?" The following article states a position that has brought about some controversy among the brethren in Arkansas and perhaps at other places. I am asked to review the article and to point out whatever fallacies I may be able to detect. I am glad to give space to the article and to offer some comment. Please read it carefully:

It is by mutual agreement that I answer this question according to my understanding and submit it to Brother G. C. Brewer for his review with the understanding that neither of us ask for a reply.

Since written laws and written covenants from God to man the Lord has had a day or a number of days out of every so many days on which he has called an assembly of his people. These days of assembling served a twofold purpose: first, as a memorial of some great epoch of God's dealing with the human race; second, as a day of public worship. All public worship has been circumscribed to day and place. In the old dispensation it was a geographical place on the earth—Jerusalem. (Deuteronomy 16:16; Deuteronomy 12:5-6; Deuteronomy 12:17-18; 2 Chronicles 30:1; 2 Chronicles 30:17-19.) These Scriptures teach two facts: first, that the Passover was to be observed in Jerusalem during the assembly; second, none only those present, those who assembled, ate of the supper. The ninth chapter of Numbers teaches that if it were ceremonially or physically impossible for a Jew to assemble to eat the passover, he was excused until the next date—a date that the Lord set—the second month and the fourteenth day. Can you imagine a Jew taking a piece of the Passover lamb, bitter herbs, and showbread, and going outside the city to administer this supper to some person who was sick and unable to attend the Passover? I am sure that you cannot. Because the Jews regarded this supper a very sacred and solemn affair, so much so that the fragments were burned immediately after supper. (What about those who take the emblems of the Lord's body and blood and give it out to the children after the Lord's Supper is over?)

Now, I am sure that the Passover is a type of the Lord’s Supper as surely as the lamb was a type of Christ. (See 1 Corinthians 5:7.) If these two institutions are type and antitype, there should be some similarity between them. They are unlike as to the frequency of observance. The Passover is limited by the expressions "month" and "day of the month," while the Lord’s Supper is limited by the expressions "week" and "day of the week," making one annually and the other weekly. But as to the assembling and eating in memory of some manifestation of God’s love they are alike. The Sabbath day with its observance in some points typifies the Lord’s day, and the eating of the twelve loaves typifies the Lord’s Supper in that there is a regular assembly of the priestly tribe with the eating of the showbread in that department of the tabernacle that typified the church. These twelve loaves were representative of the twelve tribes of Israel; our one loaf represents the Lord’s body. The Jews—that is, the priests, assembled every Sabbath to eat of these loaves in the holy place. (Leviticus 24:1-9.) We assemble the first day of every week to eat of the one loaf and to drink of the one cup. Now, can one imagine a priest taking a part of these loaves and going out of the holy place to give some sick priest a part of them? No. I am sure that none of us thinks of any eating of these loaves except the priests who assembled and went into the holy place. There is no example or necessary inference where any Jew ever offered to observe these ordinances other than in the place and on the day named by the Lord. Shall we have less regard for the Lord’s ordinances than did the Jews? Is the Lord’s Supper a less sacred ordinance than the Jewish shadows? That the Lord has one day for assembling is admitted by all who believe the Scriptures, and that day is the first day of the week. The direct command to assemble is recorded in Hebrews 10:25-28. The example to assemble is recorded in Acts 20:7; 1 Corinthians 16:1-2; 1 Corinthians 11:20; 1 Corinthians 11:33. Acts 20:7 and 1 Corinthians 11:20; 1 Corinthians 11:33 expressly state an assembly and give the exact purpose of this assembly: "When ye come together therefore into one place." "When ye come together to eat, tarry one for another." "When the disciples came together to break bread." If this does not prove that the Lord’s Supper is to be eaten in the assembly, and that the assembly should constitute all the Christians in a given vicinity, I fail to understand these passages of Scripture.

Most brethren admit that it is not necessary to carry the emblems to the sick—that the Lord does not require it; but if some brother requests that the emblems be brought to him, they will carry them out of the Lord’s appointed place to please this brother. Now, that seems just a bit queer to me. How does it happen that this is a thing that one may or may not do and still please the Lord? There is no other act of worship or service on which we would care to take such a stand. Some people talk that way about baptism. Again I say that this does not look good for those who speak where the Bible speaks and practice nothing but that which "is written."

Why would you take the emblems out of the assembly? Does the Lord require it? No. Is there an example or necessary inference in all the Bible where such was done? No. Well, then, why do it? Just because some brother wants it done. Brethren, I say the highest authority any man has for such practice is a man’s request. Now, our progressive brethren have the same kind of authority for instrumental music that you have for taking the emblems out of the assembly and going promiscuously over town delivering them to the sick. I believe that I had rather use the instrument without authority than to desecrate these emblems that have been sanctified by prayer and thanksgiving as well as by the Lord’s appointment. Matthew 18:20 will not justify the act, as Christ has given no such authority. The "in my name" will not let us use it for proof. Romans 16:4-5 was

the appointed place of worship. It would be begging the question and without example for the whole congregation to change the regular place of worship and go to the home of some sick brother in order to let him partake of the emblems. If it is not a sin to practice such a custom, it can be no more than a joke, so far as the worship is concerned; for God demands that all worship him in his own appointed way. When it is impossible to do the thing that the Lord commands, then he excuses us. It is only mockery to try to do the things that the Lord has commanded in a different way from the way he commanded it to be done.

Submitted in love of the truth and all the brethren.

A. H. LANNOM.

COMMENTS

In reasoning on the types and antitypes our brother fails to make a proper distinction. The worship in the type was to be offered at a stated place at all times. This was a specially sanctified place where the Lord’s name was recorded and where he promised to meet his people. But under the new covenant there is no special spot that is set apart as a place for worship. The worship is not limited as to location or circumscribed by geographical boundaries. At any place where saints are gathered together in the name of Christ on the Lord’s day any act of worship that is authorized of the Lord may be performed. The fact that there is a place agreed upon and appointed by the saints of a town, city, or community where they regularly assemble for worship does not make it impossible for them to worship at any other place in the town, city, or community. The place was not prescribed or appointed by the Lord; it was arranged by the saints themselves as a matter of convenience. Then when convenience requires that they or any number of them meet somewhere else, they may do so scripturally.

It is true that the disciples should come together "into one place," or that they should assemble for worship, and one item of this worship is the Lord’s Supper. But our brother says this assembly should include all the Christians in a given community. There is an element of truth in that reasoning, and yet there seems to be a fallacy here. If all the Christians of a "given community" must be gathered into one group before they can worship, then we cannot have more than one congregation in any town or city. Two or more groups worshiping at different places in the city would be unscriptural, according to that argument. And what would be the limits of a "given community"? Would city limits or county lines mark the boundaries? Perhaps we could not have more than one congregation in a county. This should enable us all to see the error in that claim.

But our brother may claim that we can have any number of congregations in a "given community," but that each church should consist of a known number of members, and that the "assembly" at each place would consist of all the "known numbers," or of all the members who are on the roster or roll at each place. Again, there is an element of truth in this claim. That would be the complete or ideal or perfect assembly at each place. But shall we wait until we have a one-hundred-per-cent attendance of the members before we can worship? I am sure our brother would give a negative answer to that question. Then how many of them would have to be together in order to worship? Suppose two or three have come together, could they eat the Lord’s Supper, provided they are in the regular place of worship? Then why could not two or three meet at some other place— in a sickroom, for instance—and worship scripturally?

Our brother speaks of carrying the emblems "out of the Lord's appointed" place to please a brother. But here is the whole trouble: The Lord has n o appointed place, as shown above. The saints appointed the place themselves. But our brother says the "assembly" is the appointed place. True, but we have seen that the assembly may consist of only two or three members of a given congregation. And if they agree to meet in a sickroom, that makes that an appointed place. If they had not appointed it, they would not have known to go there, hence to meet or assemble there.

Our brother contends that if we make our worship with a sick member depend upon the member's request, we are saying that it is an act of worship that we may do or not do at will. But the point is this: No act of worship that is authorized of the Lord may be changed by us or accepted or rejected by us at our pleasure, if we wish to please Jehovah. We must accept all when possible. But when it is impossible for us to do the thing that is commanded we are not responsible and are not condemned for failing to do that which we could not do. When a member is confined to his home or to a hospital because of illness, he cannot go to the place of assembly for worship. Then he is not expected to go to that place. But while it is impossible for him to go to the regular place of worship, it may not be impossible for him to worship acceptably where he is, if some other brethren will come and worship and commune with him. Since his physical and mental condition must determine whether this worshipshould be held with him or not, we should wait for his request, and we should also consult his physician. Often it would not be prudent to conduct a service in the sickroom.

This is the reason the matter is made to depend upon a man's request, and it certainly does not lay down a premise upon which a man may request some unauthorized act of worship. The thing done in this case is the thing commanded.

Having shown that Brother Lannom is in error in saying that it is never right to take the emblems to the sick, I wish now to commend much that he says, and especially the protest that he makes against prostituting the Lord's Supper to our own convenience. An earnest and thoughtful study of all that he says will do good. There can be no doubt that we have in some instances made a wrong use of the Lord's Supper. We have put an overemphasis or a wrong emphasis upon this sacred supper. It sounds paradoxical to say that we have made the supper too sacred, too important—that we have made it a fetish—and at the same time to say that we have secularized the supper, we have adapted it to our own convenience and carried it about with us as a heathen carries the image of an idol; but in some cases I fear we have done this very thing. How else would you describe the attitude of the man toward this institution who will disregard practically all else that the Lord teaches, and feels that he is in full fellowship with Christ if only h e partakes o f the emblems? He disregards the singing and doesn't even come to the worship until the singing is over; but if he gets there for the supper, he feels perfectly all right. He never obeys God in the matter of giving (he puts something on the plate, of course) and has no qualm of conscience on that point, but he would not dare miss the Lord's Supper! He disregards the Lord's day and will play golf, go to a baseball game, or go fishing, but he manages or contrives some plan by which he may partake of the emblems sometime during the day! H e could not afford to miss that! He will perhaps insist that the brethren hold over the scraps of the supper and let him partake at night! And the brethren will actually do this for him! Yet—and yet, mark it—if some brother in "waiting on the table" at the morning service should break the loaf before he gives thanks, there would be a

protest from many brethren. But these same brethren think it perfectly scriptural to give thanks for the fragments at night!

I can speak for myself only. I do not desire to force anyone to conform to my idea about this Sunday-night communion, but neither do I want brethren to force me to do that which is abhorrent to my soul. I will not participate in any such a secondhand, leftover, side-line, makeshift service. If I cannot be present at the regular, appointed hour and join the saints in remembering my Lord, then my failure to be there is no sin. I am excused. If I could be there, but stay away for my own benefit, convenience, or pleasure, then I have made the Lord second choice and his service subordinate to my business or pleasure, and therefore any pretense at obedience would be hypocritical mockery. Please excuse me. As to taking the emblems out. This has been overdone. We have taken the emblems and given them to a brother as a priest gives "mass" or "extreme unction" to a sick person. We should not give the emblems to a person, but we should partake o f them with a brother. They even make a "pocket" communion set called a "ministerium," which the priest or "ordained minister" may use in taking "holy communion" or "mass" to the sick. I have known of some of my brethren's using that little pocket set. Why not? If we are going to take the emblems to a number of persons, of course we should prepare for it. The Lord's Supper is a communion . One person cannot commune. It takes two or more to commune. Someone may say that we commune with Christ. Very true, but we also commune with each other. If not, why should we be commanded to refuse to eat with an ungodly person? (1 Corinthians 5:11.) Again, Paul says: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ? seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread." (1 Corinthians 10:16-17.) We all partake, we jointly participate in an act, which, therefore, is a communion and proves us to be one body.

If we have the Lord's Supper with the sick, two or three or more should partake with the brother and not let the preacher, like a priest, give to him the supper. "Think on these things." The Lord's Day The expression, "the Lord's day," occurs only one time in the Bible. (Revelation 1:10.) There has been some controversy as to what day is here meant. We understand it to refer to the first day of the week, but the Sabbatarians insist that it refers to the Sabbath—the seventh day of the week, or Saturday. But the Sabbath had been known for more than fifteen hundred years, and it is mentioned more than sixty times in the New Testament, and many more times in the Old Testament, and yet it is never referred to as the Lord's day. Is it not strange that the inspired writers could talk so much about the Sabbath and never designate it as the Lord's day until we come to the last book in the Bible and the end of revelation? The seventh day of the week had a name—Sabbath. This name was always used by Bible writers after the days of Moses to designate the seventh day. They spoke of the other days by numerical designations (they had no names), as, the first day, the second day, and so on, but they always spoke of the seventh day as the Sabbath. Then why did John depart from this universal custom and invent a new name for the Sabbath at so late a date? Is it not evident that the term "Lord's day" was new in John's day and that it designated a day that his readers would well understand? But the Sabbatarians tell us that the seventh day is spoken of as "the sabbath of the Lord [unto Jehovah, R. V.] thy God," therefore the Lord's day; and also called "my holy day." (Isaiah 58:13-14.) If it is the Lord's holy day, of course it is the Lord's day, we are told naively. They further remind us that Christ said: "The Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath." (Mark 2:28.) If he is Lord of that day, it is his day, therefore the

Lord’s day. To these people these passages afford conclusive proof that "Lord’s day" means the Sabbath day.

Let us look at these Scriptures. The first declares that the seventh was a Sabbath unto Jehovah. The King James translation says "of the Lord," but the word for "Lord" there is not the same word that is used in Revelation 1:10. In this New Testament passage we have the word Kuriake— Lord. This word occurs in only one other place—viz., 1 Corinthians 11:20. There it refers to the "Lord’s supper," and we know the word "Lord" there means Christ. Kuriakos —the nominative form of the word—therefore designates the Lord Jesus Christ. Kuriakon deipnon means "the Lord’s supper," and Kuriake hemera means the "Lord’s day." Of course, since the word "Lord" here means Christ, this refers to some day connected with Christ. What day of our Lord’s life would we select as worthy of being set apart by a special designation as the Lord’s day? Would not the day of his resurrection, the day of his triumph, suggest itself at once as the one day that would thus be signalized? We shall see later that it was thus honored, but at this point we want the reader to think for himself just what day he would suppose worthy of this honor. The second passage cited by the Sabbatarians (Isaiah 58:13-14) also refers to Jehovah—to the Father and not to the Son. And it was addressed to the Jews, to whom only the seventh-day Sabbath was given. Jehovah said: "If thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the sabbath a delight, ... I will . . . feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father." This definitely fixes the ones addressed as the sons of Jacob. The fact that the Sabbath was Jehovah’s holy day under the Mosaic dispensation does not prove anything for the Sabbath now. All the Jewish feasts were holy. They had holy convocations often. Mount Sinai is called the "holy mount" and the temple at Jerusalem was God’s holy house. In fact, everything that was set apart for God’s service was holy. When the seventh-day men refer to Mark 2:28, they always misquote it. They leave out one little word and thereby change the meaning. The word is "also." "The Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath." By leaving out that word "also," it makes it look as if Christ is Lord only of the Sabbath—the Lord of that one day. But when we read it with the word "also" or "even" in its place, we see that Christ is Lord of all days, the Sabbath included. The Sabbath also. This, therefore, proves nothing for the Sabbath under Christ. It proves that Christ, being Lord of the Sabbath, had the right to use it as he pleased and to abolish it when he pleased. This he did by his death on the cross. (Colossians 2:14-16.) But in their desperate effort to show that the term "Lord’s day" does not refer to the first day of the week, the Sabbatarians say that if the expression means that, John would have said "first day of the week" just as he does in the Gospel. They do not seem to see that we can turn this right back upon them. If John meant to designate the Sabbath day, why did he not say "sabbath" just as he does in his Gospel? He uses the name "sabbath" many times in his Gospel. He never spoke of it as the Lord’s day. Nor did any other inspired man. At the time John wrote his Gospel it is probable that the first day of the week was not then being called "the Lord’s day." It would not be at all inconsistent with the general introduction of the new order to say that this name was not given till some years after the disciples were worshiping on that day. It was more than ten years after Pentecost before the disciples were first called "Christians." But to further try to carry their point, the Sabbatarians say that the Gospel by John was not written till after the Revelation was written, and if the term "Lord’s day" was then in common use for the firs t day of the week, John would certainly have used it in his Gospel. We first reply, ad hominem, that if John invented a new name for the Sabbath at the time of the Revelation, he would certainly have made use of it in his later work.

It is by no means certain that the Gospel was written after Revelation. The date of neither is definitely known, but the consensus of opinion seems to favor A.D. 96 as the date of Revelation. We can hardly suppose that the apostle John lived and wrote very long after this. Some modern scholars say that the Gospel was written at a later date, but that is not alarming. The modernists reject the Gospel of John altogether. If John did write his Gospel after the name "Lord's day" had come into use, he was telling of things that had transpired long years ago, and it would be only natural for him to use the terms that were in use at the time of the events that he was narrating instead of at the time he was writing. If we were now writing of something that took place on the Fourth of July in some year prior to 1776, we would not speak of this as happening upon Independence Day. That the Lord's day of Revelation 1:10 means the first day of the week, the day Christ arose from the dead, there is almost universal agreement among scholars. The lexicons and encyclopedias and Bible dictionaries and church histories all in one voice say that the early Christians—those of the second century even—used the term "Lord's day" when referring to the first day of the week, and that John so used it in Revelation. The writers who lived in the first part of the second century were contemporary with the apostle John, and some of them were his pupils. They spoke of their day of worship as the "Lord's day"—the day of our Lord's resurrection.

There can hardly be a doubt in the mind of an unbiased investigator that the Lord's day is the first day of the week, or our Sunday. This being true, is not the fact that God saw proper thus to honor and signalize that day sufficient reason for us to give the day special recognition and honor? If it is in no way different from other days, why this special designation? Is it not the Lord's day in some sense that other days are not the Lord's days? Should we claim it for our day and use it in our own interest or our own pleasure? If we do this, will we not thus rob the Lord of that which belongs to him in a special way? The Lord's day should be given to the Lord, surely. THE LORD'S DAY

We have seen that the first day of the week is the Lord's day in a sense that no other day is the Lord's day. It is peculiarly honored. It is distinguished from other days by a name that was never given to any other day. It is hallowed by memories that reach the depth of human souls and climb to the most consummate heights of human hopes. It is not a holy day by divine statute or legal enactment. We are not to keep it by compulsion of law or suffer death, as the Jews had to keep the Sabbath or be stoned to death. (Exodus 31:15.) It is not a day that is exalted above other days by law as a day holy and sacred by legal rigors, to be observed by slavish fear and the slaughter of lambs, as was the Sabbath. (Numbers 28:9.) If it were that sort of day, it would be out of harmony with all things else in the new institution. We are sons and not slaves. The "thou shalt" and "thou shalt not" of the old covenant has given way to the strong inducements of love in the new covenant. In the old order the people were under the strict law of the tithe, while in the new we give voluntarily as we are prospered, as we purpose in our hearts, and not as stipulated by law or by governing officials. And all Christian service is to be done freely, cheerfully, and gratefully. Therefore, the first day of the week, the Lord's day, is a day of joy and rejoicing, of worship and praise, and this worship and praise arises voluntarily from the redeemed souls of God's free children and is not a service enforced on penalty of death. It is not so much the day that is reverenced as it is the Lord that is remembered. And yet the day deserves to be honored and is honored by a special name. If our birthdays and our wedding days deserve to be remembered and celebrated because events important to our lives took place upon those days, what shall be our attitude toward the Lord's day? If the day of our nation's independence deserves to be cherished

and commemorated, what shall we say of the day on which God "hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead"? (Mark 16:9; 1 Peter 1:3.) And what shall we say of the professed Christian who has no special respect or reverence for the day? "This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." (Psalms 118:24.)

Since this day is not made sacred by statutory law, but rose into sacredness by the innate power and peculiar grandeur of the facts it celebrates, it behooves us to know all these facts and their scriptural significance. Let us, therefore, consider the day in Types, Fact, History.

TYPES

The Jewish feasts of Passover and Pentecost had a peculiar arrangement of days, which it is worth while to consider in the light of New Testament allusions.

The paschal lamb was slain on the fourteenth day of Nisan. (Exodus 12:6.)

The fifteenth day was a Sabbath—a day of holy convocation. (Leviticus 23:7.)

On the next day—"the morrow after the sabbath"— the ripe sheaf of the barley harvest was waved before the Lord (Leviticus 23:11); nor were any of the first fruits of the harvest to be enjoyed until this offering of the fruits to God. (Leviticus 23:14) It was a pledge or promise of the harvest later to be enjoyed.

From the day the sheaf of the wave offering was presented fifty days were counted, when the feast known as Pentecost—"the feast of harvest, the firstfruits of thy labors" —was observed. (Lev. 23: 66.) At this time the first fruits of the wheat harvest were presented in two leavened loaves. (Leviticus 23:17) In addition to the prescribed sacrifices, a freewill offering was to be made by everyone who came to the sanctuary, according to his circumstances. (Deuteronomy 16:10.) This feast is also supposed to be commemorative of the giving of the law from Sinai fifty days after their departure from Egypt. "In the third month, when the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt, the same day came they into the wilderness of Sinai." (Exodus 19:1.) If "the same day" means the first day of the third month, it is possible to count the fifty days. They left Egypt on the fifteenth day of the first month. In forty-five days, therefore, they came to Sinai, the first day of the third month. On the second day of the third month Moses went up into the mountain, and God commanded him to have the people purify themselves three days. This brings us to the forty-ninth day. The next day—the fiftieth—the glory of Jehovah appeared on the mount. The Jews were not divinely authorized to commemorate this event, but it fell upon the day that they were authorized to offer the first fruits or keep the feast, afterwards called "Pentecost," and seems to have been associated with this feast.

There are frequent allusions to the above:

"Christ our passover is sacrificed." (1 Corinthians 5:7.)

"Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept." (1 Corinthians 15:20.)

"Not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit." (Romans 8:23.) "Ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest [pledge] of our inheritance until the

redemption of the purchased possession." (Ephesians 1:13-14.)

"For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." (Isaiah 2:3.) The giving of the new law.

With these allusions in view, we feel that there is a striking coincidental—not to say antitypical—significance in the following:

Christ, our paschal lamb, was slain.

The succeeding Sabbath—the last of the Jewish Sabbaths—he kept in the grave.

On "the morrow after the sabbath"—the first day of the week—he came forth from the dead, "the firstfruits o f them that slept." the earnest of a bountiful harvest that is to be gathered into the heavenly garners.

Fifty days afterwards, which brings us to another first day of the week, "when the day of Pentecost was fully come," the "firstfruits of the Spirit" were realized, and the first fruits from the white fields of humanity were waved before the Lord in the offering of about three thousand converted sinners to God. The new law went forth from Mount Zion; the newly exalted King was on his throne—the throne of his father David—and his chosen ambassadors began that day to act under his reign and authority. The first church of Christ was planted, and all the members brought a freewill offering and laid it down at the feet of the apostles. As we now have a new Lawgiver. a new law, a new institution (the church), new terms of admission into the new covenant, and a new worship, so we also have a new day —a day corresponding to the most significant day of the Passover Feast, "the morrow after the Sabbath," and to the day on which the feast of the harvest was celebrated and the giving of the law commemorated.

THE FACT

The keystone of redemption’s arch is the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." It consummated the work of redemption. He was "declared to be the Son of God with power, ... by the resurrection from the dead." (Romans 1:4.) It is the eternal triumph over the grave. It is the rising of the sun of immortality to them that sat in the valley and shadow of death. It is the denouement of the divine scheme which began to operate for man’s salvation when the dark shadow of sin first fell upon the earth. It is the rolling back of the stone from the door of humanity’s tomb and the victorious upspringing of the captive human race into endless life; the chains broken, the prison doors opened, he who had the power of death is hurled from his throne with scepter broken, and captivity led captive at the chariot wheels of the risen and ascending Conqueror. Death is abolished. Life reigns. Broken and bleeding hearts are bound up. The mourners in Zion receive beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, and the garments of praise for the spirit of heaviness. "The power of an endless life" thrills the despairing heart with rapturous joy, and divine strength uplifts the dejected soul and exalts it to the sublimest heights of a glorious hope.

Jesus is risen—man is immortal! Shall this not be commemorated? Shall the tragedy of the cross and the triumph of the resurrection remain uncelebrated? Shall we sing of earthly heroes, and keep feast days in honor of earthly deliverances, and shall there be no victory song for our risen Savior? Shall we not celebrate with gladsome songs and eternal gratitude the Miracle of Love that

led the sinless Sufferer to the cruel cross, and the Miracle of Power that brought again our Lord Jesus from the dead? Through all the endless years of eternity, this day must be distinguished as the Lord’s day, the "day the Lord hath made," and in which death-doomed mortals will have reason to "rejoice and be glad." It needs no law like that of Sinai to cause redeemed spirits to rejoice and to give this day to the Lord, who made it glorious and gave it the holy name of "Lord’s day."

THE HISTORY

From the first the disciples assembled upon the first day of the week and assigned to it the significance to which it was entitled. (John 20:19-27; Acts 2:1-4; Acts 20:7; 1 Corinthians 16:1-2.) Before the apostolic age had closed and inspiration had ceased to write for our learning and guidance the day was given its appropriate and sacred name. On into the second century we follow it, and find it universally honored and revered by the Christians. At its dawn they slipped away from their work, the slaves from their masters, and all from their enemies, to their dens and caves, to worship their risen Lord and partake of the feast that commemorated his death and suffering. On through the third century we follow the day until we find the emperor espousing the new religion, and therefore making this day a legal holiday so that Christians could have convenience and protection in keeping the day in honor of their Lord. And so on over the centuries the day comes in its march of victory until in all Christian lands it is now a legal holiday, and by all professed followers of the risen Christ, with the exception of a few who worship the Sabbath instead of the Christ, it is recognized and honored as the Lord’s day. It is a double monument to our Lord. It does not merely give recognition and honor to the teaching of a modernist’s Jesus; it is not merely a traditional religious custom that is based on the supposed ideas of a mythical character. It celebrates the miracle of his resurrection which forever lifts him out of the class of mere human beings and proclaims him the Son of the Living God and both Lord and Christ. "O, come, let us adore him!"

00B.40 Chapter 33. The Lord's Day

XXXIV. When Does the Lord’s Day Begin? Should We Have theLord’s Supper on Sunday Night? WHEN DOES THE LORD’S DAY BEGIN AND CLOSE? In our former studies we have seen that the first day of the week is the Lord’s day, and that the early disciples under the guidance of the Holy Spirit met to worship God and to honor Christ upon this day. Now, since it has become the custom with some congregations to have the Lord’s Supper— a second setting of the supper—at night for the benefit of those who could not, consistently with their own business or pleasure, attend the regular forenoon service, the question of what time the Lord’s day begins and closes is an important one. It is frequently discussed, and some people are perplexed on this point. A brief study of the issue here, it is hoped, will not be amiss.

1. What Is a Day? In the Bible, as well as in our common use, the word "day" is used in several different senses. First, it is used to denote a twenty-four-hour period of time. This period is fixed by the time it takes the earth to make one revolution upon its axis; the interval of time that elapses between two consecutive returns of the same terrestrial meridian to the sun. In this sense it is called a natural, solar, o r astronomical day. So far as the definition is concerned, it would make no difference when we begin the day. It would not matter what meridian we choose to mark the revolution. The nations have differed, and still do, in their reckoning of the beginning of the day. The nautical or astronomical day is now reckoned from neon to noon. The Babylonians reckoned the day from sunrise to sunrise; the Umbrians, from noon to noon; the Athenians and Hebrews, from sunset to sunset; and the Romans, from midnight to midnight. The United States, the British Empire, and most of the countries of Europe use the Roman method and reckon the day from midnight to midnight. The Hebrew count was, of course, the Bible count. "The evening and the morning were the first day." (Genesis 1:5) Here the twenty-four-hour period is called a day, and so of each of the days of creation week. But it is worthy of notice here that the evening preceded the morning in reckoning the days. Later, when the law concerning the Sabbath was given, the Hebrews were strictly commanded to observe the day from "even unto even." (Leviticus 23:32) So even until this day the Jews observe their Sabbath from sunset Friday till sunset Saturday. Throughout the Bible—both the Old and the New Testament—so far as we are able to judge, the day was reckoned from "even unto even." The second and perhaps most prevalent use of the word "day," both in the Bible and in everyday language, is that period of time during which the sun is above the horizon on a given portion of the earth’s surface; the period between the rising and the setting of the sun; the interval of light in contradistinction to that of darkness. Hence night and day. This is an equal division—so considered, though its length varies—of the astronomical day, and this division is called by astronomers the artificial day. The Bible uses this term just as we do today. "And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night." (Genesis 1:5) "And always, night and day, he was in the mountains." (Mark 5:5) "A night and a day I have been in the deep." (2 Corinthians 11:25.) "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale’s belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." (Matthew 12:40) "Arc there not twelve hours in the day?" (John 11:9) The Jews divided this twelve-hour-day—this

artificial day—into four divisions of three hours each—from six to nine, from nine to twelve, from twelve to three, and from three to six. It is beyond question that the New Testament writers recognized and used this Jewish division of time. Peter speaks of the "third hour of the day" (Acts 2:15), and Matthew, Mark, and Luke use the expression, "from the sixth hour . . . unto the ninth hour" (Matthew 27:45; Matthew 15:33; Luke 23:44). In writing Acts, Luke recognized this way of counting time also, for he speaks of the ninth hour, or hour of prayer in the Jewish temple. (Acts 3:1) There seems to be no reason for supposing that the New Testament ever recognized the Roman manner of counting time. When the writers speak of the first day of the week as dawning or use the expression, "upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning" (Matthew 28:1; Mark 16:1-2; Luke 24:1; John 20:1), we must remember that they are talking of the artificial day. the daylight part of the twenty- four-hour day, and not the astronomical day itself. The expression, "in the end of the sabbath," in Matthew, should be translated "after the sabbath." On this the scholars are pretty well agreed, and that is just what Mark says. It would have been "after the sabbath" even if Matthew had reckoned the day according to the Roman count, and closed it at midnight.

2. What Time Was the Troas Meeting? In the twentieth chapter of Acts we are told that the disciples at Troas came together upon the first day of the week to break bread. It is plainly shown that this was a night meeting, yet it was the "first day of the week." Now, if Luke, the writer, reckoned time according to the Jewish count, this was on Saturday night as we count time. The Sabbath closed and the Lord’s day began at sunset. Is there anything at all in the circumstances that would indicate that Luke did not use the Jewish count? Nothing at all; rather the reverse. Some suppose that what is said about departing "on the morrow" would indicate the Roman hour of beginning the day. They met on the "first day," and Paul was to depart on the second day, not on the same day—the daylight part of the first day. This is true, if "the morrow" means the second day. But it does not mean the morrow after the astronomical day —the day after the first day. It obviously means the day following this night. All we need to do in order to understand this is to keep in mind the second definition of the word "day." Remember the twelve-hour day—the distinction between day and night. With this expression understood, there is no reason at all to suppose that Luke used the Roman method of counting time here—which he never did anywhere else. On the other hand, if we do understand this passage to be reckoned on the Roman method and think of this as Sunday night, we will have the disciples partaking of the Lord’s Supper on Monday morning, for it was long after midnight when they broke bread. (Verse 11.) In order to escape this difficulty, those who think this was Sunday night say that this verse refers to a common meal and not the Lord’s Supper. But if we put the article before the word "bread" as it is in the Greek, we are forced to conclude that this was the Lord’s Supper. In verse 7 we are told that they came together to break bread, and in verse 11 we are told that after the interruption they came to the upper chamber again and broke the bread—ton arton. This being the Lord’s Supper, we have no choice but to say that the meeting was held on Saturday night and that they had the Supper early on Sunday morning, or that the meeting was held on Sunday night and that they ate the Supper early on Monday morning. We will hardly take this last-mentioned choice. Then this Troas meeting was held on Saturday night, the first day of the week having begun at sunset. This is the position taken by nearly all the commentators. See Conybeare and Howson, McGarvey, B. W. Johnson, etc.

If our brethren think they have to work on the Lord’s day, but still want to try to partake of the Lord’s Supper, they should arrange a meeting on Saturday night and thus worship on the firs t day o f the week instead of meeting on Sunday night and thus worshiping upon the second day of the week. But the way to be infallibly safe is to worship at some hour between midnight Saturday night—the Roman hour of beginning the day—and sunset Sunday night—the Bible hour of closing the day. Any hour within that period is the first day of the week, according to both counts. If brethren have to work, let them arrange an early-morning service on the Lord’s day—before their work hour. THE BEGINNING OF THE LORD’S DAY—A LETTER Mr. G. C. Brewer, Memphis, Tennessee.—Dear Brother: In the Gospel Advocate, November 17, 1932, page 1226, you say: "Throughout the Bible—both the Old and the New Testament— so far as we are able to judge, the day was reckoned from ’even unto even.’ " The quotation you give for the strict command to observe the day from even until even (Leviticus 23:32) is for the day of atonement, which may or may not be the seventh-day Sabbath. In Exodus 12:5-18 Israel is commanded to kill and eat the passover on the even of the fourteenth, which they did; at midnight the Lord smote the first-born of Egypt (Exodus 12:29); Pharaoh ordered them to leave Egypt that night (Exodus 12:31); and they left that night (Exodus 12:42; Deuteronomy 16:1). Numbers 33:3 says that they left on the fifteenth. Before midnight it was the fourteenth; after midnight it was the fifteenth. Had the count from even until even been strictly observed, it would have been the fourteenth from the killing of the passover until the even of the next day. It was at this season that Christ was crucified. He rested in the grave the Sabbath day, and his followers prepared spices beforehand for embalming his body and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. (Luke 23:56)

"In the end of the sabbath" (Matthew 28:1)—"Opse Sabbaton, late in the sabbath—that is, after or at the end of the sabbath" (Greenfield’s Greek Lexicon)—as it was dawning into the first day of the week, the women who had prepared the spices and had rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment started to the sepulcher. "In the end of the sabbath," "after the sabbath," "at the end of the sabbath" mean the same thing. The Sabbath ended at the dawn of the first day and the dawn was the beginning of the day, which, when fully come, was the first day of the week. Christ rose early on the first day of the week, before sunrise. (Matthew 16:1, Matthew 16:9) Luke 24:1-53 and John 20:1-31 record the events of this first day and the evening following. John 20:19 calls the evening following the first day the evening of the first day of the week. Not Saturday night, but Sunday night, is God’s recorded count. So, Matthew 28:1 and John 20:19 contain God’s count of what constitutes Christianity’s sacred day. God charges us to preach the word. (2 Timothy 4:1-2) And with this plain word before me, I could preach nothing else than dawn marks the end of the Sabbath and the beginning of the first day of the week, and the night following is the night of the first day of the week. This accords with the account of the day of Pentecost. (Acts 2:1) When the day was "fully come," they were assembled at one place, and (Acts 2:15) after the baptism of the Holy Ghost, the assembling of the multitude and hearing them speak in all the tongues of the earth, Peter says, "It is but the third hour of the day," showing that Pentecost began with the light of that day. It is in accord with Acts 20:7-11. They met on the first day of the week to break bread, and, in the absence of any statement to the contrary, we conclude that they did what they met to do. Paul preached and the meeting continued until midnight Sunday night. At midnight Eutychus fell out of a window and killed himself. Paul brought him to life. And while the excitement was quieting down, he broke bread, and as he alone is named, we conclude that he alone ate, and having refreshed himself, he continued his speaking till daybreak, the beginning of Monday. Every

other passage in the New Testament harmonizes with the obvious teaching of these passages. To have them meeting Saturday night conflicts with all the passages I have quoted from the New Testament about the first day, and it also has Paul traveling all day Sunday. (Revelation 1:10) At South Solon, Ohio, this summer the disciples met in an upper room on the first day of the week to break bread and they broke bread as they met to do. I spoke till dinnertime. They had brought food for all who should come, and we ate dinner. Then I spoke in the afternoon. Five confessed Christ. We went to a creek and had service there and baptized them. We returned to the hall and had supper, and I spoke until nine o'clock Sunday night. Had I been the apostle Paul, am satisfied the audience would have gladly remained till daybreak Monday. But I would have wanted to break bread by midnight to give me strength to continue speaking till daybreak.

Again you say: "But if we put the article before the word 'bread,' as it is in the Greek, we are forced to conclude that this was the Lord's Supper." I have two differently edited Greek Testaments, and neither of them has the article before "bread." Acts 20:7, "klasas arton"; 11 , "klasas arton." Luke 24:35 has "en ta klasai tou artou" in the breaking of the bread. According to your exegesis, we are forced to conclude that this was the Lord's Supper, which could not be so, for Jesus said in instituting the supper (Matthew 26:9; Matthew 14:25; Luke 22:18) that he would not drink of it again till the kingdom come, and the kingdom had not come yet. So it could not refer to the Lord's Supper, but to a common meal, yet it has the article before "bread." It is the context and not the article that determines whether it is a common meal or the Lord's Supper, according to these passages. In Acts 20:7 the context shows that the whole church met to break bread as a religious act; Acts 20:11 says nothing about any but Paul breaking bread, which makes it a common meal.

Brother, this is the position the Bible takes on the beginning and ending of the Lord's day, and I consider it more valuable in settling questions than all that sectarian and "progressive" commentators may say on the subject. May I hope that you will let the readers of the Gospel Advocate see this. Thanking you in advance, I am, Yours sincerely, J. MADISON WRIGHT.

2 8 1 6 Osceola Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, November 2 8 , 1 9 3 2.

REPLY TO BROTHER WRIGHT In last week's issue Brother J. Madison Wright takes us to task in approved manner for saying that in Bible usage the day was reckoned to begin at sunset.

He says that the day that the Jews were to keep "from even unto even" (Leviticus 23:32) was the day of atonement and not the weekly Sabbath. This is correct, but it does not alter the fact that the day was reckoned from even until even. That passage only illustrates their manner of counting a day; and since Jehovah wanted them to devote a full day to this special service, he commanded them to observe it from its beginning to its end, hence "from even unto even."

In reasoning on the Passover, our brother says: "Before midnight it was the fourteenth, after midnight it was the fifteenth." Thus he begins and closes the day at midnight; but when he comes to reason on the resurrection day, he begins the day at dawn or daybreak. He says: "I could preach nothing else than dawn marks the end of the Sabbath and the beginning of the first day of the week, and the night following is the night of the first day of the week." Well, he had preached something else in the preceding paragraph! There he began the day at midnight! Then, again, he says: "Peter says it is but the third hour of the day, showing that Pentecost began with the light of that day." But he proved, or thought he did, in paragraph 2, that the day begins at midnight! Then

at the close of his letter he says: "Brother, this is the position the Bible takes on the beginning and ending of the Lord's day." But since he has set forth two positions from the Bible, we are compelled to ask, Which is the position the Bible takes?

Now, as to the beginning of the day, Brother Wright is the only man we ever heard of who disputed the fact that the Jews reckoned the day "from even unto even." We have consulted more than a dozen encyclopedias, Bible dictionaries and commentaries, including the Jewish Encyclopedia, and they all without exception say that the day was reckoned from even until even. Moreover, the Jews now keep up the custom and begin their Sabbath at sunset Friday and observe it until sunset Saturday. Likewise the Seventh- Day Adventists begin and close the Sabbath. But the Bible itself leaves no room for doubt on this point, and the law concerning the Passover fixes the time, if there were no other proof. Our brother cites the fact that they killed the lamb on the fourteenth at evening; they were to eat it that night, leaving nothing until morning; at midnight the first-born were slain; Pharaoh thrust the people out and they left before daylight—at night (Deuteronomy 16:1)—yet they left Egypt on thefifteent h (Numbers 33:3). This proves beyond question that the day began before dawn or daylight. Our brother recognizes this and said the new day began at midnight; but where did he learn that? Why not say the new day began at nightfall? This is the exact truth. Let those who wish to know the certainty consider this: They were to kill the lamb at even, or "between the two evenings" (margin, Exodus 12:6), on the fourteenth day of the first month. "Between the two evenings" means between sunset and darkness. That is when the lamb was slain; but the feast proper began on the fifteenth at even—that is, just at the close of the fourteenth day. Read this: "In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month at even, ye shall eat unleavened bread, until the one and twentieth day of the month at even. Seven days shall there be no leaven found in your houses." (Exodus 12:18-19) Now it must be perfectly obvious to all that the fourteenth day was not counted in these seven days at all, for that would make eight days. Moreover, the fifteenth day is repeatedly called the first day of the feast. (Exodus 12:15-17) Then the firs t day began at even—at the close of the fourteenth—and the seventh day closed at even of the twenty-first day. Thus we see that the days were reckoned "from even unto even." Seven full days were kept, beginning at nightfall on the fourteenth, which was the beginning of the fifteenth day of the month— the first day of the feast—and closing at nightfall on the twenty-first.

Our brother's reasoning on the New Testament references is no more reliable than his conclusion from the Passover incident. Of course it was after the Sabbath when the women came to the tomb, for Mark so states. How long it had been since the Sabbath ended these references do not tell us. Our brother wants to say that it was "in the end of the sabbath"—that is, the Sabbath had not yet passed or ended, for it was not yet daylight (John 20:1), and he says, "Pentecost began with the light of that day." But if it was "in the end of the sabbath" in that sense, it was certainly not after the Sabbath, and Mark's testimony must be rejected. So also must John's; for, although John says it was not yet daylight, he states that it was already the first day of the week.

Luke shows us when the Sabbath began. He says that Christ died about the ninth hour, which was three o'clock, and they buried him before the day was done. However, it was running near the close of the day. Notice: "And it was the day of the Preparation, and the sabbath drew on" —or, margin, "began to dawn." (Luke 23:54) The word for "began to dawn" here is exactly the same word that is used in Matthew 28:1. It means "to light up." In Matthew it means, of course, that the day was breaking, or that the daylight part of the day was beginning. In our former article the

contrast between day and night was illustrated and the twelve hours of the day (John 11:9), shown to begin at six o'clock in the morning, and Peter's "third hour of the day" cited. All this Brother Wright ignores. But what was it that was "lighting up" or "dawning" at the close of the day, according to Luke? On this Adam Clarke says: "The Sabbath was lighting up—that is with the candles which the Jews light just before six in the evening, when the Sabbath commences." He quotes Wakefield and Lightfoot to the same effect. However you construe the word, the fact remains that Luke says the Sabbath was dawning or beginning as they placed the body of our Lord in the tomb.

Peter's language as to the "third hour" of the day has been explained.

Our brother says that he has two Greek Testaments and they do not use the article "ton" before arton, or bread, in Acts 20:11. Some manuscripts do not insert it. All who have investigated the subject know that Westcott and Hort put in the article. Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, and others also insert it.

The brother cites some passages where the article is used before the word "bread" and says that that bread is certainly not the Lord's Supper! Shades of logic! Could he possibly think that anyone would contend that the article itself determines the bread referred to? The point was that since bread was mentioned in the context (Acts 20:7), and this, as all admit, was the Lord's Supper, and no other bread was contemplated in the passage, then "the bread" in Acts 20:11 would naturally refer to the bread just previously mentioned. If we allow the context to explain what bread is intended, we can have no doubt about its being the Lord's Supper.

00B.41 Chapter 34. Why Go To Worship Every Lord's Day?

