

# THE CERTIFIED GOSPEL

A series of sermons preached at the 6th Street Church  
of Christ in Port Arthur, Texas, October 26th  
through November 10th, 1937.

BY  
**FOY E. WALLACE. JR.**

(**Second** Edition — Revised and Enlarged)

Published by

**Roy E. Cogdill Publishing Company**

P. O. Box 980

Lufkin, Texas

1948



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The following sermons were preached at the Sixth Street Church in Port Arthur, Texas, from October 26 to November 10, 1937, and were printed daily in the Port Arthur News. The News has a circulation of 10,000 which means that about 50,000 people had access to them. This was done at a cost of about \$500. To have printed and distributed them ourselves would have cost \$2,000. Just the postage on them would have been \$1200. Besides this, they were more generally read.

Sectarianism is so entrenched today that the people are kept away from our ordinary church services, so that other means must be employed to get to the people. The printing press and the radio are ideal for that purpose. Of these two, printing is far more effective. In fact, the printing press has effected civilization to a greater extent than all other inventions together. If Adventism, Russellism, Mormonism and every other "ism" can be propagated by the printing press, why not the truth? We have been so pleased with the attitude of the newspaper toward us, and the response from the public that we are planning to use it much more extensively in the future. We commend this to the brotherhood as a means for "turning the world upside down."

When first approached, Brother Wallace objected to having a volume of his sermons printed insisting, very modestly, that he did not feel that his sermons possessed sufficient merit. But we believed that the very fact that his services are so widely sought was ample evidence that the brotherhood would welcome such a volume.

Brethren sometimes lament that the gospel does not seem to be as effective as in ancient times, but I am sure the gospel has the same power and human nature is the same. The cause of failure is in us. Brethren are too anxious to be popular. Business and social matters neutralize the spirit of conquest peculiar to the early church. Now the quest of church leaders is for "good mixers." A preacher's

success is measured by his ability to get along smoothly with the denominations or his "super-salesmanship" in enticing attendance and so adroitly applying "the proper method of approach" that the unsuspecting "victim" soon wakes up and finds to his great joy that he has been made a Christian unawares. Regardless of the fancy, finely spun theories of psychology, I am certain that the only way to learn how to preach the gospel is to go to the book that "thoroughly furnishes us to every good work" and see what was preached and how it was preached.

It was not a matter of the best psychology or the most up-to-date method of approach with Elijah but simply a matter of loyalty to God. Computed by men's standards Elijah was a consummate failure, and there are thousands of small souls who never made any impression on the world who can very confidently point out the blunders in his methods.

God's method of approach for Gideon was to go out and tear down the sacred grove of his own father and his neighbors. It is true their anger was aroused and they sought to kill him. We know that he converted his father from heathenism (and probably some of his neighbors) and this