XXXIV. Why Go to Worship Every Lord’s Day?

One of the most excellent articles that we have read in recent days appeared in The Living Church (Episcopalian) of October 17, 1931. The title was, "Why I Go to Mass Every Sunday," and it was written by Jarred S. Moore, Professor of Philosophy, Western Reserve University. We do not like the title, naturally, but we do like the article and most heartily commend it. It is such an unusual thing to find a teacher of philosophy in these days that attends any sort of religious services at all, to say nothing of every Sunday, that when we find one who not only attends such services, but who gives such excellent reasons for so doing and makes such a complete reply to scoffers, it cheers our spirits like a voice from heaven. Having given full credit to the author and to the paper in which the article appeared, we quote the article in full and add a few remarks. Read carefully what this professor of philosophy says:

Churchgoing is far from popular among those who consider themselves the intellectual elite today. Upon those of us who follow the old customs the members of that exalted society look down with half-pitying, half-patronizing eyes, as upon a child playing with a doll and imagining it is alive. "How strange," they say, "that such an intelligent man as So-and-So in these enlightened days should believe all that nonsense and waste his Sunday mornings in church! But if it makes him any happier," they usually add, "I suppose it is all right." Now, in making this last concession, the critic is not only slighting the intelligence of the religious man, but displaying his own ignorance of the very meaning of religion. Of course, religion should console and strengthen its devotees in their daily life; but this is rather the product of religion than religion itself. In its essence religion is a direct personal relationship between man and God; and unless the emotions which accompany it are based on true conceptions, it degenerates into a contemptible sentimentalism. Intellectual pride is the curse of the scholar, and to scoff at religion is an indication, not of a superior intelligence, but of a superficial intolerance. To attempt to prove the truths of Christianity would require a treatise, and it would be absurd to make such an attempt in a brief article; but, in view of the prevalent attitude of the vast majority of so-called "intellectuals," it behooves those who claim for themselves also an at least respectable amount of intelligence, and yet are accustomed to worship God after the traditional manner, to give some account of themselves before their dissentient friends. This we may do by asking and endeavoring to answer two successive questions: Why do we worship? and How shall we worship?

WHY DO WE WORSHIP? The custom of worship is based on belief in a personal Deity who is the source of all goodness, who loves mankind, and who rejoices in the love of his people. If there is no such Being—if God either does not exist, or is a mere impersonal force in nature, or is a personal Being, who, however, cares nothing for mankind—the impulse to worship becomes a pitiable illusion; but if, on the other hand, there is such a Being, the urge on the part of man to seek personal relations with him naturally follows. It is as natural to seek fellowship with such a God, and as unnatural to neglect such fellowship, as in the case of parent or friend in whom one has

confidence and of whose affection for oneself one is assured. It is far from fashionable to accuse of sentimentality a young man who admits a love for his mother and is accustomed to greet her frequently with expressions of affection and gratitude, or to scoff at him for so doing; and is considered quite justifiable, on the other hand, to condemn the ingratitude of a woman who allows her husband to shower her with affection and thoughtful consideration, and rewards him with indifference or bitter words. But to acknowledge one's obligations to the God who is supreme love, goodness, and truth is usually to lay oneself open to sneers and ridicule from the self-appointed guardians of present-day intelligence. This attitude of intolerance and contempt is no doubt largely due to indifference on the part of the scoffers, but more frequently, I think, to the reasoned conclusion that the idea of a personal God who loves mankind is no longer tenable—that if there is a rational governing Principle in the universe, a "Power not ourselves that makes for righteousness," this must be either an entirely impersonal Principle, or else a suprapersonal Being who can have little if any concern for such a contemptible creature as man, dwelling upon such an inconspicuous planet as ours in an extreme corner of the inconceivably vast universe which modern science has revealed to us. As to the objection against divine personality, it is a constant source of surprise to the present writer 1o find how common it is for even intelligent persons to think that religious adults conceive of God in human, or even sometimes in corporeal, terms. No doubt many do so think of him, but certainly not those whose reflective powers are alive. The essential attribute of personality is selfconsciousness, the capacity of being conscious of oneself; all other distinctively personal qualities — intelligence, self-determination, moral sense, love, and the rest—are but necessary implications of self-consciousness. Of course, as human personality is the only kind of which we have any evidence in this world, we must take ours as the most intelligible symbol within our grasp of personality as it is in God; but no human being who thinks out his beliefs at all thinks of human personality as an adequate expression of divine personality. And how personality could ever have "emerged" in the phenomenal world unless it is grounded in ultimate reality, it is difficult to understand. As to the objection that the world is too large and we too small for the God of the universe to concern himself with our petty affairs, there is here also a strange confusion—a confusion between quantity and value. How long has it been possible to weigh love in the balance, or to measure fidelity with a yardstick? Is human love measured by the wealth, tallness, or heaviness of the beloved? What are any number of millions of light-years as compared to the yearning of one human soul for spiritual perfection? As knowledge concerning the immensity of the physical universe advances, so should appreciation of the glory of God. But though God is Creator of heaven and earth, he is Father of human souls; and it is with this latter relationship that religion is concerned—a relationship on which quantitative vastness has no bearing whatsoever.

HOW SHALL WE WORSHIP? When we come to our second question, we find ourselves in even deeper water. Even if we confine our inquiry to Christianity, there are so many conflicting denominations, each with its own type of cultus, that the impartial observer is naturally confused, and so inclined to be even more cynical than he is as to the more general question. Here again it is impossible to do more than offer a few broad suggestions.

Now, there are many answers that may be given which are true enough so far as they go, and which to a considerable degree avoid the difficulty just referred to. One may, of course, approach God in the privacy of one's closet, in the solitude of the forest, in the quiet of an empty church, or

even in the busy office or on the crowded sidewalk. Furthermore, if one recognizes the special value of congregational worship, and is satisfied with the popular sentimentality that "one denomination is as good as another, since they are all aiming at the same thing," there are numerous opportunities, at least weekly, to worship God in this way. But to say nothing of the extraordinary intellectual inanity of the "one is as good as another" idea, we meet at this point with a fundamental difference within the Christian fold as to the primary purpose of common services of worship. To the average Protestant this primary purpose is spiritual edification, and the value of worship is judged solely according to the spiritual benefit one feels he has obtained from the experience. The sermon, therefore, is the center around which all the other elements, now regarded as merely incidental, revolve; and the chief reason offered by those who formerly were accustomed to participate in religious exercises for having abandoned this custom is that they "got nothing from them," that the sermons were impractical or intellectually weak, etc. But this, again, is a total misconception of religion. It is not what one gets from the sermon, or the hymn singing, or what not, that counts, but what one gives out of his own heart to God. Worship is an act, not a passive state. In worship one should, it is true, receive grace from God; but in worship, as in the affairs of ordinary life, one gets out of it only in proportion to what one gives.

REMARKS The English of this article is faultless, as we would expect, and the points are all perfectly clear to those who have thought on the questions; but for the sake of emphasis and in the fear that some readers of this department, not being used to such scholarly style, will overlook some fine thoughts, we here offer some comment on the following points:

Churchgoing Is Unpopular Among the Intellectual. We all know that this is true, and we know, too, that this attitude of the intellectual has had great influence with those who can lay no claim to scholarship and very little claim to intellect. Great mobs go to the golf links on Sunday because they think it is "smart" so to do. They think it puts them in the class with intellectuals and shows that they have outgrown old religious nonsense! Many others "sleep" on Lord’s-day mornings—not that they actually do rest and slumber—just to show that they are different, independent, and freed from old foolish traditions. Oh, they are folks of ease and leisure! Others go fishing to show their "emancipation" and defiance of religious ideas!

The author of the article says in a very beautiful sentence that the attitude of all these scoffers does not manifest a superior intellect, but a superficial intolerance. If some of these should go to church, it would take a great deal of patient preaching to give them soul and intellect enough to worship.

The Soul Communes with God. The author shows that religion is a direct personal relationship between man and God, and "unless the emotions which accompany it are based on true conceptions, it degenerates into a contemptible sentimentalism." The fanatical raving of ignorant "religionists" is not true religion. Real religion involves man’s intellect and all else that goes into his being. Worship is the calm, serene, purposeful, meditative emotions of the soul joyfully expressed in song, in prayer, and other scriptural acts.

God Is Personal. When we speak of God as a personal Being with any attributes that man possesses, scholars of the scoffer class cry anthropomorphism, and thus intimidate some weak worshipers who desire to be "intellectual." The author nails this fallacy and shows what the essential attribute of personality is. Nothing could be more logical than the conclusion that if God is

a personal Being who is related to us as a Father and who loves us and blesses us, we should seek to know him and to express our gratitude and love to him. And, of course, the oftener we can commune with him, the better it will please us. Hence, there will never be the complaint from a true, intelligent worshiper that every Sunday is too often. To say that God is an impersonal force or principle or law is equal to saying that there is no God. Therefore, when men do not feel inclined to worship God and to want him in their lives, the cause is—call it what you will—atheism. They do not believe in God as a loving Father. They do not believe that "he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek after him." If they did, of course they would diligently seek after him.

The Vastness o f the Universe Does Not Prove Man o f No Value. It is a common thing, now that we know something of the vastness of the universe, to hear men say that if God made and controls all these worlds and systems of worlds he "cannot be bothered" with poor, puny man. The author’s reasoning on this point is good. He refutes the idea. How can astronomy prove the insignificance of man when man himself is the astronomer?

We Worship to Give and Not to Get. The finest point in the whole article is the last point made. The author shows that the primary purpose of worship is not how it makes one feel; not what one gets out o fit, but what one gives into it. This is true, but it is also true that one should and will receive grace from God in true worship. This is one of those strange paradoxes where we get by giving. If we do not put our souls into the worship, remembering that "worship is an act, not a passive state.” we will get nothing out of the worship. Even when we do not sing or pray audibly, we must exert the soul. Worship is a soul act. Spiritual energy must be expended. We must "stretch every nerve." as the old hyman says.

"Oh come, let us worship and bow down; let us kneel before Jehovah our Maker."

00B.42 Chapter 35. Why I Don't Go To Church

XXXV. Why I Don’t Go to Church (AN ANSWER TO MR. WILLIAM CORBIN’S ESSAY IN THE AMERICAN MAGAZINE) In the August (1937) number of the American Magazine there appeared a lengthy article under the heading, "Why I Don’t Go to Church." The article was written by Mr. William Corbin and consisted largely in Mr. Corbin’s own experience with churches—his failure to find anything of special meaning or value to him in any church service that he had attended, and he had been on a special quest across the continent and had visited every denomination of any consequence seemingly. His inquiry was for a reason for the church’s continued existence in the earth. He thinks the church has served its day and is now a useless institution. He sums his whole problem up in this pointed question: "What, then, has the church to offer that is unique, peculiar to it, that is not found in better form elsewhere?" Our answer to that question may not be acceptable or satisfactory to Mr. Corbin, or anyone else who is troubled by the question, but to us and to all others who think as we do it is so simple and obvious and necessary that we marvel that the first person he went to in his investigation did not give it to him without hesitation. He may wonder how we can give such an answer to his question or accept such a solution of his problem, but we can assure him and all those like him that their wonder cannot equal ours that they could ask such a question or have such a problem. But our various viewpoints and our respective wondering will be explained in the body of this reply. The cause for such diverse attitudes will be found to be the cause for the question in the first place; for in this reply we shall not only attempt to give answer to his question, which can be given in one word, but we shall also offer what we believe to be the reason for his confusion; for he is confused, according to his own statements. He tells us at great length about his searching, and admits his lack of satisfaction, and even acknowledges that he does not know for what he is seeking! He closes his long article with these words: "I wish I knew what I sought." No wonder he did not find satisfaction! He does not know what it is he is looking for, and consequently would not recognize it if he should see it. When he learns what it is that he wants, it will be an easy matter to tell him where to find it in abundance. He represents the whole human race without the gospel, and his yearning is the universal heart cry of mankind. It is the exact mission of the church and the spiritual instinct of every reborn soul—hence, of every Christian—to tell such inquirers where to find that for which their souls are sighing. That really answers his question, but we shall be more specific and give a categorical answer to his question, and then give attention to what we regard as fallacies in his reasoning. For the sake of perfect clarity we shall give the questions and the answers in dialogue form, thus:

Question: "What, then, has the church to offer that is unique, peculiar to it, that is not to be found in better form elsewhere?"

Answer: Salvation from sin; regeneration of the human spirit; victory over death; and eternal life in the presence of God and in company with our friends "whom we have loved and lost a while."

Question: "What reason is there for the church’s continued existence? What mission or function has it that is not better performed by secular institutions, social clubs, or welfare societies?"

Answer: The same reason that brought it into existence in the beginning. It has the same work to do now that its divine Head and Founder gave it to do when he set it up in the earth—namely, to tell those who, like Mr. Corbin, seek endlessly and know not what they seek, what the object of their search is and where to find it; to bring answer to those who are'

Like a babe crying in the night, A babe crying for the light, And with no language but a cry.

It is set for a light to the Gentiles; it is "the pillar and ground of the truth"; through it "the manifold wisdom of God" is to be made known.

Fallacies. Let us now consider what from our viewpoint are flaws in Mr. Corbin's reasoning:

He says he is a religious man, and that he prays. He may, therefore, reject our first answer on the ground that one may have salvation, if he believes in sin and salvation, which is exceedingly doubtful, judging from his inquiry; and if he does not believe in these, he is wholly inconsistent when he speaks of himself as a religious, praying man— outside of the church and independent of any ecclesiastical body. In that he is correct, if he thinks of the church as a denomination, as an organized body. And that is his fallacy on this point. He seems to think that in turning from organized religion he is turning from the church of the Lord. He speaks of the church all the time in the sense of an organized body with all the mechanics of a human institution or of an earthly government. He thinks in the terms of an ecclesiasticism. But the church as the New Testament reveals it is not an organized body with human head and earthly headquarters and visible means of revenue and objects of material investment. It cometh not with observation, but is within the heart. It is not meat and drink, but it is righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit. It consists not in socialistic activities nor in rationalistic theories nor in deductions and conclusions nor in creeds and decrees nor in conventions and statistics nor in movements and money. The church is the spiritual body of Christ. This body is composed of all who have been born of the Spirit, and to be born of the Spirit means to believe in the divinity and the power of Christ and to surrender heart and life to him; to become obedient to his word and a partaker of his nature. Or, in the shortest possible statement, it means to become a Christian. The church, therefore, is composed of all Christians. In fact, it is Christianity. Christianity and the church are one and the same. You would as well try to separate between the sunlight and the sunshine as to try to distinguish the religion of Christ from the church of Christ. Therefore, to become a Christian is to become a member of the church. To be born of God is to become a member of the family of God. Hence, one becomes a member of the church by conversion, and one does not need thereafter to join any denomination nor to put one's self under any board or body of men. One needs only to follow one's Lord, to obey the teaching of the New Testament.

"Then, according to that," Mr. Corbin might reply, "you do away with organized religion yourself and agree with me. Then I ask again: Why go to church?" This objection will be met and this question answered further down in this article. At present we want to get all the fallacies before us.

Mr. Corbin assumes that the church was once useful, but that it is now obsolete. He shows that the work that it once did is now done by human (the church is divine) institutions. But the duties and activities that he alludes to were only the secondary works of the church. Educational and social works are the outgrowth of a renewed heart; they come as a result of the primary work of the church, which is to preach Christ and save souls. The children of God manifest the disposition

of their Father and do good unto all men. They preach and practice peace and show good will unto all men. To assume that there is no work for the church now is to assume that there is no sin now, no lost souls, no perplexed and inquiring hearts, no fear of death, and no desire for eternal life; or else it is to assume that science and human institutions are meeting these needs, which would be nothing short of absurd. Human nature has not changed, and, therefore, fundamental human needs have not changed. All our science and our enlightenment, our inventions, and our advancement have not changed and cannot change these things. Men still enter this world by birth and go out by death, and science has not made any change at either end of the line. During the interim we still sin and suffer and wonder about our whence and our whither and ponder and puzzle over the phenomena of nature and the meaning of life. We experience soul ache and constantly yearn for we know not what, until we either die in despair or find satisfaction and hope in Christ. There is no difference in the work, the organizations, and the devices of men today and those of a former day, except in degree or size and methods, and man’s devices never did meet man’s spiritual needs. The world had science, sociology, culture, and philosophy before Christianity came, and the attainments of the world in these fields then were in relation to the size of population and the demands of the times as great as ours. But those things could not save society or satisfy human hearts. Ancient Rome had a totalitarian government which, as the word implies, assumed to be all-sufficient, and it tried to meet all the needs of its citizens. It even resorted to the dole, which resulted in the ruin of Rome. The Greeks had science, art, athletics, music, culture, and philosophy, and to them the preaching of the cross was "foolishness." They could see nothing in the church, even in its infancy, and therefore in its purity, that could not be obtained or accomplished through other means in better form. That is the reason they did not "go to church," and that is also the reason Greece fell an easy prey for the heathen hordes and heartless hosts that robbed her not only of her glory, but also of her life. Hence, Lord Byron wrote: " Tis Greece, but living Greece no more."

Mr. Corbin seems to think of the church as only a social institution, and therefore a competitive organization, and he sees it outstripped and defeated; whereas the church is a divine institution and has no competition in its special field. Christianity is a revealed, a supernatural religion. A denial of, or at least a failure to recognize, this fact is the basic fallacy in the reasoning of all those who agree with Mr. Corbin. It is the cause of all their trouble. Even those religious institutions that Mr. Corbin praises, those he thinks still have a place in modern society because of the superior powers of their leaders—Fosdick, Jenkins, etal. —deny this fundamental fact. They only say, "Lord, Lord," and do not the things which he says. They have a form of godliness, but deny the power thereof as to regeneration and eternal salvation. They are the ones that Mr. Corbin praises, and yet, to us who believe in the things herein set forth, they do not seem to offer anything that cannot be found elsewhere and through means and institutions not religious. We grant that they have more intellect and learning, more culture and entertainment, more momentum and money than can be found anywhere else in the name o f religion. But an equal amount and quality of all these things can be found in the universities and clubs, in the theatres and lyceums, and in political groups and machines—the money power in the last named. But the religion of Christ is not merely social and cultural, it is spiritual; it does not merely educate, it regenerates; it does not merely give us the best there is in this life, it assures our hearts of eternal life in a better world to come.

Mr. Corbin reverses the telescope. He looks at the church through the wrong end of the instrument. Instead of measuring professed Christians by the divine standard, he measures the divine standard by professed Christians; instead of judging Christianity by its original principles and by the character of its divine Author, he judges it by those who now profess to espouse it—those who have "stolen the livery of heaven to serve the devil in." That quotation is applied in only a limited sense. We do not mean that these religionists are wicked men or that they have ulterior motives; we only mean that they do not present the full gospel or represent the church as Christ and the apostles left it in the earth. They do not point men to the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world. They do not preach him as a divine Savior who suffered a sacrificial death for our sins. Mr. Corbin searched among men across the continent for his answer and found it not. He could have found it in any hotel room where there is a Gideon Bible. He should heed the admonition of the ancient prophet, "Seek ye out of the book of the Lord, and read" (Isaiah 34:16), and believe the promise of our Savior that "he that seeketh findeth" (Matthew 7:8 K Look not at the stumbling followers of Christ, but look at their Lord. All men are imperfect, even the most devout Christians. We do not condemn the science of medicine or surgery because of the blunders of some members of those noble professions.

Mr. Corbin measured the services he attended by what he could take out of them and not by what he could put into them. (This has no reference to the collection.) He went there seeking something from men who have the same frailties, limitations, and needs that he has. He went not there to meet his Lord and to offer to him the sacrifice of a broken and a contrite heart. He did not "enter into his gates with thanksgiving" and "worship and bow down." He listened to the service with the consciousness of the fact that he was an investigator and that he had assigned himself the special task of examining every detail and of searching out the similarities and the differences in all the services, and especially to note the new things and the old things. He compared the services with other programs, and perhaps contrasted them with some. He listened with the ear of a critic and with the heart of a censor. It is also entirely possible that he had it in mind to write his article for the magazine. He expected the poor preacher to offer something so new and different and appealing that it would challenge the attention and stir the soul of one who had already repudiated the old-time religion and was surfeited with the new and the modern. If the preacher warned against the evils that are ensnaring youth, wrecking society, and damning souls, he called it platitudes—out of date—McGuffey’s Reader stuff. If a preacher had told of Christ as our Savior, he would have said: "Medieval theology. Not for me; I am a modern." Truly, he is a modern. But no generation of men ever needed Christ more than moderns or wanted him less. If the chaotic confusion into which moderns have plunged the world does not prove their utter lack of a balanced intelligence, what would it take to prove it? If the wars and the threatened wars which the nations are either engaged in or are expecting soon to be engaged in, and which they do not want, but say they are unable to prevent, do not prove that "it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps" (Jeremiah 10:23), how could we go about proving that? But still foolish man blunders on blindly to his ruin. And still Mr. Corbin will write, and the American Magazine will publish an article, against the only thing that can save civilization!

Mr. Corbin judged everything by the carnal mind, and not by the mind of the spirit, or by the spiritual nature. He knew not that "the mind of the flesh is enmity against God [and seeks to find all the fault with God and religion that it can]; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can

it be." (Romans 8:7.) He knew not that "the natural [unspiritual] man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged." (1 Corinthians 2:14.) This does not mean that man cannot receive the things of God without a miracle being performed to change his nature, but it does mean that man has both a carnal and a spiritual nature and that the things of God do not appeal to the carnal man. He is not even qualified to discuss them. The word of God to him is like pearls cast before swine. The reasoning of a carnal mind upon spiritual things may be allegorically presented by a barnyard scene: A chanticleer of proud carriage and beautiful plumage is strutting before a flock of ducks and haranguing them on this fashion:

"Tell me, you waddling ducklings, why do you go to the pond to swim and fish, or to the brook to hunt periwinkles? What do you obtain from the water that I cannot get in better form elsewhere? You go there for food? Why, I can get grain at the barn and bugs in the garden. As for water—oh, I am a waterfowl myself! I drink it every day, and the old duck that mothered me used to take me to the pond every day when I was a dependent chick to hunt for food and, as she said, to enjoy the water; but when T grew old enough to have some sense and to be independent, T abandoned such a practice. I obtain bugs in the flower garden, and the environment is much more beautiful. I get worms in the plowed fields, and there is no necessity for getting wet and bedraggled. T have discussed this with others—many others—and they agree with me. I am not alone. Ask the hens and the turkeys and the guinea fowls and the peacocks and see what they tell you. They see no need for the pond, and they think that swimming around and diving for minnows is foolish when you can obtain better food in open fields. Now, as for yon crane, with his long and shandy legs and his elongated neck and his sharp and lengthy beak, he may well continue to wade among the lily pads or to stand proudly in the brink of the lake and to thrust down his graceful head and take up and swallow at will the foolish fish that disport themselves about his feet. But, you poor, short-legged, blunt-billed, mud-splattering ducks, why do you continue to go to the lake? T have visited all your swimming places and I have watched your performances, and I saw nothing new. I saw you paddle about; I saw you close your foolish eyes and thrust your bill into the mud: I saw you use your silly head to throw water on your back; I saw you dive and stay under till you were dying for air; I saw you push your head down to the full length of your neck and turn your tail up toward the sky and scratch at the top of the water with awkward feet. And I said: Yet this is 1937! These things were all right before men gave us convenient drinking places and invented granaries and stored up grain, before they plowed the fields and planted gardens. Then our forebears had to seek food in the waters. But now that is all out of date. And yet even you young ducks insist that you are going back to the lake for your enjoyment. Well, it is not for me and the turkeys and the peacocks!"

"Why go to church?" This is an accommodated expression that means why go to the meetings of the church? And here we see why it is that we can reject the denominational machinery and still insist upon attending the meetings of the saints for worship. In the Bible sense it would be just as sensible to say "go to religion" as it is to say "go to church." But the idea is: why go to worship? A truly regenerated soul, a really spiritual man, would no more ask that question than a hungry person would ask: why go to the dinner table? or a duck would ask: why go to the lake? Hear the devout soul of the psalmist exult and imagine him asking: why go to the courts of Jehovah to worship? Listen to the raptures of a consecrated heart as it tells of the joys obtained in the house

of the Lord:

I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go unto the house of Jehovah. (Psalms 122:1.)

And:

I hate the assembly of evil-doers, And will not sit with the wicked.

I will wash my hands in innocency: So will I compass thine altar, O Jehovah; That I may make the voice of thanksgiving to be heard, And tell of all thy wondrous works.

Jehovah, I love the habitation of thy house, And the place where thy glory dwelleth. (Psalms 26:5-8.) And again:

Oh send out thy light and thy truth; let them lead me:

Let them bring me unto thy holy hill, And to thy tabernacles.

Then will I go unto the altar of God, Unto God my exceeding joy.(Psalms 43:3-4.)

Also:

Blessed is the man whom thou choosest, and causest to ap- pi-oach unto thee, That he may dwell in thy courts:

We shall be satisfied with the goodness of thy house, Thy holy temple(Psalms 65:4)

Then again: For a day in thy courts is better than a thousand.

I had rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my God, Than to dwell in the tents of wickedness. (Psalms 84:10.)

Also let us consider a few other joyful shouts of the psalmist as he declares his determination to sing the praises of his God i n the assembly (he never thought of seeking an excuse to be absent from the hour of worship), and calls upon others to praise the Lord in like manner.

Hear him:

I will declare thy name unto my brethren: In the midst of the assembly will I praise thee.(Psalms 22:22.)

Again:

I will give thee thanks in the great assembly:

I will praise thee among much people. (Psalms 35:18.) And again:

Let them exalt him also in the assembly of the people, And praise him in the seat of the elders. (Psalms 107:32.) And this:

I will give thanks unto Jehovah with my whole heart, In the council of the upright, and in the congregation. (Psalms 111:1.)

This, from an Old Testament servant of God, shows what will be the attitude of heart in a real child of God in any age or in any country. But Christians have some very definite teaching from their

Lord and his apostles on this point. To them has been committed a very sacred service which memorializes the most important fact in their religion. To engage in this service is a sublime privilege. Think of the promise of our Lord that where two or three are gathered together in his name, he is there in the midst of them. (Matthew 18:20.) All true Christians rejoice to meet him and to commune with him. Our Lord also said: "I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." (Luke 22:29-30.) The first Christians "continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers." (Acts 2:42.) And the incident at Troas shows their custom and upon what day they "went to church." "And upon the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread, Paul discoursed with them, intending to depart on the morrow; and prolonged his speech until midnight." (Acts 20:7.) The inspired word also teaches us to forsake not "the assembling of ourselves together." (Hebrews 10:25.) The persecuted Christians of the first century who slipped away to the caves to worship God never asked: "Why go to church?" They went to worship despite all hindrances and rejoiced in every opportunity to get together and to praise the Lord and to admonish one another. If our hearts were as full of faith and love and humility and the spirit of Christ as theirs were, we would do as they did. No one would then ask: "Why go to church?" All the saints, who are not unavoidably hindered, would be in the worshiping assembly every time there is such an appointment—morning, noon, or night.

00B.43 Chapter 36. Is There An Eternal Hell?

XXX VI. Is There an Eternal Hell? AN ANSWER TO THE "LIBERAL" POSITION ON THEQUESTION OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT

Some of my friends have requested me to give some attention to a newspaper article on the question of future punishment for the wicked. The author of the article calls himself a "liberal," and he seems to think that his position is new; but those who are at all acquainted with the age- old controversy on this question will know that there is not a new point in the whole article. They will recognize the "stock-in-trade" arguments of universalism. Likewise they will find nothing new in this review of the "liberal" position. But like all other questions that pertain to the eternal destiny of souls, this controversy cannot be abandoned. It is vitally and perpetually important. Also it is always timely. Just at this time there is an especial need for teaching on this question, for men are putting "far away the evil day," and the preachers of today, like the prophets of Jeremiah’s day, are saying "unto every one that walketh in the stubbornness of his own heart, ... no evil shall come upon you." (Amos 6:3; Jeremiah 23:17.) For this reason this review, or partial review, of the article in question is here given. Just the points in the article shall be noticed and no long quotations given. The article is well written, and our "liberal" friend attempted at times to become real learned and literary. This is all beautiful, and with many people it will be effective; but from the viewpoint of a logical and analytical man, all such embellishments will go for nothing. In fact, cruel logic would classify some of his poetic appeals as petitio principii, or begging the question. In picturing the final salvation of all the human race, the "liberal" quoted the following beautiful and famous lines from Tennyson:

O yet we trust that somehow good Will be the final goal of ill, To pangs of nature, sins of will, Defects of doubt, and taints of blood; That nothing walks with aimless feet; That not one life shall be destroy’d, Or cast as rubbish to the void, When God hath made the pile complete.

These lines have been quoted thousands of times, but those who recite them do not follow the poet on to his conelusion. He said that this was his dream, but he admitted that he "knew not anything." Let us now add the three stanzas that immediately follow the two that the "liberal" quoted. Read them together: That not a worm is cloven in vain; That not a moth with vain desire Is shrivel’d in a fruitless fire, Or but subserves another’s gain.

Behold, we know not anything;

I can but trust that good shall fall At last—far off—at last, to all, And every winter change to spring. So runs my dream; but what am I? An infant crying in the night; An infant crying for the light; And with no language but a cry.

If we are going to quote the language of a poet’s dream to lead dying men to hope for eternal salvation, would it not be better to be at least honest enough with men to tell them that the poet admitted that he had no assurance that his dream would ever come true? Should we not also give men this same poet’s advice when he tells us to hold t o the good and not to follow philosophy too

far?

He was even afraid his philosophy might procure some souls for the lords of hell. Read this stanza also:

Hold thou the good; define it well: For fear divine philosophy Should push beyond her mark, and be Procurers to the lords of hell.

(These stanzas are from Tennyson’s "In Memoriam," Sections 52, 53.) This must suffice for an answer to the "liberal’s" excursion into literature.

Let us try to find out just what the point at issue is. What doctrine is it that is assailed, and is that doctrine correctly stated? The "liberal" directs all of his arguments against what he calls the "orthodox view." He gives us a clear statement of his own view, which is the common view of universalism, or, as it is now called, "restorationism." But here is the issue. THE ISSUE STATED That all sin will be punished will not be denied. Both the Bible and man’s experience show that sin brings suffering. But there is a great diversity of opinion about the nature, severity, and duration of the punishment inflicted ecause of sin. The present controversy seems to be over the duration chiefly. The "liberal view" is that the wicked will suffer for their sins in this life and after death until their sins have been expiated by their suffering—until they have suffered the full measure that their sin deserves; that the suffering is reformatory and corrective and intended to prepare the souls for heaven; and that finally the souls of all mankind will, through this means, be made holy and happy.

Orthodoxy is a variable quantity, and it would be difficult to say what the orthodox view at the present time is. Dr. Adam Clarke, who died nearly one hundred years ago, has been appealed to for an expression of the orthodox belief, and even he was made to endorse a heathen picture of hell. Doctor Clarke was one of the ripest scholars who have written on theological questions, and his commentaries are very widely used today. Truly, Doctor Clarke was a firm believer in eternal punishment for the willfully wicked, but to say that he took literally either the fiery symbols of the Bible or the grotesque description of the Hindoo system is a gross and inexcusable misrepresentation. The opponents of the so-called "orthodox view" can best refute it by caricaturing it. They picture the orthodox clergyman as a frenzied fanatic and his god as a monster with a malevolent glare in his eye, watching poor, helpless sinners, ready to pounce upon them and hurl them down into smoke- begrimed, lightning-scathed, and thunder-riven pits of perdition. They characterize the orthodox doctrine as heathenism, barbarous, and blasphemous. But what is the orthodox view? As said above, it would be difficult to say what would be the generally accepted view today, but the doctrine that is here defended and that is by many people held to be a scriptural doctrine is as follows:

All who die in willful disobedience to God will suffer eternal punishment—will be eternally banished from the presence of God; have forfeited eternal life and lost the privilege of the "beatific vision." What that means, no man can imagine, because the heart of man has not conceived of the blessed state of the righteous, which is then impossible to the condemned. Neither the nature nor intensity of the punishment is known and certainly cannot be described; but it is not so much what is endured as what is forfeited that we emphasize. The severest punishment that men can inflict is of the same nature. When a man is put to death in the electric chair, his actual physical suffering is of very short duration and is possibly less painful than the whippings which some convicts receive

at the hands of prison wardens. But the punishment consists in the loss of life. The orthodox hell is more of a state than a place and consists more in the happiness that is lost than in the "torture" that is gained. Cannon Farrar said that heaven, in so far as it is a place at all, is a place where sin is not. So hell, in so far as it is a place, is a place where God is not and where all sin is and all incorrigible sinners are.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED In the newspaper article under review there were objections urged against the doctrine of future punishment from the theological, the philosophical, and the humanitarian viewpoints. These are high-sounding and learned words, but let us try to follow the author and consider the objections in the order given.

Theological. It could serve no purpose except vengeance, and that would be a denial of the perfect goodness of God. A finite being cannot commit an infinite sin, and infinite punishment would, therefore, be wholly unjust. Answer: The purpose of the punishment will be taken up later. That sins by finite man cannot be followed by infinite consequences is purely an assumption that has nothing for a basis. The experience and observation of man are against the assumption, and the Bible unequivocally contradicts it. No man can trace one sin to a conclusion and reckon the ruin it has wrought. Why, then, should he arrogate to himself the power to measure the consequence of a life of sin? If the Kaiser was responsible for the awful World War, let some man try to follow the consequences of his sin down through the ages and note the effect upon the yet unborn generations and tell us where it will end. The results of sin not infinite? Let us put it on the "liberal" theory and see. A pure, innocent Christian girl is assaulted, maltreated, and murdered by a depraved, beastly negro, and in less than twenty-four hours the negro is apprehended and lynched. The souls of the two—the negro and the innocent victim—enter eternity at nearly the same time. They will both be saved finally, according to the theory. But at death there was a hundred degrees of difference in moral worth between them; and as the theory argues endless progression, we may logically assume that the girl would progress at least as rapidly as the negro, and there will, therefore, be a hundred degrees between them through all eternity. The infinite consequence of the negro’s sins. But the word of Christ will settle it with all who will recognize his authority. He says: "Whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin." (Mark 3:29.) To be guilty of an eternal sin is to be an eternal sinner— to be eternally guilty of sin; and since no sin can enter heaven, a man who is guilty of this sin must necessarily spend eternity somewhere else. Where will it be?

Philosophical. It is said that the doctrine that willful sinners—unsubdued rebels—will be eternally banished from the presence of God and from the home of the righteous is unphilosophical. But, in reply, the good of earthly governments frequently demands the deportation of radicals. The welfare of society compels us to incarcerate criminals, deprive them of their liberty, for the length of their lives; and if death be the end of existence, they have been by human power deprived of happiness eternally, hence eternally punished. But it is argued that it is unjust to punish a man eternally for the sins committed in so short a time. That reasoning is certainly unphilosophical. Men do not reason that way in measuring punishment for crimes in our civil courts or in making our laws. The time that it takes to commit a crime has nothing to do with the punishment it deserves. But the logic of the above objection is that the duration of the punishment should be coextensive with the time occupied in committing the crime. Frequently the action of a moment or the decision of one hour brings on an irreversible sentence of lifelong suffering. And it is not so much the

heinousness of the crime as what the deed involves of choice—of selection or rejection. Esau in a moment of hunger sold his birthright for a "morsel of meat." The sin does not seem so terrible and there were extenuating circumstances, but the judgment was irrevocable and his loss was for life.

Nature also deals with her children on the same principle. Her judgment can never be set aside; her punishment is always severe and often seemingly out of all proportion to the offense. But whenever a law is broken the inevitable results must follow. Men may disbelieve her threatenings, as they disbelieve the Bible, but that will in no way alter the consequences. Men may curse nature's judgments, ignore her warnings, blaspheme her laws, and denounce her penalties, but at last they must bow to her mandates and suffer the consequence of their folly.

Hundreds of illustrations of this from real life—from actual experience of men—could be given. But here is one of recent occurrence. I myself preached this girl's funeral. A sweet, young girl of the tender age of sixteen, just blossoming into womanhood, was guilty of an indiscretion. There were many excuses to plead for her—ignorance, love, overpersuasion. But the deed was done, and now the child realizes that an awful thing is about to happen. She begins to suffer agonies of shame, humiliation, and fear of exposure. Driven almost mad, she ignorantly undertakes to interfere with nature and arrest the consequence of her former sin; but in the eyes of nature her second offense is much worse than the first, and the penalty is terrible. Blood poisoning, her whole sin made public, physical agonies, convulsions, and death. Her first and only sin, and that, in man's judgment, to a great extent excusable; but, oh, what a price she paid! Weeping brothers and sisters would gladly have forgiven her, brokenhearted parents would willingly have died in her stead, and sympathizing friends would charitably have shielded her from public disgrace, but nature was implacable. The girl's deathbed was haunted with an intolerable sense of shame, the bright hope of future years was blasted, and physical pain was unendurable, and untimely death stalked in and carried away a victim. But (softly) the male brute who was responsible for the whole sin goes scot-free! Yet infidels and some "liberals" tell us that the only hell there is is in this life! If that is true, it should at least be equally distributed.

Humanitarian. It is said that no human parent would for any conceivable crime inflict such punishment upon his child. That will be admitted, and the best we can say on that is that God's ways are not our ways. Neither would an earthly parent inflict any such punishment upon a daughter as nature inflicted in the case mentioned above. No earthly father would permit his child to go through life as an idiot, deaf, blind, or physically deformed, if he had the power to prevent it. God has power to prevent all such things, but he does not do it. Therefore, we and God differ on this point, and we cannot measure God's judgment by our feelings. There is no man on earth today who would not, if he could, give sight to all the blind, hearing to all the deaf, and strength to all the crippled. God can, but he does not. This should admonish us that his ways are inscrutable, and we should preserve the strictest and most reverential silence in regard to them.

SCRIPTURE CITATIONS EXAMINED

There were three passages of Scripture used as texts in the newspaper article under review. Upon the first there is no controversy; the second was absolutely ruinous to the doctrine advocated; and the third was grossly perverted. Even a casual reading will prove this.

Let’s see. First: "Be sure your sin will find you out." (Numbers 32:23.) No controversy. Second: "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth unto his own flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth unto the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap eternal life." (Galatians 6:7-8.) In the article under review, Weymouth’s translation of the New Testament was highly recommended—and I recommend it; but if the author of the article had examined Weymouth’s translation of this passage, he would not have used it. The word for "corruption" is there correctly translated "destruction"; and as it is used as an antithesis of eternal life, it clearly means "eternal destruction," the same thing taught by Paul (the writer) in so many other passages. (See Romans 6:23; 2 Thessalonians 1:7-10.) No postulate of uni- versalism in that passage certainly. Third: "He chastens us for our profit, that we may be partakers of his holiness." (Hebrews 12:6-10.) This is the way it was quoted; but if the part that was omitted be allowed to enter the record, the point is ruined. Read the seventh and eighth verses. "God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is there whom his father chasteneth not? But if ye are without chastening, whereof all have been made partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons." This is beyond question, the chastening which God’s children, God’s sons, Christians, receive in this life, and not punishment inflicted upon "bastards" and children of the devil in order to make them sons of God and save their souls, which the passage was used to prove. The Bible recognizes children of God and children of the devil (John 8:44; 1 John 3:10; 1 John 5:19), and even in this passage there is a distinction between sons and bastards. What good end can be served by a perversion of the Scriptures? THE PURPOSE OF ETERNAL PUNISHMENT

It is affirmed by the "liberal" that the punishment that is inflicted upon the wicked is designed to bring about a reformation of life, purify the heart, and make the sinner holy. Now, God’s children are allowed to suffer for righteousness’ sake—not for sin—and for his name, and they are taught that these light afflictions, which are but for the moment, work out for us more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory. (See 2 Corinthians 4:17; Romans 8:17-18; Matthew 5:10-11; 1 Peter 4:16.) "For let none of you suffer as a murderer, or a thief, or an evil-doer, or as a meddler in other men’s matters: but if a man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God in this name." (1 Peter 4:15-16.) But that God punishes obstinate and rebellious sinners in order to force them to repent or to make them holy is most emphatically denied. The doctrine is here indicted as irrational, unphilosophical, unscriptural, and antiscriptural.

Considering the question philosophically, we observe that it is the province of mind power to control mind; moral power, to control heart and moral nature; physical power, to control physical nature. Any attempt to control mind and heart by physical force is as foolish and futile as to try to control matter by thinking and feeling.

If punishment purines the heart, then all the long-time inmates of our penal institutions ought to be saints. Both Catholics and Protestants have made the terrible mistake of adopting this heathen idea, and their history is stained with bloody crimes committed in the belief that they could purify a sinner’s heart by torturing his body. Fagot, fire, dungeon, rack, and wheel have all been used as a "means of grace" to force a renunciation of heresy and a belief of the truth. On this same hypothesis the heathen mutilate their own bodies in their devotions. Out of this doctrine have come two widespread and dangerous errors. They are Roman Catholic penance and universal salvation. In life the Catholics do penance for their sins, and after death they are saved through purgatorial expurgations. Archbishop Purcell said, in his debate with Alexander Campbell, that he "had no

doubt that there were popes then in purgatory expiating their crimes in its penal fires." The universalist or restorationist saves all mankind through the refining influence of suffering in this life and also in the subterranean darkness of the Tartarean world. This doctrine is unscriptural because it vitiates the atonement and makes the sinner atone for his own sins in suffering. He should, therefore, sing glory to suffering instead of glory to the Savior.

WHAT SAY THE SCRIPTURES? The Bible teaches that the purpose of eternal punishment—eternal destruction, which means eternal banishment —is the same as that which prompts us to deport radicals from the United States—to be free of their presence and safe from their disturbance. Our God has designed that his children have a home where "the wicked cease from troubling; and there the weary are at rest." (Job 3:17.) God commanded the children of Israel to stone to death both man and woman when they were taken in adultery; not to correct their morals and purify their hearts, but "thou shalt put away the evil from the midst of thee." (Deuteronomy 22:24.) After the wicked have all been banished, the righteous "look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." (2 Peter 3:13.) Nothing that defiles can ever enter the sweet home of the soul. "And there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean, or he that maketh an abomination and a lie: but only they that are written in the Lamb’s book of life." (Revelation 21:27.) BUT WHAT WILL BECOME OF THE WICKED?

(1) They shall be without the city. "Without are dogs, and sorcerers." (2) They shall be driven from the presence of God forever. "Who shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might." (2 Thessalonians 1:9.) (3) They shall go to a place that was prepared for the devil and his angels. They did the devil’s will, became partakers of his nature, and they must, therefore, share his destiny. "Begone from me, with the curse resting upon you, into the fire of the ages (aionion —eternal fire) which has been prepared for the devil and his angels." (Matthew 25:41—Weymouth’s Translation.) (4) This will come after death. "Be not afraid of those who kill the body, but after that can do nothing further. I will warn you whom to fear: fear him who, after killing, has power to throw into Gehenna." (Matthew 10:28—Weymouth.) (5) This state of the wicked will be eternal. "And these shall go away into eternal punishment: but the righteous into eternal life." (Matthew 25:46.) The same word is used here, both in the Greek and the English, to measure the duration of the punishment of the wicked and describe the length of the life of the righteous. If the punishment is limited, then so must be the life of the righteous, by all rules of either language or logic. In the Greek, the word is "aionion," and is translated "eternal" in the American Revised Version, Living Oracles, by Bloomfield, by Westcott and Hort, by George Ricker Berry, and many other ancient and modern versions. THE VALLEY OF HINNOM But it is said that Gehenna is derived from "Ge Hinnom," which was a valley a few miles southwest of Jerusalem, where the idolatrous Jews offered their children to Moloch, the fire god. This is true; but it must be remembered that such cruel worship had been stopped, and the valley had been polluted by Josiah some four hundred years before Christ came into the world. (2 Kings 23:10.) The place was not Gehenna; but Gehenna, an entirely different place, had derived its name from that awful valley. When Christ said, "Fear him who after you are dead may cast your soul into Gehenna," he certainly did not mean that God would cast the soul into the Valley of Hinnom, three miles southwest of Jerusalem. The word "heaven" originally meant anything that was heaved; hence, in the Bible it is frequently applied to a mountain. It meant that which is high, and men came to think of God’s high dwelling as heaven. Both heaven and hell have derived their names

from something else, and one is just as real as the other. But it will be noticed that of all of the quotations that have been used in this article, only one of them contains the word "Gehenna," and we could easily omit that and prove the point. If any reader will take the trouble to read the following references, he will still be further convinced that the doctrine can be proved without using either "Sheol," "Hades," "Tartarus," or "Gehenna." Neither word is used in any of the passages. Read them all. (Daniel 12:1-4; Luke 13:25-27; John 5:28-29; Matthew 13:40-43; Romans 2:2-6; 1 Peter 4:17-18; 2 Thessalonians 1:6-10; Matthew 7:13.)

00B.44 Chapter 37. Desultory Descanting

XXXVII. Desultory Descanting

(Poems and paragraphs written by the author of this book for the bulletins of the churches with which he has labored. They illustrate the type of teaching he has done and which he wishes to continue to do even after his tongue has been hushed and his pen stilled by death.) When a physician is called to a case, he is not so much concerned about the seriousness of the patient's condition as he is in the way the patient responds to treatment. If the patient is not serious, he will get serious if he does not respond to treatment; and if he is serious, he will get better if he responds. So the way he responds to treatment is the thing that the good doctor looks to most anxiously. This is also true with a preacher. When a church responds to treatment, there is hope even for the most indifferent. If a church does not respond, the case is alarming. What shall we do? Change doctors? Change the treatment? Yes, that can be done, but it does not avail except where the wrong treatment has been given. But in some diseases there is a certain, definite remedy and a universally recognized course to pursue, and any doctor who is called in will only agree in the treatment and continue the course. This is absolutely true with a church. There is but one thing that can be done: teach the word of the Lord and try to persuade the members to obey it. If they do not respond, the case is hopeless.

COMMITTEES Your present preacher does not like committees and does not often appoint any. Why? Does he have a good reason? Yes, several of them. We will here mention two: first, when a committee is appointed to do a special work then that eliminates all the other members from that work, and often it is a work that all should do—like visiting sick and helping the poor. But where there is a committee others let them do it. And if they do not, the committee gets horribly hurt! Second, committees that are sometimes appointed for a work for a special occasion or under special circumstances sometimes arrogate to themselves permanent and official authority and will insist upon "bossing" certain functions forever! In England they cry: "The king is dead: long live the king." Thus in one breath they announce the death of one ruler and hail the accession of another. So we no sooner recognize that the old year has gone than we face the fact that a new year is upon us. It is here, and even while we are welcoming it a part of it is passing us by. It brings its new obligations, opportunities, and sufferings as well as its joys. It is well for us to wish each other a year of joy and happiness, but for most of us, if not for every one of us, the year will bring some hardships, heartaches, and suffering. We must take the bad with the good and face the future with a stout heart, knowing that "all things work together for good to them that love God." When we think of the unknown future with all its possibilities for success or for tragedy, we naturally feel a little weak at our own helplessness and tremble before the thought of what may come. But our faith should help us here. In William Cullen Bryant's poem, "To a Waterfowl," there is a stanza that many people love. It has been beautiful to us for many years:

He who, from zone to zone, Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight; In the long way that I must tread alone, Will lead my steps aright. CAN YOU PRAY JOB'S PRAYER?

If I have withheld the poor from their desire, Or have caused the eyes of the widow to fail; Or have eaten my morsel myself alone, And the fatherless hath not eaten thereof; . . .

If I have seen any perish for want of clothing, Or any poor without covering;

If his loins have not blessed me, And if he were not warmed with the fleece of my sheep;

If I have lifted up my hand against the fatherless, When I saw my help in the gate:

Then let mine arm fall from my shoulder blade, And mine arm be broken from the bone.

(Job 31:16-22.)

All the servants of God that we read about in the Bible combined prayer and work without confusing them. If ever an enterprise was begun, continued, and ended in prayer, it was Nehemiah's reconstruction of Jerusalem. Hear him tell of it:'

I prayed to the God of heaven. And I said unto the king.(Nehemiah 2:4-5.) We made our prayer unto our God, and set a watch against them day and night. (Nehemiah 4:9.) Remember the Lord . . . and fight.(Nehemiah 4:14.) Call unto me, and I will answer thee. (Jeremiah 33:3.) Ask, and it shall be given you.(Matthew 7:7.) All things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive. (Matthew 21:22.) THE MAN WHO HAS A BOY To you who have a boy to train, You've work to keep you night and day.

There's much to him you must explain, And many a doubt to clear away; Your task is one which calls for tact And friendship of the finest kind, Because, with every word and act, You mold the little fellow's mind.

You must be careful of your speech, For careless words are quickly learned;

You must be wise enough to teach Which corners may be safely turned. Your habits then give constant thought, For with the child they are no joke; With cigarettes be never caught Unless you want the boy to smoke.

Doing things you can't commend, Or teach the little tike to do To the little mind you can't defend, It will be hypocrisy in you. Be careful then no offense to give In making the path for him to tread, And he'll make you glad while you live, And honor you more when you are dead.

— Written for Perry Mason by the Grandfather of His Boy.

OSTARA, OSTERN, EASTER This is Easter and all the man-founded and man-governed churches will be celebrating the day in great style. Excellent music, special costumes, and elaborate programs will characterize their services. And eloquent sermons will be preached on the resurrection of Christ—whether the preachers believe that he rose or not. The resurrection will be the motif of all the programs. But with some of them it will be like Easter, a myth with a beautiful allegorical meaning: the coming of spring; a time for the bursting of the buds and the opening of the flowers; new life is coming forth from the barren and bleak tomb of winter. So we should burst out of the dead past and rise from under the debris of shattered hopes and feel the urge and glory of new life in our souls! Selah. Bla, Bla! When a Christian thinks about the resurrection he wants the real thing, not an allegory by an infidel. "But i n vain they d o worship me, teaching for

doctrines the commandments o f men."(Matthew 15:9.) Our word Easter and the German name of this day, Ostern, come from the name of the goddess of spring in the Teutonic mythology. Ostara. A spring festival was always held in honor of this goddess, but we at Broadway do not worship this mythical lady, and therefore we have nothing special in our service today. Our Lord said: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." (Luke 4:8.) But if anyone should deny that our celebrating the resurrection has any connection with the heathen festival, he could not deny the origin of the name Easter, and he would still have to admit that this special celebrating is of human origin and based entirely upon the commandment of men— the decree of council. Our Lord was raised from the dead on the firs t day o f the week —no one knows what day of the year (Matthew 28:1-4; Mark 16:9)—and the early Christians, under the teaching of inspired men, met for worship and remembered the Lord in his own appointed way upon the first day of each week (Acts 20:7; 1 Corinthians 16:2). We follow their example and celebrate our Lord's death and resurrection and proclaim his coming each Lord's day.

Decades after the last inspired man had delivered his divine message to the church, uninspired men began to appoint feasts and fasts and celebrations and ceremonies that the Lord's church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit never heard of. In the fourth century there was much dispute about when Easter should come, and the first creed-making body that was ever assembled settled the question by a decree—by legislation—hence, by a commandment of men. "Controversy over the exact date of Easter was settled by the decision of the Council of Nice under the emperor, Constantine, in 325, fixing Easter day on the first Sunday after the full moon on or after the spring equinox."

PURE RELIGION

James says: "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." (James 1:27.) The religion of our Lord means more than merely believing in the existence of God, the divinity of Christ, and the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. It means more also than merely keeping certain commandments and ordinances, such as the Lord's Supper and baptism. It means more than living up to just certain standards of righteousness. While all of these are needful and indispensable, the very heart of pure and undefiled religion is:

UNSELFISH SERVICE

Lending a helping hand, visiting the fatherless and widows in their affliction, gladly bearing each other's burdens is the spirit that must master our souls if we are to have the religion that the one who died that we might live brought to this old world. H e "went about doing good." So must we, if we are to be indeed his disciples.

Note the following facts: (1) The only kind of fast that God would accept required that his people remember and provide bread for the poor. Read Isaiah 58:6-7. (2) Nebuchadnezzar was commanded to break off his sins and iniquities by showing mercy to the poor. See Daniel 4:27. (3) Don't fail to read the special blessings God bestows on those who consider the poor. (Psalms 41:1-3.) (4) One of the evidences that Jesus was the divine Son of God was the fact that, in his preaching, he did not fail to go to the poor. (See Matthew 11:2-5.) (5) The Bible declares that God will not listen to us when we pray if we stop our ears to the cry of the poor. (Proverbs 21:13.) (6)

When Paul was sent to the Gentiles with the gospel of salvation, special instruction was given to him to remember the poor. (See Galatians 2:9-10.) (7) John says: "But whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" (1 John 3:17.) Suppose you answer this question. And with it study Matthew 25:31-46 and ask yourself the question: Can I be ready for the judgment to come and be indifferent to the poor and those in trouble?

Solomon says: "The righteous considereth the cause of the poor: but the wicked regardeth not to know it." (Proverbs 29:7.) And how well has Ruskin said: "How often it is difficult to be wisely charitable—to do good without multiplying the sources of evil. To give alms is nothing unless you give thought also. It is written not 'blessed is he that feedeth the poor,' but blessed is he that considereth the poor." A little thought and a little kindness are often worth more than a great deal of money. (Study Job 29:11-16.) Massillon well says: "I would have none of that rigid and circumspect charity which is never exercised without scrutiny, and which always mistrusts the reality of the necessities laid open to it."

WAITING FOR GOD

I read a story of a little boy "Waiting for God" to come and take him home to love, provide for, and protect. An epidemic had taken all but this little lad. Father was taken, then the little brother, and last to go was this darling boy's mother. She was a Christian, and believed with all her heart in God, the God that lives, loves, and sees us every moment. Her mind had been continually on her boy. This mother knew that she too must go. "What is to become of my child?" she thought. Not a friend on earth that she knew to whom she could now give him, so she told him not to worry, to be sweet and good and God would come and take care of him after she left him. An angel took her home, leaving her dear boy all alone, so far as earthly friends were concerned. A short time thereafter, a man unusually kindhearted and in whose heart Jesus had found a place to dwell was walking along the street and noticed a little ragged, sick, but bright-eyed and intelligent-looking boy reclining against a building. He gently laid his hand upon the boy's shoulder and asked him what he was doing there.

"I am waiting for God to come for me," he answered.

"What do you mean?" kindly asked this good man.

"God has sent for father and mother and little brother," said the lad, "and he took them to heaven. Mother told me while she was sick, and just before she left, that God would take care of me. I have no home, nobody to love me, nowhere to go, nothing to eat, so I am just waiting for God to come to me, like mother told me he would. Now, he will come too, won't he? Mother never told a lie." These words were said as the child looked up through his tears into the man's face.

"Yes," said the man, with tears also in his eyes, "mother was right about it, and God sent me to you to take you home with me and care for you."

Then he took the ragged boy into his arms and hugged him and started home with him, and the little fellow put his arms about the man's neck and said: "I knew God would come for me or send someone. "

Come to Broadway, friend of mine, Come to worship, be on time;

Join with ours your voice in praise, And sing to God in joyful lays;

Let melody flow from your heart, And in each hymn have a part.

Come to Broadway, friend of mine, Come to worship, be on time;

All our worship must be right, For each act his word we cite; Your service then is incomplete If you miss a tone or beat.

Come to Broadway, friend of mine, Come to worship, be on time; Be in the worship at the start, Nothing's whole without each part. Your tardiness our peace destroys, Besides your sin, you disturb our joys.

Come to Broadway, friend of mine, Come to worship, be on time;

How can we have an hour of prayer If praying hearts are never there? And your heart is not praying, sure, When you stand outside the door.

Come to worship, friend of mine, Come to Broadway, be on time.

It will surely be fine when we get that nursery prepared where our babies can be taken care of in comfort, while the mothers worship God in peace and reverence. Babies cannot worship God any more than they can be baptized. If a mother is going to be baptized she gets someone to care for her baby, of course. How about when a mother wants to pray or partake of the Lord's Supper? Are these things less important than baptism? They are not. Nor can a mother or father do these things acceptably while caring for a baby any more than they could be baptized while caring for a young hopeful. There is nothing on earth sweeter than a baby, but a baby cannot worship God. Therefore, we mean to provide a place where the little innocents may sleep or play while the parents worship.

"But we did not have no such things when I was a baby or when my younguns wus babies, nuther." No, and we did not go to church in automobiles then, and we did not have electric lights then, and we did not have baptismal suits for the preacher and robes for the subject. No, things were sometimes crude as well as hard then, but must they continue so?

Furthermore, if you and I had been taught in early life what worship is, what devotion is, what reverence is, and that such things must be in the heart and that, of course, they require an atmosphere of quietude and solemnity, we would today have more respect for the beginning hour and more reverence in the presence of God.

A PSALM OF THE MORNING The morning cometh with great glory;

It bringeth a flood of golden light;

It gladdens the heart of the watchers and filleth the earth with beauty. The messengers of brightness announce its appearing, And the creatures of darkness see its signal in the heavens;

Yes, they stealthily steal away into their hiding. The sun cometh up in silent splendor, The gates of day open quickly before him, And he entereth softly upon the wings of the morning. The fear and darkness of the night flee before him, Yea, joy cometh with the morning, The flowers wet with the tears of night raise their heads to greet him. The birds sing aloud in the trees, The squirrel also

playeth joyously in their branches, The hills and valleys ring with gladness for the sunrise.

O, my God, my life is but a day. The evening shadows make haste to fall upon me, Dispel them, I beseech thee, and let me stand in thy presence as in the glory of eternal morning.

ONCERS Lord, I thank thee for the love that makes my life so bright: for this I praise thee Sunday morn, but not on Sunday night. am glad to hear our singers chant my pure and deep delight; on Sunday morn I hear them sing, but not on Sunday night.

I love to hear our preacher speak; his views are sound and right; they feed my soul on Sunday morn, but not on Sunday night. At 11:00 A.M. I stroll to church—in Sunday garb bedight; but, Lord, I crave my easy chair and slippers Sunday night.

Lord, bless our church and help to fill our preacher's soul with might, to charge the sinful ramparts of my empty pew at night.

Yes, a broken home is sad, inexpressibly deplorable! For children to see parents torn asunder and fighting each other is a damaging experience that their lives can never overcome. It is a scar in their characters. Nor can their parents ever atone for their sin against each other and against their children. They can never balance their own lives with complete self-respect and happiness. They are among the most unfortunate people of earth. No true Christian will wish in any way to punish such people. No, but they will feel an unutterable pity for them. When a child sees its father and mother alienated from each other and then going into conjugal union with another woman or another man, what can be that child's reaction? If he is old enough to think at all, his thoughts must be in this vein: What caused my parents to come together to produce me? Was it love that united them and made the union sacred and holy? Or was it a mere physical desire and am I an accident of lust? If so, why should I respect myself or try to regard life as sacred or any relationship as holy? Or if they were once united by love and their union consecrated by an honorable purpose, what has happened in their hearts? Have they lost their ideals? Do they now find life unworthy of such a high purpose and do they think that physical attraction for another person is after all sufficient reason for throwing overboard their ideals, their rule of life, and severing the strongest ties known to mortals? Is lust their law? Then I will not make the mistake of starting with the ideals they once held? I will order my life on the plain of lust from the beginning. That seems to be the dominant thing and the only worth-while thing in life. A PSALM OF THE LORD'S DAY I will sing of the blessings of the Lord's day. In it the dead come forth from the tomb—

Yea, the Redeemer came forth victorious. In it the people of God assemble for worship;

They come together with joyous heart; In songs of devotion they mingle their voices.

They fill the courts of Jehovah with praise;

They offer to him the incense of grateful hearts; In thankfulness they surround the table of communion.

Quiet also taketh hold of all the earth; The sounds of industry are not heard in the streets; The workshops sleep, and their whistles wake not to scream at dawn. The men of toil remain with their families; Their children are very glad of their company.

Yea, they talk pleasantly together. The horse is also glad of its return; His master cometh not with whip and bit! In the pasture he runneth to and fro and prounceth proudly. The beasts of burden rest in the stalls;

They lie down gladly upon their hay;

Drowsily they munch their provender till the morrow.

How merciful art thou, O God, to all thy creatures.

Thy earth is full of thy loving-kindness—

Yea, the creeping things share thy goodness. Did you ever sing, "Sweet Hour of Prayer"? Well, did you really mean that such an hour is sweet to your soul or were you just saying what someone else thought of that hour? If you say it is or was sweet to you, how d o you know? You must have experienced (tested) it. You know by experience that such an hour is blessed and sweet— unless you sing a falsehood and engage in mockery and a hypocritical performance. Then there is no reason why you should deprive yourself of that which is sweet to your soul. Attend prayer meeting. Does not your church have an hour of prayer each week? If not, you invite the spiritual members to your home and have a "sweet hour of prayer" each week or oftener.

We have many additions to our congregations by "transfer of membership." This means that they come from some other congregation. No strength has, therefore, been added to the forces of righteousness. But one community has gained, while another has lost. The more additions a church has the stronger it should become; the more work it should do; the more help it should lend to the weak places and to the workers in the new fields. To boast of such additions and then not use the added strength is a double sin. It is a sin to boast and it is a sin not to use these forces. These additions left the fellowship of one group of Christians and entered the fellowship of another group. But fellowship means a joint participation or sharing together. They once shared the joys and benefits, the burdens, and responsibilities of one church and now they, by "putting in membership," express the desire and make a request to share these things with another church—to participate in the affairs of another church. But how many members of any congregation really participate in the affairs of that congregation? In what sense are they in the fellowship?

If all the members—nay, if half the members of our congregation would actively participate in the duties and burdens and responsibilities as well as the blessings and benefits of the congregations, we would have a far different situation in the land.

We have more than a thousand churches in Tennessee. We have fifteen hundred churches in Texas. Several of these churches boast of more than a thousand members. Many of these churches have six or seven hundred members. What a combination of forces, what a unit of strength, what a source of supplies each one of these churches should be! But what are we doing?

If each church would take a measure of its strength— form an estimate of its resources—and then outline a program of work worthy of its strength, we could do a thousand times more work than we are doing.

We should remember that a church as such has responsibilities according to its size and opportunities just as an individual has. But how can the elders know what the strength of their

church is? They can know the numerical strength by keeping a correct membership roll and by keeping up with the Hock "allotted" to them as a charge. As to financial strength, if all the members would prayerfully purpose in their hearts to give as the Lord teaches them to do, there would be money available for every need and even new needs would have to be found. If the members would sign a card expressing to the elders what they had purposed to do, the elders could make their plans and engage their workers.

One reason some people object to signing the purpose card is not that they do not want the elders t o know what they are giving, but they do not want to know themselves. They just give without thought and without a record. If they really put down in figures what they are giving and then compared the figures with their income or even with what they spent foolishly, they would be so ashamed they would either do better or quit altogether. For they would see that they are not obeying the Lord and they would quit the pretense and sham. Examine yourself and see what you are doing.

Also examine your congregation and see what it is doing. What is the size of your membership? What is your weekly contribution? How much is this per capita? What is your yearly contribution—assuming that you have some special donation for special purposes? What would this be per capita?

Money is not everything, you say. No, indeed, it is not. If we had no money at all and had no income, we could worship God more acceptably than most of us do now. We would not then be disobeying God in the matter of giving, for we would not be expected to give.

Chapter 60

01.00. CUSTOMS and CHRISTIANITY

CUSTOMS and CHRISTIANITY With a Special Discussion OF

BOBBED HAIR Should Women Wear Men’s Garments? By G. C. BREWER Price 10c per copy; $1.00 per dozen FIRM FOUNDATION PUBLISHING HOUSE 104-108 East Ninth Street

AUSTIN, TEXAS

01.01. Introduction to the Topic

The custom among women of wearing the hair cropped or bobbed or completely shorn has now become general and many of our best Christian women have conformed to this custom. When some fifteen years ago only a few moving picture actresses began cutting off their hair there was a great protest raised among the women and no conservative cultured woman, to say nothing of a Christian woman, would have thought of sanctioning such a practice and much less of adopting it. But the actresses won out and sentiment has so completely changed that the woman, or the man either, who now opposes bobbed hair is the exception and is therefore something of an oddity, and, in the eyes of some people, a crank. However there are still a few women left who have scruples against bobbed hair; and a great number in whose minds there is a question about the propriety and the scripturalness of this practice.

Also there are many men who object seriously to this custom. In some instances it has caused divorces. In others it has brought about marital unhappiness and in a few instances men have committed suicide because their wives bobbed their hair.

Some preachers of the gospel consider this practice an open violation of divine law, the flaunting of disobedience and defiance of a scriptural prohibition. In view of these conditions it seems important that we should give this question serious study and if possible make the truth about it so plain that there can be no further question. If it is not wrong for women to wear short hair that fact should be generally known so that those who yield to the custom with mental reservations and qualms may be freed from such annoyances and those who cannot get their own and their husband’s consent to cut their hair but who nevertheless long to be in the style may be relieved and set free. But if it is wrong and unscriptural it is far more important that this fact be made known, for many souls are in danger.

Let us therefore turn our attention to this question in a serious and prayerful way. These lines are not written for those who are biased. They are written for those upon either side of the question who desire earnestly to know what is right and proper and, above all, what will please the Lord. There are some women who would continue to bob their hair if we should show them a plain, positive "thou shalt not" in the holy Scripture. But it is needless to say that a woman with that sort of spirit is not a Christian with either short or long hair.

Likewise there are some men who are prejudiced against women and who object strenuously to women’s doing anything that is not in accord with their narrow and prejudiced ideas of propriety. Then there is another and a larger class of men who are more reasonable but who nevertheless object to bobbed hair from purely sentimental reasons. They don’t like the custom. They were never used to it, therefore it is wrong. But such objections are not valid—that is they are not valid as a general law against bobbed hair. Of course any Christian woman should be careful about disregarding such objections from her own husband. Even sentiment, likes and dislikes must be considered in married partners if congeniality and domestic felicity are desired.

01.02. The Attitude of Approach

THE ATTITUDE OF APPROACH

Let us now come to this subject resolved to be honest and open-minded, not to be swayed by sentiment, prejudice or by the customs of this age or of any past age. If the Bible has spoken upon this question let us learn what it says and abide by its teaching regardless of whether others do or do not heed it or believe it. The laws of Jehovah are eternal and they are based upon man’s nature and needs and are therefore perpetually applicable to every generation. The fads of men are fleeting and transient as a rule. There are customs however that become firmly established and continue to be observed through many generations and in such cases the custom comes to be regarded as sacred and any departure from it is looked upon as sinful. It is necessary therefore for us carefully to distinguish between

Chapter 63

01.03. Human Customs and Divine Law

HUMAN CUSTOMS AND DIVINE LAW When any custom is generally observed among any people for a long period of time it becomes recognized as a characteristic of that nation or people and any departure from it will be looked upon as disloyalty to national or race traditions. Customs and traditions some times become so deeply impressed and ingrained that they seem to be laws of our nature and when we endeavor to change such a custom we appear to be fighting against nature. And in some cases the customs of men are indeed built upon some primal instinct, some biological law or some social necessity and to change such a custom without substituting one that would better meet those fundamental needs would be foolish. It would bring about intellectual and moral confusion and social unrest and unhappiness. And such a condition would continue to prevail until men could work out and establish a practice that would meet their needs. We should therefore be very careful to distinguish between a mere convention and a useful, sensible and salutary custom—even though it is only a custom.

World conditions have changed radically in the last twenty-five years. Our mode or method of living is entirely different from that of our fathers. Hence we were reared under one set of conditions and we are now rearing our children under another set of conditions. We were also reared under one system of rules and we are rearing our children by a different system—and in many cases by no rules at all. The world is now in a large measure in confusion. There seems to be no standard of conduct that is universally recognized. A certain class of literature today is filled up with some such ideas and expressions as "the modern revolt," "the revolt of youth," etc. Naturally we ask what these "revolts" are against? The best answer we can get from the writers who use those expressions is that they are not only against all traditions, conventions and customs but they are against all established institutions, all laws, human and divine. Every man must be a law unto himself. He must be free to satisfy every desire of his flesh and no man has a right to say him nay. Such propaganda is being broadcast throughout the land and it is no wonder that crime and immorality are holding high carnival among the youth.

Before we fall too much in line with any of the modern styles and customs we first should ascertain whether or not they are brought about by or contribute to this vicious propaganda.

01.04. What Say the Scriptures About Custom and Dress?

WHAT SAY THE SCRIPTURES? The Bible is not at all silent upon the relation of the sexes and upon their behavior toward each other. Nor is it silent upon the question of dress and adornment, including the style of arranging and dressing the hair. Some things that are said upon these questions may be intended as a condemnation of extravagances that were practiced at the time the writer lived but if we believe that the writer was inspired we will understand that those same extravagances are still condemned. What was wrong then is wrong now, that is what was morally wrong. (Some things in the Old Testament were only ceremonial). Moral principles do not change. Even if the same things that are condemned in scripture are not in vogue today there will usually be found a principle in the teaching of the scripture that applies to us and to all generations.

1. Then What Say the Scriptures About Customs? The general teaching of the New Testament seems to be that Christians should live in harmony with the customs of their time when these customs are not condemned as sinful. They should not make themselves either obnoxious or conspicuous by defying the established or accepted rules of behavior. When there is no principle involved, when the custom is neither right nor wrong per se, the Christian will be governed by the general practice. He will do as the people where he is do (See 1 Corinthians 8:8-13; 1 Corinthians 9:19-26; 1 Corinthians 10:23-33; Romans 14:1-23; Romans 15:1-3; 1 Corinthians 7:21). But the Christian should not in any sense conform to, partake of or connive at the evil practices of the world or any custom that grows out of or lends itself to such practices. (see Ephesians 5:7-21; 2 Corinthians 6:14-18; 1 Peter 4:1-6; 1 John 2:15; 1 Thessalonians 5:22 and many other passages. Read your Bible).

2. What Say the Scriptures About Dress? Upon this question we shall give the exact words of the inspired writers. Hear them:

" Moreover Jehovah said, Because the daughters of Zion are haughty, and walk with outstretched necks and wanton eyes, walking and mincing as they go, and making a tinkling with their feet; therefore the Lord will smite with a scab the crown of the head of the daughters of Zion, and Jehovah will lay bare their secret parts. In that day the Lord will take away the beauty of their anklets, and the cauls, and the crescents; the pendants, and the bracelets, and the mufflers, the headtires, and the ankle chains, and the sashes, and the perfume boxes, and the amulets; the rings, and the nose-jewels; the festival robes, and the mantles, and the shawls, and the satchels; the hand-mirrors, and the fine linen, and the turbans, and the veils. And it shall come to pass, that instead of sweet spices there shall be rottenness; and instead of the girdle, a rope; and instead of well set hair, baldness; and instead of a robe, a girding of sackcloth; branding instead of beauty. Thy men shall fall by the sword, and thy mighty in the war. And her gates shall lament and mourn; and she shall be desolate and sit upon the ground. And seven women shall take hold of one man in that day, saying, We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel: only let us be called by thy name; take thou away our reproach" (Isaiah 3:16-26; Isaiah 4:1).

"A woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment; for whosoever doeth these things is an abomination unto Jehovah thy God" (Deuteronomy 22:5)

"I desire therefore that the men pray in every place, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and disputing. In like manner, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with braided hair, and gold or pearls or costly raiment; but (which becometh women professing godliness) through good works. Let a woman learn in quietness with all subjection. But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over a man, but to be in quietness. For Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not beguiled, but the woman being beguiled hath fallen into transgression: but she shall be saved through her child-bearing, if they continue in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety" (1 Timothy 2:8-15).

"In like manner, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, even if any obey not the word, they may without the word be gained by the behavior of their wives; beholding your chaste behavior coupled with fear. Whose adorning let it not be the outward adorning of braiding the hair, and of wearing jewels of gold, or of putting on apparel; but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in the incorruptible apparel of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price. For after this manner aforetime the holy women also, who hoped in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection to their own husbands: as obeyed Sarah Abraham, calling him Lord: whose children ye now are, if ye do well, and are not put in fear by any terror. Ye husbands, in like manner, dwell with your wives according to knowledge, giving honor unto the woman, as unto the weaker vessel, as being also joint-heirs of the grace of life; to the end that your prayers be not hindered" (1 Peter 3:1-7).

These passages clearly teach that it is wrong for women to dress or adorn themselves in any style that is gawdy, immodest or wanton. And we may put that down as the one correct conclusion from their teaching—the sum of all that is said here. Women are forbidden to "braid" or "plait" (A. V.) their hair but since they must dress and arrange their hair in some manner it seems clear that Paul and Peter allude to the gawdy braiding of the hair which was practiced by the heathen women who wreathed or wove fine jewelry into their hair. The following note from Dr. Macknight upon the passage in Timothy is appropriate here:

"For, in this passage, the apostle doth not forbid either the richness or expensiveness of the dress of women in general, as is plain from the commendation given to the virtuous woman (Proverbs 31:21-22), who, through her industry, clothed all her household with scarlet, and herself with silk and purple; not to mention that the good of society requires persons to dress themselves according to their rank and fortune. What the apostle forbids is, that immodest manner of dressing which is calculated to excite impure desires in the spectators; also that. gawdiness of dress which proceeds from vanity, and nourishes vanity; in short, that attention to dress which consumes much time, leads women to neglect the more important adorning of the mind, makes them careless of their families, and runs them into expenses greater than their husbands can afford. How apt the eastern women were to indulge themselves in finery of dress, we learn from the prophet Isaiah's description of the dress of the Jewish ladies of his time" (Isaiah 3:16-24). With this understanding of the teaching of Paul and Peter, surely no one can deny that it is applicable to our generation and needs to be emphasized today much more than it is. But some one may ask why it is wrong

for a woman to put on man’s clothing or vice versa. The fact that God says it is wrong is reason enough for those who desire to walk according to his word, but if we can see a reason beneath this divine law, it will only increase our appreciation of it. This is entirely in harmony with the laws of nature. The sexes are different and nature gives them distinguishing marks. There is a difference in feature, in figure and in voice as well as in characteristics of movement and manners. These differences are brought about solely by the male or female organs. These marks are called secondary sexual characters. That is, this is what is done by the sex generative organs in addition to their primary function of procreation. The ovaries of the woman manufacture an internal secretion which consists of various chemical substances and has a tremendous influence not only upon the development of her body but also upon her feelings. Without it the woman would look more or less like a man; she would not develop her pretty long hair, her feminine voice, etc.

It is some times argued that nature does not give to woman any longer hair than she would give to man if he would permit his hair to grow. But this is a mistake. An abundance of long hair on woman is a secondary sexual character. A man with such an abundance of hair as long as a woman’s hair would be an exception just as a bald headed woman is an exception. Nature does not herself destroy these distinguishing marks When they are destroyed there is something wrong with bodily functions, unless we destroy them by artificial means. Why should we want to do this? But some one may say, if nature gives us these distinguishing peculiarities why do we need to have a distinction in clothing? The difference in clothing is called for by these natural differences. And we thus recognize and honor nature’s differences. For the sexes to exchange clothing is an abomination to Jehovah and it is also abhorrent to men.

There are civil laws against this practice. A man could not walk through any city in woman’s dress without being arrested, unless his disguise was so complete as not to be detected. He would at once be suspected of some crime or of some criminal intent. For the authorities know that no normal, sane man is going to try to look or act like a woman unless it is for some special purpose, and that could not be a worthy purpose unless it is only for a few moments of amusement. The authorities overlook a violation of this law by women as a sort of a patronizing concession to one of their various whims. Some of our "equal rights" sisters surely ought to protest against this and demand that they be arrested like men!

There is another and yet a deeper reason why Jehovah may have prohibited this exchange of wearing apparel. As we have seen, the sexes are different and have different functions and God, nature and reason demand that these differences be respected. Yet there have always been perverts in the world. We have them today as all medical men know.

Persons who confuse, pervert and abuse sex functions. Homosexuals, sadists, etc. Such perverts were very numerous in Old Testament times. Men with men "working that which is unseemly." Women doing that which is against nature. The men of Sodom were such vicious perverts that they refused Lot’s virgin daughters and demanded the men who were in his house (Genesis 19:1-12). Hence these perverts are still known as Sodomites and those who yield to such abuse are known as Catamities (Effeminate, is the word used in English Scriptures) (See Romans 1:26-29; 1 Corinthians 6:9; 1 Thessalonians 4:5).

These are vile things to even think about and very few preachers ever speak or write about matters of this nature. And many good people perhaps do not even know that such things exist.

But they do exist and they constitute a real social problem.

Now these poor perverted individuals were not all so born. They became that way by their own practice. By their own perversion of their natural powers. Is it necessary to say that we should not want to do anything that would give us the remotest resemblance of a pervert? Should we do anything that would look like an effect to confuse or exchange our sex natures? Should we even start in the direction of such a possible ultimate end? Or is an indication of dissatisfaction with one's sex a wholesome sign? Should we not recognize and emphasize the difference of sexes and honor the function of each?

Jehovah's word is not to be ignored and laughed at.

Let us now, before we study the one passage of Scripture that bears more directly upon the subject of bobbed hair, sum up what has already been said and draw some conclusions:

1. The Christian should conform to the customs of the people around him when these customs are not wrong.

2. The Christian must not partake of any evil practice. He must abstain from the appearance of evil.

3. There is a wide spread propaganda in the world today which has as its purpose the throwing down of established institutions and customs with nothing better to offer. We should be careful not to aid in this sinister movement by adopting styles that it dictates.

4. Gawdy and immodest dress is condemned. It shows a lack of taste and culture; a lack of humility and refinement; a lack of devotion and spirituality and other qualities that should adorn the mind or heart.

5. The sexes are different and are given distinguishing peculiarities or characters. To pervert the sex function is the grossest of bestiality. To destroy the secondary sexual characters is a mistake and a sin. Long beautiful hair on woman is a sexual characteristic. The mere cropping of the hair does not destroy this mark but the shingling of the hair in the style that men wear does destroy the mark. It is to simulate the appearance of one of the opposite sex: it is at least an apparent effort to disguise or hide the real sex and appear to be of the other sex. Such a thing can hardly be thought proper by right thinking people. It is condemned by Jehovah.

01.05. What Say the Scriptures About Bobbed Hair?

What Say the Scriptures About Bobbed Hair?

We are ready now to enter upon a study of that one chapter that serves as a battle ground for those who contend over this question. Let us study it analytically and prayerfully, laying all preconceived notions aside. Do not tell yourself that you already know exactly what it says; that you understand it so well that you do not need even to reread it. Some men who thought for years that they understood this passage have changed their ideas concerning it upon a more careful examination of the language.

It would be impractical to submit here a copy of the Greek text, but in the hope that the different ways of expressing the thought may cause it to stand out so that no one can fail to get the meaning, we here submit three different versions or translations of the verses. The passage is of course (1 Corinthians 11:3-16).

1. (American Standard Version.) "But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God. Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoreth his head. But every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoreth her head; for it is one and the same thing as if she were shaven. For if a woman is not veiled, let her also be shorn; but if it is a shame to a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be veiled. For a man indeed ought not to have his head veiled, forasmuch as he is the image of God; but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man: for neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man: for this cause ought the woman to have a sign of authority on her head, because of the angels. Nevertheless, neither is the woman without the man, nor the man without the woman, in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, so is the man also by the woman; but all things are of God. Judge ye in yourselves: is it seemly that a woman pray unto God unveiled? Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a dishonor to him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering. But if any man seemeth to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God."

2. (New Testament in modern speech—Weymouth.) "I would have you know, however, that of every man, Christ is the Head, that of a woman her husband is the Head, and that God is Christ's Head. A man who wears a veil when praying or prophesying dishonours his Head; but a woman who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered dishonours her Head, for it is exactly the same as if she had her hair cut short.

"If a woman will not wear a veil, let her also cut off her hair. But since it is a dishonour to a woman to have her hair cut off or her head shaved, let her wear a veil. For a man ought not to have a veil on his head, since he is the image and glory of God; while woman is the glory of man. Man does not take his origin from woman, but woman takes hers from man. For man was not created for woman's sake, but woman for man's. That is why woman ought to have on her head a symbol of

subjection, because of the angels. Yet, in the Lord woman is not independent of man nor man independent of woman. For just as woman originates from man, so also man comes into existence through woman, but everything springs originally from God.

"Judge of this for your own selves: is it seemly for a woman to pray to God when she is unveiled? Does not Nature itself teach you that if a man has long hair it is a dishonor to him, but if a woman has long hair it is her glory, because her hair was given her for a covering? But if any one is inclined to be contentious on the point, we have no such custom, nor have the Churches of God."

3. (The Twentieth Century New Testament.) "But I am anxious that you should understand that the Christ is the Head of every man, that man is the Head of woman, and that God is the Head of the Christ. Any man who keeps his head covered, when praying or preaching in public, dishonours him who is his Head; while any woman, who prays or preaches in public bareheaded, dishonours him who is her Head; for that is to make herself like one of the shameless women who shave their heads. Indeed, if a woman does not keep her head covered, she may as well cut her hair short. But, since to cut her hair short, or shave it off, marks her as one of the shameless women, let her keep her head covered. A man ought not to have his head covered, for he has been from the beginning 'the likeness of God' and the reflection of his glory, but woman is the reflection of man's glory. For it was not man who was taken from woman, but woman who was taken from man. Besides, man was not created for the sake of woman, but woman for the sake of man. And, therefore, a woman ought to wear on her head a symbol of her subjection, because of the presence of the angels. Still, when in union with the Lord, woman is not independent of man, or man of woman; for just as woman came from man, so man comes by means of woman; and all things come from God. Judge for yourselves. Is it fitting that a woman should pray to God in public with her head uncovered? Does not nature herself teach us that, while for a man to wear his hair long is degrading to him, a woman's long hair is her glory? Her hair has been given her to serve as a covering. If, however, any one still thinks it right to contest the point—well, we have no such custom, nor have the Churches of God."

01.06. Comment on 1Co_11:3-16

Next, we shall give our readers the benefit of the comment, by McGarvey and Pendleton upon these verses:

1 Corinthians 11:3 But I would have you know, that the head of every man Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God. [Paul settles the humblest difficulties by appealing to the loftiest principles: thus he makes the headship of Christ over man the basis, or principle, on which he decides that the man has headship over the woman, and as we shall see further on, he makes the headship of the man over the woman the principle by which he determines the question as to whether men should worship with uncovered, and women with covered heads; for the uncovered head was the symbol of royalty and dominion, and the covered head of subjection and submission. The order in which he states the several headships is peculiar. We would expect him to begin with God and descend by the regular steps, thus: God, Christ, man, woman. But the order is thus: Christ, man; man, woman; God, Christ. Subtle distinctions are to be made with caution, but it is not improbable that Paul's order in this case is determined by the delicate nature of the subject which he handles. Dominion is fruitful of tyranny, and so it is well, before giving man dominion, to remind him that he also is a servant (Matthew 18:21-35; Matthew 5:7). Again, the arrangement makes the headship of the man over the woman parallel to the headship of God over Christ, and suggests that there should be between husband and wife a unity of will and purpose similar to that which exists between the Father and the Son. The unquestioned, immediate and absolute submission and concurrence of the Son leave no room for the exercise of authority on the part of the Father, and the infinite and unsearchable wisdom, love, benevolence and good-will on the part of the Father take from the Son every occasion of unwillingness or even hesitation. All Christian husbands and wives should mutually remember this parallel. Jesus the Incarnate, the Son of man and the Son of God, is subject to the Father, by reason of his humanity and his mediatorial kingdom (ch. 3:23; 15:24-28; John 14:28). As to the subjection of the Logos or the eternal Word of the Father we are not informed (compare Php 2:6).]

1 Corinthians 11:4 Every man praying or prophesying [speaking by divine inspiration], having his head covered, dishonoreth his head. 5 But every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoreth her head. [Corinth was made up of Greeks, Romans and Jews, and all these three elements of her population were found in the church to which Paul wrote. The Jew and the Roman worshipped with covered, and the Greek with uncovered, head. Naturally a dispute would arise as to which custom was right. Moreover, as the women were beyond all doubt acquainted with the principle that there is neither male nor female in the spiritual realm (Galatians 3:28), they seem to have added to the confusion by taking sides in the controversy, so that some of them asserted the right to worship with uncovered heads after the fashion of the Greeks. Now, in the East in Paul's day, all women went into public assemblies with their heads veiled, and this peplum, or veil, was regarded as a badge of subordination, a sign that the woman was under the power of the man. Thus Chardin, the traveler, says that the women of Persia wear a veil in sign that they are "under subjection," a fact which Paul also asserts in this chapter. Now, the symbolic

significance of a woman’s headdress became the determining factor in this dispute. For a man to worship with a covered head was an act of effeminacy, a disgrace to his head, and for a woman to worship with uncovered head was likewise disgraceful, for it would at once be looked upon as a bold assertion of unwarranted independence, a sign that she had laid aside her modesty and removed from her sphere. From this passage it is plain that it was not intended that Christianity should needlessly vary from the national customs of the day. For Christians to introduce needless innovations would be to add to the misconceptions which already subjected them to persecution. One who follows Christ will find himself conspicuously different from the world, without practicing any tricks of singularity];

(1 Corinthians 11:5-6 continued) for it is one and the same thing as if she were shaven. For if a woman is not veiled, let her also be shorn; but if it is a shame to a woman to be shorn [with shears] or shaven [with a razor], let her be veiled. [Paul does not command that unveiled women be shorn, but he demands it as a logical consistency, as a scornful reductio ad absurdum For a woman to wantonly lay aside her veil was an open repudiation of the authority of her husband, and such a repudiation lowered her to the level of the courtesan, who, according to Elsner, showed her shamelessness by her shorn head, and likewise to the level of the adulteress, whose penalty, according to Wetstein and Meyer, was to have her head shaved. Paul, therefore, demands that those who voluntarily seek a low level, consent to wear all the signs and badges of that level that they may be shamed into rising above it. Having thus deduced a law from human custom, Paul now shows that the same law rests upon divine and creative relationships.]

1 Corinthians 11:7 For a man indeed ought not to have his head veiled, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God [Man has no created superior (Genesis 1:27; Psalms 8:6), and, in addition to the glory which is his by reason of the nature of his creation, his estate has been further dignified and glorified by the incarnation of the Son of God (Hebrews 1:2-3), so that, because of his fellowship with Christ, he may stand unveiled in the presence of the Father. Therefore, by covering his head while at worship, man symbolically forfeits his right to share in the glory of Christ, and thus dishonours himself. We are no longer slaves, but sons (Galatians 4:7). "We Christians," says Tertullian, "pray with outspread hands, as harmless; with uncovered heads, as unashamed; without a prompter, as from the heart"]: but the woman is the glory of the man. 1 Corinthians 11:8 For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man: 1 Corinthians 11:9 for neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man [Genesis 2:18; Genesis 2:21-22]: 10 for this cause ought the woman to have a sign of authority on her head, because of the angels. [The argument here runs thus: The rule which I have given you rests upon symbolism—the symbol of the wife’s subjection. But this symbolism is correct, for, as man proceeded from God, being fashioned as a minor representative of God, so also woman proceeded from a man as a minor representative of man, and her minor state is apparent from the fact that she was created for the man, and not the man for her. Hence, women ought not to do away with the veil while in places of worship, because of the symbolism; and they can not do away with the subordination which it symbolizes, because it rests on the unalterable facts of creation. To abandon this justifiable and well-established symbol of subordination would be a shock to the submission and obedient spirit of the ministering angels (Isaiah 6:2) who, though unseen, are always present with you in your places of worship" (Matthew 18:10-31; Psalms 138:1; 1 Timothy 5:21; ch. 4:9; Ecclesiastes 5:6). Here we find Paul not only vindicating the religious truths of the

Old Testament, but authenticating its historical facts as well.]

1 Corinthians 11:11 Nevertheless, neither is the woman without the man, nor the man without the woman in the Lord [means by divine appointment.] 1 Corinthians 11:12 For as the woman is of the man, so is the man also by the woman; but all things are of God. [Lest any man should be inflated with pride by the statement in 1 Corinthians 11:7, fancying that there was some degree of proportion between the exaltation of God over man and of man over woman, Paul adds these words to show that men and women are mutually dependent, and hence nearly equals, but that God, as Creator, is exalted over all. The idea of proportion, therefore, is utterly misleading. To the two reasons already given for the covering of a woman's and the uncovering of a man's head, Paul adds two more.] 1 Corinthians 11:13 Judge ye in yourselves [he appealed to their own sense of propriety, as governed by the light of nature.]: is it seemly that a woman pray unto God unveiled? 1 Corinthians 11:14 Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a dishonour to him? 1 Corinthians 11:15 But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering. [Instinct should teach us that the head of a woman is more properly covered than that of a man, for nature grants it a greater abundance of hair. In Paul's time the hair of a man, unless he was under some vow, such as that of the Nazarite, was uniformly cut short. Long hair in a man betokened base and lewd effeminacy, and we find those who wore it ridiculed by Juvenal. Since nature gives a woman more covering than man, her will should accord with nature, and vice versa. Masculine women and effeminate men are alike objectionable. Let each sex keep its place. And in point of attire it is still disgraceful for men and women to appear in public in each other's garments.]

1 Corinthians 11:16 But if any man seemeth to be [a mild way of saying, "if any man is"] contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God. [Knowing the argumentative spirit of the Greeks, and being conscious that it was likely that some would even yet want to dispute the matter, despite his three reasons to the contrary, Paul takes it entirely out of the realm of discussion into that of precedent. The settled and established practice of the church had from the beginning followed the course outlined by Paul, which showed that other apostles beside himself had either established it by rule, or endorsed it in practice. In this appeal for uniformity Paul makes it clear that all churches should strive to make their practices uniform, not variant. Paul is here discussing how men and women should be attired when they take a leading part in public worship. He will speak later as to whether or not women should take any such part at all in public worship (1 Corinthians 14:1-34-35; 1 Timothy 2:12). We today as males worship with uncovered heads in consequence of Paul's instruction; but not for his reasons. It is now an expression of reverence, which the Jew then expressed by taking off his sandals. "Holland," says Stanley, "is the only exception. In Dutch congregations, men uncover their heads during the psalmody only. "In Western countries a woman's hat has never had any symbolism whatever. We see nothing in Paul's argument which requires us to make it symbolic. The problem in Western assemblies is how best to persuade women to take their hats off, not how to prevail upon them to keep them on. The principle, however, still holds good that a woman is subordinate to the man, and should not make any unseemly, immodest, vaunting display of an independence which she does not possess.] (Commentary on Epistles, Standard Publishing Company.)

01.07. Further Examination of the Topic of Head-Coverings

It would seem unnecessary to add further remarks upon this passage but since in this age we have persons who not only "seem" to be contentious but are obstinately so, we shall continue this examination a little further. We cannot dismiss the subject as Paul did by saying we have no such custom as women praying with uncovered heads or wearing short hair. Some of our women do both. Whether they do wrong or not depends upon what Paul here teaches.

1. In the first place let us observe that Paul is here giving instructions, to regulate the conduct of men and women in a worshiping assembly primarily. These are the things they should do or not do when praying or prophesying. In giving his reasons for these instructions he tells something of the relationship of men and women and therefore something of their general behavior.

2. Let us also remember that it was the custom among the Greeks, the Romans and the Jews for women to wear a veil in the presence of men, especially men whom they honored (See Genesis 24:65; Genesis 38:14-16; Ruth 3:3; Ruth 3:15). It appears that Rebekah did not have on her veil in the presence of the servant but put it on before meeting Isaac. But none but harlots went without veils. They did and they also wore short hair.

3. A woman who was found guilty of impurity was punished by having her veil taken from her and her hair cut off. Thus she was marked as a harlot (Numbers 5:18). (For proof that this was the custom among the other nations as well as among the Jews see the commentaries by Drs. Clark and Macknight and the classical authors cited by them.)

4. The veil was a symbol of submission, subjection, and inferiority. Hence a woman put on her veil when going into the presence of men to express her inferiority. Men took off their hats or head coverings in the presence of women to express their superiority. The custom among men of uncovering in the presence of women, on entering a house, in the presence of the flag, when singing our patriotic hymns, at funerals or burials and in all religious services still prevails. But the meaning of it has changed. Instead of thus expressing superiority, men now do it to show respect, reverence and honor. We have passed through the age of chivalry since Bible times when men took off their hats to express respect for and honor of women; bowed upon the knee before them, kissed their hands etc. But women were not satisfied. They wanted equality. So today women must fight for themselves. They are not respected, protected and guarded as they were fifty years ago, when their honor was avenged by the Gatling gun in the hand of any male relative. Today if they cannot cope with men and keep them from getting the advantage of them that is just their misfortune.

5. Since, in Paul’s day, women did not go into the presence of men unveiled, unless they were harlots, and men always uncovered in the presence of women, and since this custom had a meaning, symbolized the relation existing between man and woman by divine command (Genesis 3:16), of course it was wrong to violate or ignore this custom. It would have been tantamount to a refusal to recognize God’s order and rule, a refusal to admit that man is the head of the woman. Of

course those who thus refuse to obey God could not worship him acceptably. Therefore Paul admonished them to observe this custom. In our day there is no symbolism whatsoever about a woman's hat or head covering among Protestants and men remove their hats for the very opposite reason from that which Paul gives. We would have to change our custom entirely in order to obey Paul's instructions to the Corinthians. This we should be willing to do, however, if Paul was laying down divine laws.

6. The man who says that Paul was giving the sanction of inspiration to the then existing custom with. its symbolism, thus making it a divine law which must be obeyed for all time, is compelled by every demand of logic as well as by the plain facts in the case not only to demand that women wear long hair but that they also always wear a veil or head-covering in worshipping God. According to that position any woman who comes into a worshipping assembly with uncovered head is a rebel against God's authority. She should be withdrawn from if she persists in her rebellion. There can be no escape from this conclusion. But in an effort to escape some superficial reasoner will say "But Paul says in the fifteenth verse that the woman's hair is given her for a covering. Therefore if she has long hair she doesn't need a hat or veil." And he dismisses the subject with a self-assured, self-satisfied, complacent air. He is committed on the one hand to the theory that it is all right for women to go to church bareheaded and on the other hand that it is all wrong for them to bob their hair, and therefore to justify his inconsistent and mongrel idea he adopts, unconsciously no doubt, the sectarian and infidel trick of making one verse offset and contradict another.

Look carefully at the sixth verse. Paul says if a woman will not wear a veil—artificial covering—let her also have her hair— natural covering cut off. How then can any honest thinking man say that he contradicts himself in the fifteenth verse and says, If only a woman will not cut off her hair—natural covering—she may with perfect propriety leave off her veil or artificial covering. The very reverse of what he says in verse six.

It was not the hair or natural covering that was symbolic— the sign of authority, verse 10—it was the veil. All the women who wore the veil had also long hair. Those who threw off the veil in addition cut the hair or even shaved the head. If the hair covering is symbolic, then man's head is also covered!

Now look again at verse 15 and note its meaning. A woman's hair is her glory—something to be proud of, to delight in—for it is given her for a covering. What sort of covering? The one that is a sign of authority to which she must submit as a memorial of Eve's transgression? Is that covering a glory, something to delight in? No. Woman's hair is given her—by her nature, her sex nature, of which of course God is the author—as an ornamental covering in which she may delight or glory. Its abundance and length and lustre make her attractive and beautiful and mark her as distinctly feminine.

What other sort of covering could this verse mean? The longest hair does not cover the body and short hair still covers the head. Inevitably Paul here speaks of woman's ornamental glory—her long hair. On man long hair would be an attempted denial of his sex nature and an effort to appear feminine, hence shameful or disgraceful.

Keep the sexes distinct and in their places even as nature teaches you, is Paul’s argument here. The sixteenth verse shows that Paul was not giving a divine law but discussing customs and the propriety of observing them. It has been thought by some that the apostle here meant to say "we have no such custom" as the one he had been discussing, namely, of women praying with the head covered and men with the head uncovered etc. But this is so obviously wrong that it does not need correction. That was exactly the custom they did have. The translations and comments hereinbefore quoted make the meaning of this verse plain. If any one contends against what Paul had just said he must know that his contention is also against the practice of the churches. The rules that Paul had given were the ones by which the churches were governed. As Brother McGarvey says, Paul here takes the matter out of the realm of discussion and places it in the realm of precedent. But the fact that Paul settles the matter by an appeal to precedent shows conclusively that he had not been legislating on the question. Otherwise he would no doubt have said as he did in Chapter fourteen; If any man seemeth to be contentious, let him take knowledge of the things which I write unto you, that they are the commandment of the Lord. That women have been put in subjection to men is a fact that admits of no dispute by those who believe the Bible, but that the manner and way that ancient women acknowledged and expressed this subjection should be adopted and followed by women for all time is a very different question. Paul’s reasoning was to this purpose: women and men ought to honor this law of God in reference to their relation by those marks of respect which the customs of the countries where they live have established as marks of respect. Whatever is understood as a recognition of God’s law must be observed: whatever is or would be understood as a rejection of God’s law must be refused and avoided. The whole teaching of this passage relates then to the Christian’s attitude toward the custom of women praying with head veiled—artificial covering—and men praying with head uncovered. What is said about long hair for women and short hair for men is a collateral consideration. The apostle just calls attention to the difference which nature has thus made between the sexes and uses that to enforce his argument for those outward, artificial marks of acknowledgment and respect for this difference.

01.08. The Conclusion

We conclude therefore that

THERE IS NO POSITIVE DIVINE LAW REQUIRING A WOMAN TO WEAR A HEAD COVERING IN PUBLIC WORSHIP OR PROHIBITING HER FROM BOBBING HER HAIR. IF THE LATTER IS PROHIBITED THE FORMER IS CERTAINLY ENJOINED. But even though there is no statutory law violated, still

1. If bobbing the hair serves to deny the sex and makes the woman mannish it is condemned by the general teaching of the Scriptures.

2. If bobbing the hair is immodest or flapperish and serves to mark the woman as lacking in piety or in quiet, conservative, refined and cultured disposition, it is wrong.

3. If bobbing the hair is a concession or a giving way to that vicious propaganda which cries against all restraints and all laws under the spacious plea of "emancipating women" strikes at home and marriage and preaches free love and promiscuous sex intercourse, then bobbing the hair is a step toward hell.

4. If bobbing the hair comes from or lends itself to the tendency to renounce religion, denounce the Bible, ignore and deny the difference in the sexes and throw men and women together in a lawless relationship—then it were better that our women cut off their heads instead of their hair.

Now whether or not the practice of bobbing the hair comes from or belongs in any of the classes mentioned, the readers may decide for themselves. But the following page from a moving picture magazine of only a few months ago may help the readers to see what is regarded as the difference in appearance between a girl with long hair and one with bobbed hair. The page consists chiefly of pictures with a few words under each picture. We cannot reproduce the pictures but we give the words and must ask the readers to see the pictures in imagination. At the top of the page we have the headline and the subheadline thus:

BARBEROUS TREATMENT TO THE GIRLS Real Salt Tears, Not Glycerine Ones Were Shed by Helen and Lois.

First picture, a barber cutting off the flowing tresses of a sad-looking, sweet faced girl. Underneath the picture are these words:

"Helen Costello’s hair was long, beautiful and curly. But directors cannot see long hair in snappy modern comedies. With a sob in her throat and tragedy in her eyes, Helen allowed herself to become a shorn lamb."

Second picture, another barber at work with a director standing by and watching. Under the picture these words:

"Herbert Brenon felt like a tyrant, the barber felt like a hangman, when Lois Wilson’s hair was bobbed for ’The Great Gatsby.’ And Lois wept all during the operation."

Third picture, Lois before the operation, back turned and long, thick, curly, beautiful hair hanging far below her waist. These words:

"Lois beautiful hair was the pride of her life." (A woman’s hair is her glory—Bible) "To her it was a symbol of protest against a flippant and flapperish world. She resolutely refused to have it cut, until friends and directors coaxed her to make the sacrifice to the Great God Pep."

Fourth picture, the shorn head of poor Lois These words:

"Curiously enough the bob has changed Lois’ personality. Gone all the old demureness. And in its place an unsuspected piquancy." This page in a moving picture magazine preaches its own sermon. Whether pep and piquancy and a flippant and flapperish appearance is more becoming in Christian women and girls—especially women—than demureness, judge you.

"Look therefore carefully how ye walk, not as unwise, but as wise; redeeming the time, because the days are evil."—Paul.

02.00.1. THE MODEL CHURCH

Title Page THE

MODEL CHURCH

BY

G. C. BREWER

NASHVILLE, TENN.

McQUIDDY PRINTING COMPANY

1919

02.00.2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Title Page.

Introduction by F. W. Smith.

Author’s Preface.

What Constitutes a Congregation.

The Qualifications of an Elder.

The Duties of the Elders.

The Relation of the Overseen to the Overseer.

How Elders Are Made.

How Elders Are Unmade.

The Diaconate.

Dealing with the Disorderly.

Figuring on the Finances.

Church Music.

A Model Church.

Prayer Meeting Topics.

02.00.3. INTRODUCTION.

INTRODUCTION.

THE following pages are intended as a practical application of the fundamental principles underlying the work and worship of the church revealed in the New Testament--an effort to set forth the characteristic features of an efficient church, such as the model given in the New Testament requires. That greater efficiency is needed among the churches of Christ in order to more successfully prosecute the work committed to them by the Master will not be called in question by any thoughtful person. The eldership, deaconship, and general management of the Lord’s business in many congregations is very much below par; and the author of this book has endeavored to point out the trouble, while at the same time suggesting the scriptural remedy. He does not claim for his work the merit of "perfection," as the title would seem to indicate, but merely suggestive and helpful thoughts upon the subjects treated, knowing full well that all human works are subject to criticism and improvement. The author’s position on the "manner" in which elders should be set apart is the same as held by many able brethren, and at the same time rejected by others equally as able. To my mind, it is one of those questions about which a man should hesitate to be dogmatic; and if I understand the author, he has endeavored to occupy a conservative ground on the subject. Some may think he assigns too much authority to the eldership; but a careful reading of his book will, I think, dispel that impression. The book contains so much that is good, suggestive, and helpful in a large degree that I could wish for it a wide circulation among the churches. The author has given much study to the topics discussed, and he deals with them in a straightforward and forceful way, never leaving you to guess at what he means. May the book be productive of much good, is my sincere and earnest desire.

F. W. SMITH.

02.00.4. AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

AUTHOR’S PREFACE.

THIS series of lessons has been prepared as an aid to those who wish to see the congregations of Christians everywhere developed according to the New Testament order. Many church members are in no sense "disciples"-learners-in the school of Christ, and often those who go off after the ways of the world do so because they have never been instructed in the way of the Lord. The people sometimes regard the preachers and elders as "cranks," and what they insist upon as simply their own bigoted notions; and if such people remain loyal, they do so as a matter of convenience, and not from conviction. It is no unusual thing to hear some members in the best congregations prate against the "cranky," "fogy," "ignorant," "backwoods" way of their leaders. Many who do this would not do it if they realized that these leaders are trying conscientiously to please the Lord and striving jealously to maintain his order. There was once a day when the disciples knew the Bible, and any member of the church would detect the slightest digression from the Scriptures in doctrine or methods; but that day has passed, and we need now to teach again the "first princples of the oracles of God." Any one who has observed the management of the affairs of a congregation will readily appreciate the need of such lessons as are here given. Those who read the query department of the religious papers know how frequently these questions come up among the churches. These lessons have been prepared for use by those who see the situation as it is, who feel the distress of it, and who are seeking a remedy for it. These lessons are put in a form for use as a textbook for classes, and it is hoped that whole churches will study them together. All the members must be trained along these lines if any church would become a "model church." This work will supply a ten- weeks’ course of study. Competent teachers or leaders should have charge of the classes, and the work should be under taken in all earnestness. Drills, reviews, and examinations should be held, and no class should suspend work till these lessons are thoroughly learned. All Scripture references should be read, and the more important ones should be committed to memory. The author acknowledges his indebtedness to many men and many books. He claims nothing new for this work except the arrangement. May it be used of the Lord to the glory of his name and to the joy of his people everywhere.

G. C. BREWER.

02.01. CHAPTER 01 - What Constitutes A Congregation.

CHAPTER 01 - What Constitutes A Congregation.

The Church General. The church of Christ, in its universal sense, includes all Christians. It is the family of God; and, of course, it contains all of God's children. There is no such thing known to the Bible as first becoming a Christian and afterwards joining the church. Some men of the present time may teach that sort of doctrine, but it has come as a result of the many religious parties and denominations which now exist, but which are all also unknown to the Bible. Certainly one may become a Christian before one joins any particular religious party, and one may live a Christian and never join any religious party or denomination; but when one becomes a Christian, one then and thereby becomes a child of God, a member of the family of God, which is the same as the church of God. Religious people of to-day frequently have union meetings, in which they convert people, make Christians of them (they claim), and then urge them to "join some church"--to "join the church of your [their] choice." But we never read of anything like that in the Bible. In the days of the apostles people obeyed the gospel, and that added them to the church. It is said that the Lord added them to the church, because that is the Lord's way of making church members. (Acts 2:37-47.) They did not join some denomination or have some preacher add them to his communion according to his rules of receiving members--the rules of his creed. It would be interesting to hear some denominational preacher tell what church the Ethiopian officer became a member of when he obeyed the gospel under the preaching of Philip. (Acts 8:1-40.) In the same chapter we read that Philip went down to Samaria and preached the gospel, and Acts 8:12 says: "But when they believed Philip preaching good tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." There is nothing said about these people joining the church; that expression is never found in the Bible; but are we to suppose that they were not members of the church? Paul went to Corinth to preach the gospel, and we read that "many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized." (Acts 18:8.) Did that constitute them members of the church? If so, what church? If that made them members of the church of God, then, without doubt, we have learned how we may become members of God's church to-day. That they did become members of the church of God is clearly proved by the fact that Paul wrote them a letter and addressed it to "the church of God which is at Corinth." Those who at Corinth heard, believed, and were baptized constituted the church of God at Corinth. If people will now hear the gospel, believe the gospel, repent of their sins, and be baptized into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, they will then be children of God, Christians, members of the church of God; and there is no need for them to join any human organization, with a human head and a human creed, in order to live the Christian life. They can and they should do all the Lord commands them to do in the name of the Lord, and not in the name of some human society; as Christians, and not as Campbellites, as Methodists, as Baptists, or as Presbyterians. But some one may say that there must be some system, some organization, or some understanding before the Lord's work can be done. That is exactly true, and it is the purpose of the following chapters to point out the system that God has ordained. Because the

church of the New Testament is not a great ecclesiasticism, with a human head and man-made methods, no one should suppose that there is not, therefore, any organization or any system about the Lord’s work. The Lord’s plans are perfect; and if his pattern is followed, the Lord’s children will live in harmony and their work will be done regularly, systematically, and enthusiastically. You are invited, therefore, to a careful study of the Lord’s plans. The Church Local. Those who have obeyed the gospel as described above constitute the church of God in any locality. But the Lord has ordained that they should unite their efforts or band themselves together in order to carry out his appointments and to be mutually helpful one to another; and thus they become an organization, which we usually designate as a congregation. The word "congregation" has about the same meaning as the word "church," but we more often use the latter word in its universal sense the "church," including all Christians; hence, all congregations or local churches. The Greek word for "church" is ecclesia and means "assembly." The word "congregation" is from the two Latin words con and grex. Con means "together" and grex means "a flock." Hence, a congregation means a flock together or a flock assembled. To take the word literally, therefore, Christians compose a congregation only when they are congregated or assembled. But we use the word to mean those in a town or community who meet together for worship at a stated place and at appointed times. But the place of worship must be prepared and maintained and the time must be agreed on. This, if there were nothing else, would necessitate some sort of organization; but there are many other and far more important things to be done, and the Lord has ordained that every congregation shall be an organization with divinely appointed officers. There is no organization in the church of God larger than the local church, and every church is independent of every other church and has its own bishops and deacons. No church is, therefore, a model church, does not fill the divine measure, till it has appointed men, who are scripturally qualified, as bishops or elders or overseers or pastors. (All these terms designate the same office.) There may be--yes, there are--many congregations that do not have men who meet the requirements of an elder, and in a case of that kind it is better to remain scripturally unorganized (because not full grown) than to become unscripturally organized. In a band of conscientious and zealous Christians men should soon grow to the divine pattern laid for an elder. The duty of developing elders will be considered in another chapter. But some one may protest that it is not necessary to have bishops in every congregation. In reply it would only be necessary to say that if every congregation is not to have bishops there should be no bishops at all, for it is certain that the bishops of one congregation have no authority to oversee the affairs of another congregation. They have authority in only the one congregation. All the ecclesiasticisms and hierarchies of the present day have come as a direct result of a failure to observe that principle--the principle of congregational independence. If there are to be no elders or bishops at all, what would constitute a congregation, and in what sense would it be an organization? How could order be maintained or discipline be enforced? Nothing is more plainly taught than that the New Testament churches all had elders over them. The mother church at Jerusalem had in it the twelve apostles, but it also had elders--not the apostles as elders, but we read of the apostles and elders. "The apostles and the elders were gathered together." (Acts 15:6.) "Then it seemed good to the apostles and the elders, with the whole church." (Acts 15:22.) The letter to the Gentiles began: "The apostles and the elders, brethren," to those in Antioch, etc. (Acts 15:23.) Paul, who had great anxiety for all the churches and who returned to them again and again to see how they fared, "appointed for them elders in every church." (Acts 14:23.) The Holy Spirit, probably through Paul, had made certain men elders

in the church at Ephesus. (Acts 20:28.) It is evident, too, that the church at Thessalonica had elders, for Paul exhorts that church to esteem highly its elders--those who "are over you in the Lord." (1 Thessalonians 5:12.) The church at Philippi is often called "a model church," and it is certain it had both bishops and deacons, for Paul addresses them as follows: "Paul and Timothy, servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus that are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." (Php 1:1.) If there is any further need of proof, it is supplied by Paul's charge to Titus. To him he said: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that were wanting, and appoint elders in every city, as I gave thee charge." (Titus 1:5.) Paul also gave Timothy full instructions as to what sort of men to appoint as elders, which shows clearly that to set things in order--to perfect each organization and to appoint elders in each congregation was also a part of Timothy's charge. From the instructions given to the churches of Galatia and Corinth we learn that each church had a common fund or treasury into which they put their contributions each Lord's day--contributing as the Lord had prospered them; and this shows the necessity of having some one to have charge of the funds and to look after the disbursements. In the face of all this plain teaching of the New Testament, can any one deny that all scriptural congregations are organized--each one an independent organization, with divinely appointed officers. Membership. It is now in order to consider the question of membership in a congregation. Since God has ordained that certain men should be overseers, it is inevitable that there should be others over whom this oversight is exercised. And these persons must submit to this oversight and in some way make known their willingness to be under the rule, discipline, and watch care of the elders; otherwise there could be no elders, and hence no divine organization. When a Christian severs his connection with one congregation--goes from under the oversight of one set of elders he must, if he wishes to respect the Lord's order, unite himself with the congregation where he goes publicly make known his willingness to be under that eldership. Much teaching is needed on this point. The condition in some cities, and even in some rural districts, is such that the individual drifts from one congregation to another not claiming to be members of any local congregation or church. Such persons are clearly out of harmony with the will of God and are hindering his cause. Again, there can occasionally be found a brother, who is neither as wise as a serpent nor as harmless as a dove, but who is rather more hobbyistic than holy, who will prate against keeping a church roll and against "putting in membership" or "taking membership" with a congregation. But men of that kind would thwart the divine arrangement and defeat the plan of God. How can the elder have charge of persons to watch concerning their souls without knowing who is thus committed to him? And how can he exercise the divine function of oversight, rule, control, etc., unless the persons submit themselves to him? Just such objections as we are here considering have resulted in the disorganized condition of the churches all over the country. They have nullified the work of elders and have robbed the church of the living God of its power in every place where their influence is felt. People hear the gospel and are converted to Christ; but the church, which should offer them a home and spiritual food, recognizes them just long enough to count them and report a "big meeting," and then goes on splitting hairs, wrangling, and riding hobbies, and these babes in Christ straightway go back into the world. Not only is this too frequently the case, but it is also a fact susceptible of demonstration that a large percent of our own children are growing up and either joining some denomination or remaining unbelievers. This condition must not be allowed to continue. If Christianity is not strong enough to impress itself upon one who has been under its influence from infancy through all the years of adolescence--the formative period of life how will it

ever overcome its bitter antagonists? How can we say, "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith," if our faith doesn't even overcome those nearest to us? is the fault in the principle of the religion, or is it in our lives? Is the fault in the faith or in our faith--rather, our lack of faith? These questions get close to the secrets of our lives, and we should all give them careful and conscientious consideration. Too frequently we find people whose faith seems to be in some doctrine, theory, or hobby, and not in Christ. Their efforts are prompted by partisan zeal, and their only exertions in the name of religion are when some opponent attacks what "we" believe; then they will rush with might and main, muscle and money, to the defense of "our doctrine." They love "our doctrine," but they manifest but little love for the millions of souls that are perishing at home and abroad for the want of the gospel of our blessed Lord. They can argue eloquently that only those who hear the sayings of Christ and do them can be saved; they can prove by numerous passages of scripture that one who refuses to be baptized has not done the will of Christ--is a rebel against his authority and command; but they seem to be utterly unable to see that if they fail to contribute of their means as the Lord has prospered them, if they fail to regard the Lord's appointed order in the congregation, if they do not read the Scriptures, pray, repent, and confess their sins, forgive one another, love one another, and bear one another's burdens, they are also not doing the Lord's will--they also are rebels. The worst and saddest of all is that they are self-deceived. They think they are Christians. There are not many of that type, however; and it is hoped that they will become fewer and fewer. Every congregation organized after the New Testament order should be a missionary society and every member a campaigner for Christ. Forsaking not "their own assembling," but "exhorting each other daily," they labor together in mutual helpfulness; and when one member suffers, all the members suffer with him; and when a member moves out of the town or community, he departs with the blessings of the church and with letters to commend him to the brethren wherever he may go. Then they will receive him readily and give him the encouragement and spiritual help that he needs and must have in order to be faithful. Under our present slipshod way of doing things, any sort of schismatic or hobbyist may tear up a church and then go to another and be received and get in his evil work there before he is known; or even one who has been withdrawn from by a congregation for unchristian conduct, incest, or immorality may go to another congregation and be received. We are a long way from the New Testament. In a scriptural congregation, if a member leaves without formally severing his connection with the congregation by asking for a letter, the faithful elders will soon miss him and find out where he has gone, and then communicate with the elders of his nearest congregation concerning him. Yes, and they will communicate with the brother himself, for they watch concerning his soul. So perfect is the Lord's arrangements.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION.

What is the church of God?

Can one be a Christian and not belong to the church?

How does one become a church member?

What is a congregation?

What are the officers of a congregation?

Should every Christian be a member of some congregation?

How does one become a member of a congregation? Answer: By stating his willingness to work with the congregation and to be under its elders. This is all that is necessary where the person is known. If he is a stranger, he should have a letter or some other evidence of his faithfulness.

Is it possible to carry on the Lord's work properly without organization? Can you have discipline without it?

What is some of the work of a congregation?

NOTE.--Do not confuse the duties and responsibilities of the congregation, as such, with the duties and privileges of an individual. If the individual, for instance, puts into the treasury each Lord's as he is prospered, he is not likely to have money to give to other benevolent purposes; but if he wishes to make a sacrifice in that, he has that privilege.

What are the officers of a scriptural congregation?

How many elders should each congregation have?

NOTE.--A plurality. The number should be determined by the size and needs of the congregation, and also by the number of men it has who are qualified for the place. Very few churches will ever have too many.

Over how many churches should one set or board of elders preside?

What is meant by church autonomy or congregational independence?

What is the difference between the elders and bishops of the New Testament churches and the elders and bishops of the Methodist Church and the Episcopal Church? Answer: In the New Testament church a plurality of elders presided over one church; but the Methodist elder presides over a plurality of churches, and then the bishop presides over him; whereas in the New Testament an elder and bishop are the same--two terms for one man. The Episcopal bishop, one man, also presides over a whole diocese.

02.02. CHAPTER 02 - The Qualifications of an Elder.

CHAPTER 02 - The Qualifications of an Elder.

It was shown in the preceding chapter that there were elders in every congregation in the apostolic times, and that it is essential in any well ordered congregation to-day that elders be appointed and duly recognized. Since, then, no congregation is like the New Testament pattern and cannot do the work of the Lord without being thus organized, it is necessary that all Christians be well instructed on all questions pertaining to the organization. What are the qualifications of an elder? How is an elder made? What are the duties of a congregation to her elders. All of these questions are exceedingly important, because if we do not know the teaching of the Lord on these points we can never be what the Lord wants us to be or do what the Lord wants us to do. Again, these questions are important because of a woeful lack of information on these points among church members. The reader is not unaware, perhaps, that there is some controversy on these questions. But, as in some other cases, the controversy, instead of clearing up the matter, has to some extent complicated it and obscured some plain truths. Brethren have talked and argued so much about how things ought to be done and criticized each other to such an extent that there are some good Christians who, not wishing to take sides in a controversy, have given the question no consideration whatever. They have regarded it as something to be let alone. This has been the attitude of many young preachers. They have shunned the question for fear they would start a controversy or cause factions among some of the churches. But these are scriptural questions, and they vitally concern us; and we cannot, therefore, afford to be ignorant of them. No teacher of God’s word is faithful to his trust if he shuns to declare all that God teaches on these and all other questions. Sometimes we hesitate to present what the New Testament teaches relative to the elders and their duties and qualifications because we find our practices clearly out of harmony with it in many instances. This, however, is unworthy of any honest, God-fearing seeker after truth. When the scriptural qualifications of an elder are presented, if any brother who is recognized as an elder finds himself deficient in any of them, let him begin at once to develop the needed grace or condition. If for any reason he finds that it will be impossible for him soon to measure up to the divine standard, let him refuse to be recognized as holding this responsible position among Christians. If he is too sensitive to have his deficiencies pointed out, or if, seeing them, he refuses to get out of the way, that alone is certain and sufficient evidence that he is not fit for the place and should be told by the congregation to retire. He should not be allowed to blockade the Lord’s work. This painful experience will never be necessary if the Scriptures are followed in selecting and appointing elders. Let every Christian, therefore, learn what the New Testament teaches. Let him forget that there was ever a disputed point in this whole subject, and let him study just as if what the Lord says had just recently been spoken to him by the Lord and had never been heard or read by a human being before. Since some (both) of the qualifications and of the duties of the elders are seen in the words that designate them, it is probably as appropriate to give those words with definitions here as in the chapter on duties. No one can be well informed on the important questions we are studying unless he makes a careful study of these words. For instance, it is

sometimes said that an elder is not an officer in the church, and that the place he holds is not to be considered an office. But it will be seen that the word presbuteros, which is universally translated "elder," had that signification both among the Hebrews and the Greeks. Elders were common among the Jews. Every synagogue had its bench of elders. They gave counsel and advice, decided questions, and presided over the people. That they were looked upon as holding an office, and not simply as old or elderly men, may be seen from the following: "And Jehovah said unto Moses, Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom thou knowest to be the elders of the people, and officers over them." (Numbers 11:16.) The Hebrew word for "elders" in this passage is zawkane, and in the Septuagint the word is presbuteroi, which is always "elders" in the English text. An other passage which shows that the word designates an officer is Luke 22:66. It reads: "And as soon as it was day, the assembly of the elders of the people was gathered together, both chief priests and scribes; and they led him away into their council." Here Luke seems to use the word to embrace the whole Jewish court, council, or Sanhedrin. It is true that the expression, "office of a bishop," in 1 Timothy 3:1 is from a single Greek word; and some have contended, therefore, that the word "office" should be eliminated. But the man who objects to the expression as conveying the wrong meaning would have difficulty in translating the sentence so as to omit the objectionable idea. And it devolves upon him to do that very thing. If he objects to the rendering of our standard translations, he is under obligation to give us a better rendering. But can he do it? He might easily omit the word "office," but he cannot properly translate the sentence without retaining the same idea. The Greek word is episcopes, the noun in the genitive case, showing that it is something belonging to the bishop, something of the bishop; hence, most naturally, "office of a bishop." The noun must be so translated as to show its genitive or possessive nature and at the same time to supply an object for the verb. "If man desire the -------- of a bishop, he desireth a good work." Let the reader supply the word--fill in the blank. This noun occurs only four times in the New Testament. It is twice translated "visitation" (Luke 19:44; 1 Peter 2:12), and once "bishopric" (Acts 1:20, A. V.) or "office" (R. V.), and once "office of a bishop" (1 Timothy 3:1). It is plain that it could not be translated "visitation" in the passage in Timothy. It could be translated "bishopric" or "overseership," but that would not change the idea or better express the meaning. The eldership is an office, and there is too much evidence to prove it for any one to deny it if he will consider evidence. Presbuteros itself is a term of rank or office. However unscriptural the hierarchies of present day religious denominations may be, they certainly are unscriptural and even antiscriptural; and however much we may emphasize the blessed doctrine of humility and equality among Christians, it is, nevertheless, a fact that we must not deny that the New Testament churches had men in them holding the office of a bishop--the bishopric or overseership--into which they were inducted by some form of appointment or ordination. And that there was some honor to being thus recognized is shown by the expression, "if a man desire the office of a bishop." This implies that it was something to be aspired to and desired. Again, the precaution against appointing a novice, lest he become inflated with the honor, further illustrates the same point. If we can give people the proper conception of this noble, and honorable work, there will be men to-day who will "desire the office of a bishop," and they will prepare themselves for it. It should be observed that there are several different words in the New Testament that designate an elder. The words are not synonymous, but they very evidently refer to the same person, each one representing some particular phase of his office, work, or duty. These words in English are "bishop," elder," "presbyter," "pastor" or "shepherd," "overseer," and "ruler" ("those

who rule"--Romans 12:8). Let us now learn the meaning of these words, for in them we have many of the duties and qualifications of those who are to do the work of a bishop. These words and their definitions are here presented in a form that can be used as a chart if any class so desires to use them. On the left is the Greek word, first in Greek then spelled out in English. Beneath these is the English word by which the Greek word is or may be translated and the reference in which the word is found. On the right the definitions are given in full from Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. By this method it is hoped that the youngest Bible student may be able to appreciate the lesson from these words.

episcopos

bishop, overseer

(Acts 20:28; Titus 1:7; 1 Timothy 4:1;

Php 1:1.)

An overseer--a man charged with the duty of seeing that things done by others bishop, overseer are done rightly; any curator, guardian, or superintendent; in the New Testament, a guardian of souls, one who watches over their welfare; the superintendent, head, or overseer of any Christian church.

presbuteros

presbyter, elder

(Acts 14:23; 1 Timothy 5:1; 1 Timothy 5:17;

Titus 1:5; 1 Peter 5:1.)

1. Of age--(a) the elder of two; (b) advanced in life--an elder, a senior.

2. A term of rank or office; (a) among the Jews, a member of the Sanhedrin; (b) those who preside over the assemblies (or churches). That they did not differ from the (episcopos) bishops is evident from the fact that the two words are used indiscriminately. (Acts 20:17; Acts 20:28; Titus 1:5; Titus 1:7.) The title episcopos denotes the function; presbuteros, the dignity. The former The former was borrowed from Greek institutions; the latter, from the Jewish.

poimeen

pastor, shepherd

(1 Peter 2:25; 1 Peter 5:2; Ephesians 4:11.)

A herdsman, especially a shepherd; (a)in the parable, he to whose care and control others have committed themselves and whose precepts they follow (John 10:11; John 10:14); (b) metaph, the presiding officer, manager, director of any assembly. So of Christ (1 Peter 2:25); so of overseers of Christian churches (Ephesians 4:11).

proistamenos,

to rule. (Romans 12:8.)

"are over you." (1 Thessalonians 5:12.)

"rule well." (1 Timothy 5:17.)

ruler, president

1. To set or place before, to set over.

2. (a) To be over, superintend; to preside over (1 Timothy 5:17); with the genitive of the person or thing over which one presides (1 Thessalonians 5:12; 1 Timothy 3:4); (b) to be a protector or guardian; to give aid to rule (Romans 12:8, to rule).

hegoumenoi to lead, to rule (Hebrews 13:7; Hebrews 13:17; Hebrews 13:24.)

1. To lead--i. e., (a) to go before; (b) to be a leader; to rule, command; to have authority over; leading as respects influence, controlling in counsel; so of the overseers or leaders of the Christian churches. (Hebrews 13:7; Hebrews 13:17; Hebrews 13:24).

As it is the duty of a bishop to care for, watch over, rule over, and lead a congregation of Christians, it is certainly no matter of surprise that the Lord has been very minute in telling us just the kind of men to place in this position. It is a hazardous business to ignore or to make void any of God’s arrangements. Because men have been honored with the office of a bishop who were unworthy of it, many churches have come lightly to regard the Lord’s appointed. Even in some places the elders (so called) are treated with contempt by some members of their flock. This is bringing God’s order down very low indeed. Either the man should cease to be recognized as an elder or he should be treated with the respect and deference due an elder. But the qualifications of a bishop are many, and are such that no man can possess them and not be a power for good wherever he is. No man can possess all these qualities and not be respected and loved by his fellow men, whether he has ever been appointed to the overseership or not. Christians will naturally seek counsel and instruction from such a man. He inspires confidence and elicits the best there is in one. Let us remove the cause of trouble, then, by appointing men who meet the divine requirements. The qualifications mentioned in the third chapter of the First Epistle to Timothy and the first chapter of the letter to Titus are here given in a tabulated form in the hope that they will be duly impressed upon the minds of the readers. These are quoted from the American Revised Version.

TIMOTHY.

TITUS.

1.

Without reproach.

1.

Blameless.

2.

Husband of one wife.

2.

Husband of one wife.

3.

Temperate.

3.

Having children that believe.

4.

Sober-minded.

4.

Not self-willed.

5.

Orderly.

5.

Not soon angry.

6.

Given to hospitality.

6.

No brawler.

7.

Apt to teach.

7.

No striker.

8.

No brawler.

8.

Not greedy of filthy lucre.

9.

No striker.

9.

Given to hospitality.

10.

Gentle.

10.

Lover of good.

11.

Not contentious.

11.

Sober-minded.

12.

No lover of money.

12.

Just.

13.

Rules well his own house.

13.

Holy.

14.

Not a novice.

14.

Self-controlled.

15.

Good testimony from without.

15.

Sound in the faith.

The first and the second are the same in both Timothy and Titus; the third in Titus is the thirteenth in Timothy; the fifth in Titus seems to correspond with the tenth in Timothy; the sixth and the seventh in Titus are the same as the eighth and ninth in Timothy; the eighth in Titus is the twelfth in Timothy; the ninth in Titus is the sixth in Timothy; the eleventh and the fourth are the same, and the fourteenth in Titus is the third in Timothy. But this leaves five in Titus that are not mentioned in Timothy--namely numbers four, ten, twelve, thirteen, and fifteen. And since they both have an

equal number, this, of course, leaves five in Timothy that are not mentioned in Titus. They are numbers five, seven, eleven, fourteen, and fifteen This, then, gives twenty qualifications that every bishop must possess. But it is claimed by some men that it is not necessary for each elder to possess every one of the qualifications, but that enough men, each one possessing some of the qualifications that another does not possess, be appointed to have all the qualifications in the eldership of each church. This, however, is very obviously wrong. What requirement is it that any elder can afford to be deficient in? Can one be a lover of money provided the others are not? Can one be a brawler if some of the others are not brawlers? Can one be contentious provided the others are not contentious? Can one be unholy, unjust, intemperate, self-willed, soon angry, disorderly, or unmannerly, provided his fellow elders in the same church are the reverse? Considered in this way, the contention appears to be absurd. It was devised, no doubt, to justify some man who had been appointed to the overseership, but who was manifestly not apt to teach. It is no unusual thing these times to find a man professing to serve in the capacity of an elder who cannot lead a public prayer, much less offer words of instruction to the congregation. Yet he has been appointed by the Holy Spirit (?) to feed the flock! This is a travesty on the divine order. If these requirements appear to be rigid, just take time to consider them and see which one any Christian should not possess. Aside from the fact that an elder is not to be a novice--new convert--there is not a thing required in his character that is not also required of every Christian to some degree. The elder is supposed to have these things, developed in his life to a greater degree than the average Christian, because he is older as a Christian than many (not a novice) and because he has (should have) "desired," stretched forward to, or prepared himself for the office of a bishop. Every Christian is to be a teacher (Hebrews 5:12; Titus 2:3-4; Matthew 28:18-20); but a bishop is to be apt to teach, gifted as a teacher, capable to teach, qualified to give instruction, and so familiar with the Scriptures that he can convict the gainsayers and put them to silence. He must by sound teaching be able both to exhort and convince. (Titus 1:9-11.) In saying that all the qualifications are to be possessed by all Christian men in some degree, it is assumed that the expression, "the husband of one wife," means the husband of but one wife. If a man insists that this requires an elder to be a married man, he would also have to insist that the third qualification mentioned in Titus requires an elder to have children; not only that, but his children must be old enough to be believers. If they are old enough and are not believers, the man is disqualified. It seems that that is an extreme view, but it would be best to have men who are heads of families as elders if they can be had and if they possess the other qualifications. And if a man had children who are grown and are not Christians, it would be well to consider whether or not he is not lacking in some of the qualifications of an elder; for it would seem strange that a man measuring up to this high standard of Christian conduct could have the training of a child from its birth and fail to make a Christian of it. Would he be capable of caring for and training the babes in Christ, or would they, too, go astray under his influence and guidance? It should not be thought that the word "blameless" means "sinless" or "faultless." No man is faultless. It means that the man should be irreproachable, unblameworthy in any manner of conduct. He is not "blamed" or charged with any misdealing by his fellow men, but is recognized by all as an honest, honorable, upright Christian gentleman. Each student should get a Bible dictionary and a good commentary, and, with these aids, study carefully every one of the twenty qualifications of an elder. Every congregation that has existed for any number of years should have men in it who possess these qualifications and should be training others for the work of a bishop.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION.

How many words are used in the New Testament to designate an elder?

Name these words.

Is there any difference in an elder and a bishop? An elder and a pastor?

Is the eldership an office in the church? If not, what does the appointing, ordination, or consecration do for him?

How many qualifications of an elder does Paul mention in Timothy and Titus?

Name them.

Does each elder in every church have to possess all of these?

NOTE.--Besides these qualifications, every elder should possess natural characteristics of sense, judgment, tact, ability to lead, etc. A man may may be in every sense a good man and still not have sufficient force or strength of personality to impress his goodness upon others. If a man "rules well his own house," it is pretty fair evidence that he has some ability to lead and govern.

What does "apt to teach" mean?

What does "orderly" mean?

What does "blameless" mean?

Should a man be appointed to the eldership who does not possess the qualifications?

Where a church does not have "material" for elders, what should it do?

NOTE.--If you cannot agree as to the meaning of all the qualifications, such as "the husband of one wife'" take a safe course and do not argue and contend. Strife is deadly; it kills. Contentions are a devil’s stew pot, a witch’s cauldron.

02.03. CHAPTER 03 - The Duties of the Elders.

CHAPTER 03 - The Duties of the Elders.

In this chapter we shall endeavor to set forth just what the Scriptures show to be the work of elders, with little effort to elaborate or illustrate. Every reader who has had any experience in Christian service or who has with any care observed the condition and working of the church will be able to call to mind examples of the disastrous results of not having these duties performed, either because there were no elders or the so-called "elders" were negligent and incompetent. As some of the duties of the elders were shown in the preceding chapter, because they were contained in the terms that designate the elders, so also will some of the lessons of the next chapter be implied in this. It would be impossible to present the elders' relation to their flock without showing by implication at least a part of the flock's relation to the elders. But these lessons are so very important that they cannot be stressed too much. A proper understanding and application of these lessons on the organization of the congregation will revolutionize the majority of our congregations everywhere. Therefore let us make an honest and a prayerful effort to learn fully what God declares to be the work of the elders. We could not begin the effort in a better way than by quoting two matchless passages on this subject from the two greatest apostles--Paul and Peter. To the elders of Ephesus, Paul said: "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood." (Acts 20:28.) To your elders, or the elders that are among you, Peter said: "The elders therefore among you I exhort, who am a fellow elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, who am also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: Tend the flock of God which is among you, exercising the overnight, not of constraint, but willingly, according to the will of God; not yet for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind: neither as lording it over the charge alloted to you, but making yourselves ensamples to the flock. (1 Peter 5:1-3.) Before studying the duties here laid upon the elders, let us notice particularly Peter's negative injunctions. Whatever the elders do must be done: 1. "Not of constraint," or by compulsion, hence reluctantly, but with a willing mind; anxious to serve, willing to suffer, and ready always to do the will of the Lord. 2. "Nor yet for filthy lucre"--not as a means of livelihood. This shows that the elders in the New Testament times were paid by their flocks for their work or were supported while they did the work. But they were strictly forbidden to do the work with a view to the pay. Elders, preachers, or any others who do any part of the Lord's work for money are unworthy. 3. "Neither as lording it over the charge allotted to you." Some have inferred that the elders in this passage were simply the elderly men of the church, because the apostle in the same connection gives an exhortation to the "younger;" but that these elders were the bishops--those who held the office of a bishop--is shown by the fact that they had a "charge allotted to them" and that they were not to do their work for "filthy lucre." Also what is here commanded of these elders is exactly what other scriptures state as the duties of bishops. The word "younger" means "inferior" (Luke 22:26), and here evidently refers to those subject to the elders--those "allotted" to them. Much harm comes from a lack of judgment in applying scripture, and more often from a lack of sincerity; for surely our judgment would not be so faulty if our desires

were right. If a church member is obstreperous, or if a whole church sets out to do something that is not right, when the elders object or protest, they are sure to be told that they are not to "lord it" over the church; and thus those bent on evil will force that expression to license them to ignore the elders and even impeach them. On the other hand, if an elder lacks enough of the divinely required qualifications to be arbitrary and tyrannical, he may take those passages that contain the word "rule" and put a forced construction upon them. But one whose desire is to do the will of God will have no trouble with either of the scriptures. His ideas, whims, and preferences are secondary, and he first seeks to know what the Lord wishes instead of trying to force the Lord to say what he wishes. The elders are to be over the church, have the oversight; but they are not to act as feudal lords and treat their brethren as servile servants. They are not to be arbitrary, tyrannical, or unduly dictatorial. All their work is to be done not for their own glory or gratification, but for the good of those allotted to them. They are the servants of the servants of the Lord. Analyzing the above quotations from Paul and Peter, we learn several of the duties that belong to the elders. Paul admonishes them to--

1. "Take heed to yourselves." In serving God, self always comes first in this very important sense. He who would save a man from drowning must have a firm footing himself; he who would pluck the mote from his brother’s eye must see that there is no beam in his own eye. Before we condemn others, we must examine ourselves to see whether we are in the faith. (2 Corinthians 13:5.) He who would be a faithful workman must first give diligence to present himself approved unto God (2 Timothy 2:15); he who would save souls must give heed first to himself and then to his teaching, for in so doing he will save himself and those who hear him (1 Timothy 4:16). The elders are to be examples for their flocks, and no man can live an exemplary life without taking heed to himself. He must watch his words, his deeds, and his thoughts. He must study the word of God and try earnestly and prayerfully to be what God says an elder must be. How necessary that he who is to take heed to the flock must first take heed to himself!

2. "To feed the church of God." Of all the work that is given to the elders, nothing is more important than this, and nothing is more sadly and shamefully neglected in our day than this often-commanded duty. We cannot live physically without food; neither can we live spiritually without spiritual food. God has provided the food for us, and has ordained that each congregation have qualified men appointed to dispense this food. That is why God has particularly required every bishop to be apt to teach. If a congregation goes wrong for the want of proper instruction, the elders are at fault. But this does not mean the elders are to confine their teaching to certain doctrines, such as faith, repentance, baptism, the sin of using an organ in the worship, etc.; but they must strive to teach all God teaches, teach their flocks to observe all that God commands. Their teaching should not consist entirely in criticisms of the methods of others; should not be altogether negative and destructive. They should have a positive message, and should impress the brethren that they stand for something; that they have something to do and must be about their Father’s business if they would be saved. Their teaching must be constructive, it must build up Christian characters. It is not necessary that the elders do all the teaching that is done, but all that is done must be done under their supervision and with their approval. If there is a Sunday-school class or other Bible classes taught in the church, the elders must oversee the work and know that it is done properly. They should visit the classes or in some other way keep informed as to what they are doing. If any teacher teaches error, he should be corrected and admonished; and if he will

not desist, he must be asked to give up his class. If any teacher is not regular in attendance, does not feel his responsibility, does not prepare his lessons, or in any other way shows a lack of interest, he should be either stirred up to do his work faithfully or asked to quit. Now many elders do you know who show this sort of interest in the teachers and classes of the Bible schools? There are men who do not approve this class system. They think the elders ought to do all the teaching and that all the church should be in one class! That is, they think that if they happen to be the elders. If they are not the elders, they are pretty certain to argue that we should not have elders in the church to-day. It hardly seems possible that such men could be found in a civilized country, but such is the case. For the honest persons who may be troubled by such men let us observe: There are different classes of individuals to be taught and different kinds of food provided for them. This is true without children who are not yet old enough to be members of the church. There are babes in Christ and these must have milk. There are full-grown men in the faith, and these require strong meat. (1 Corinthians 2:6; Hebrews 5:12-14; 1 Peter 2:1-2.) This of course, necessitates in order that the teaching be done to the best advantage. To further illustrate this necessity, we remind you that there are persons who and times when women are forbidden to teach. Yet women are by the same authority commanded to teach. (Titus 2:3-5.) They must be teachers of that which is good. This shows clearly that those whom the women teach must be in a class apart from those whom it is improper for women to teach publicly. Here let us be reminded that all this teaching does not have to be done in forty-five minutes on Sunday forenoon. All churches should have plenty of classrooms to accommodate all the children and the milk-and-meat classes in the church. These rooms should be well supplied with charts and maps and other conveniences for teaching. These classes may meet and study and recite any day or night of the week or as many days or nights of the week as may be convenient. Why do we not have more work like this? Is it not needed? If the assistance of an evangelist is required by the congregation, his work, too, must come under the direction of the elders. How else could a congregation be protected against false teachers? If the elders feel the need of an evangelist, they, with the church, may employ him for two weeks, six weeks, two months, six months, a year, two years, or as long as his services are needed. He should not, however, be allowed to displace the pastors and become the pastor. There are examples in the New Testament of evangelists, apostles, and others who were not elders laboring with churches that had elders. The modern pastor system is not scriptural, and the tendency of our congregations to drift into it is to be regretted. Those brethren who are now crying against it are doing more harm than good, in that they are abusing and misrepresenting--unintentionally, of course--certain brethren who are living with the churches, but who no more wish to change the divine order than they do. Some of the preachers who are now accusing their brethren of digressing in this particular are elderly men and have been preaching many years. Yet what of the churches that they have been preaching for all these years? Are they scripturally organized? Do they have scriptural elders who are doing their work faithfully? It seems that these brethren have waited too long to begin teaching the truth on the organization of the local church. It is a sad fact that some congregations now need the constant services of some evangelist in order to exist, to say nothing about doing the work that a church ought to do. They have men as elders who are not at all qualified, and it takes some outside help to keep down strife among the "elders" and between the "elders" and their flock. At least, that is known to be the deplorable condition of some few churches. Now, if an evangelist lives with a church like that for the purpose of setting things in order and of placing the church in scriptural position, he is certainly doing a good work; and the

Lord help a man who undertakes it. Brethren would better spend their energies trying to improve the condition of the churches instead of wasting them abusing those who are trying to do something. 3. The third duty, as we are numbering them, is to "tend the flock." The Greek word for "tend" is poimanate, and may be translated "shepherd"--shepherd the flock. The imagery here is very beautiful. The church is a flock; Christ is the chief shepherd, and the elders are the undershepherds. As the shepherd feeds his flock and protects them from wolves and bears, thieves and robbers, so the elders must care for the church. They must protect it from evils without and within. They should keep out false teachers. If there is a hobbyist in the congregation, the elders should not give him any recognition as a public teacher, and should keep him from sowing discord among the brethren as far as is possible for them to prevent it. Care is needed here; "for there are many unruly men, vain talkers and deceivers," even to-day. The elders should show the proper spirit in this sort of work, of course, as scriptural elders always will. 4. "Taking the oversight" is the fourth duty in our catalogue. The word for this expression is episcopauntes--one word for the whole expression. It may be translated "filling the office of a bishop," "doing the duty of a bishop," or "exercising the oversight." The one given in the Revised Version is probably the best. We have already seen that all the teaching in the congregation is to be done under the oversight of the elders. We may now add that all other activities of the church are to be directed and supervised by the elders. They do not do all the work, by any means; but they take the oversight and see that what is done by the others is done rightly. Wise men it takes to fill this place! Well may we pray for the Lord to fulfill his words in Jeremiah: "And I will give you shepherds according to my heart, who shall feed you with knowledge and understanding." (Jeremiah 3:15.) 5. To rule well is the fifth duty that demands our attention. It has already been observed that no elder should "lord it over the charge allotted" to him. The qualifications required by the New Testament will prevent a man who is self-willed, self-opinionated, and domineering from being appointed an elder, if the requirements are observed. It is necessary in any well-regulated family, church, or school.that there be a leader, head, deciding voice. In a school the teacher is the ruler; in a family the father is, or should be, the head; and in a congregation elders are the head. (This does not interfere with the fact that Christ is the head of the church. Christ is also the shepherd of the flock, but the elders are shepherds under him.). In a disorganized congregation any officious old sister or cranky brother holds the veto power of the church and may blockade the Lord’s work entirely. This will never happen where the elders are what the Lord has ordained that they should be. They will decide what course the congregation is to pursue in any matter, and their decision will be final. Thus you see the Lord’s plan, if followed, will forestall all factions, disagreements, and dissensions. The elders should always consult together and reach an agreement among themselves on any question before it is brought before the church. Otherwise they might have the unfortunate result of a disagreement between themselves before the congregation, and that would certainly cause a disagreement among the members, for they would take sides with the different elders. When the question for decision is one of mere preference or convenience, the elders should rule in accord with the wishes of the congregation always. If it is a question of who shall preach for the church, the members should have the man they want, if he is sound in the faith and of good report. If it is a question of the time when a meeting is to be held, the people must be consulted. If it is a question of what shall be done with the money contributed by the congregation, the members must help decide it. They should know just what particular phase of the Lord’s work it goes to help and how much to each need. They should know what missionary they help and to what extent. This is

entirely right, and it is also expedient. It will give the members more interest in the work; they will feel a partnership in it; and they can, as they certainly should, pray for it. In all cases where no principle of right or wrong is involved, the elders should have due regard for the wishes of the congregation. The elders should rule their flocks in something like the same way that a kind, tactful, yet firm and watchful, father rules his family. If any movement is started in the congregation that is contrary to the Lord's word, the elders must stand firm for God and put down the evil. If any one doubts that God intends that the elders are to rule in the manner here presented, let him read the following scriptures: 1 Timothy 5:17; Hebrews 13:7; Hebrews 13:17; Hebrews 13:24. Let him also consult the meaning of the words that designate an elder.

6. The elders are to watch in behalf of the souls of their flock. (Hebrews 13:17.) They are responsible for the spiritual condition of their members, and will have to give an account to God for them. Read carefully the reference--Hebrews 13:17. The elders should, therefore, know the spiritual status of each member of the congregation. They should, by a keen watch care over them, be able to see the first indication of indifference, worldliness, or backsliding. They should know whether the member is growing or whether he is deteriorating. They should know whether the babes in Christ are properly nourished, whether they are being fed, and whether they are digesting and assimilating their food.

Are we accustomed to see this kind of watchfulness on the part of the elders of our present-day churches? They rarely know how many members they have, and often they do not even know some of their members when they meet them face to face. Yet these members have been "allotted" to them as sheep to a shepherd, and they are to feed them, tend them, and watch concerning their souls! The elders, in watching on behalf of their "charge," should protect them against dangerous doctrines, false teachings, hobbies, and strifes about words as far as it is in their power to protect them. The elders should instruct their members thoroughly, admonish them often, even in tears when there is danger of their falling, and pray with them much. This is necessary in order to keep some members from falling away. The elders will have to give an account to God for their members. Their blood is upon the elders' heads.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION.

How many duties of an elder can you name? Can you name any that are not discussed in this chapter? What do you think of James 5:15-18?

What is it to feed the flock? What sort of food does the flock require?

Should the elders do all the teaching?

If they do not do the teaching, how can they know what is being taught?

Who should rule over the congregation?

How should the elders rule when the question is one of preference or convenience?

Who is responsible for the spiritual condition of the church?

How should the members be kept from backsliding?

In ruling the congregation, should the elders do things without the knowledge, hence without the acquiescence, of the members?

Should they not rather plan and propose work and lead in it, but always secure the aid and participation of all their members?

Is it not their duty to develop the talent in the congregation?

Should they not make teachers of all the members? (Hebrews 5:12.)

Instead of the elders doing all the work, is it not their duty to see that all work? (Hebrews 10:24.)

When an elder fails to discharge these duties, should he be recognized by the congregation as one of its elders? Why should he be recognized? What entitles him to such recognition and respect? Does he claim it? If so, that shows him to be all the more unworthy.

02.04. CHAPTER 04 - The Relation of the Overseen to the Overseer.

CHAPTER 04 - The Relation of the Overseen to the Overseer.

There must always be an understanding and agreement between the elders and the congregation if their work is either pleasant or profitable. The Lord knew this, and he has made laws to govern their conduct toward each other. The Lord’s laws are perfect, and his way is always best. He knew the human nature before he devised the plan of redemption, and all the laws that he has given to regulate human conduct are adapted perfectly to man’s needs, frailties, and weaknesses, though not always to man’s wishes. All the disorder, misunderstanding, jarrings, and frictions of earth come as the result of the infraction of some of God’s laws. Where his laws are known and properly observed, there is always harmony and peace and perfection. When man and woman lived in their Edenic home and were the companions of their Creator, there was no law given to govern their relationship further than that they should be one flesh. They needed no law then. God’s order obtained, and all things were good and very good. Both woman and man filled their respective spheres as naturally as the fishes swam in the water or the birds flew in the heavens. The question of their inferiority or superiority to each other never troubled them. It was after sin entered the home of man and wrought its ruin that God told the woman that her desire should be to her husband and he should rule over her. A failure to observe this law has made countless thousands mourn. In the interest of the cause of Christ and for the peace and happiness of each local church, every Christian should learn what is the will of God relative to the organization of the local church. Having learned in the preceding chapters that each congregation is to have a board of elders, and having studied the duties and qualifications of elders, it is now appropriate to learn what are the duties of each church to her elders. Let us number the New Testament injunctions to the members of the congregations and take particular notice of them just as we did its instructions to the elders. The members are admonished to--

1. Duly regard the elders. (1 Thessalonians 5:12.) "But we beseech you, brethren, to know them that labor among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them exceeding highly in love for their work’s sake." The word which is here translated "to know" is used Hebraistically and means "to acknowledge," "to respect," or "duly regard." Any Christian who ignores the elders and proceeds with any of the affairs of the church without consulting their wishes or heeding their directions is in flagrant disobedience to this passage of scripture. Any member who lightly regards their admonitions or disrespects their ruling is guilty of disobeying God.

2. Esteem them exceeding highly in love. This emphasizes the first admonition. They are admonished to know and to esteem the elders--not only to esteem them, but to esteem them exceeding highly; and not only to esteem them exceeding highly, but to esteem them exceeding highly in love; and all of that for their work’s sake, or because of the honor of their work, because of the responsibility and dignity of their position. Also men who possess the character and scriptural knowledge and spiritual attainments that elders are required to have are worthy of the

esteem, respect, and love of all men. But it should be noticed that the elders are to be esteemed highly for their work's sake, or, as stated above, because of the honor of their office. Men respect the governor of a State or the judge of a court not because his character merits deference, but because of his position or office. In the light of the above scripture, what shall we say of those church members who speak disrespectfully and, even disparagingly of the elders? Let us try the Lord's way a while, brethren.

3. Imitate their faith. (Hebrews 13:7.) The elders are told to be examples for their flocks, and here the members are told to imitate them. Paul often exhorted Christians to follow him, as he followed the Lord. Every religious teacher should teach by example as well as by precept. We learn to do things best by seeing others do them. Like the village preacher, the elders should not only allure to brighter worlds, but they should also lead the way; and the congregation should be content to follow.

4. Submit to them. (Hebrews 13:17.) When a Christian becomes a member of a congregation, he then and thereby places himself under the oversight of the elders of that congregation. It is then his duty to submit to the elders. When they admonish him, he must hear them. If they find it necessary to reprove or even rebuke him, he must heed. If they give him work to do, he must do it, if he can. From the elders he should be willing to receive counsel, encouragement, and help. And this they will, if they are the Lord's kind, be ready and anxious to give. Sometimes a man comes into a congregation and begins at once to try to change the methods and manners of a congregation, to force the elders to submit to him, and to make the whole church over to suit himself. In some cases the change might be an improvement, but it is assuming too much authority for a man to undertake such a task uninvited and before the people know whether he is either capable or worthy of the task. All members of the congregations, whether they are new or old, must submit to the elders.

5. Obey the elders. (Hebrews 13:17.) It would,be impossible for the elders to rule over the church if the members would not submit to them and obey their ruling. The eldership would be mere mockery unless their authority is regarded. This is the reason many congregations do not have elders to-day--not because they do not have men who could do the work, but because they have members who love to have the preeminence and who do not have the requisites for membership in a Christian congregation. It is very convenient for such individuals to discourage any desire to appoint elders with the suggestion that there is not a man in the congregation who is qualified. Not infrequently they ignore the elders and dispose of them with a contemptuous "they-are-not-fit-for-elders" remark. If the elders allow such as,that, they are truly "not fit." The congregation must obey its elders in all that God teaches, or ask them to retire. If the elders do something that any member considers wrong, he should speak to the elders about it and ask for an explanation. Possibly they can make it clear to him, or it might be that they would see that they did make a mistake. No man is, and no set of men are, past making mistakes. All scriptural elders know that they are not infallible, and they welcome corrections and advice and information. If any decision of the elders is found to be wrong or injudicious, they will correct it. If they do not, they, and not the members, are rebellious. If a man should find it impossible conscientiously to obey any ruling of the elders, there is but one course for him to pursue: withdraw his membership from the congregation. This will never be necessary unless either the member or the elders are obstinate and desire to exalt an opinion or whim of their own above the word of God and the good of the

church; for if it is a matter of fidelity to God, it would be an easy matter to turn to the New Testament and determine what is right or wrong. People who will not obey the elders rebel against the will and authority of God and cannot expect his approval or blessings. God plainly says: "Obey them that have the rule over you."

6. Count them worthy of double honor. We have already learned from Peter's language, forbidding an elder to do his work for the sake of lucre or money, that the elders in the New Testament church were paid by the congregation for their work. That fact is brought out still clearer by Paul in this passage (1 Timothy 5:17): "Lot the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor." The word which is translated "honor" is "times;" and, according to the lexicons, it means "salary," "stipend," "reward," "wages." The elders, therefore, received wages from the congregation, and those who ruled well were to have a double portion, especially those who labor in preaching and teaching. Where are those brethren who used to oppose paying a preacher? Where are those who said it was wrong to give the preacher a stipend or stipulated amount? Did they never read or study this scripture? But some one may object that it is the elders that are here spoken of. Exactly; but the passage speaks especially of those who labor in preaching (logos) and teaching.

If we had any doubt about the meaning of the word "honor," the rest of the passage would show its meaning. "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in word and in teaching. For the scripture saith," Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn. And, The laborer is worthy of his hire." There can be no question as to whether the elders were supported by their flock in Paul's time; that is clear; but the question is, whether the churches should now support in a financial way the elders that rule over them. Why not? Is not this passage meant for us as much as any other part of the letter? Of course no man should do the work for a money consideration; and where a congregation is not able to thus reward its bishops, of course no faithful man would on that account refuse to do the work. Or if any faithful elder--or preacher, either--wishes to support himself and not be burdensome to the church, he has a fine example to follow. That was Paul's course, as we all know. He reminded the Ephesian elders of his course and told them to do likewise. (Acts 20:35.) Where the church is not so large but that the elders can meet all its demands--do their whole duty--and at the same time work for their support, there is no need for the church to support them; but in the towns and cities where the congregation is large and of a cosmopolitan membership, many weak members, a number of babes in Christ, and these completely surrounded by multifarious temptations and every influence but Christian, somebody must tend that flock; and whoever does it will have need to be everywhere at once and to be somewhere all the time. And yet he must have time for study, meditation, and prayer. If he looks after the sick, the dying, the destitute, the funerals, etc., and then prepares to teach (feed) the flock when it assembles for worship, what time will he have to watch concerning their souls, to get personally acquainted with his members and know their wants and needs? What man can make a living for himself and family and then do all this work for the church? Either task will keep a man busy night and day in our times. Every city church of any size ought to support at least two or three pastors (elders), if it cannot support all its elders, while they do their work; for they will all be kept busy if they do the work the Bible requires and the exigency demands. Those brethren who oppose a "pastor" should begin to teach the churches the necessity of supporting their elders so they can do the work. This work must be done, brethren; and if a church does not have men who are competent to do the work, by all means let them import a man

or men according to their needs and ability to take care of them; and if these do their work well, let them be counted worthy of double honor, or stipend. O, how we need shepherds! Our flocks are scattered, our sheep have all gone astray. For the sake of the cause we love, brethren, stop arguing and go to work for Christ. Brethren sometimes say that if a disciple is not strong enough to stand alone or will not do his Christian duty without being urged,coaxed, invited, etc., he is no account, anyway. God's whole arrangement contradicts this. He has ordained that certain men be set apart and supported by the church to tend the flock, to feed his lambs, to watch in behalf of the souls of his children. Let the reader get his New Testament and read carefully 1 Thessalonians 5:12-28. In 1 Thessalonians 5:12 Paul says: "But we beseech you, brethren, to know them that labor among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them exceeding highly in love for their work's sake. Be at peace among yourselves." Now he adds a postscript to the elders: "And we exhort you, brethren." First he beseeches the brethren to esteem the elders, and then he exhorts the elders to encourage the faint-hearted, etc. "We beseech you, brethren," to esteem the elders; "and we exhort you, brethren," you elders, to "admonish the disorderly, encourage the faint-hearted, support the weak, be long-suffering toward all." So God recognized the fact that there would be weak, faint-hearted, faltering, and even disorderly Christians, and he has arranged that these be cared for. It is the duty of every child of God to do all he can in caring for the little ones in the kingdom of heaven, "even these least;" but the work demands that men competent and qualified be enabled to give their whole time to this work. All around us people are perishing who never heard the gospel, and the churches that should be centers of power, cities set on a hill, radiating the light of the gospel into the darkest corners of the earth, are wrangling, slavering, driveling, debating, deteriorating, dying, and going to the devil; and all want of food--real spiritual food--husks of hobbyistic harangues or skinning" sermons from legalistic laggards in the religion of Christ. To all elders let us say, with Paul: "Take heed unto thyself and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood." (Acts 20:28.) To every preacher may we say, with Paul, again "Take heed to thyself, and to thy teaching. Continue in these things; for in doing this thou shalt save both thyself and them that hear thee." (1 Timothy 4:16.) To all congregations say: "We beseech you, brethren, to know them that labor among you, over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them exceeding highly for their work's sake. And: "Remember them that had the rule over you [viz., Paul, Peter, Stephen, James, John], men that spake unto you the word of God; and considering the issue of their life, imitate their faith (Hebrews 13:7.) And: "The things which ye both learned and received and heard and saw in me [them], these things do." (Php 4:9.) And by all means "let us cast off the works of darkness, and let put on the armor of light." (Romans 13:12.) QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION.

How should the elders be regarded by the members of their flock?

Why should they be esteemed and loved?

Should the members follow the example of the elders?

In what way should Christians submit to the elders?

Is a man who will not submit to the elders guilty of disobedience to God?

How far should the members obey the elders?

Is a member allowed to rebel against the decision of the elders simply because he wants to have his own way? If he does, of what is he guilty?

If a man believes the elders to be in the wrong on any matter, what should he do?

How will the faithful elders receive and treat such a man?

If a man charges that the elders have done wrong, how should the other members treat his charges? Read carefully 1 Timothy 5:19. Remember this when you hear the elders spoken against?

What does it mean to count the elders worthy of double honor?

How much of the elders' time will it require to care for the church properly.

How can we find men who are able to spare so much time from their personal affairs?

What proof can you offer that the churches of the New Testament supported or paid their elders?

Is it right to support them now?

Is there not as great demand on their time now as in the first century?

Is the work any less important?

What is the greatest need of the churches with which you are acquainted?

02.05. CHAPTER 05 - How Elders Are Made.

CHAPTER 05 - How Elders Are Made.

It has been said that "poets are born, not made." This is also true in some sense of elders. There is no doubt that some of the qualifications required in an elder are attained by him or developed in his character, and a lack of these would unfit him for the work; and sometimes circumstances of a man's life might render him ineligible for the office or work of an elder. If a man is unable to control his family and his children are known to be guilty of misconduct, to be riotous and unruly, or if his wife is a busybody, a tattler, etc., he is not suitable for an older, although he may not be at all responsible for the wrongdoing of his family. This may seem upon first thought to be unjust, but upon more mature study it will be seen to be both just and wise. Such a wife and such children, especially when they are considered members of the church, are certain to have difficulties with other members of the church, and the husband and father might not be able impartially to decide between them; or if he is, he is liable to be accused of partiality. In the civil courts he would be disqualified as a juror. But, in addition to these attained qualifications, the elder should have certain natural qualifications; hence in that sense he is born, not made. He should at least have good sense. A man who is not normal either physically or mentally would hardly be suitable for an elder. We know human nature by knowing our own nature; and if we are not an average normal human being, we cannot know the feelings, weaknesses, and temptations of others. Some men have by nature what others have by culture and attainment. Some men are kind, gentle, and meek by nature; others have to develop these beautiful graces in their characters; but, whether natural or attained, an elder must possess these. Whatever else is necessary to make a man an elder of a church, it is certain that he must have developed or inherited, or both developed and inherited, the characteristics required by the New Testament. And these should not have come to him in a purposeless and accidental way. He should have been training himself for the work of an elder. Every congregation, and especially its elders, should always be developing and training men with a view to making them elders, at least preparing them for the eldership, so that whenever there is a need for them, either in the church that trained them or some other that they may chance to be members of, they will be ready. We need men who are trained for service in all lines of Christian endeavor, and there is no greater responsibility or nobler work than that which is placed in the hands of the elders of a church of Christ. Let us say, then, that the first essential in the making of an elder is: I. Training. Paul says that "if a man desires the office of a bishop, he desires a good work." In this sentence the word "desires" is used twice, but it is from different Greek words. The first word is oregetai, which means "to reach out after," "to stretch forward to," "to give oneself up to the love of," etc. The second word is epithumei, which means "to wish for crave," or "long for," etc. Either word expresses strong desire, but the first signifies aspiration to obtain, efforts to reach, etc. The sentence might be paraphrased thus: "If a man seeks the office of a bishop and gives himself up to the preparation for it, he is desiring an honorable work." How else would a man stretch forward to the office of a bishop except by preparing for it? How else would he seek it? We could not suppose that he would canvass the congregation and work political schemes in order to

influence the members to elect him. He could only aspire to the office by aspiring to possess the qualifications, to be able to do the work, and to merit the respect and esteem of a congregation that would be willing to submit to him. He would acquire the qualifications only by experience in the Christian life, by growing in the graces of religion, and by the practice of self-denial and self-control. He would gain the ability to do the work by doing it. All the work that is done by the elders may be and should be done by all Christians, except that of ruling and overseeing the whole congregation, which can be done only when the church appoints them to do it and thereby agrees to submit to them. So the man seeks the work of a bishop will learn to teach by teaching; he will learn to admonish the erring by practice. There are always people who need admonition and encouragement, and we are all our brother's keeper. This is another reason why a novice should not be appointed. Paul states one--namely, lest he become "puffed up." But the man who has had the widest experience in Christian service is best fitted for the duties of an elder if he is otherwise qualified. A man who is rich in experience in the ordinary duties of a Christian will be able to perform the work of an elder. In all walks of life the man who most diligently meets the obligations that fall upon him and discharges whatever duties are incumbent is best prepared for promotion--for greater responsibilities and higher duties. So also the man who most faithfully lives the Christian life is best prepared to help others. It is sometimes stated that work of an elder he is then an elder and needs no appointing ceremony to make him an elder. In one sense this may be true; but it is not a systematic, a satisfactory, or scriptural of becoming an elder. If by doing the work a man does not excite jealousies or bring down upon himself the charge of wanting to "run" things, and if the congregation tacitly agrees to submit to him and to be ruled by him, then he is, indeed, an elder. But how often would such a condition exist? Even if that condition should prevail, in ordinary circumstances the man's authority would certainly be questioned if he undertook to discipline the disorderly members. For that reason that manner of becoming an elder is not satisfactory. The following considerations would lead us to believe it is not the scriptural way: 1. In the New Testament the elders were appointed. (Acts 14:23; Titus 1:5.) They did not merely assume the position. It would not have been at all necessary to leave Titus in Crete to appoint elders if no appointing ceremony is necessary. 2. The Holy Spirit has given minute instructions as to what kind of men should be appointed to the eldership. This was all unnecessary if any man who does the work of an elder is thereby constituted an elder. The Holy Spirit would no doubt have given only the duties of elders and said nothing about their qualifications if that contention were correct. If a novice--new convert--begins at once faithfully to do the work of an elder, is he then an elder? If so, the precaution against appointing a novice was useless. If a man who does not rule well his own house does the work which the Scriptures specify as the work of an elder, is he, therefore, an elder? Why, then, was that required as one of the qualifications of an elder? In fact, it seems that the contention that the eldership is not.an office among Christians which a man can enter and hold only by the consent and appointment of those whom he rules, makes useless and even absurd the instructions concerning the character of men who should be made elders. If a woman should do the work assigned to the elders, would she be an elder? Or if all the men of a congregation should do the work of the elders, would they all be elders? This condition could not exist, it matters not how faithfully all the men serve the Lord, because there are certain duties that belong to an elder that a man cannot do unless he is authorized by the congregation to do them. He could not rule the church unless the church agrees to submit to him and to recognize him as an overseer. We conclude, therefore, that after a man has developed or acquired the qualities of

character required in an elder, which has been set down as the first step necessary in becoming an elder, he must be-- II. Appointed or Set Apart. It is believed that what has been said is sufficient to prove that some form of appointment is necessary; but there is no scarcity of proof on this point, and we shall offer a little further evidence. If all men who assume the responsibilities and do the work of elders are by that made elders, Paul would have left Titus in Crete to build up the church and instruct all the members to do the work instead of instructing him to appoint elders to do certain duties. Paul addressed the Philippian Epistle "to all the saints in Christ Jesus that are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." (Php 1:1.) Of course the bishops and deacons were included in "all the saints," but they are mentioned as special individuals among the saints. They were unquestionably persons set apart or appointed to a special work--that of overseeing the flock, as we know from other scriptures. Again, Paul beseeches the Thessalonian church highly to esteem those who were over them in the Lord. How could some men be over the church if they were all privileged to be over it? What would they be over if none of them are subject to certain ones? It would be impossible for the church to obey those who are over it without an understanding as to who they are, and no man is over the church unless the church submits to him. He must, therefore, be placed over the church by some authority. Two questions naturally present themselves here: (1) Who can or should do this appointing? (2) How is the appointing done, and by what ceremony? In answering these questions we shall take the liberty to quote from others who are more able to speak on this subject. After arguing ably and at length to prove that the ordination ceremony consisted in fasting, prayer, and the laying on of hands, Alexander Campbell gives the following directions for appointing elders and deacons: "1. The congregation, after having proved the abilities and capacities to teach and rule found in its own members, and, above all, tested their character as approved by those within and without the congregation, appoints a day for the proper election of its officers. "2. Having agreed upon those eligible, possessing, in an acceptable measure, the qualifications commanded by the apostles, a day is appointed for their solemn consecration to the Lord. "3. The day arrives. The church assemble with fasting and proceed to select members to impose hands on the officers-elect in behalf of the congregation. The persons thus chosen then proceed to impose their hands on the heads of those elected, while all unite in prayer to God that those brethren chosen by them, and now devoted to the Lord as their bishops and deacons, may, feeling their responsibilities, with all diligence and fidelity to the Lord, and with all humility of mind and affectionate concern for the brotherhood, exercise the office with which they are hereby invested in the name of the Lord, according to the true intent and meaning of the Christian institution, as they shall account to the Lord at his glorious appearing and kingdom. The whole congregation then, lifting up their voice, say, 'Amen.'" It will be observed that Mr. Campbell was giving directions for a congregation that was being organized for the first time; hence it was necessary to select certain members of the congregation to impose hands on those who were being ordained as bishops or deacons. If the congregation already had ordained officers, but needed others either to fill a vacancy or because their number was not sufficient to administer the affairs of the congregation, their ordained officers would impose their hands on the newly elected officers. On this point Mr. Campbell says: "It will be remembered that we are writing in reference to a new church-to a congregation coming into the apostolic order; for after being once set in order, it will be unnecessary to select persons to ordain, or to introduce other seniors into a participation of the oversight or ministry of the community. Those already ordained will, for the brotherhood, always act in such matters. They are the standing presbytery or

senate of the congregation." (This quotation from Mr. Campbell will be found in the 1835 volume of the Millennial Harbinger; or his whole essay on this subject can be found in Dr. Brents' "Gospel Sermons," Chapter XX.) It will be observed that in the directions given by Mr. Campbell there is, first, an election, and, second, an ordination. The whole congregation selects or elects the men whom they would have to be appointed as officers over them, and then at a convenient time the officers-elect are ordained or inaugurated by fasting, prayer, and the laying on of hands. The whole congregation takes part in this ceremony also; but only the presbytery, if they have one, selected members if they do not, lay hands on those being ordained or appointed. This seems to be the scriptural order. In the church at Jerusalem the whole "multitude of the disciples," at the command of the twelve apostles, appointed men to serve the church. Notice, there was first an election, then an ordination or appointing. After the whole church had elected the seven, the record gives their names--the names of all those "whom they set before the apostle: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands upon them." (Acts 6:6.) It certainly seems proper that the whole church should select their overseers; for the Lord strictly requires that the church submit to the elders and obey them, and no earthly authority can put a man over the church who is objectionable to the church. Alexander Campbell argues that only members of the congregation should lay hands upon those already elected by the congregation; that visiting preachers or visiting elders from other congregations are not the ones to do either the electing or the appointing. But how can the will of the entire congregation be ascertained? The whole transaction should be participated in by the whole congregation--if in no other way, by the sanction of presence. If any one in the congregation has any reasonable or scriptural objection to anything that is being done, he should be allowed to state the objection, with reasons for it; and it should be considered fully, fairly, and in the spirit of Christ. If it can be explained to the satisfaction of the objector, well and good. If he cannot be satisfied, but if all the rest of the congregation are satisfied that the objection is not sustained by the Scriptures, but that the brother is in error either honestly or willfully, there seems to be no other choice but to proceed with the organization. The brother should be admonished in all meekness and love to abandon the objection. Brother Campbell said the congregation should express its wish by a vote. Many people object to voting in the church, and there can be little doubt that the ordinary business matters of the congregation should not be submitted to a vote. That is why we must have elders. There were objectors to voting in Campbell's day, and in the essay from which the above quotation is taken he treats the objections in his usual vigorous and masterly style. He begins his argument with this sentence: "Some Christians are opposed to voting in the church. They only vote against voting." A number of persons together cannot agree on anything or could not know when they are agreed, unless they expressed their minds or wish in some way. Voting in an orderly and systematic way in organizing a congregation, which would then prevent further voting on every minor question, is far better than letting the church remain unorganized and the work undone, while the members wrangle, dispute, and contend about the "whys," the "whats," and the "whos" of the church. In every unorganized congregation every little question must be decided and settled by the whole body, because they have no officers to administer their affairs. Either all questions must be submitted to the whole body, or else some self-appointed man or men must assume arbitrarily to manage the business of the church; and men who assume such authority are usually unsuitable for the place and objectionable to a large number of the members. But if the congregation does not submit to them, there will always be strife. God's way is best. Let us sacrifice our opinions and be governed by his

word. We have cited one New Testament example to show the directions Brother Campbell gave are scriptural, and we might say that all the cases of ordination in the New Testament are the same. On this point allow this quotation from Conybeare and Howson: "In all cases, so far as we may infer from the recorded instances in the Acts, those who were selected for the performance of church officers were solemnly set apart for the duties to which they devoted themselves. This ordination they always received, whether the office to which they were called was permanent or temporary. The church, of which they were members, devoted a preparatory season to 'fasting and prayer;' and then those who were to be set apart were consecrated to their work by that solemn and touching symbolical act, the laying on of hands, which has been ever since appropriated to the same purpose and meaning. And thus, in answer to the faith and prayers of the church, the spiritual gifts necessary for the performance of the office were bestowed by Him who is the 'Lord and Giver of life.'" ("Life and Epistles of Paul," Volume II., page 437.) Those who object to laying on hands say that it was done for the purpose of conferring some spiritual gift. In reply to this it is usually argued that none but the apostles could confer spiritual gifts by the imposing of hands, and we know that others than the apostles laid their hands on those being ordained or set apart for service. (Acts 13:1-6.) In the Old Testament they practiced the laying on of hands as a ceremony of consecration, and not for the purpose of conferring a gift. The children of Israel laid their hands upon the Levites to consecrate them to the priesthood, and we could hardly suppose that it would be contended that the children of Israel could confer the Holy Spirit. (Numbers 8:9-10.) Luke does not give any account of the institution of the eldership, as he does of the diaconate, perhaps because this same office was a well-known feature of the Jewish synagogue. The synagogue naturally served as a model in the organization of churches. On this point Brother David Lipscomb says: "So God set Moses and the elders the judges to decide the difficulties that would rise among the Jewish people. These elders in the different tribes, families, and cities continued to adjudge the difficulties and settle differences until the days of Jesus Christ. This order of elders, with their duties, was by Jesus and the Holy Spirit transferred to the churches of God, and the same duties seem to have followed them." ("Queries and Answers," page 142.) We may well suppose that the Old Testament manner of ordination followed them also. If any reader is inclined to think that there is no appointing or ordination ceremony needed now, he should ask himself by what consistency could we retain an officer and yet eliminate the office; and if we retain both officer and the office, how can we eliminate that which is essential to induct him into the office? How can a man be placed in any office without some form of election, initiation, inauguration, consecration, or ordination? While the plan suggested by Brother Campbell is held to be scriptural and we recommend it, it must be understood that it is not the purpose of these lessons to contend for any plan or theory. The Lord's work must be done if we desire to please him and to receive his blessings, and all Christians, of course, want to follow the New Testament order in both work and worship; but where there is a difference of opinion as to why a certain thing was done, it would be poor judgment to let that difference interfere with the work. We must not neglect to appoint elders in some way--some way satisfactory to the congregation to be allotted to them. Never mind whether it is satisfactory to all the editors and preachers in the brotherhood or not. They differ; and we cannot, therefore, follow all of them. Let us earnestly and prayerfully try to learn for ourselves what God teaches and follow that. Do not let the things said herein stir up a controversy, but rather let them provoke you to love and good works. The author of this book believes that the appointing should be done as indicated in the preceding paragraphs, but he does

not contend that it cannot be done acceptably in any other way. So far as he has been able to see, that is the method used in all the cases that are reported in the New Testament; but there are some good brethren who contend that hands were imposed in those cases to confer the Holy Spirit, and out of deference to that view it is thought best to leave the manner of appointing optional with the congregations. The author has, however, clearly shown his views in the matter, and he has done so intentionally; but he is willing to concede that it is a debatable question, and he does not, therefore, dogmatically contend that no way is acceptable which does not include the laying on of hands. He does contend, however, that the practice of most of our congregations of the present time is wrong. The result of such practice is all the proof that needs to be cited. The appointing is done without any sort of solemnity or ceremony, and it is most frequently done without the acquiescence of the congregation. Somebody nonchalantly announces that Brother ----- will, after two weeks, be an elder of the congregation if no one objects. Those members who happen to hear the announcement pay about as much heed to it as they do to the announcement of a midweek prayer meeting. The two weeks expire; and no objection having been offered, Brother ----- is an elder! That is one way that is in use to-day. Other congregations wait till some preacher comes along and appoints elders all on his own authority; or if he gets suggestions, they come from some few members who may have personal reasons for their choice. Either method is sadly, shamefully, and manifestly wrong; and the results of either process when not entirely negligible are disastrous. This is a serious matter, and it should be seriously attended to. If a congregation about to appoint elders or deacons cannot agree to follow the New Testament custom and lay hands on them, thinking that it was done in those cases to confer a gift, let them at least not dispense with all solemnities and ceremonies. Let the whole church acquiesce in the formalities in some way, so that it can be truthfully said that the elders thus made are over them in the Lord. Let them submit to the elders. Appointing elders is a very important and far-reaching step. It is full of possibilities, both of good and of evil. Such a step should always be attended by fasting and prayer. Why eliminate the fasting and prayer even if we do refuse to lay on hands? Do we not need it as much as the apostles and other inspired and Spirit-guided men of the New Testament did? Some of our present day congregations never did anything in the history of their work that they regarded as solemn and serious enough to fast and pray over. It is small wonder that there are factions and strife among them. Let us return to the New Testament pattern, brethren, and have qualified men selected by the congregation and duly appointed to the eldership; let; the elders rule well, and let the church submit to them and obey them, "esteem them exceeding highly in love for their work’s sake." That would mean a new day in the history of the church in our country. God speed the day! For the aid of those who may wish to appoint elders without the laying on of hands the following program is suggested. It will make the act solemn and impressive, and it will also be the act of the whole church. It is given, however, simply as a suggestion, and it may be modified by those who lead in the service as they may think proper.
THE ORDINATION OF ELDERS.

PROGRAM.

Those who are to be appointed having previously been selected by the congregation for their overseers, the whole church assembles to ordain or appoint them, to inaugurate them; or if these terms are not pleasing to the feelings of all, lot us say that they have come together publicly to acknowledge their elders. The meeting has been repeatedly and thoroughly announced, and every

member has been urged to be present. When the whole church has assembled with solemn purpose and the elders-elect have taken the front seat, the following order may be observed:

1. Hymn.

2. Scripture reading. (1 Timothy 3:1-7; Titus 1:5-9; 1 Peter 5:1-4.)

3. Prayer.

4. Hymn.

5. Sermon or talk on eldership.

6. The evangelist, or the leader, asks the elders-elect to stand and face the audience; and when they have done this, he says: "These are the men, brothers and sisters, that you have elected to serve this church as overseers; and now, to assure these men that you have chosen them for that office, and to actively express your approval of the steps now being taken, I shall ask you to answer this question: Do you, as members of the ------ church of Christ, now publicly acknowledge that you have chosen these brethren to be your overseers, and do you now agree to submit to them and to obey them in all things that God has commanded them as bishops of the church to require of you? If this be the sense of the congregation, you will please signify it by standing." (Let the whole audience stand.) When the people have resumed their seats, the leader turns to the elders-elect, who are still standing, and asks.: "Do you, John Loyal and James Faithful and Philip Worthy and Cephas Humble [the leader will call their real names], who have been so highly honored by the people of God as to be chosen to lead them and to direct their affairs, now accept this charge, and do you solemnly pledge yourselves to this church in the sight of God, to whom you shall account for every member of this body, to learn and to perform the duties of your office to the best of your understanding and ability?" Each one shall answer for himself. "I do." Then shall the leader say. "This, then, brethren, seals the covenant. You and the other members of this church have entered into a solemn agreement. They have honored you by placing you in the most exalted, because the most responsible, position in the whole church of God. You are now their bishops, and they have placed themselves under your oversight. You have promised to lead them, to feed them, and to watch concerning their souls. In order to perform these duties faithfully, you will have need of the help that comes from God; therefore let us now invoke his blessings on what we have here done."

7. Prayer.

8. Hymn.

9. Benediction.

10. Congratulations and general handshaking.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION.

What is the first step necessary in making an elder?

Name some of the qualifications that an elder must have by birth. Name some that he may have by birth.

How can a man who desires to be an elder acquire the ability to do the work?

If a man assumes the position of an elder, is he, therefore, an elder?

If some member of the congregation should deny that such a man was an elder and refuse to submit to him, could there be any action taken against him, or against the members?

What is the second step necessary in becoming an elder?

Give, in full, the steps Brother Campbell said should be taken in appointing elders and deacons.

What do some people think the laying on of hands was for?

Could you find some place in the Bible where they imposed hands as a ceremony and not to confer the Spirit?

If we eliminate fasting, prayer, and the laying on of hands from our appointing ceremony, in what would the appointing consist?

Granting that there is no need to lay on hands, is there any reason why we should eliminate the fasting and prayer?

Did your congregation or the leaders of your congregation, as a body, ever fast and pray over anything?

Who should elect the elders?

Who should appoint them?

Does your congregation have elders?

If so, how were they appointed?

Is the congregation in submission to them?

If not, would it not be best for the congregation to all together solemnly agree to submit to them and obey them and by that place them "over you in the Lord?"

If that is not scriptural, what is?

Should personal animus lead any one to endeavor to find fault with the elders and pronounce them unfit?

Should personal preference or favoritism cause any one to suggest or nominate a man for the eldership?

To avoid this, would it not be best that making elders be done with fasting and prayer?

Is fasting and prayer ever wrong except when it is done to be seen of men?

If we feel at liberty to leave off the fasting, can we afford to omit the prayers?

The whole future welfare, the growth and prosperity, and the final salvation of the congregation depend, to a great extent, upon the kind of men who are placed as elders over it. Should not every member, therefore, be interested? Should not the whole proceedings be seriously, earnestly, and

prayerfully carried out?

02.06. CHAPTER 06 - How Elders Are Unmade.

CHAPTER 06 - How Elders Are Unmade.

Frequently this question is asked: "If a man is once an elder, is he not always an elder?" it seems strange that such a question would be asked, but we hear it often. It is just another evidence of the lack of information on these questions that is seen everywhere. After we have learned the lessons on the nature of the office of a bishop and how it is entered, there will be no such difficulty as the above question implies. Some men have contended that if a man is once an elder he is always an elder. One advocate of that view says that an "elder can no more resign his eldership than a mule can resign his muleship." Now, it will have to be admitted that there is a striking resemblance between the present-day eldership in some places and the "muleship" of our well-known hybrid. And his chief characteristic is plainly displayed by an elder (?) who insists that if he was once an elder he is an elder forever; that he cannot resign; that he cannot be impeached or recalled or any other way unmade. The men who hold that view contend also that the eldership is not an office. They oppose any appointing ceremony, and affirm that any man is an elder if he does the work of an elder. O, some of them might say that he must possess the qualifications; but any man who will assume the position will also assume that he possesses the qualifications. He will stoutly contend that he has them all. And who shall tell him that he does not possess them? If no one has the right to tell a man when he is an elder, who shall tell him when he is not an elder? If the congregation has no right to set men of its choice over it, what right has it to deny that any man is its overseer if he assumes to be? The whole position is absurd. No man is an overseer of a congregation unless he is elected and appointed by the congregation to that office, and the same authority that puts men into that position can take them out if there is a reason that would justify such a serious step. When elders are made, they and the congregation enter into a solemn agreement, and this agreement should be sacredly regarded by both. No one should think of breaking the covenant or of undoing the arrangement without the best of reasons. If such reasons exist, they should be carefully and prayerfully weighed before any action is taken. The Lord was asked to recognize and bless the action when the man was made an elder, and now the action must not be rescinded unless it is plain that the Lord is not pleased with the man’s conduct and would not recognize him as worthy of so responsible a place in his church. Then the Lord can be invoked to bless the proceedings against the brother. The Lord made Saul king of Israel; but when Saul proved unsuitable for the place, the Lord reversed his act and deposed Saul. Therefore even if a man is appointed to the eldership by fasting, prayer, and the laying on of hands, there is no reason why he may not be deposed if the good of the church demands it. The following are some reasons that would justify a congregation in retiring an elder and in placing another man in his position: 1. If an elder fails to do the work of an elder, the work he was ordained to do, he should not be considered a bishop or treated as the New Testament requires Christians to treat the bishops. But some formal action should be taken against him. It is no unusual thing to see members of a church refuse to respect and recognize the so-called "elders," but those elders continue to be "bosses" and to claim authority. When an elder fails to do the work required of an elder, he must be

impeached and some one else put into his office who will care for the congregation. It matters not what caused the failure, if it is a failure, the work must be done and somebody must be appointed for it. If the man has failed because of negligence and indifference, of course his would be a "dishonorable discharge." He might fail through incompetency, but this would not occur if proper care were used in appointing men; or a man might fail through ill health. In either of the two last-mentioned cases the man should be treated with all kindness, courtesy, and love; but some one must do the work which he cannot do. He ought to get out of the way voluntarily. 2. If an elder loses his qualifications, be should be recalled. Any man who believes in the possibility of apostasy will surely not deny that an elder can lose his qualifications. Many good men go astray. Preachers and elders are not exempt. A man who was once appointed to the eldership of a large congregation became guilty of atrocious sins, was indicted in the civil courts on capital crimes, fled the country, and is now a refugee from justice. Perhaps some gentle, consistent, and sweet-spirited hobbyist will insist that he is still an elder or overseer of the church of God and watches concerning the souls of the flock. When an elder loses his qualifications, the congregation should take formal action to depose him, whether he is criminal or not. He may just be worldly and unconcerned about the Lord's work. An elder may lose his qualifications through old age and a failure of physical and mental strength. Where that is true, the above directions do not apply. The aged brother must be allowed to retain all the honor, but some one else will have to do the work. Great care must be used in such a case. 3. If an elder becomes unacceptable to a congregation, he should be retired if he will not voluntarily resign. A man cannot be over people who will not be under him. When an elder finds that he is objectionable to the congregation, that they will not heed his instructions and will not take his advice, he should resign. Even if the aversion was caused by his loyalty to God's word, he would as well resign; for he has lost his influence with the people and he cannot check the error. It will never happen, however, that a whole church will turn against a man for such a cause unless his manner is at fault. When an elder is appointed, he is the choice of the congregation. He was elected by the members to be over them in the Lord. They put themselves under his watch care, and they promised to submit to him and to obey him in all that is right. They should, therefore, remain true to the agreement. If they do not, God will judge them. A true elder is the Lord's appointed; and if the members rebel against him, they are disobedient to God. Any action taken against an elder except for scriptural and righteous reasons is treason against Jehovah. Remember Miriam. (Numbers 12:9-10.) But if an elder has become inflated with the honor conferred on him and desires to show his authority to the extent that he is arbitrary and domineering and demagogical, he should be impeached. Let him remember Saul. (1 Samuel 15:17-23.) If an elder shows partiality in dealing with the members and after due admonition refuses to correct the fault, he will lose his influence and power over the members. If an elder lacks patience, loses his self-control, and becomes angry when dealing with the problems of the brethren--if he does this habitually--he will not be loved and respected by his members, and he will eventually cease to be acceptable to them, and he could not, therefore, do the work of a bishop. He should not, then, continue in the office of a bishop. If an elder does anything habitually that is not worthy of emulation or that could not be held up as an example before those young men in the congregation who aspire to the office of bishop, he should be asked to resign. Elders must "become ensamples to the flock." (1 Peter 5:3.) If for any reason an elder loses his influence with his people or becomes odious to them, he can no longer do for them what an elder is ordained to do, and the circumstances demand his resignation. The congregation, of course, must be

longsuffering and forbearing, and must overlook such faults and foibles as are common to men. If an elder is gentle and humble and shows a willingness to hear suggestions; if he frequently confesses his faults and asks for the prayers of his congregation, he need not fear that mere imperfections will render him unacceptable to his people. It is the man who loves the preeminence, the self-important man, who excites contempt. The man who disregards the wishes of his people and insists upon his own way (he must have his preacher, his song book, his time for the meeting, etc.) is the man who becomes obnoxious. He ought to be retired. It must be remembered that all public men are criticized; and, therefore, the mere complaints of critics against an elder must not be countenanced. They should not be allowed. The faithful Christian should rebuke the critics every time unkind criticism is heard. All this, however, is thoroughly covered in the scriptures that teach Christians to esteem the elders highly in love. When formal action is to be taken against an elder, the whole congregation should come together in solemn session. Every step should be taken with due deliberation and with fasting and prayer. No personal feeling should be allowed to the into the transaction, and no accusation against the should be considered unless it comes through two or three persons, and those persons must not be in any sort of league. (1 Timothy 5:19.) Personal grievances should not be heard on such an occasion. They must come up at another time. If the accused elder confesses his shortcomings and manifests his desire to do better, he should be retained unless the offense is such that it would forever stain his reputation. In such a case he must, if he is penitent, be retained in the church, but not in the eldership. The spirit of Christ and brotherly love will be a guarantee against error in such proceedings. Any such action that is not controlled by such a spirit will be a miserable failure and will bring reproach upon the cause of Christ. In such a meeting the other elders--those not accused--will have charge and will conduct the deliberations. In a case where all the elders are unacceptable to the congregation, outside help must be invited. Godly men from some other congregation and some faithful evangelist should be brought to the scene of trouble, and perhaps through their mediation and prayers a reconciliation can be effected. Think of the elders being in league against their flock and the flock up in arms against the elders! Could a more disgraceful thing be imagined? It has been known to occur in these wicked last days. Such things come, however, as a result of our unscriptural practice--loose, careless way of appointing elders. When the churches begin to fast and pray over that all-determining act, these things will not occur. When they do occur, there is sin somewhere. It is either on the part of the elders or of the congregation, and most likely both. Why self-respecting men will insist that they are the overseers of a congregation when they know that the congregation is not under them, will not submit to them, and does not respect them, is beyond comprehension. It certainly needs psychological explication. But let us suppose that where the whole congregation is antagonistic to the elders cause the congregation wants to depart word of God and bring in some unscriptural practice and the elders will not allow it. If that be the trouble, then the elders are exactly, and they are unquestionably doing what God ordained them to do in keeping down such digression. But they should be patient and gentle, and should manifest a spirit of earnestness in trying to show the people the error. If they will make it clear that they are not opposing this movement simply to show their authority, but because it is wrong, they will convince some of the members. If they will show that it is their love for the word of God, and not pure "mulishness" on their part that causes them to stand against the innovation, they will save some of the members, perhaps a majority of them, and thus they will save the church and put down the wrong or force the wrongdoers to withdraw from the congregation. The elders must be sure that it

is the WORD OF GOD, and not their own word, not a partisan doctrine or prejudicial whim, that they contend for. They should meet with the members and hear their complaints and their desires and discuss them fully; and if error is advocated, they should point it out in gentleness and love. That is their work. They should be able to teach the congregation what God has revealed on all questions. Where the elders just persist in directing the affairs without regard for the wishes of the congregation, ignoring their complaints and vetoing their suggestions, without giving reasons, they need not be surprised if the whole congregation quits or divides and forms another congregation and builds another house of worship. If such a thing happens under those conditions, THE ELDERS ARE AT FAULT. The cases that have been observed by us came as a result of such behavior on the part of the elders. They would not meet with the congregation and discuss the cause of trouble. They would not agree to call in disinterested brethren and lay the charges and counter charges before them. They would make no concessions whatever, but assumed to rule with an iron hand. Yet the congregation was not in submission to them, was not willingly under them, did not respect them, and would not obey them. Consequently there was no peace, no harmony, no worship, no fellowship, no love, and no Christianity. Our greatest need is Christianity--just simple, primitive, New Testament Christianity. That would prove a panacea for all our ills. Let us try faithfully to follow Christ, "doing nothing through faction or through vainglory, but in lowliness of mind each counting other better than himself; not looking each of you to his own things, but each of you also to the things of others. Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross." (Php 2:3-8.) "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and railing, be put away from you, with all malice: and be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ forgave you." (Ephesians 4:31-32.) Paul, the apostle of Christ and the prisoner of the Lord, allow a man to control its affairs, why even now beseeches "you to walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called, with ALL LOWLINESS and MEEKNESS, with LONG-SUFFERING, FORBEARING ONE ANOTHER IN LOVE; giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." (Ephesians 4:1-4.) "If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he.is none of his." (Romans 8:9-10.) Where these scriptures are observed, there will never be a "church fuss." We must abandon our hobbies and return to God’s word if we expect to be saved.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION.

Can an elder resign his position?

If he moves away from a church, is he still one of its elders, and does he have the oversight of it?

When he contemplates such a change, should he not publicly surrender his claim, show an interest in having some one take his work, and ask the congregation to release him?

Can an elder ever be recalled, deposed, or retired?

If so, who has power to take such action?

By virtue of what does an elder hold his position?

If no one has power to remove an elder, who has power to make one?

If the congregation has no power to refuse to allow a man to control its affairs, why could not any presumptuous egotist assume control?

On what grounds would a church be justified in taking action against an elder?

In what spirit should such steps be taken always?

If an older is unacceptable to a congregation, can he do the work God teaches an elder to do?

Can a man be over a congregation that will not be under him?

When such a condition exists, does it not indicate that there is sin there; that the Scriptures are being disobeyed by one side or both sides to the dispute?

Should they not, therefore, come together and discuss the trouble, locate the sin, and correct it?

What will cause an elder to become unacceptable to his people?

Would an elder who possesses all the qualifications be guilty of those things?

Will a congregation that follows the word of God become dissatisfied with scriptural elders?

If it does, of what is it guilty?

In order to keep the people from growing tired of an elder, would it not be well for him to study in order to have new thoughts and lessons for them?

Should an elder not also keep himself in the background as much as possible, overseeing the work, but allowing others to do it?

Must not the elders develop the talent in the congregation?

Quote Ephesians 4:1-7; Ephesians 4:31-32; also Php 2:1-11.

NOTE--Let the teacher see that these passages are memorized by each member of the class. Every Christian should know them. Do not play at studying these important lessons. If your class is not really in earnest, you would better quit.

02.07. CHAPTER 07 - The Diaconate.

CHAPTER 07 - The Diaconate.

If we confine our study of the diaconate to the English version of the New Testament, our information on that subject is likely to be rather fragmentary and unsatisfactory; for though we find the deacons distinctly mentioned as a special class of servants in the church and though there are some very strict requirements given for those who would serve as deacons, we are not given any undisputed history of their origin and but little information with regard to their functions. We are accustomed to gain a great deal of information from the sixth chapter of the Acts, but we must remember that those seven who were appointed to see that the Hellenistic widows were not deprived of their share in the "daily ministrations" are nowhere called "deacons" in the English Scriptures. The Greek word which designates them is diakonos, and it is afterwards employed to designate those who were appointed to the diaconate; but its primary meaning was simply "minister," "servant," or " attendant," and it is used many times in the New Testament to designate any servant--used without any technical or official signification whatever. It is even applied to the Christ in Romans 15:8. Paul says Christ "was made the minister [diakonos] of circumcision." The same apostle several times calls himself a "minister" (diakonos) of God. (See 2 Corinthians 6:4; Ephesians 3:7.) It is difficult, therefore, to determine whether the seven were the same officers or servants, if you prefer it, mentioned by Paul in Php 1:1; 1 Timothy 3:8. The word diakonos occurs some thirty times in the New Testament, and only about four times is it used as an official designation. In point of time the earliest mention of deacons as officers or appointed servants in the church is found in the salutation of the Epistle to the Philippians (unless we consider Phoebe an officer in the church, which is probable, but not certain). A little later in the history of the church we find Paul giving Timothy careful instructions as to the qualifications of the men who were to be appointed to the diaconate. It is certain, however, from these references, that the service of deacons was already established when these Epistles were written. How long it had been established, we cannot definitely determine. It is pretty generally assumed that the ministry of deacons began with the appointment of the seven at Jerusalem, but this is not undisputed. Some very reputable scholars insist that an order of deacons had existed in the church even before that time. As the word presbuteros means more than simply elderly or aged, likewise the word neoteros means more than younger in years, or youthful. It is thought, therefore, that the elder and the younger in the infant church were the same class of servants who were afterwards called the "bishops" and the "deacons." The young men mentioned in Acts 5:6-10, who attended to the burying of Ananias and Sapphira, are by some supposed to be the deacons. It is also thought by some Bible scholars that the diaconate, like the eldership, was borrowed from the Jewish institutions. They claim that there was a class of servants or attendants in the synagogue that corresponded to the deacons in the Christian church. The twentieth verse of the fourth chapter of Luke is used to support this inference. The word for "attendant" in that verse is synonymous with diakonos, and, of course, may designate any servant or a special class of servants. Every man is left free to form his own opinion about the meaning of the word in this verse, and no one can say

definitely that he is right and the other man is wrong. We are practically shut up to one passage of scripture in the study of the service of deacons. Let us, therefore, quote it in full: "Deacons in like manner must be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre; holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience. And let these also first be proved; then let them serve as deacons, if they be blameless. Women in like manner must be grave, not slanderers, temperate, faithful in all things. Let deacons be husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well. For they that have served well as deacons gain to themselves a good standing, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus." (1 Timothy 3:8-13.) From this passage we learn that those who would serve as deacons must possess the following qualifications:

They must be grave, or sober-minded.

Not double-tongued, or two-faced.

Not given to much wine.

Not greedy of filthy lucre--no lover of money.

They must hold the mystery of faith in a pure conscience.

The husband of one wife.

Ruling well their own houses.

From these requirements we would naturally suppose that the deacon’s work is of some importance. They are not as numerous as those stipulated for the elders; but they embrace the most important ones, except the deacons are not required to be "apt to teach." It has been observed by some one that the deacons were to hold the mystery of faith, while the elders were to be able to impart it to others. They must be sound in the faith, but the elders must also have an aptitude for teaching. We rather think this qualification required the deacons conscientiously to remain sound in the faith, not to waver for fear or favor. We can gain but little information from this passage on the functions of the deacons. Some have supposed that the deacons were "sort of" junior elders; that those who serve well as deacons gain to themselves a good step or degree and may be promoted to the eldership; and it is true that the elders were chosen from among the deacons in the churches of the second century. This, however, seems to have been the hierarchy in embryo, and we suspect the idea was born after the apostolic day. The duties of the bishops and deacons were, no doubt, different; but the degrees of rank and the importance of work is just the estimation of men. Some things that God has said may appear to us to be more important than some other of his commands, but we do not know that we are privileged to pronounce them so. However much the functions of the deacons may differ from those of the elders, it is impossible, for them to please God and not perform their functions. Hence it is just as necessary that they serve faithfully as deacons as that the elders serve as elders. Let us notice the expression, "those who have served well as deacons." "Have served as deacons" is all one word in the Greek. It is diakonesantes, and it is translated by Dr. MacKnight, by Conybeare and Howson, by "Living Oracles," by Bloomfield, by George Ricker Berry, and by the King James translators thus: "Used the office of a deacon" or "performed the office of a deacon." Of course the rendering of the Revised Version does not differ from these in meaning, but it gives those whose righteous souls

are vexed by the word "office" an opportunity to make a distinction where there is no difference. The expression, "those who serve well as deacons," must mean those who serve well in the position of deacons, or in the capacity of deacons, or in the office of deacons. The word might be translated "those who serve well as servants," but that would be but little better than Mr. William ("Billy") Sunday's "deacons who would not deac." Whatever translation we use, we will get the idea that there were certain duties belonging to the deacons, and those who faithfully discharged them would be honored for it. Now the question that concerns us most is: What are those duties? It is generally agreed that it was the work of the deacons to look after the temporal affairs of the church, while the elders overlooked its spiritual affairs. It would be the duty of the deacons in the present-day congregation to see to the lighting, heating, cleaning up, and maintaining the church building; to usher the crowds auto ventilate the auditorium; to see that the emblems are prepared for the Lord's table; to always have a baptistery ready, whether indoors or out; and to care for the poor of the congregation--relieve their wants from the church treasury. All cases of need should be reported to the deacons. The care of the poor seems to have been the chief work of the deacons in the early church. Of course it is doubtful whether the New Testament deacons did all the things named above, for they had no church houses to keep repaired or janitors to jog in those days. However, they looked after all the temporal affairs that were necessary. All the things mentioned above must be done to-day in order to have system, comfort, and decency; and it seems that the deacons should attend to such matters. It is a disputed point as to whether there was an order of deaconesses in the New Testament church, and there is probably no way definitely to decide the question. There is, however, some evidence in favor of the idea. But before we consider the evidence, let us remove any forebodings of heresy by observing that there is nothing in the work that belongs to the deacons that a woman cannot do consistently with the inhibitions laid upon her by the Scriptures. On the contrary, there is a part of the work that women seem eminently better adapted to than men. In our present-day congregations the good women do most of this work, whether we call them "deaconesses" or something else or nothing. The strongest indication that there were deaconesses in the early church is the language of 1 Timothy 3:11. Right in the midst of his instructions concerning deacons the apostle says: "Women in like manner must be grave, not slanderers, temperate, faithful in all things." "Women!" What women? Why, those who are appointed to the diaconate. "In like manner"--the same as the men who are appointed. But we are reminded that the Authorized Version reads: "Even so must their wives, etc." But in the Greek there is simply the one word gunaikos, which may mean either wives or women. To translate it "their wives," and thus make it apply to the wives of the deacons only, is a mistake, evidently. If it is rendered "wives in like manner," etc., it would then either apply to all Christian wives or to the wives of both the bishops and deacons. But it would seem contrary to all reason to suppose that the apostle would insert a general remark concerning Christian wives in the midst of his instructions concerning church officers and it would seem strange that the apostle had omitted to say anything concerning the wives of the bishops both in this chapter and in his letter to Titus and yet require so much of a deacon's wife. Again, it would be rather awkward to place the qualifications of the wives of bishops and deacons right in the middle of the requirements of those who should be appointed to the diaconate. The Revised Version gives us the best translation, decidedly. "Women in like manner"--this might be understood to mean all Christian women, but the same reason for not making it apply to all wives would stand against that interpretation also. Why should the apostle throw in a general remark about women in his instructions about deacons? If it

is true that the churches had deaconesses in them, we would most naturally understand Phoebe to be a deaconess and not simply a servant. Indeed, the language concerning her seems to sustain the idea. She was a servant or deaconess of the church at Cenchrea, and not a servant of Paul or of the church at Rome in carrying the letter from him to them, as some have supposed. She had succored many, and that is the very work that deacons are appointed to do. We need women now to do such service. Frequently women and girls who are to be baptized do not know how to prepare for the ordinance. Some mothers who seem to have more sentiment than judgment want their daughters to be dressed in white, which color is all right if the material is proper; but it is usually muslin or some other sort of filmy, clinging material. A good, sensible, motherly woman could be of great service in helping such persons prepare for baptism. Again, the greater number of cases of needy poor are among the widows and orphans; and when they are self-respecting and inclined to be proud, they would much more readily and with less embarrassment tell their needs to a good, kind, motherly woman than they would to a man. Furthermore, if a man manifests too great interest in such cases, the evil minds and long tongues of the community may seize the opportunity to damage the church. Let not your good be evil spoken of and do not give place to the devil. To pure minded persons what is suggested may seem utterly unthinkable, but experience will teach them. "We are not ignorant of his [the devil's] devices." Whether women are called "deaconesses" or "servants," and whether they are appointed or not appointed, there is much for them to do in the Lord's cause, and there is greater need for women to be "teachers of that which is good" in the present day than ever before in the history of our country. O, how the young women of this age need to be taught the very things Paul tells the elderly women to teach! (Titus 2:3-4.) It is not necessary to say that the deacons were appointed in the same way that elders were. If we understand that Stephen and his six companions were appointed to the diaconate, we have an apostolic example of how the appointing was done. From Paul we learn that the deacons must first be proved and then appointed. If there were deaconesses, we would suppose they were appointed in the same way. We see no reason for thinking they would not be so appointed. If the laying on of hands was for the purpose of imparting a spiritual gift, the women, no doubt, received the gifts also. There were women in the New Testament who had spiritual gifts, particularly the gift of prophecy. It has been said that the fact that Paul said, "Let deacons be husbands of one wife," shows that there were no women in the diaconate; but that is fallacious. The word that designates a deaconess is of different form and gender in the Greek as in the English. What is said, therefore, about a deacon would not always apply to a deaconess. No Jew ever had a husband, but that doesn't mean that no Jewess ever had a husband. So the question cannot be settled by that point. So far as any objection we have ever heard applies, there is no wrong in supposing that there were deaconesses in the early church, though there is no definite proof for the claim. However this may all be, we know the qualifications of a deacon and we know what his work is. We also know the importance of such work. Let not the disputed points hinder the work, therefore. Learn all you can and do all you learn, but leave that which is not clear to the Lord.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION.

When do we first read of deacons?

Do you think this order of servants was borrowed from the synagogue?

What are the qualifications of deacons?

What is the work of deacons?

If it is the duty of the deacons to look after the temporal affairs of the church, make a list of the things that they should attend to. Do your deacons do these things?

Can women scripturally do the things you have listed?

Name some things that women can do and should do.

Why can women care for the poor better than men can?

Can you name any women who are mentioned in the New Testament as faithful servants of God and worthy laborers in his cause? (See Acts 21:9; Romans 16:1-7; Romans 16:12; Romans 16:15; Php 4:2-3.)

Debate: "Resolved, That the New Testament churches had women appointed as deaconesses in their membership."

AFFIRMATIVE.

NEGATIVE.

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

NOTE.--Let the teacher select four of the best-informed members of the class, whether men or boys, and let them discuss this question. It will quicken the interest of the whole class, and will cause the disputants to study the whole subject of the diaconate more diligently. Suggest that they should consult the Bible dictionaries, encyclopedias, commentaries, etc., freely; but impress them with the fact that these are not infallible. They will see that also from the lack of agreement.

02.08. CHAPTER 08 - Dealing with the Disorderly.

CHAPTER 08 - Dealing with the Disorderly.

It is impossible to enforce discipline in any congregation that is not scripturally organized; hence, until the lessons which we have tried to teach in the preceding chapters are learned and put into practice, it will do no good to know what the Bible teaches on the subject of discipline, unless, by seeing the importance of this subject, we seek to bring about such conditions in the congregation as will permit us to obey God in this matter also. If there were no other reasons for desiring to have the congregation organized after the New Testament pattern, the care of the erring would be sufficient. The Lord desires that his church be a pure church--without spot, wrinkle, blemish, or any such thing. He died that he might thus cleanse and sanctify his church, and he has given laws by which it may be kept pure. (Ephesians 5:20-30.) The church is the bride of Christ, espoused as a chaste virgin to Christ (2 Corinthians 11:2); and it is unthinkable that Christ will own his bride if she becomes unchaste, plays the harlot after the world, and has her affections taken away from Christ and set on things of the earth. And there is a danger that such a condition may take hold of either the individual Christian or the congregation. If a congregation permits impure individuals to remain unchastened within its fellowship, it thereby becomes a partaker of their sin and will soon so far fall out of the favor of the Lord that the candlestick will be removed. (Revelation 2:5.) Paul says a little leaven will leaven the whole lump. (1 Corinthians 5:6.) He showed that the whole church at Corinth had already become guilty of the wicked man’s sin. If there is an Achan in the camp, the Lord’s cause will never prosper. This is why so many of our congregations have lost their influence, have ceased to grow, and never convert sinners. They may use much money in their work, but money is no substitute for righteousness. They may have the very best preachers that live to-day, and they may preach the gospel with eloquence, earnestness, and power, but with no results to speak of. What is the trouble? Why, the congregation is in the way. The same preaching in a new field would have converted fifty or a hundred times as many people. Is it right, then, for preachers to waste their time and energy on such churches? But shall we turn them over to the devil in a body? There are always many good people in every congregation. No; the better way is to put away the evil and save the body. Organize the congregation according to the Lord’s word in order that they may keep free from such conditions. There are three questions which we should like to consider in this chapter. They are: 1. How can we prevent disorderly conduct on the part of any member? We should not forget that God’s laws were given to men and not to angels--that is, the laws we have. The Lord knew our weaknesses, and has made all necessary provisions for them. The fact that God is holy and righteous himself should encourage us and not discourage us. True, he hates sin; but he loves the sinner. The reason he hates sin is that it has wrought ruin among men whom he loves. Yes, God loves the sinner; and the more like God we are in holiness, justice, and mercy, the greater will be our love and compassion for the erring. The good man deals with his erring brother in meekness, gentleness, and a kindly sympathy. It is all Pharisee--the self-righteous man, the hypocrite--who is exacting and censorious. Because God loved us and knew our weaknesses he has, as said above, made provisions for us; and the reason so many of us fail is that we do not

appreciate his provisions and appropriate the means of grace that he has given us. There would have been no need for the throne of intercession and the mediatorial reign of Christ if men were made perfect at conversion. Our boldness in approaching God comes from our trust in our High Priest and not from our own sufficiency. (Read Hebrews 2:10-18; Hebrews 4:14-16; Hebrews 7:26-28.) "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (1 John 1:9.) " And if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world." (1 John 2:1-2.) These things should encourage us and keep us from sinning; for, having this hope in ourselves, we purify ourselves even as he is pure. (1 John 3:1-4.) But if some of our members are not as faithful as they should be in following this teaching, or if they are inclined to be weak, how shall we prevent their becoming disorderly? By doing as God directs. He knew there would be such persons, and his arrangements included them. There is danger that the best of us will fall; hence we should take all precautions. "Take heed, brethren, lest haply there shall be in any one of you an evil heart of unbelief, in falling away from the living God: but exhort one another day by day, so long as it is called To-day; lest any one of you be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin." (Hebrews 3:12-13.) " And let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works; not forsaking our own assembling together, as the custom of some is, but exhorting one another; and so much the more, as ye see the day drawing nigh." (Hebrews 10:24-25.) "Confess therefore your sins one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed." (James 5:16.) Analyzing the above quotations, we learn that in order to keep from falling away from God--from being hardened by sin--(a) we should take heed, be watchful for ourselves and for each other. (b) We should exhort one another, and do so daily. (c) We should consider one another, be thoughtful of, solicitous for one another, and provoke one another to love and good works. (d) We should not forsake our own assembling together, because by our communion, fellowship, and exhortations we strengthen and help one another. And this exhorting of each other should be the more diligently attended to as we see the day drawing nigh. It is unfortunate that this text has by some among us been so much used as a proof text that it has come to be regarded as nothing else, and has with those who thus misuse it lost all its force and beauty. While in all probability the assembling here referred to was their Lord’s day services, this text by no means proves that they assembled on the first day of the week. We must learn that from other scriptures. The teaching of this text is of mutual helpfulness--consider one another, provoke one another to love and good works, exhort one another, and neglect not your assembling together, that you may be helped by your association, exhortations, and prayers. The "day drawing nigh" did not mean the Lord’s day. No Bible scholar worthy of the name ever took that position. (e) "Confess your sins one to another, and pray one for another." We think this text is appropriate only when a backslider returns, but that is a mistake. We are all sinners; and if we do not admit it, we are self-deceived (1 John 1:8-10); and we should not only confess to God, but to one another also. If we could often have meetings where nothing but love and sympathy for one another exists and we would freely confess our sins, specifying the exact sin when possible, and tell our weak points and our struggles against evils of heart and life, and then pray together, we would all be better Christians. Why don’t we do it? The Bible teaches us to do it. The three thousand who obeyed the gospel on the day of Pentecost continued steadfastly in (a) the apostles’ teaching, (b) in fellowship, (c) breaking of bread, and (d) prayers. (Acts 2:42.) The way they continued in the apostles’ teaching was, no doubt, to sit at their feet and hear them and learn the will of God. To-day we would

continue in their teaching by reading the Bible, studying the New Testament daily. Of course we all know what the other three things mean. Then let us also continue steadfastly in these things. If we will do as these scriptures teach, we will not often, if ever, be troubled with disorderly members. 2. What is it to walk disorderly? We have already seen that we all sin, and we would now naturally inquire: What sin, or what nature of sin, would one have to commit in order to be considered disorderly? Are we all disorderly? It would be difficult to classify sin as regards guilt or degrees of gilt. In fact, it is doubtful whether or not man knows the demerits of any sin. He cannot know how God regards sin except as God has spoken on the subject. Men may speak of the exceeding sinfulness of certain sins and of the comparative innocence of other sins; but their judgment may not be correct, and what they regard as minor offenses may be monstrous in the sight of God, and what men may consider heinous and unpardonable may not appear so to God. "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith Jehovah." (Isaiah 55:8.) Men look on the outward appearance; God looks on the heart. Some men who do very bad things are not bad men at heart; other men who have not broken through into outrageous acts are at heart presumptuous, rebellious, envious, covetous, and ready to do all sorts of little, mean, underhand, disguised deeds of evil. In the nature of things, however, we can only deal with persons whose sins are overt. Any person who sins is in need of the encouragement and admonition of faithful Christians; but only the person who sins and is impenitent, defiant, and shows the purpose to continue his sins should be considered disorderly. It is more the disposition than the deed. It is not so much a question of what a person has done as it is of his attitude toward his wrong and toward those whose duty it is to correct him. True, the apostle Paul did name certain sins that the church must put away from its fellowship (1 Corinthians 5:11); but even persons guilty of these sins must be forgiven if they repent, as the history of the case at Corinth shows. To answer the question, "Who is disorderly?" we would say that any person who persists in sin any sin, or who refuses to repent, or to be corrected, should be regarded as disorderly and should be dealt with as such. 3. How should we deal with the disorderly? (a) We should pray for them. "If any man see his brother sinning a sin not unto death, he shall ask, and God will give him life for them that sin not unto death." (1 John 5:16.) (b) We should make an effort to convert them from their error. "My brethren, if any among you err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, that he who converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins." (James 5:19-20.) (c) We should restore them if possible. "Brethren, even if a man be overtaken in any trespass, ye who are spiritual, restore such a one in the spirit of gentleness; looking to thyself, lest thou also be tempted." (Galatians 6:1.) (d) We should admonish them. "And we exhort you, brethren, admonish the disorderly, encourage the faint-hearted, support the weak, be long-suffering toward all." (1 Thessalonians 5:14.) (e) We should withdraw from them, if they will not repent. "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which they received of us." (2 Thessalonians 3:6.) "Put away the wicked man from among yourselves." (1 Corinthians 5:13; read the whole chapter.) As in all other efforts to obey God, there will be persons who object to following the instructions just quoted from Paul; but these lessons are too plain to be misunderstood and too important and too emphatic to be ignored. If the church is properly organized, as it must be before these directions can be followed, the elders will pay no heed to such puny and perverse objectors; for they are either too ignorant of God’s word to have a voice in such serious affairs or they are actuated by some selfish, stubborn, or perverse desires;

and that would, of course, disqualify them for any part in such matters. If people do not know what the Bible teaches, they must not criticize or otherwise hinder the elders who do know; and if they know, but will not obey, they are themselves disorderly and the Scriptures must be applied to them. Such persons will most likely quote scripture to justify themselves, but that makes their offense all the more flagrant. Almost all classes of sinners do that. The Bible never justifies wrong, and any man who tries to pervert scripture to excuse that which is obviously wrong is a blasphemer. Of course this does not apply to any sincere person who does not see the truth; but it does not take long to show sincere, honest souls what God teaches. Any person who will try to destroy the plain, unmistakable teaching of one passage of scripture by quoting another could hardly be considered honest. In view of the teaching of 1 Corinthians 5:1-13; 2 Thessalonians 3:6; Matthew 18:15-19, what shall we say of a person who would refer to the parable of the tares in an effort to prove that we should not "put away the wicked man from among" ourselves? Like all other efforts to make the Scriptures cross themselves, this effort is a failure, for the Scriptures will not cross. In explaining the parable of the tares, Jesus said that "the field is the world" (Matthew 13:38), not the church; and Paul said that we had nothing to do with judging them that are without, and that we could not avoid having company with evil men of the world unless we go out of the world (1 Corinthians 5:9-10; 1 Corinthians 5:12). No church should ever allow objectors to hinder it in clearing itself of evil. The method of procedure in dealing with a disorderly member is given in Matthew 18:15-19. Some may say that that passage refers only to personal offenses, but the same manner should be followed in dealing with any offense, as has been shown in this chapter. After all the admonitions, entreaties, tears, and prayers of the elders and other personal workers (of course the elders will require the assistance of any earnest Christian, especially any one who seems to have any influence with the erring brother. Let them see him personally and privately; for if the man is visited by a committee in a "professional" or "official" capacity, it looks as if he is "arraigned" and "held to answer," and it will excite anger and arouse rebellion. He will begin to fight in defense. All this, however, is taken care of in the passage-- Matthew 18:18-20) have failed to bring the erring brother to repentance, then the matter must be told to the church-brought before the whole congregation. There are many reasons why he should be tried (though it should not be considered a trial) before the whole church and not by the elders alone. It must be told to the church before action is or can be taken by the church. The expression, "if he will not hear the church," shows that the church should appeal to him to repent. If the whole church does not know the brother’s offense, the efforts that were made to restore him, and, therefore, still considers him good enough for its fellowship, sympathy, and love, he would not be disfellowshiped by the church, no matter what the elders had done. Further, if the church does not know fully the merits and demerits of the case, it would make it easy for the wrongdoer to appeal for sympathy and claim that he had been unjustly treated. He would be sure to have sympathizers; hence there would be factions in the church, the brother would be encouraged in his wrongdoing, the elders would lose the respect of their members, and the whole purpose of discipline would be defeated. In fact, the elders ought to lose the respect of all the members if they should try to withdraw from a brother without first "telling it to the church." Paul told the church at Corinth that, "being gathered together," they should deliver the wicked person unto Satan. It must be told to the whole church in an assembled capacity--that is, the offense must be told that the church may then be heard in an effort to gain the brother. Let us suppose a case: In the congregation at Christianville a brother has sinned--walked disorderly. He has been admonished by the leading brethren of the church, singly,

to repent. The elders have assured him of their love and of their earnest desire to see him saved--of their anxiety for his spiritual welfare. They have warned him against his course and begged him to repent. He stoutly refuses, and gives the brethren to understand that it is none of their concern. It is then announced to the congregation that there is a brother who has been guilty of sin, who has been earnestly and repeatedly admonished to repent, but who refuses, and that, therefore, the church is now requested to come together at a stated time to endeavor to bring the brother to repentance. The fact that it is the business of the whole church is stressed, and every member is urged to be present. The appointed hour has arrived, and the brethren and sisters are all there. One of the elders acts as chairman of the meeting and calls for a song. After the song, another elder reads appropriate scripture, and the whole assembly engages in prayer, led by the chairman. The brother who sinned is not present, though he was told of the meeting and asked to come. The chairman then tells the whole congregation who the offender is, what he has done, and what efforts have been made to bring him to repentance. He states that they should all earnestly pray for his redemption. They all together kneel and pray for the erring brother. After the prayer, the chairman asks if any member can see any mistake that the elders have made in dealing with this case, or if any can suggest a further step that they should take for the man’s restoration. Nothing is suggested. The chairman then suggests that, as the brother refused to come in order that the whole church might be heard, each member should see him personally if possible and make an effort to save him. Then another time for meeting to deal with the case is announced, and the audience is dismissed. They meet again at the time appointed, and engage in singing and prayer. Then all efforts are reported. None of them have availed. The chairman then asks if any one can give any reason why the disorderly person should not be disfellowshiped. No one can give any. Then it is simply, but gravely, announced that the brother is no longer a brother, but is now looked upon as unworthy of Christian friendship or fellowship. Under another example we might suppose the disorderly brother present; but the same order would be followed, except that, if he did not acknowledge the sin he was charged with, the elders should be able to tell the church what evidence there was of his guilt. In such a meeting there should be a very manifest spirit of seriousness, of earnestness, and of prayer. Any member should be allowed to speak in order that nothing be left unsaid and in the hope that some one might be able to reach the brother’s heart and save his soul. Great patience should be used in trying to show the man that his excuses do not justify his action, and he should be made to say whether he wishes publicly to renounce the Lord as he once publicly confessed him. If he says that he does, of course that would end the matter and place him outside the fellowship of the church. If he will not state that he so intends to treat the Lord, he should be shown that his conduct in refusing to hear the church is equal to a public renouncement; that if the church is forced to put him away, disfellowship him, or turn him out, their action will be recognized in heaven and his name will be taken out of the Lamb’s book of life. (Matthew 18:18-19.) If after all this is done in the proper spirit--no personal dislike for the brother allowed to enter the matter, no sort of personal animus in any way present--the sinner is still obstinate and impenitent, the elders should ask if anybody knows any reason why the man should not be "turned over to the devil." If any reasons are offered in the right spirit, they should be considered, and those who offered them should be satisfied. If none are given, or after those given are disposed of, the elders should make it plain that the whole church acquiesces in the withdrawal, and that any criticism of the action would force them to also discipline the critics. Then the elders should announce, with becoming gravity, that Brother or Sister (calling the person by

name) has, by persisting in sin, in rebellion to the church, by spurning the entreaties and prayers of the brothers and sisters in the Lord, rendered himself or herself unfit for the society of Christian people, unsuitable for the fellowship of the church, and unworthy of the name of the Lord. And the Lord should be invoked to recognize the action. After this solemn action, the disfellowshiped member should be allowed to pass out of the assembly without a single handshake or word of sympathy. Let no one in any way encourage him or indorse his conduct. That would defeat the whole purpose. When he is made to realize that he is disfellowshiped, that he is undeserving of sympathy and unworthy of Christian associations, he will repent; and that is the end to be sought in the whole procedure and what every Christian prays for. This may look hard, but it is far better than to let the man be self-deceived and remain in sin till he must at last hear the same sentence pronounced by the Lord in the awful word "depart." Then it will be too late; and we, if we have connived at his sin and become partakers of his guilt, will have to share his doom. The Lord’s way is best. Let us be faithful. "Let all that you do be done in love."

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION.

Is it right to allow sin to go unreproved in a congregation?

Who sins?

What should we do about our sins?

When should we confess our sins one to another?

On what condition does God forgive our sins?

Is there provision made for our sins?

Tell how we may keep ourselves and others from becoming disorderly.

What is it to walk disorderly?

What is a backslider?

Should a brother be considered a backslider because he has done wrong?

Should any man be called a "backslider" until he gives up trying to do right and says he publicly renounces the Lord?

If he says he does not intend to make any effort to serve the Lord, should his statement be publicly announced?

If any member is persistently disorderly, what should be done with him?

Tell how he should be put away.

After he has been withdrawn from, how should he be treated?

Suppose certain members take the part of the erring brother and criticize the action of the church, how should they be treated?

In what spirit should all this be done?

Should we let our sympathy influence us?

Who shows the greater love for a brother--the one who permits him to be self-deceived and continue in sin or the one who corrects him even when harsh measures are necessary?

What is the purpose or purposes of discipline?

Does your congregation follow God’s word in this matter?

02.09. CHAPTER 09 - Figuring on the Finances.

CHAPTER 09 - Figuring on the Finances.

It is impossible to carry on any sort of enterprise without money, and the church of God should be the most enterprising institution in any community. It takes money to do the work God has required of his church. If you know of any congregation that manages to run along without money, you may rest assured that it is doing nothing in the name of our King. If a church has only money enough to defray its own expenses--for song books, Bible-study helps, lights, fuel, the upkeep of the house, etc.--it cannot be considered as doing much for God. A congregation that does nothing but exist is not much of an honor to Christ, and it is no honor at all to be a member of such a church. The church is the pillar and support of the truth, the light of the world, and the salt of the earth. Every congregation should be a radiating center, and its light should shine in every direction and into far distant fields. But some man, willing to justify himself, may argue that our light shines through our conduct; by living a righteous life we have an influence for good. That is true, and all else is worthless without a righteous life; but a man whose work for God is limited to his personal acquaintances is not a very brilliant light. What honor is it to Christ that a man behaves so as to keep out of the penitentiary? We owe that to ourselves. What have we done for Christ? Christ commanded us--you, all Christians--to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. How can we say that we have obeyed him if we spend three hundred and sixty-five days of the year working for ourselves, trying to build up a comfortable home for ourselves, trying to make money--if all our time and energies are spent in our own interest? Souls for whom Christ died are perishing, the cause of Christ is languishing at home, and the few missionaries that are on the foreign field are starving. Yet God’s children are living in ease, in luxury, feasting and growing fat! We are not grieved over the "afflictions of Joseph;" we are singing idle songs, dancing, going to shows and theaters, and are deaf to the gospel word. Can we be saved in such a condition? How can we expect salvation? We do not wish to be either caustic or pessimistic, and we don’t want to make any invidious comparisons; but in the hope of provoking us to greater efforts we want to submit a few facts. Statistics show that small sectarian bodies give many times more money in the interest of their propaganda, have more missionaries in the field, than all the "loyal" churches of Christ. We will mention another thing that has come under our observation. In a certain town there is a Methodist Church and a church of Christ. The church of Christ has a greater number of members, if we count only the adult members of the Methodist Church, and more wealth. The Methodist Church has a "pastor" to whom they pay $2,400 per year. The church of Christ has a preacher whom they support by the hardest with a salary just exactly half that large. The Methodist Church has a missionary in China whom they support with $1,000 per year. The church of Christ gives about $50 or $60 per year for missionary purposes. The Methodist Church gives more to "charity" or benevolent purposes than the church of Christ gives; it has a better meetinghouse, more conveniences for Bible study; and its members are more zealous in their work, more regular in their attendance at prayer meeting, Sunday school, and all their services than the members of the church of Christ, with one exception--they always go to church

on Sunday morning, usually too late for the Bible study and song worship and the prayers, but in time for the Lord's Supper. "Think not to say within yourselves, We have the truth on baptism and the Lord's Supper and the Methodists do not. Verily I say unto you, These things cannot save you." This is not a pleasant comparison, and it is to be hoped that there are not many cases that it would fit; but it certainly is a matter of serious concern that we are not doing any more for Christ than we are. The scriptural way to raise money for the Lord's work is, we presume, well known to all who may read this chapter; and it is not necessary, therefore, to discuss the many methods that are used by men for this purpose, some of which are even questionable as to their morality. Our trouble does not come from a lack of information on this point; but it comes here, as it does in all other phases of the Lord's work, from a failure to do what God commands and as he directs. His way is always best. Though we already know what the Bible teaches on this subject, we submit here an arrangement of the Lord's plan of raising money as given by Paul, and we suggest that this be put on a chart and placed before the congregation to study. It would be well for the elders to use it in teaching the members their duty in respect to giving. They should especially emphasize the lesson taught under the division, "PERSONAL." We can no more obey God for our sons or our daughters in the matter of giving than we can in baptism or the Lord's Supper. If they have no income, we should teach them to deny themselves some pleasures and give to the Lord a portion of that which we allow them for such things. But here is the chart:

PAUL'S PLAN OF CHURCH FINANCE.

(1 Corinthians 16:2.)

PERIODIC

"Upon the first day of the week Habitual

Worshipful

Prayerful

Cheerful

PERSONAL

let each one of you

Each Man

Each Woman

Each Boy

Each Girl

No Proxies

No Merging

PROVIDENT

lay by him in store

Forehanded

Deliberate

Thoughtful

Intelligent

PROPORTIONATE

as he may prosper

Generous

Careful

Responsible

Faithful

PREVENTIVE

that no collections be made when I come"

No Deficit

No Interest on Loans

No Worry

No Retrenchment

If Paul’s plan were followed in all our congregations, there would be no lack of funds for all our needs. In most places we do pretend to follow this plan, and often you find persons who are punctilious and scrupulous about "contributing on the first day of the week;" but they never do what that passage teaches. They overlook one chief point--viz., "as he may prosper." They think that if they go through the form of putting something into the collection basket they have obeyed God. Their income may be twenty-five dollars per week and their contributions ten cents, but that does not disturb their peaceful souls--they contribute every week just as the Bible teaches! Sometimes their income is more and the contribution less, or a smaller percent; that is a fair illustration of the way we sometimes obey (?) God in the matter of giving. We need to quicken our consciences on the duty of giving. We need to feel that we are disobedient when we fail to give as we may prosper just as much as we do when we fail to attend services or partake of the Lord’s Supper. Our giving should be purposeful. We have too much accidental giving. Whatever amount we happen to have about us when the collection is taken we give, provided the amount is not more than twenty five or fifty cents; or the first small coin we get our hands on as the plate passes we drop in and feel that we have done what God requires. "These things ought not so to be." Paul said: "Let each man do according as he hath purposed in his heart: not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver." (2 Corinthians 9:7.) Every Christian should purpose in his heart to give so much to the Lord. But some one is ready with the objection that we do not know what our income will be. That is true with some, but it does not affect the lesson. We can purpose to give a certain, definite percent of our income, and then the amount of the income will determine the amount that we give.

Such a purpose and such giving is more businesslike and shows more real faith and a true, conscientious desire to do the will of God. This loose, disjointed, purposeless giving is wrong. It is an excuse for the individual to shirk duty, and it is a handicap to the congregation. No church can ever do its full duty until it undertakes something--obligates itself to do something. Every church should obligate itself to support or help to support with a definite amount some work. But how can a church undertake anything like that unless there is some way of reckoning its resources? The elders should know something of the financial strength of the congregation. It would be easy if each member would willingly state what he purposes to do. If all were conscientious in this duty as in others, there would not be so much trouble and negligence. But we are too prone to say that we will give as we prosper; and then if we have any sickness or other misfortune, we make the Lord pay the expense. Why not give a certain per cent of our income--not of our profit over and above our living, but of our income--our living; then if misfortune puts us behind with the Lord, do just as we do with our grocer--pay as we can? This would manifest an earnestness and an honesty in dealing with the Lord that he would in no wise despise. Here is a good place to test our faith. It may be that we are not what we profess to be. The next time we grow real zealous and boast of our superior loyalty to the Lord and feel inclined to declare that we believe the Bible from cover to cover, let us get our New Testament and turn to 2 Corinthians 9:6-8 and read carefully, slowly, meditatively, and then ask ourselves if we believe that. Do we sow bountifully? Do we believe if we did we would be prospered? Do we believe that God is able to make all grace abound unto us? But some one asks how much or what percent of our income we should give. That depends on our faith in the Lord's promises. If we believe that the more bountifully we sow the more bountifully we will reap, we would naturally want to give a liberal per cent. It is a good investment. Under the law the Lord required his people to give one-tenth of all they made. The Jews obeyed God in this, and they were always prosperous. Some Christians give a tenth to the Lord, and they are more prosperous than those who do not give anything. It is easy if our will and purpose is to do that, but it is awful if it is against our will. The heart must be in it, otherwise it is worthless; and that is why God has not stipulated a definite amount for us to give and forced us by statutory commands to obey. So the amount we give must be determined by our faith. Let us consider the amount we give as a measure of our faith in God's promises--that is, the percent of what we have. Of course the amount in dollars and cents cannot be taken as a measure, for some would give millions if they had them. But those who do not give of what they have would not give if they had billions; and if they did, it would not be acceptable; for they would give then not through faith in God, but because they had no dread of poverty, no fear of ever coming to want; they would most likely give in order to be praised by men. The congregations are not awake to their possibilities. We do not know our strength, because we have never put it to the test. We could take the world if we would. Israel could have taken Canaan at first; but ten of their spies told them they could not, and because the people believed them and disbelieved God they died in the wilderness. Let us figure a little on the possibilities of a church. We will suppose that there are one hundred and fifty members in the congregation, with an average income of three hundred dollars per annum each. That is, of course, a very small amount, being twenty-five dollars per month to the individual; but there are always some members who have no income, while others will make from four to ten times this amount, and we want to be conservative; hence we will let three hundred dollars be an average. That does not mean at much profit above the living, but that much income. Now, if we multiply three hundred dollars by one hundred and fifty (the number of members), we will have the neat

sum of forty-five thousand dollars. The Lord’s children in a given place make that much money in one year. But how much of that will they give to God? Let us suppose that they give one-tenth. The congregation would have four thousand and five hundred dollars with which to glorify God each year! That would support two preachers in the field and still leave enough to pay all the expenses of the congregation, allowing them a big expense account at that! This is not visionary or impractical. It is a very conservative estimate. A congregation of only one hundred and fifty members is a small congregation, three hundred dollars is certainly a very small income, and one-tenth to the Lord is not unreasonable. But if we suppose that only one-twentieth is given to God, we would still have two thousand two hundred and fifty dollars to use in his service. How many congregations that size do anything like that much in a year? And what would be the possibilities of a church of three or five hundred members? Just figure it out on the same basis and see if we are using our strength. Let the reader apply these figures to his own congregation and see its possibilities. Let him show them to others and try to start a movement for better things. We are not weak; we are strong. The churches of Tennessee alone could support five hundred missionaries, if they would, and still do all they are now doing. But some one may suggest that we have not the missionaries if we.had the money. That is true at present. But if we would begin to show more interest, to agitate the question more, to allow the great need to weigh upon our hearts more, and to pray the Lord of the harvest to send more laborers into his harvest, we would soon see a great awakening, and men would begin to prepare themselves for the work and to offer themselves for the fields. Our present state of lethargy would discourage any effort. When war is agitated and preparedness is preached, men volunteer as soldiers by the hundreds. Let us declare war on Satan and call for volunteers. They will come. Will we equip them? Are we just playing at being Christians? Are we honest with God? We shall have to account to him for our stewardship, and he knows the purposes of our hearts and the motives that have prompted us in all things. Let us be faithful. In nearly all congregations there are a few members who do their whole duty in the matter of giving, as in other things; but the problem is to get all the members to do their duty. Self-respecting men who would not think of going with an excursion party or on a fishing expedition without bearing their part of the expenses will worship with a congregation, enjoy the preaching that others provide, and receive all the benefits of the congregation, and never feel that it is their duty to help pay expenses. This, however, is covered in Paul’s plan, which we have already submitted. "Let each one of you," said Paul, "lay by him in store upon the first day of the week, as he may prosper." Let us try conscientiously to follow the Lord’s word in this matter.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION.

How should the church raise the money that is needed to carry on its work?

Should all the funds of the church be collected in this way?

Should the church take special collections for special purposes?

Would this be necessary if Paul’s plan were followed?

Should the need create the demand for the money, or should the money be ready when the need comes?

About how much should a church of ordinary size give to the Lord in a year?

Estimate the financial strength of your own congregation. Is it doing its duty?

What should be done with the money that is put into the treasury? Discuss this thoroughly.

Do you believe 2 Corinthians 9:6-8?

Then is not giving to God a pretty good investment?

Read all of 2 Corinthians 8:1-24; 2 Corinthians 9:1-15; 2 Corinthians 10:1-18.

What does Paul call giving in these chapters?

Is giving one of the Christian graces?

What other texts could you cite on this subject?

Is it right to support those who preach the gospel? Read carefully all of 1 Corinthians 9:1-27; also Galatians 6:6.

For the benefit of those who wish to make talks on this subject, we append the following outlines. If they do not care to use the outlines, they will at least find it convenient to have the scriptures collated.

GIVING.

Outline 1.

The fact of receiving blessing in our need involves the obligation to impart to others in their need. (Matthew 10:8.)

All that we have we have received. (1 Chronicles 29:11-12.) We are but stewards, holding in trust, for certain ends, the treasures bestowed upon us. (1 Peter 4:10; 1 Corinthians 4:7; 1 Chronicles 29:14-17.)

It is a divine command to give. (Matthew 5:42; Luke 6:38; Luke 11:41; Luke 12:33.)

We are to work in order that we may have to give. (Ephesians 4:28; Acts 20:34-35.)

We are to give

(1) According to our means. (2 Corinthians 8:12; Acts 11:29.)

(2) First providing for honest things. (2 Corinthians 8:21)

(3) Cheerfully. (2 Corinthians 9:7.)

(4) Bountifully. (2 Corinthians 9:6-7.)

(5) Steadily. (1 Corinthians 16:1-3.)

(6) Unitedly. (2 Corinthians 8:13-14; Acts 11:29.)

(7) Not only for the poor, but for sending out the gospel, maintaining teachers in the church, and promoting every good work. (1 Corinthians 9:7-14; Php 4:15-17; 3 John 1:5-8; 1 Timothy 5:17-18;

Galatians 6:6-10.)

Motives to this duty:

(1) Giving, it shall be given unto us. (Luke 6:38.)

(2) The Lord will deliver us in the day of trouble.(Psalms 41:1-3.)

(3) It makes us Godlike. (Luke 6:35.)

(4) It enlarges the heart and purges it of petty scruples and burdensome follies. (Luke 11:41.)

(5) It gives acceptance to our prayers. (Acts 10:2; Acts 10:4.)

(6) It is a means of laying up treasure in heaven. (1 Timothy 6:8; 1 Timothy 6:19; Matthew 25:34; Matthew 25:36.)

(7) We shall reap as we have sown. (2 Corinthians 9:6; Galatians 6:6-10.) GIVING.

Outline 2. A Duty and a Privilege.--A mark of true religion. (Psalms 112:9; Isaiah 32:8; Ephesians 4:28; 1 Timothy 6:17-19;

1 John 3:17-18.)

Source.--The grace of God. (2 Corinthians 8:1-24.) An echo of God’s great love in Christ.

Sphere.--Unlimited. To all so far as we have the power. (Luke 6:30; Galatians 6:10.) To "them who are of the household of faith." (Romans 12:13.) To the poor. (Matthew 5:42; Deuteronomy 15:11; Isaiah 58:7.) To strangers.

(Leviticus 25:35.) To enemies. (Proverbs 25:21.) To services of God at home and abroad.

GIVING.

Outline 3.

Manner.--True liberality should be:

(1) Voluntary. The freewill offering of a loving heart and an open hand. (Exodus 36:21; Matthew 10:8;

2 Corinthians 8:3-12.) "Not grudgingly, or of necessity." (2 Corinthians 9:7.)

(2) Bountiful. Not sparingly. (Proverbs 29:9; 2 Corinthians 8:3; 2 Corinthians 9:7; Mark 12:43-44; Acts 2:46; Acts 4:36-37.)

(3) Unostentatious. (Matthew 6:3; Romans 12:8.)

(4) Prompt. (Proverbs 24:11-12.)

Measure.--

(1) According to ability. (Deuteronomy 16:10-17; Matthew 10:8; 1 Corinthians 16:2.)

(2) According to a fixed and settled principle. (1 Corinthians 16:2.) Not governed by caprice or emotion, much less to please a friend or make a display.

Model.--The blessed Lord. (2 Corinthians 8:9.) When Paul wishes to teach liberality, he refers to the Lord, who "gave himself."

Value and Importance.--There are special blessings annexed to Christian liberality:

(1) It is peculiarly pleasing to God. (2 Corinthians 9:7; Hebrews 13:16.)

(2) It is a means of glorifying him, both in giver and receiver. (2 Corinthians 9:12-13.)

(3) Connected with rich promises. (Proverbs 11:25; Proverbs 19:17; Proverbs 22:9; Proverbs 28:27; Ecclesiastes 11:1-2; Isaiah 58:6-11.)

(4) The benedictions of Jesus upon it. (Acts 20:35.)

02.10. CHAPTER 10 - Church Music

CHAPTER 10 - Church Music

The music of the New Testament churches was very simple. The elaborate programs, the offertories, the operettas, the aesthetic art performances of modern churches are of comparative recent origin, and they came into the different denominations by degrees and, in most instances, over opposition. Of course the early disciples knew nothing of such things, and there is no authority for them in the New Testament if authority were sought. In this chapter it is assumed that no one will deny that churches of the apostolic period used only vocal music; and as this is written for those who wish to follow apostolic example in work and worship, the question of the kind of music is not discussed. Probably "The Purpose and Power of Song in Our Services" would be a proper heading for this chapter. We have contended strongly against the song service being made void or being made unscriptural by the introduction of instruments, and against choirs--hired choirs and others--usurping the privilege of the congregation by doing the singing and causing the audience--those who should be worshiping and praising God--to sit silence and be entertained; but it seems that we have not yet been able sufficiently to impress the majority of Christians with the importance of this part of the worship to get them to take any serious or sincere part in it. If singing is no part of the worship, our controversy against innovations is not only useless, but sinful; or if the singing is a nonessential part of the worship, it makes little difference who sings, what is sung,or whether with or without accompaniment. But if it is an essential part of the worship--and it most certainly is--how wrong it is for us to be indifferent about it or to use it as a mere convenience for people to enter the house and be seated by or call the house to order! And how sinful it is for worshipers (?) to read letters or carry on a conversation while this very sweet and solemn service is in progress! Yet every reader of this chapter has seen such things done. Why should one who has no more interest in or respect for such service object to any sort of innovation? And how can a congregation that does not teach against, warn against, and educate its members above such a perversion and prostitution of the song worship consistently object to innovations? It cannot do it. If we would have our service scriptural, we must enter into it with purpose and meaning, with concentrated thought and worshipful heart. To use God’s name in song and not make the sentiment of the song our sentiment is to use God’s name without meaning; hence, to take it in vain. To utter a prayer in song like, "Lord Jesus, I long to be perfectly whole;" or, "My faith looks up to thee;" or, "In the hour of trial, Jesus, plead for me," and not mean it--not utter it from our heart--is to sin grievously. It is mockery. O, how we need to be careful! And how we need teaching on this subject so that we will have such a condition in our worshiping assemblies as will aid us in getting our minds in proper frame, as will inspire reverence and awe! All worshipers, whether Christian or heathen, in so far as they have music at all, make vocal music in their devotions. They may have instrumental music also, but they do not discard vocal music. On the question of kinds of music, we may set down vocal music as universally recognized and accepted; and we know, too, that it has the sanction of Holy Writ. But we must not forget that there are different kinds of vocal music. Singing should be classified not only according to the words uttered, but also according to the

feelings that actuate the singer and the emotions they arouse in the hearers. There are spiritual songs and there are sensual songs, and then there is what might be termed a "middle class" of songs. These are songs that are not at all spiritual, but neither are they grossly sensual. They are light, meaningless jingles that make one want to "trip on light fantastic toe" or frisk about in harmony with the movement of the music. Such is the power of music that some melodies make you want to weep or pray, even if you do not know or understand a word of the song. Others sound a note of joyful praise, and you feel like shouting, "Bless Jehovah, all ye hosts!" and "How excellent is thy name, O Lord, in all the earth!" And then there are tones of deep dignity, of solemn calm and reverential silence; and when you hear them, you feel like bowing your head and saying: "God is in his holy habitation; let all the earth keep silence before him." God has not blessed man with any richer gift than the appreciation of music and the power to sing. No means of grace that is available to Christians is more potent than sweet songs. Nothing stirs the soul more deeply and nothing than the heart-searching brings us nearer to God sentiments of sacred songs and the sweet, soulful singing of a band of humble, yet joyful, worshipers whose very souls are ascending in unison to God on the vibrant strains of holy song. Song worship should be the spontaneous outbursts of the feelings of adoration that fill the soul--the overflowings of a heart surcharged with devotion, reverence, and veneration. Hence the apostle Paul said, "Be filled with the Spirit;" and, as a result of that, sing and make "melody in your heart to the Lord." In harmony with the same thought James said: "Is any afflicted among you? let him pray. Is any cheerful? let him sing praise." Christians should sing because they feel like singing, because it is the most satisfactory way of expressing the emotions or of giving utterance to the feelings that surge in the soul. When one is afflicted, one does not feel like singing. Prayer is more agreeable to the feelings then. When one is cheerful, singing is the natural outlet to the energies of the heart. In the cold, bleak days of winter, when the sky is overcast and a sullen gray shroud hangs over the earth, the song birds are never heard in the forest. They hide away under some friendly shelter and sit ruffled and shivering through the day. There is no music in their feelings, and hence none is heard from their throats. But when the warm spring comes, these little songsters make the woods vocal with their joy. Their feelings and their nature bid them sing, and they must sing. So should we worship God in song. There is a great difference between the man who has something to say and the man who has to say something; also there is wide difference between the man who sings because his feelings prompt him to sing and the man who sings because he is paid to sing or because he wants people to hear his voice. But where the heart is not in a worshipful or a songful attitude when we enter the assembly of the saints, it should soon be made so by a concentration upon the sentiments of the hymn and by a hearty and enthusiastic participation in the singing. That is the purpose, or at least one purpose, of the singing--to make melody with the heart or to make the heart full of melody and joyous emotions. Thus the minds of the entire congregation are unified. As Christians assemble, they come from many different homes, with many different thoughts and feelings in their bosoms. Personal affairs, domestic cares, and business interests occupy the thoughts of some, while others have just laid down the Sunday newspaper and their minds are still upon the affairs of the world. But there is one purpose that has brought them all together--viz., to worship God. And when the worship begins, every one should be in his place ready to join in the first note of the first song. Then, all singing together, their minds quickly run together, and their united praise ascends to God as from one man. The thoughts of other things are crowded out, and feelings of adoration and worship fill the soul, and the man is enabled to worship God in spirit and in truth, which is the only

sort of worship he will accept. The heart is then made mellow and full of melody, and the worshiper is prepared for all the other acts of worship. But the unfortunate attitude that most church members of to-day hold toward the singing make such sweet and soulful singing impossible. They do not regard it as a part of the worship, and they do not feel called upon to be present for the singing; or if they are present, they do not sing, and some do not think it necessary to be specially attentive while the others are singing. In most places the song worship cannot be what it should be, because the worshipers (?) are constantly coming in, hunting seats, and saluting their neighbors while the saints are hymning the praises of their Maker and are endeavoring to "make melody with their hearts to the Lord." While some are thus making melody with their hearts, others are making a din with their feet, a disturbance with their bodies, and a discord with their tongues. Yet those who thus ignore that part of the solemn worship for themselves and ruin it for the others would be the first to object and the last to yield the objection if some one should wish to bring in musical instruments to use with the singing. This is so inconsistent, and even so absurd, that we cannot well censure those favoring the instrument for disrespecting their objection. If you are never present during the song worship, what right have you to say how it should be conducted or what should be used in connection with it; or what consistency is there in your objection to instrumental accompaniment when you accompany the singing with boisterous talking as you approach the door and by a noisy promenade down the aisle? This is a thing too frequently done; and--O!--if we could make every one see just how ugly it is! Such conduct is boorish if not blasphemous. Such a thing should never be thought of among polite, refined people, to say nothing of those who should be worshipers and should at that very instant be engaged in the worship, or, if for any reason they are not in it they should by all means feel a keen sense of their loss and get into it with all speed. In the hope of making Christians see the need of making the song worship what it should be, let us ask a few vital questions, and we trust every reader will seriously consider them and answer them to his own conscience: Is there any meaning in the singing? If not, why not do away with it altogether? Is it any part of the worship? If it is, should not every Christian try conscientiously to have part in it? Is singing an act of faith? If not, is it not sinful to practice it? (Romans 14:23.) If it is an act performed in faith toward God, how dare any Christian to neglect it or disregard it? If we should delay the Lord’s Supper, the sermon, or any other part of the worship while "tarrying one for another," should we not delay the song worship also? If not, why not? If we should carry the emblems to those who enter the assembly after they were passed to the audience, why should we not repeat the song or songs that were sung before they entered also? Was there anything in the songs for worshipers? If not, why were they sung? If there was, did not those who came late miss something? While the thought of tardy worshipers is before us, let us consider another serious question: When is the most appropriate time to enter a worshiping assembly? It seems to be universally understood that it would be inappropriate to enter during prayer. That would show a lack of reverence; and, on account of our custom, it would show a lack of culture and training, though it may be seriously doubted whether that would show any more lack of reverence than to enter while the Scriptures are being read. Which is the more important--what we say to God or what God says to us? No person with any depths of feeling or any degree of reverence would want to enter while the Lord’s Supper is being celebrated. Then, to repeat the question, when is a good time to enter? While the singing is in progress! Ah, yes, that’s the time! Come on in, and take your time about finding a seat. Go up and down the aisles till you find the place you want, and then crowd in past four or five persons and sit down. Then get up again and take off your wraps, and

turn around and throw them across the back of the seat and sit down. Now adjust those things on the back of the seat again. Look about over the audience to see who is there. Now emit a loud sigh to indicate that you are about to get settled. Now turn to the one sitting next to you and ask him how many songs "they" (ignore the fact that he is one of the singers) have sung. Tell him all about what made you late. O, you had such a time! Tell him all about it. He is just singing "Nearer, my God, to thee," or tiny faith looks up to thee, thou Lamb of Calvary," or "If ever I loved thee, my Jesus, 'tis now;" and, of course, he would be glad to hear all.you have to say. If you do not think that would be proper, then answer the question: When is an appropriate time to enter an assembly of worshipers? There can be but one correct answer: Before the worship begins. Of course it is permissible to enter later, but it is not--never is--proper. It is something to be overlooked and excused by. those whose worship you disturb, and hence something to be regretted by you. When a person who is late to worship tells of some mishap or of some extraordinary occurrence that has caused his tardiness, and says he thinks he ought to be excused, there is, of course, an admission that the tardiness was improper, else why think of being excused? What is there to be excused for? There are times when tardiness is unavoidable, but there is never a time when it is not to be regretted by those guilty. If we could get this lesson taught and learned, we would have removed one great handicap to our worship. We need reverence. There is no surer indication of a well-bred character than reverence--reverence for everything sacred. A lack of reverence not only shows a lack of culture, but it also shows an absence of the finer feelings that go into the delicate construction of a gentle and refined soul. It proclaims one of coarse breed, of common stock, and lacking in the essential qualities of the finest character. Boisterousness is a well-recognized characteristic of coarseness. It is a negro characteristic. Surely there is no need to speak against such a thing among Christians. There are two passages of scripture that should be printed on placards and placed in every school-house and church house in the country, and the preachers and teachers should frequently call attention to them, illustrate their lessons, and point their morals. They are the following: "Wherefore, receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken, let us have grace, whereby we may offer service well pleasing to God with reverence and awe: for our God is a consuming fire." (Hebrews 12:28.) "But we exhort you, brethren, ... that ye study to be quiet, and to do your own business." (1 Thessalonians 4:10-11.) The lessons just given may appear to be foreign to the subject of this chapter, and in theory they are, but in fact they are not. Boisterousness, tardiness, and irreverence have done a great deal toward ruining the song worship of many congregations. Now let us suppose that we have a band of brethren who have all heeded these lessons and the first day of the week--the day for worship--has dawned. Eleven o'clock in the forenoon is the hour for worship to begin. When that time arrives, the Christians are all in the house, in their seats, and are quiet, reading a hymn or the Bible, meditating, not talking and laughing-quiet. (1 Thessalonians 4:10.) Then the song leader arises and announces a hymn. The congregation, being already in a meditative, worshipful frame of mind, takes up the tune as the leader starts and sings with the spirit (the spirit of each singer is in the worship; hence he worships in the spirit) and with the understanding--he understands what the hymn says, understands the words he utters, and speaks them fervently to the glory and praise of God and to the edification of his fellow worshipers. What else is there now to learn about acceptable song worship, and what more is to be desired in the way of church music? But we may sum up all the New Testament says about church music in a few words, and we believe then each reader will see that the above meets all the requirements. Let us first read the passages: "And be not drunken

with wine, wherein is riot, but be filled with the Spirit; speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord." (Ephesians 5:18-19.) "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly; in all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto God." (Colossians 3:16-17.) "I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also." (1 Corinthians 14:15.) "Through him then let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to his name." (Hebrews 13:15.) We may say now that--

It is the privilege, if not the duty, of each worshiper to sing.

That the songs must be spiritual songs.

That the singing must be such as will teach, edify, admonish all the worshipers.

That singing must be done with the spirit with grace in the heart, and must make melody in the heart to the Lord.

It is no violation of anything in the New Testament--rather, it is sanctioned by it--for one man to sing to the audience if he can thereby edify and admonish the audience. Nor is it wrong for two persons, four persons, or six persons together to stand before the assembly and admonish them with a song or speak to them through a hymn--provided always, of course, that the singers are themselves worshipers and that they are singing for the scriptural purpose, and provided, also, that they do not do all the singing and thereby take away the right and privilege that belongs to every Christian--to praise God in song. But some one suggests that some persons cannot sing. In reply, we say that they ought to learn to sing. Some people cannot read the Bible, but we insist that they ought to learn to read. It is further objected that some can never learn to sing. We cannot say whether that is true or not; but in a case of that kind we would suggest that the person get the hymn book, follow the words as the others sing, and try to make melody with his heart to the Lord. At least there is no excuse for his being inattentive.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION.

What sort of music did the New Testament churches have?

Can you quote all the New Testament says on the question of music?

When were instruments of music first used by professed Christians in connection with their worship? Answer: Not before the sixth or seventh century. (See encyclopedia.)

What is the purpose of singing?

What kind of songs should be sung?

Who should do the singing?

What feelings should fill the heart of the singers?

If the song should fail to arouse or inspire such feelings, is the singing scriptural? Will God accept the worship?

What should persons who cannot sing do during the song worship?

What is one great hindrance to song worship in our churches?

Quote Hebrews 12:28; 1 Thessalonians 4:10-11.

When is the best time to enter a worshiping assembly?

Is not habitual tardiness a sin?

Is it in harmony with the divine command to do all things "decently and in order?" (1 Corinthians 14:40.)

Each elder of the church is to be "orderly;" and should they not see that the services are orderly, therefore? Why else does God require elders to be orderly?

Give a description of an ideal condition at the hour of worship and during the hour of worship.

Does your congregation fit the description? Would it if every member were like you?

If your home church does not come up to the ideal, who is at fault? If you are, correct your fault; if others are, help them to do better. Hold up the ideal.

02.11. CHAPTER 11 - A Model Church

CHAPTER 11 - A Model Church

In considering a model church, we must, of course, have some standard by which to measure a church--some ideal to which we can appeal. In the minds of some modern religious teachers no church would be a model church till it added to its services all the paraphernalia of the theater and some of the adjuncts of the barroom. Connected with the house of worship there must be a gymnasium and a culinary department, and possibly a pool room and a swimming pool. But with such things we have nothing to do. We have a standard, a criterion, and to it we appeal. It is the Lord we wish to please, and not man. The fads and fancies of men change with the seasons, and what is popular in this generation will be entirely out of date in the next generation. A true Christian cares nothing for popularity. To have the favor of men of the world in matters religious is a certain sign that we do not have the favor of Christ. (Galatians 1:7-10.) But in striving to please Christ we must know his wish or will in Everything, and we find that in the Bible--the New Testament. He is the Founder of the church (Matthew 16:18-19), the Head of the church (Ephesians 1:23; Colossians 1:18). He is the Mediator of the new covenant--new laws, new will, or testament. (Hebrews 9:15-16; Hebrews 12:24.) After his death and resurrection and coronation as "Lord and Christ," he sent the Holy Spirit to completely reveal his will and to declare all his plans, to execute his laws, and to set his church in operation. (See John 14:26; John 16:13-14; Luke 24:46-49; Acts 1:8.) Shall we assume, then, that the Founder built such a church as would please him, that the Lawgiver inaugurated such a government as he desired, and that the Head directed such work and worship as he approved, as would honor him? Can weak, mortal, frail, fallible, feeble man know what would please the Lord better than the Lord knew himself? Who honors the Lord most--the Lord says, man who humbly submits to what the even though he (the man) does not see the need of the thing done, or the man who ignores the Lord’s directions, disrespects his authority and commands, and does according to his (the man’s) ideas and according to popular sentiment? To ask such a question is to answer it. Let us say, therefore, that a model church, or congregation (for we are discussing the local church chiefly), is one that measures to the New Testament pattern in organization, in work, and in worship. Considering these items in order, we shall discuss-- 1. Organization.--From the preceding chapters we have learned that there is no organization in the church of God except a local church or congregation; that there is no officer in the church that has jurisdiction or authority over a diocese, with its subordinate officers; that there can be no corporation of congregations, but that each congregation is strictly autonomous--an independent body. Each congregation is a complete mechanism, considered under another figure, and is fully equipped to do all the work the Lord has ordained. A model church will have a plurality of scriptural bishops--not fewer than four and preferably six or eight. The number will depend somewhat upon the size of the congregation, but more especially upon the number of men in it who are qualified for the office. All these bishops will be scripturally qualified, each one possessing all the qualifications, and scripturally appointed. They will be found prayerfully performing their functions. They will have a complete register of their members and will know the spiritual condition

of them all. These elders will hold regular business sessions or conferences at least once a month, and oftener if the work demands it. There will be perfect understanding among them as to what the church is doing and what it plans to do. They will call the whole church together every sixty or ninety days and report to them what has been done, what is being done, and what plans for work are made. This will inspire confidence, stimulate a feeling of fellowship and partnership in the work, and stir up much interest. The elders will, in such meetings, invite suggestions from the members, welcome criticism, and allow full and free discussion on all questions pertaining to the welfare of the church. Thus there will be always perfect understanding and good feeling in the congregation. To assist the elders, the model church will have a board of deacons. The number will be determined by the size of the congregation. These like the elders, must possess the Pauline qualifications and must be scripturally appointed for their work. They will be busily engaged in looking after the temporal affairs of the church. They will know of the needy poor in the congregation and will relieve their needs. This will be a great work; and when diligently performed, it will " purchase to the deacons a good degree." In the model church the members will all be in subjection to the overseers, or elders. They will trust their judgment and abide by their decision in all matters of order and discipline, with the understanding, of course, that every Christian reads the word of God for himself and that any violation of Scripture by an elder may be pointed out by the humblest member. This should be done privately and in the spirit of meekness and fear. The elders will welcome such correction. The members will have a voice in all the affairs of the church when no principle of right or wrong is involved. With such conditions prevailing, the congregation will, without question, be scripturally organized. 2. Work.--The model church will be a working church. Every member will be a worker. Each one will be so busy doing his part of the work that he will not have time to find fault with the others. No member will be heard to speak of the church as "they" and of its work as what "they" do or do not do. Each member is a unit of strength, an integral part of the whole, and feels his responsibility for the success or failure of the congregation. Each one does what he is directed to do, and finds work and does it on his own initiative. No one wants to be petted and humored, but each desires to minister instead of being ministered to. Even those who have to have the help of the church will accept it reluctantly and gratefully, and not as that which the church owes them and which they expected and idly waited for. Such help, in a model church, will never be given grudgingly or in a spirit of condescension, as "charity." In the model church there will be definite plans for work--a certain task undertaken which will call out the whole strength of the body, which will utilize all the forces of the congregation. There will be a program for each year, involving an outlay of money--so much for an evangelistic campaign at home; so much for missionary efforts in near-by fields; so much for foreign missions; enough to do good to all men as the opportunities come; so much for Bible study--equipping the classrooms and supplying books, charts, maps, etc.; so much for books and song drills. These things will all be so provided and so managed as to engage the attention of the young and keep them away from worldliness and sin. Their hearts cannot get full of evil if they are kept full of good. In a model church the children will not graduate from the Bible school when they reach the "upper teens;" but little and large, young and old alike will attend the classes, prepare their lessons, and manifest real interest in God’s word and in the condition of his cause among men. There will be no fault finding members in the model church, but each member will esteem others better than himself; they will in honor prefer one another; they will all be members one of another; they will bear one another’s burdens; they will weep with those who weep and rejoice with those who rejoice. There will be no

schism in the body, but love will be without hypocrisy among them. Thus working together, they will also be coworkers with God, and such a church will not be barren of good fruits--nay, it will be a city set on a hill, and no power can hide it from the world’s view. 3. Worship.--A model church is necessarily a converted church. Its members have "put off the old man." They are in Christ, and are, therefore, new creatures. Their affections are on spiritual things--things above--and not on fleshly, worldly, sensual things; and, of course, therefore, they enjoy spiritual food, spiritual songs, spiritual surroundings, more than Sunday dinners, Sunday newspapers, Sunday baseball, or Sunday picture shows; for all such things are connected with sensual practices even if they are not sensual per se. Worship is a natural expression of a consecrated soul. He who does not enjoy things spiritual is carnal-minded; hence, is in a state of death, is not a Christian, and cannot be saved unless he repents and is converted. When the members of a model church assemble, they come into the worship with reverence. They come with one purpose, with one mind--their minds are all together on one thought. They come with devout hearts. They are all there when the worship begins, and they all always take part. They all worship. They all participate in the singing. Those who cannot sing follow the words of the hymn (for, of course, a model church will have hymn books enough for every person present), and listen to the melody, and try to worship with grace in their hearts. All the members engage in the prayers and say "Amen" at the close, either audibly or in the heart. The worship is always orderly, systematic, and solemn. There is no confusion, no distractions, and no unseemly commotions; for there are no idle minds present. Every one is worshiping; every one is full of God. God is in the midst, and all are filled with awe. There is an atmosphere of calm of quiet, of peace and reverence; for we are now living in the age "when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshipers. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth." (John 4:23-24.) QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION.

In what way are we to decide whether a church is a model church?

By what are we to measure the church?

How many kinds of church organizations are mentioned or authorized in the Bible?

When is a congregation organized according to New Testament teaching?

What is some of the work a model church must do?

Who should do this work?

Who is responsible for the success or failure of a congregation?

Will you have to answer to God for the condition of your congregation?

What is worship?

Can we call acts performed in the name of God worship if the heart is not in them?

Can we sing and pray and still not worship?

In a model congregation, how many of the members worship?

What part or parts of the worship do they all participate in?

How many of them should be there when the worship begins?

Is habitual tardiness a sin?

Then should not the one guilty be admonished?

Give a description of a model church.

In the last paragraph under the division "Work" of this chapter there are ten allusions to scripture, or ten scriptural expressions without quotation marks and without the references. Can you find the expressions? Can you find the passages alluded to?

In the first three sentences of the first paragraph under "Worship" there are three scripture expressions. Can you find the passages from which these expressions are taken?

Did you read all the references given in this chapter?

02.12. CHAPTER 12 - Prayer-Meeting Topics.

CHAPTER 12 - Prayer-Meeting Topics.

Some Reasons Why Church Members Should Always

Attend the Prayer Meetings.

All reasons why one should attend the preaching of the word apply here.

The example of the apostles: Acts 1:13-14; Acts 2:1.

The example of the early Christians: Acts 2:42; Acts 12:5.

Shall the practice of the Jews shame Christians? See Acts 16:13; Psalms 116:18-19; Joel 2:15-18.

United prayer was a duty: Joel 1:14; Luke 1:10; also Psalms 34:3.

There are special promises to united prayer: Matthew 18:19-20.

We are social beings; an isolated Christian life is not adapted to our requirements: See Psalms 142:4; Malachi 3:16; Hebrews 3:12-14; Hebrews 10:25.

We must strive to enter heaven, and we cannot, therefore, neglect such a potent means of grace: Luke 13:24.

One stick will not burn alone; put the scattered fuel together if you want a blaze; the more the fuel, the hotter the fire: Proverbs 27:17.

To aid the elders in getting the young men to take part in the prayer meeting, the following topics are submitted. Let one of the older men take the lead each week, and let him assign the different divisions to young men. If they do no more than read the references at first, it will be a start; but they should be encouraged to comment also.

PRAYER.

Prayer Enjoined-- Luke 18:1-4; Matthew 6:5-15; Matthew 7:7-12; John 16:23-24; Matthew 18:19-20.

Prayer Encouraged.-- Deuteronomy 4:29-31; 2 Chronicles 7:13-14; Psalms 50:15; Isaiah 65:24; Luke 11:9-13; 1 John 5:14-15; Hebrews 4:16; 1 John 3:20-22.

Prayer Requested-- Romans 15:30-32; Ephesians 6:18-20; Colossians 4:2-4; Hebrews 13:18-21; 2 Thessalonians 3:1-2; 2 Corinthians 1:11; 1 Thessalonians 5:25.

Prayer Offered-- Acts 20:32; Php 1:2-11; Colossians 1:9-14; 1 Thessalonians 3:9-13; 2 Thessalonians 1:11-12.

PRAYER-MEETING TOPIC.

Subject: "How to Become a Christian, and Why Wear That Name"

Hear-- John 17:20-21; Romans 10:17; John 6:44-46; Acts 15:7.

Believe-- Mark 16:16; John 1:12; John 3:14-18; John 3:36; John 5:24; John 6:29; John 9:21-24; Galatians 3:26; Hebrews 11:6-7.

Repent-- Matthew 9:13; Mark 6:12; Luke 13:1-7; Luke 24:47; Acts 2:38; Acts 3:19; Acts 17:30; Acts 20:21; Acts 26:20.

Confess-- Matthew 10:32; Acts 8:37; Romans 10:9-10; Php 2:9-11; 1 John 4:15. Be Baptized-Matthew 28:19-20; Mark 16:15-16; John 3:5; Luke 7:30; Acts 2:38; Acts 8:36-38; Acts 10:46-48; Acts 22:16. Romans 6:3-6; Galatians 3:27; Ephesians 5:26; Colossians 2:12; 1 Peter 3:18-21. THE NAME.

Value of a Name-- Leviticus 18:21; 2 Samuel 7:23; Proverbs 18:20; Proverbs 18:22; Ecclesiastes 7:1.

A New Name, God-Given-- Isaiah 56:5; Isaiah 62:2; Acts 11:26; Acts 26:28.

The Name of Jesus-- Acts 2:38; Acts 3:6-8; Acts 4:12-30; Acts 5:28; Acts 15:16; Ephesians 1:21; Php 2:9-10; Colossians 3:17; 2 Timothy 2:19; 1 Peter 4:14; James 2:7.

PRAYER-MEETING TOPIC.

Subject: "God’s Ownership of Us--We Belong to God"

By Creation-- Isaiah 43:7; Colossians 1:16; Revelation 4:11.

By Providence-- Deuteronomy 8:3-18; Psalms 36:6; Psalms 115:16; Psalms 136:25; Psalms 145:15-16; Ecclesiastes 5:19.

By Redemption-- Psalms 107:2; Isaiah 43:1; Acts 20:28; 1 Peter 1:18-19; 1 Corinthians 6:20; Revelation 5:9.

For Service-- Acts 27:23; 1 Corinthians 7:23; Ephesians 2:10; Titus 2:14; 2 Timothy 2:21.

PRAYER-MEETING TOPIC.

Subject: "Daniel, or Devotion to Principle--Daniel’s Character Analyzed"

Resolute-- Daniel 1:8; Hebrews 10:23.

Abstinent-- Daniel 1:8; 1 Thessalonians 5:22; 1 Peter 2:11.

Prayerful-- Daniel 2:17-18; Php 4:6.

Thankful-- Daniel 2:23; 1 Thessalonians 5:18.

Faithful-- Daniel 4:27; Acts 20:27.

Loyal-- Daniel 6:10; Revelation 2:10.

Humble-- Daniel 9:3; Daniel 9:7; Daniel 9:9; 2 Corinthians 3:5.

PRAYER-MEETING TOPIC.

Subject: "Christian Union, and How to Hasten It."

The Sin of Division-- Romans 16:17; 1 Corinthians 1:10-13; 1 Corinthians 3:3; 1 Corinthians 11:17-18; 1 Corinthians 12:13; 1 Corinthians 12:24-25; Galatians 5:19-21; James 3:14.

UNITY. The Ideal-- John 17:21-26; Romans 12:5; 1 Corinthians 10:16-17; 1 Corinthians 12:12-13; 1 Corinthians 12:27; Ephesians 5:30-32; Psalms 133:1.

How to Attain It-- Romans 12:16; Romans 14:19; Romans 15:5-6; 1 Corinthians 1:10; 2 Corinthians 13:11; Ephesians 4:1-4; Php 1:27; Php 2:2-6; Php 3:16-17; 1 Peter 3:8.

LESSONS FROM NAAMAN.

Leprosy a Type of Sin-- 2 Kings 5:1; Leviticus 13:1-17; Numbers 5:1-3.

Human Power Helpless to Remedy-- 2 Kings 5:6-7; Romans 7:18-24.

Human Pride Keeps Men from Pardon-- 2 Kings 5:11-12; 1 Corinthians 1:18; 1 Corinthians 1:21; 1 Corinthians 1:23; 1 Corinthians 2:6-8.

God’s Way of Pardon is Simple-- 2 Kings 5:10; Acts 2:38; Acts 8:35-39; Romans 6:17.

Cleansing Comes by Obedience-- 2 Kings 5:14; Romans 6:17; 2 Thessalonians 1:9-10; 1 Peter 1:22; 1 Peter 4:16-17.

The Gifts of God Cannot Be Bought-- 2 Kings 5:15-16; Acts 8:20; Isaiah 55:1-2; Ephesians 2:8-10.

Chapter 85

S. Pamphlet On Premillenialism

Pamphlet On Premillenialism

Outline I. Historical Introduction II. The Issue Introduced and Defined III. The Speaker's Own Position IV. The Premillennial Doctrine Stated and Refuted V. Questions Submitted to Brother Boll and His

VI. Answers VII. Comment Upon the Answers VIII. An Appeal for Peace

Addenda

DAVID LIPSCOMB COLLEGE, NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE Write for additional copies

PREMILLENNIALISM My Brethren and Friends: I am happy indeed to have this great audience to speak to tonight. I do not think that it is the speaker that has brought you but the subject; I don't know why we should be so much interested in the subject, but we are, and if I can do anything to help us solve our problems or settle our questions, I shall be very happy to contribute my effort to that end.

There are two sides among us on the question of Premillennialism, and there have been two sides ever since l have been preaching the gospel, even among us. I, however, have never been upon but one side and I am still on that side; and necessarily I may not be able to please all who are present tonight, because we probably have both sides represented and maybe a third side; I don't know. I should be very glad indeed if I could make us all happy and please everybody present, but I am not giving that my chief concern. As has been my practice in discussing any question that I have attempted to handle since I have been before the public, my heart's desire and prayer to God is that I may please Him. Then if I have pleased Him, I will have nothing to regret so far as my work is concerned but, of course, I will be sorry if my brethren are not pleased.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

A few words in reference to the history of Premillennialism and our relationship to it, I think, will not be out of place. It is not by any means a personal issue. It is almost as old as the Christian religion and has been discussed probably in every century, at least from the third century on, and the position among the Premillennialists has been the same all down through time. From this we see that it is not personal and did pot originate with any one who is now living.

I am reluctant only for one reason to speak upon this subject tonight. It has been said that I do not speak against Premillennialism and some of you have heard that. Naturally I don't like to do a thing that will give the falsehood to any of my brethren but since I have been preaching against it for thirty- three years, naturally I can't change my lifelong practice just to save some man's statement. It is very true that I haven't always used the term "Premillennialism" in preaching against it. If I had so named my subject in times past, many people wouldn't have known what I was talking about; and furthermore, I have usually tried to use scriptural phraseology in my

preaching. I haven't always done it perhaps but I have tried.

"Premillennialism" is not in the Bible—the word is not; neither is "millennium," the word, in the Bible. Sometimes, therefore, I have preached against certain phases of premillennialism without naming it. And always I have set up the kingdom of our Lord on Pentecost. In the first debate I ever had in my life, I affirmed that the kingdom of our Lord was set up on the Day of Pentecost and I have been affirming that ever since. Right here in your own city the last meeting I held preached two or three sermons on the subject of Pentecost and I set that up as the inauguration day of our Savior; the time his kingdom was set up and he was exalted in fulfillment of the oath that God made to David to set him upon his throne. So, that has been my position always. This discussion of my personal relationship to the issue brings up the name of another man—a man with whom I was associated in this School. I hope I may be pardoned for these personalities at this time. Back in 1908, 1909 and 1910, Brother Robert H. Boll held meetings here at David Lipscomb College. He was a prime favorite with all of the students and, I think, with the teachers as well. He did me much good; taught me many lessons that I still believe and preach and they still bless my life. He did, however, in one meeting here, preach the whole of the premillennial theory. He did not call it the premillennial theory but he set forth the ideas that are now included in those terms. He set forth the idea of the rapture and the revelation, that is, Christ's coming, and his saints meeting him in the air and then coming back with Him. I shall never forget the night he presented that. He took the passage of scripture that says that two women shall be grinding at the mill and one shall be taken and the other left; two shall be in bed and one taken and the other left, and he interpreted that to mean that one is a Christian, and that when Christ comes in the air, the Christian will be taken up to meet him and the other will be left. The one that is not a Christian will miss his companion but will not know what has become of him. He illustrated this by Enoch. God translated Enoch and he was not found. He put the emphasis on that; that they were seeking for Enoch is implied in the expression "he was not found;" therefore, they went about looking for him. And I never shall forget how he represented them as saying, "Where is Enoch?" We Doys kept saying that as a kind of proverb around school here for months—"Vare iss Enoch?" Hut he preached the whole thing and we heard him. Brother Lipscomb, Brother Elam and many of the other preachers here in Nashville heard him but if any of them -greed with him I didn't know it. If there was a single member of this faculty that agreed with him I don't know which one it was unless it was Brother John T. Glenn and I would be afraid to say that he did because I don't know that he did.

I remember distinctly seeing Brother Pittman walk up to him one day and say, "Brother Boll, you don't expect us to believe all that, do you?" And Brothel Eoll said, 'Why, yes, Brother Sammy." But Brother Sammy didn't. We had no trouble about the matter at that time, however. We did not fight about it then. We discussed what he preached on the campus, and we discussed it in our .ooms and often discussed it in the classrooms, and the idea that was advanced by the difJ -ent teachers was, as I remember, that Brother Boll's conclusions were far fetched and fanciful. We thought he was drawing on his imagination a little on many of those things. The only conflict that came up about the matter that didn't seem to be pleasant was right here (indicating in front of rostrum in auditorium). Brother Boll was speaking on the Jews going back to Palestine and Brother Lipscomb was sitting right out there, As Brother Boll told of the history of the Jews and showed that they have remained a distinct nation through all the centuries, despite the persecutions they have endured, and advanced the thought that God is with the Jews and is preserving them for some

future blessing in fulfillment of his purpose in them and of his promise to them, Brother Lipscomb spoke up from his seat and asked, “Do you think the Jews are now the people of God and above the Church’” Brother Boll replied, “No, Brother Lipscomb, Christians—the Church—are the people of God par excellence. But the natural branch is to be brought back into the root and fatness of the olive tree."

Boll had spoken of the necessity of studying the prophecies and had implied that some people do not encourage the study of prophecies, so Brother Lipscomb’s next remark was, “Yes, I understand you are attacking me.’ And he seemed to be agitated as he raised his palsied hand in gesture and tears were in his eyes. Brother Boll was moved also and tears suffused his eyes as he replied, “O, no, Brother Lipscomb, I was not attacking you. I had no thought of offending you.”

Brother Lipscomb said, “Well, I thought you were. You know my well-known position, about the Jews and the teaching of the prophecies.”

Brother Boll said, I think, that he was not sure that he did know Brother Lipscomb’s position about the teaching of the prophecies.

Then Brother Lipscomb alluded to some controversies he had had on these points before Boll’s day. And he mentioned having read something from Boll’s pen in a recent issue of the Gospel Advocate that he thought was directed at him. It had something to do with the teaching or the objection to teaching the prophecies in the Bible schools.

Again Brother Boll disclaimed any i.nttention to criticize Brother Lipscomb, but he asked why the prophecies were not taught, in this school.

Brother Lipscomb said that the prophecies were not taught in this school and he gave the reason. He said, “Our students are young and immature and do not yet know the simpler and easier parts of the Bible. I have always held that one should know the rest of God’s word thoroughly before one undertakes to study the prophecies. Even then he will encounter things that lie will not understand, but a general knowledge of God’s word should save him from false and speculative interpretations.” This dialogue ended pleasantly enough, but it resulted in two things that I think it will be profitable for us to remember: (1) Brother Boll gave up the afternoon lectures on the Jews and the prophecies relating to them. He did this out of deference to Brother Lipscomb. He did not want to appear to be attacking him. He did not speak again on the subject. In doing this he increased the respect and admiration that we all had for him and he probably caused some to be more inclined toward his position than they would have been if they had heard all of his arguments. If my memory is not at fault, Brother John Glenn told me that he and the other teachers who were near Brother Boll’s age, including Brother Pittman, Brother Ed Sewell, Brcther H. Leo Boles, and Dr. J. S. Ward, advised Boll to abandon those lectures. (I was interested in them and was asking why they did not continue.) (2) Brother Lipscomb also made a concession. He said that if the older and. more advanced students wanted to study the prophecies he would teach the class. We clamored for the class and when it was started, all the preacher students enrolled as did nearly all the faculty. Several men who are here tonight were in that class. Brothei Pittman, Brother Boles, Brother Charles Brewer, and I were all in the class. There may be other members present, I do not know, but I know we were all in it.

I have related these things in the hope that the manner and the spirit in which this matter was handled then might be a valuable suggestion to us now in this time of rancorous disputing and disfellowship- ping each other. I lay special emphasis upon Brother Boll's willingness then to abandon his lectures for the sake of peace.

It was several years after the things here related before the bitter fighting and personal impeachments over these questions began among us. The beginning of this unfortunate condition was in 1915 when Brother Boll and his fellow editors of the Gospel Advocate disagreed about what they thought was an agreement on Boll's part to cease to teach these things. But upon that incident we here draw the curtain.

Now with this much history given in which my own position and the position of the teachers in this school has been set forth as it now is and always has been, may we not enter upon a study of the issue proper without accusing each other of being off sides —a football term—on this question? Surely we can. We shall attempt to discuss the question on its own merit without any reference to any personal dispute that may exist between any of us anywhere.

THE ISSUE INTRODUCED AND DEFINED

As we begin to study this question, however, I must disclaim any purpose tonight to examine the arguments in detail and to refute them all. You would hardly expect me to do all that in one lecture. Men have written books on these points and you would not expect me to do in one speech what they did in volumes. These books are still extant and are available to all of you. Brother Boles here had a debate with Brother Boll and that debate is now in book form and may be read by all of you. I have said and I still say that it is the best thing in print on the subject. I have commended all of Brother Boles' and Brother Hinds' writings against premillennial- ism. I still commend them. But take now the word premilleimialism: that word, no form of it, Is anywhere found in the Bible. Neither is the word millennium ever used by any Bible writer. This word, however, comes from the two Latin words mille—thousand—and annus—year—and, therefore, means a thousand years. This is mentioned in Revelation 20:1-9. In this one reference that period of time called "a thousand years" and "the thousand years" is discussed and those expressions occur six times—three times each. Since we have "the thousand years" in the Bible it is not incorrect to use the equivalent expression the millennium. But so far as I know this is the only passage in the Bible that says anything about the thousand years. Yet there has been an endless discussion of Millennialism or Chili- asm—the Greek word chilias means a thousand and in Revelation 20:1-15 the expression for a thousand years is in the Greek ta chilia etee—for hundreds of years. The two main ideas connected with this famous passage are the premillennial theories and the post-millennial theories. "Pre" means before and "post" means after. Therefore the pre-millennialists are those who contend that Christ will come before the millennium and the post-millennialists contend that He will come after the millennium. And there are those who think that we all must be either the one or the other. They do not see any other position for us to take and this fallacy causes many people to accept the pre-millen- ial view without knowing anything else that is contained in that theory. They think that there is a period of time one thousand years in duration that is definitely set in God's program and that it is yet future. If that period has yet to come and then run out before our Lord comes, that would make his coming at least a thousands years yet future, even if we could begin the millennium now. They think that contradicts all those passages of Scripture that teach us

to watch for, look for, wait for, and be ready for the coming of our Lord. Why should we be watching for a thing that we know cannot occur for a thousand years yet? They ask with great earnestness. And they understand the post-millennialists to hold that the triumph of righteousness is to be brought about by the preaching of the gospel and the conversion of the world. And that, therefore, the millennium will not begin until the entire world is converted. That seems to be a long'~way in the future and then the coming of Christ will not take place for a thousand years after that! Truly there is no need for our looking for Christ, according to that theory. This seems to be the one point that our premillennial brethren cannot get by. Just here I wish to read from a letter just recently written to me by Brother Robert H. Boll. The occasion of this letter was some questions that I submitted to Brother Boll. He answered them and further on in this speech I shall read both the questions and the answers, but on the point now under consideration, I wish to read from his letter that accompanied the answers. I think this will be fair to him. (Incidentally, that you may know that it is not unfair to read these questions and the answers, I may tell you that Brother Boll gave me permission to do this). But here is the paragraph from the letter that applies on this point:

"The term 'Premillennialism' covers a great deal of ground. The essential point in all premillennial doctrine" (now, watch that) " the essential paint in all premillennial doctrine, as I see it, is that Christ's coming is now, and always, to be expected and looked for and not to be postponed to some far-distant day, beyond a golden age to come. As to what the 'Millennium' will be, or whether there is to be any millennium, is really secondary to this. (See enclosed leaflet on Premillennialism.) I, of course, believe that there will be such an age, following this one in which we now live. But I do not claim to be able to answer all questions that might be asked about it, or to set forth all the circumstances and conditions that will prevail then. A devout Old Testament believer in God's prophetic word might not have been able to answer all the questions about the Messiah's first advent, and all the new conditions that would follow it. So much as the Bible reveals can be known; no more." That is prefatory to my questions and alludes to some questions about conditions on the earth, but here is the point: he says, "The essential point in all premillennial doctrine is the fact that the coming of Christ is not definitely postponed beyond some supposed golden age."

Well, if that is the essential point, I don't see why we could not all agree, because I don't know that any of my brethren anywhere now hold or contend for the position that there is yet to come a golden age on this earth that will have to come and expire before our Lore, breaks in upon the earth. I don't know anybody that holds it now. It is true that this position has been held. Ashley S. Johnson of Kimberly Heights College held that position. I was there in his school two years; he held that position and sent us out to preach and made us believe that we could convert the world and bring in that millennium. Then after the world reached that high state of righteousness under Christ and stayed that way for a thousand years, the Lord would come. And I went out preaching, therefore, with some of his enthusiasm and fire, believing I hat I could convert the world and 1 thought I would be through by the time I was forty years old. I am "about" that now, but I am not quite through. (Laughter). (The speaker is "about" 14 years above 40)

Dr. H. Christopher, who was a contemporary of Brother Lipscomb and Brother McGarvey, wrote a book, entitled "The Remedial System." In that book he has a chapter on the Millennium. He set forth the idea that the gospel will convert the world and bring in the time of righteousness and peace on earth which he says is foreseen in Revelation 20 and there symbolized by the

millennium He does not make this perioa a literal thousand years, but he uses a day for a year and makes this time extend over a period of three hundred and sixty-five thousand years. But these were only the ideas that these men held, and they were never gnerally accepted, and I do not know of any one who would now contend for such a view. We would all be slow to say under present conditions that the world is going to be brought to Christ. And there are some scriptures that teach/ that when He comes the world will be in a wicked'1 \ and faithless condition (Matthew 24:37-48; 2 Timothy 3:1-5; 1 Thessalonians 5:1-10 : 2 Thessalonians 1:1-10). But when he comes will He bring in that thousand years of triumph over Satan? When He comes, He will bring eternal triumph, rest, peace and joy for those who are ready to meet Him, whether they be living in Him or sleeping in Him. But what about that Millennium? When is it going to come in God's scheme of things? That is the question that many people ask. They make this one passage of Scripture the pivotal point of their thinking and form all their conclusions around it. And many of those who will not accept either the premillennial or the postmillennial theories still feel it necessary to make some explanation of the millennium. Well, says one, don't you believe that some explanation of this passage, some understanding of the millennium is necessary? If it is, we are lost. For no explanation has ever yet been given that we all accept, and if I should offer my explanation how could I know that it is correct? And if I could not know, how could I ask others to abandon their explanation and accept mine? Some say that the millennium began on Pentecost. Others say it began with the Reformation of the 16th century. Still others say that it began with the Restoration under the Campbells. And there may be yet other views that I do not know about. It is a favorite theme for guessing and it is always open season on the millennium.

THE SPEAKER'S OWN POSITION

But some of you are wondering what my position on the Millennium is. You know some people will never be satisfied on such things until you express an opinion or make a guess. But I shall have to disappoint you on this point tonight. I do not know anything at all about the Millennium. I do not know what Revelation 20:1-6 means and I will not venture a guess or spin a theory. All my thinking and believing is independent of this passage. With me, it is not a pivotal point at all. My view on this point is expressed completely by Dr. Robertson. I published this a year or two ago in the Gospel Advocate and I still say that it expresses better than I can express it myself, my attitude toward the Millennium. Here is what he says—Dr. A. T. Robertson—in his book called "New Testament History," page 116:

"The millennium plays a really unimportant part in the book itself (only in Revelation 20:1-15), and yet it has been made to dominate the interpretation of the book by premillennial or post-millennial theories. As for myself, it is by no means clear what the millennium is, nor how long it lasts, nor what is its precise relation to the second coming of Christ and the end of the world. So I leave the millennium to one side in my own thinking, and grasp firmly and clearly the promise of the personal second coming of Christ as a glorious hope and have no program of events in my mind for that great event."

I have no program of events in my mind in reference to the second coming of Christ except that he is coming to judge the world, make up his jewels and take his children home, and when that judgment is completed and death has been defeated he will surrender the kingdom to God, the Father, and we will live with Him forever and ever. That is all I know. About the millennium, I know nothing

in the world.

THE PRE-MILUENNIAL DOCTRINE STATED AND REFUTED

But we must now give our attention to the Premillennial theory, so that those who are unacquainted with it may know what it is and may also hear in brief our reasons for not believing it. We shall see that it embraces more than just the view that Christ will come before the millennium begins. It tells what will take place during the millennium. In giving a statement of this theory, I am going to avail mvself of another man's efforts. I am going to read to you from this book. It is entitled "Systematic Theology" and it was written by a Presbyterian teacher of theology, Dr. R. V. Foster, who taught for many years in Cumberland University here at Lebanon. This book was published in 1898. I read from this old textbook on theology for three reasons: (1) I want you to see that this is not just a controversy that has arisen among us, and that it is not in any sense personal. Theologians have discussed all these theories for centuries. (2) Thi is not a modem doctrine and did not originate with anyone who is now living. It is not "Bollism" in any sense, except that Brother Boll believes this theory. It is net his however. (3) I think this is as good a statement of the doctrine as I have ever seen and I think Dr. Foster's strictures on it are as good is I ever saw, although they are brief. I make liis objections to the different points of the theory my objections and shall content mvself with these without further effort at refutation at this time. We emphasize the statement of the view and then change the inflection on his comment so that you may get what he states as the theory and then distinguish his objections to the joint. (In type the point is in Italics and his comment in plain type). This is found under the general subject of Eschatology. Here is what he says:

"We close, then, what we have to say on this subject with a brief statement of what is known as the premillennarian doctrine concerning the second advent of Christ, and with an equally brief comment upon it With more or -ess unanimity the premillennarians affirm the following propositions:

That the second advent of Christ is to occur at a time not very far from our day. This may indeed be true; but it is a matter in regard to which we are all equally ignorant. The attitude of every Christian (and hence of the Church), whether he be a premillennarian or not, should be one of expectancy.

The second coming of Christ is to be visible and personal, and that it is to be signalized by the resurrection of some or all of the saints. Of this latter fact, as an event distinct from the general resurrection, there is far from being any decisive proof in Scripture.

That Christ, with the risen saints, is to reign a thousand years on this earth, visibly and in person, and that the end of the world and the general resurrection and judgment are not to occur until after this thousand years. Concerning which it may be said, that the Scriptures uniformly speak of the visible return of Christ, the resurrection, and the final judgment, as occurring in immediate consecution, unless this passage in Revelation 20:1-6, be regarded as the one exception.

That at the beginning of this thousand years the scattered Jews are to be restored the land of Palestine, and re-established as a kingdom of which Christ is to be the visible and personal head, and that during this interval, and from Jerusalem as a center, the process of world- evangelism is to be carried on by extraordinary agencies. This is equivalent to saying instead of Two there are to

be three dispensations, viz., the Old Testament dispensation, the New Testament dispensation, under which we are now living, and this millennial dispensation. This, also, is equivalent to saying, that the agencies instituted by Christ when he was on earth before for the evangelization of the world are not adequate to this end and that they were not designed to be so.

That this millennia) reign is to be followed by the withdrawal c Christ and by another temporary supremacy of Satan. We don't mean that each of these propositions is affirmed by all premillennarians, but that each one is peculiar to the premillennarian theory. And the general remarks which we make upon it are these:

However attractive to some minds, and however true, this chronology of the world's future may be, it is utterly imposible to verify it by Scripture.

Theoretically, there may be no harm in believing any one or every one of the propositions, but it is difficult to see what intrinsic advantage, either theoretical or practical, the theory has over the commonly received Church doctrine. If it soothes our sense of discouragement and despair as we contemplate the slow progress, which the ordinary agency of the gospel has ever made ana still makes, in its conquest of human hearts, so, also, is it calculated to damage the zeal and energy at least of the great mass of Christian people.

The theory is no more calculated to induce devoutness of spirit, serious mindedness, and earnestness, on the part of Christians, than are the simple words of Christ, "Watch and he ready, for ye know not the day nor the hour when the Son of Man cometh." The pertinency and value of these words do not depend upon any millennial theory.

The premillennarianism which has to a greater or less extent ever been in the Christian Church (of course, you know he uses the term Christian Church" not meaning a denomination. This is a presbyterian writing and he is talking about Christian people) has ? twofold origin: First, historically, it is an inheritance from Judaism, the first Christians being Jews. Shortly before and after Christ, the Jews, as does every people in its own way under similarly dark circumstances. were eagerly longing and looking for a brighter and better day, anci these national hopes were centered about, iot the second, but the first coming of the Messiah. To this end and on this account the glowing Messianic prophecies in their Old Testament Scriptures were grossly carnalized, and their golden age was construed mainly as a secular one which should dawn when the Christ should come. Even the disciples of Jesus, during his early life, shared this secular expectation, and after his ascension, transferred and spiritualized the glories from the first to the second advent,

Second, morally or socially, the millennarian notions of the post-apostolic Christians were due to the dark iimes of persecution in the midst of which they lived; and by some of them, as Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus and Terlullian, the secular and materialistic conception of Judaism were incorporated as elements of their millennarian- isrn. They naturally and properly looked forward to the time when the Church would not be despised and downtrodden as it then was, but under the visible and personal leadership of King Christ would be victorious over all enemies and the joy of the whole earth. Essentially, they were right, of course, but in v ,-rking out the details of that golder, future, the Church itself has for the most part long since agreed that these early fathers were in several respects unscriptural and Judiastic. That much I have read because it states

clearly as you see that the theory has come on down from those men in early times. You see, also that it rises and falls along through the ages. In times of distress and darkness it comes again to prominence. I do verily believe that today it is prominent among the denominational people chiefly because of the confused and disturbed state of the nations, which seems, to some extent, to contribute to the view of our own brethren, who hold the premillennial idea. I also believe that although Brother Boll believed this theory and preached it long before the World War came along and long before the dispute came between him and tire brethren that led him to leave the Gospel Advocate, the World War then in progress in Europe contributed a part to his belief in the probable coming of the Lord at a very early period. Today they are predicting that perilous times are ahead of us. Today the outlook is not pleasant by any means but we should not, therefore, try to fix up some theory for the settlement of these difficulties. Leave that with the Lord, and if He wants to work it out and let the world continue to run, we will be happy. If it is the Father's will that our Savior return during our lives, leave that also with the Lord. At least, I should be glad to see Him, but above everything else, in our confusion and dispair it certainly wouldn't become us to be fighting and devouring each other about the Lord's coming You remember the story of the servant who said, "My Lord delays his coming," and he began to beat his fellow-servant and the Lord came in upon him and cast him out among the hypocrites? Above all, if we fight and beat and devour each other at all it certainly should not be about the second coming of our Lord, and most certainly not about some fanciful, far-fetched theory that we may have about what the Lord will do when he comes. In order that I might have some detailed description of what ,vili take place when the Lord comes and sets up his kingdom, according to the premillennial view, I asked these questions and I beg you to listen as I read them and then read the answers to them. Of course, I had known all the time that the idea held is that Jesus would come and reign on the earth a thousand years but I couldn't understand what kind of reigi men thought it would be and I submitted these questions to three different men, prominent men in the religious world. Only one of them, however, is reckoned among us, and that is Brother Robert H. Boll. I asked him these questions and he answered them frankly and then, as I have already stated, gave me permission to use his name. The other two men did not answer. Therefore, I read the questions and the answers.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO BROTHER BOLL AND HIS ANSWERS

1. When Christ comes to reign on the earth—on David's throne — will that be a political ormaterial government such as David's was, except grander and more extensive?

2 Will the government be supported by taxes paid by the citizens in literal, earthly coinage, such as we now use?

3. Will the citizens of this kingdom be flesh and blood men and women, as we are now? Will there be births and deaths on the earth during that thousand years?

4. What sort of beings will Christ and the risen saints be during that time? If Christ becomes flesh once again, becomes an earth dweller, will he have to die again? If not, how will he pass back to a glorified spirit being?

5. Does it seem reasonable — or even possible — to have a temporal, material, political government composed of flesh and blood people and supported by "Caesar coinage" and yet the ruler and his subordinate officers all spirit-beings who neither eat nor drink, sleep nor die, exercise nor

rest, rejoice nor weep as their mortal subjects do?

6. Since those nations over which Christ and his saints shall rule with a rod of iron are wicked, sinner nations, how will they be controlled, by a spiritual force or by physical force? Will there be armed police and trained soldiers to inforce the Ruler's will?

7. Will the gospel be preached during the millennium and will some of these sinners become Christians? If so, will these Christians live on to the end of the thousand years and then die or be changed or will they be dying along during the reign? If tbej die, what words of omfort could be said to the weeping ones seeing they could not use such scriptures as II Thess. 4:13 to close, and Revelation 21:1-7?

8. If this reign is to be entirely spiritual and in a new Heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness and where ihey shall not "hurt nor destroy" in what sense shall the rule be with a rod of iron and how break the nations in pieces? Are we not forced to "spiritualize" this " Also, why should such a reign end in a thousand years? Furthermore, why shoula we speak of such a reign as being on earth at all seeing it will not he this present earth at all and will not be "earthly" in nature?

I would like to imagine trying tc preach a funeral during the thousand years when I couldn't tell them that Christ would come and the dead would rise or that the tabernacle of God is with men and he will wipe all tears from their eyes, but nevertheless, without any further comment upon the questions, I will read the answers.

1. "It will be a theocracy, extending over all 'the kingdoms of the world'. (Revelation 11:15), taking over all the realm 'under the heaven', which was previously held by 'the fourth beast' (Daniel 7:27); and its sovereignty is 'over the nations'. (Revelation 2:20) Whether in view of this it should be described as 'political' and 'material' you must decide. 1 never use either of those terms when speaking of it.

When God headed the ancient theocratic kingdom. He demanded tithes and offerings. When Israel asked for a human king, God warned of the heavy taxations that such a king would demand (1 Samuel 8:1-18). Whether in the New Order anything will be demanded, is not perfectly clear. A typical indication may be discerned in 1 Kings 10:24-25 (Compare Revelation 21:24-25) and more direct prediction in Psalms 72:10; Psalms 72:15; Isa. 60:0,9,11,16. Nothing is anywhere said about any 'coinage' so far as I know.

That Israel, and the nations, over whom that reign extends are composed oi human beings in the flesh is seen in many scriptures e.g. Psalms 72:1114; Jeremiah 30:19-21; Zechariah 8:4-5 (See contexts also). There will be births and deaths. The lives of men. especially the righteous, will be much longer than human lifetimes run now. (Isaiah 65:20-25).

Christ is not a 'glorified spirit being', but a resurrected and glorified man. Such will also His saints be. As such they have access to earth or to heaven. After His resurrection, Christ walked on the earth for forty days, not bound by physical laws, yet able at will to use them and act in ac cordance with them. That Christ is a glorified spirit-being is the doctrine of Russell and Rutherford. The Bible teaching is that He is Man, now. (I. Tin 2:5) If He were not Man he could not sit on David's throne, now or ever; for God's oath is definite, that 'of the fruit of his (David's loins' He would set one upon

his throne. (See Psalms 89:3-4; Psalms 132:11; Acts 2:30-31).

This question is answered to all effects by the preceding.

The rod (sceptre) of iron is the symbol of strong, unswerving rule. Only rebels and oppressors will feel the weight of that rod. (Psalms 2:4; Psalms 2:9; Isaiah 11:3-5). There is no indication that the King will need or use carnal forces to execute His judgments. After the great judgments of that Day the remnants of the nations will subject themselves willingly to His rule. (Ps. -7:9; Psalms 72:11; Psalms 102:22; Zechariah 8:20-23). But also note Isaiah 60:12.

There is a distinction between salvation and government. Government may have to be enforced; salvation is always by grace and voluntary. There never can tie any salvation except through the gospel. During the millennium, Satan, who now blinds the minds of men (II Cor. 4:40) is bound and imprisoned, and the knowledge of Jehovah will cover the earth as waters cover the sea. All conclusions drawn from these facts must stand as conclusions only. The word of God denies that those who died in sin will have life and opportunity in the millennium; and there is no proof that those who today reject the gospel will have opportunity then.

We must distinguish between the new order under the “Millennium” on the one hand, and the ‘new heaven’ and ‘new earth’ which follow the passing away of the present earth and heaven, on the other. The rule of the rod of iron pertains to the former, not the latter. The latter represents the final perfect goal of Christ’s work, the eternal state. (Even in regard to the millennium we would not be forced to ‘spiritualize’ the ‘rod of iron,. There is a difference between ‘spiritualizing’ and recognizing a simple figure of speech.)”

COMMENT UPON THE ANSWERS

You now have his answers to the questions, and so far as I can see there is no attempt at evasion on any point. He answers promptly and frankly. I do not intend to attempt a detailed review of these answers. I do not think that such a review is necessary. I wanted these answers in order that I might understand what they think the nature of that future kingdom will be and what the conditions under that reign will be. He has told me, and it seems to me that he has committed himself to some rather gross things. It seems to be an unseemly mixing of the material and the spiritual; the temporal and the eternal, the terrestrial and the celestial. And, as Dr. Foster said, it throws things into confusion and promises a fourth dispensation. I cannot believe this theory. I would not say that I can’t believe any thing that God’s book teaches, and of course, Brother Boll thinks that this is all clearly taught in God’s word. He cites references for all his answers, but I can’t see that they prove the point. To connect some of these passages with the millennium requires a more active imagination than I possess. Some prophetic utterances I do not profess to understand but, as Brother Lipscomb used to say, in the light of plain New Testament teaching, I cannot put the interpretation upon them that premillennialists do.

I do not believe that our Lord is ever to live on this earth, even as a glorified human being, and reign over a political kingdom or be the head of a world government composed of mortal beings and maintained by dirty dollars—that which belongs to Caesar. (This it not a denial of the fact that Christ is coming back to the earth to judge and destroy it before the eternal state of the righteous and the wicked begins) (Matthew 25:31-46) Our brother says that Christ is now Man. Yes, 1 Timothy 2:5 says that. In like manner Christ was “God” while he was here on earth. He was

Emmanuel, God with us (Matthew 1:23). It would be easy for us to speculate and dispute about the nature of Christ now just as theologians in the days of Arius and Athanasius disputed and disfellowshipped each other about the nature of Christ while he was on earth. Of course, Brother Boll does not believe that Christ is a mortal man—subject to temptations, to pain and sickness and death. Nor will he ever be again. Then we will have an earth ruler that is in no way earthy—subject to or adapted to earth conditions. He is not mortal, but his subjects are mortal. See the mixture to which I referred?

AN APPEAL FOR PEACE

But what is the profit of all this disputing? Why shoulcPwg "atempt do tett -what "God is going to do In the future and how he is going to do it? He may do some things about which. I have no knowledge and of which I am not even able to conceive. If, therefore, he had told me about them I would not be able to bear them now, as the apostles were not able to take in the coming kingdom and its work in the long ago. (John 16:12). Would it not be wiser and better for us to leave God's plans" with Goct and give our time and thought and energy to the work he assigned us? We cannot change his plans anyway. He "will carry on his program and accomplish his purpose regardless of what we do or say or believe about it. If he intends to do- all that the premillennialists say he does and in just tne way they have mapped it out; all our disbelief, of the plan and our fighting against it wjll not change it one-iota: We cannot defeat God put if these men are wrong in'their -interpretation!? and conclusions then all their faith in the plan and all their fervor and zeal for it cannot bring it to pass. They cannot tell God how to do things.

Wtial profit is it, I ask again? It makes little difference what our ideas concerning future things are, but it makes an eternity of difference about what we do in the present and how we treat each other about our ideas and conclusions. This whole premillennial view does not touch present time or present duties at all. It does not concern one item of work or worship in the Church. It has nothing to do with any experience through which we must pass in this life. It is entirely future and has to do with what some men think God and Chrisi are going to do sometime in the future. We should not worry about what Christ is going to 'do in the future- the thing that should concern us is what are we doing today? Why should we lose valuable time and God-given opportunities by quibbling over eschatology? And why should we separate friends, alienate brethren, destroy fellowship, fill our hearts with rancor, offend these little ones and stab love dead at our feet just because we cannot agree on what is to be the denouement of the divine drama? On how Christ is going to wind up His work? Brethren, this is folly!

I make one more appeal for reconciliation and for peace. Why not hold your views on these questions in private, brethren, and not give an occasion to stumbling to anyone? These things are not only future and outside the realm of our duties and responsibilities, but on some points, at least, they are nebulous. But none of us would presume to tell you that you cannot believe them, all we ask is that you do not preach them. Surely you brethren are too well informd in the word of righteousness to insist that you have the right to preach what you believe and that we are presumptuous, sectarian and dictatorial when we say, "Thou shalt not." Men frequently have rights that they should forego for love's sake and sometimes out of regard for the weakness of other men. (1 Corinthians 1:4-6; 1 Corinthians 8:13) The condition among us today is deplorable. While Premillennialism has been taught by some of our brethren for more than thirty years, as we related

in the beginning, we have had more agitation concerning it in the last five years than we had in the twenty-five that preceded this period. We have had more hard feelings, more suspections among us and more judging one another and even misrepresenting one another than we ever had before. You may account for this as you think you should and lay the blame on the man or men whom you think deserves or deserve it, but you cannot deny that what I state is a fact. We have a demonstration of it here in Nashville. It is lamentable and some of us like Jeremiah of old are weeping over our people. But regardless of who has stirred up this schism in the last five years, it remains a fact that there has been trouble for twenty-five years, and it is all sc useless. Let us cease teaching millennial theories and disarm those who speak evil of us, restore fellowship among ourselves and let us see peace and joy and a spirit of cooperation and good will abiding among us again. I am praying to see this come about before I am mustered out of service. Will you not join me in this prayer, brethren?

VIII. ADDENDA

Following the lecture on premillennialism at Harding College, one of the teachers came to me and asked me what I would do with Revelation 3:21 which says that Christ is not now on his throne but upon the Father's throne. J told him I had attempted to answer that in the Gospel Advocate in 1937, and cited the issue. After the lecture at David Lipscomb College a preacher and also a sister came to me with the same question. They both stated that they had never heard any one attempt to explain this passage or to answer the argument that is made upon it. Since this seems to be such a favorite text with the premillen- nialists and since they think it unanswerable, I here present what I wrote on it some two years ago. The following was published in the Gospel Advocate in two articles. They appeared in the issue of June 24, 1937, page 578 and July 1, 1937, page 606. Here they are:

MYTHRONE; MY FATHER'S THRONE OR, IS CHRIST NOW ON HIS OWN THRONE?

G. C. Brewer

See Addenda Above

A brother who heard me through a meeting recently writes me a long letter filled with compliments, criticisms, and complaints. He feels that the glory has departed from spiritual Israel because some of us have sacrificed truthfulness, and fair dealing, for a ranting sectarian spirit; a spirit of factionalism and the determination on the part of some men to make themselves prominent, and even necessary, by becoming the champions of a faction. He in a halfhearted way exonerates me from this charge, but he thinks I, too, have either overlooked or repudiated at least one plain passage of Scripture. Here is an excerpt from his letter:

"You made the statement that, so far as you know, Christ is now on the only throne he will ever be on. I appreciate the fact that you were modest enough to say "so far as I know." That is much milder than the brethren usually put it. Some of them are so cocksure, dogmatic, and intolerant that they go to the point of blasphemy in declaring and announcing what Christ can and cannot do in the future, and they have definitely decided and decreed, as if in ecclesiastical convention assembled, that Christ shall not reign with his saints a thousand years, and woe unto him if he tries it! But you say "so far as I know," and yet you surely are well acquainted with the passage that clearly states that Christ is now on his Father's throne and that in the future he will be on his own

throne, and those who overcome will at that time sit with him on his throne. (Revelation 3:21) If you are acquainted with this inspired statement, how can you say “so far as I know, Christ is now on the only throne he will ever be on?” It is hard to think that you are not acquainted with this passage, and yet it is harder to think that you, with this before you, would make the statement you made. If you do not know this passage, will you now read it and learn about the difference between the Father’s throne, upon which Christ now sits, and Christ’s throne, upon which he and his saints will sit in the afterwhile? Or will you do like the rest of the brethren: repudiate this passage, tear Revelation out of your Bible, and berate, denounce, disfellowship and damn those of us who still believe the Bible, and, therefore, accept this plain statement of God’s word?”

REPLY:

A Charge and a Challenge. The brother (he signed his name, but requested that it not be made public) makes severe charge against some of his brethren, but he intimates that I do not belong in that class. Before he gets through, however, he puts a test before me. He challenges me either to believe what he says a certain passage teaches or else be put in that class that repudiates the word of God and deals out damnation. I shall let those who feel themselves guilty of this charge make their own denial. Since I am not guilty as yet, I shall try to convince the brother, whom I know to be an earnest, sincere man, even though he may be wrong in his interpretation of Scriptures, and also in his judgment of his brethren, that I believe and revere the word of God, even the passage which he cites, and yet I do not accept his view of the future throne and kingdom. I shall hope to give him no room whatever to make his charge against me. I think v. e can study the passage on which relies without denouncing or damning any one.

Surely the brother will be willing to enter into an honest analysis and study of the passage. He must not insist that what it says is so plain that it needs no study when to make it state what our brother understands it to mean would be to make it contradict other passages, and even throw the whole New Testament teaching into confusion. Can it be that this passage has a figurative meaning? Shall we not examine it in the light of its context and in the light of other passages?

The Promises to Those Who Overcome. The passage that our brother cites is the concluding part of the letter to the church at Laodicea, the seventh of the seven churches of Asia. If we read carefully these seven letters, we will see that each one of them i nay be divided into the following parts: introduction, commendation, condemnation, anu promises. Each time the one who speaks is named or described and the description is borrowed from the description that is given of the One who appeared unto John in the first chapter. Some parts of that general description are given in each letter—a different aspect given in each one, thus:

“These things saith he that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand, he that walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks.”

“These things saith the first and the last, who was dead, and liveth again.”

“These things saith he that hath the sharp two-edged sword.”

“These things saith the Son of God, who hath his eyes like a flame of fire, and his feet are like unto burnished brass.”

“These things saith he that hath the seven Spirits of God, and the seven stars.”

“These tilings saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth and none shall shut, and that shutteth and none openeth.”

“These things saith 1he Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.”

No one will suppose that this was a different speaker each time, though he is described differently. It is the same speaker under different description, and these descriptions are given in language that is highly figurative. The letters abound in figurative expressions, though most of them are easily understood. Some had not “defiled their garments”—plain. Some needed “eye-salve to anoint” their eyes—plain, but figurative of course.

II. As we saw in the preceding article regarding promises, we now see that the blessings promised to those who overcome are described in figurative language, and a different description is given in each Jetterr

“To him that overcometh, to him will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the Paradise of God.”

“He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death.”

“To him that overcometh, to him will I give of the hidden manna, and I will give him a white stone, and upon the stone a new name written, which no one knoweth but he that receiveth it.”

"And he that overcometh, and he that keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give authority over the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron, as the vessels of the potter are broken to shivers as I also have received of my Father: and I will give him the morning star.”

“He that overcometh shall thus be arrayed in white garments; and I will in no wise blot his name out of the book of life, and I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels.”

“He that overcometh, I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go out thence no more; and I will write upon him the name of my God. and the name of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God, and mine own new name.”

“He that overcometh, I will give to him to sit down with me in my throne, as I also overcame, and sat down with my Father in his throne.”

Now, is any one ready to contend that these seven churches will all have different rewards? Will only those of Ephesus be permitted to eat of the tree of life? Will only those of Smyrna escape the second death? Will only those of Pergamum have the hidden manna and the white stone? Will only those of Thyatira have authority and rule the nations with a rod of iron? Will only those of Sardis be arrayed in white and be confessed before the Father? Will only those of Philadelphia be pillars in the temple of God and have things written upon them? And will only those of Laodicea sit with Christ in his throne? Will not our brother admit that these are just different ways of telling of the victory, the glory, and the blessings that the faithful shall receive and enjoy? Does he not also see that the language in each case, with the possible exception of “confessing his name.” is figurative? What is the white stone? Are the white garments literal? Will any one be a literal pillar in a literal temple and have a literal inscription upon him? This is just carrying out the figure. We put inscriptions upon cornerstones and pillars. Will any one be a literal ruler of a nation and break and destroy his foes as a vessel is broken? Is this not explained by the expression, “as I also have

received of my Father?" Does it not show that Christ will give his faithful ones just such victory and authority over the nations as the Father gave him? Is Christ now ruling with a rod of iron? Does he break and destroy his foes by force? Is it the desire and the disposition of Christians to rule nations with a rod of iron and to break and destroy them by superior physical force? (In another article we may attempt to show what this figure of speech means.)

How will we be given the morning star? If the morning star here means Christ (Revelation 22:16), do we not now have Christ? To sit with Christ in his throne must mean that we shall enter into and share his final victory and glory as he entered into the glory that he had with the Father before the world was. (John 17:5) This is not something different from the rewards promised in the other six letters. It is only a different way of describing it.

My Kingdom. Christ calls the present kingdom "my kingdom." And he told his apostles that some of them would live to see him come in "his kingdom," (Matthew 16:28) or that they would see the kingdom of God come with power (Mark 9:1). If Christ did not come in his kingdom during the lifetime of those apostles, his promise failed. Our brother would not accept that conclusion. He would agree that this promise was fulfilled on Pentecost. Shall we say, then, that Christ is now in his kingdom reigning, but not yet on his throne? Is he ruling his kingdom from his Father's throne? If that future throne, which our brother contemplates and upon whiuu we shall sit with Christ, is to be spoken of as the Father's throne and also Christ's throne?" If it can be spoken of as both David's throne and Christ's throne, why not the present throne to be David's throne, how can Christ speak of it as "my throne?"

This sort of discussion is distasteful to me, and in my view wholly unnecessary if not "unprofitable and vain." Let us be faithful Christians and eschew all such speculative questions. Leave the future with the Lord. He will fulfill every promise.

sermon index

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
- 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net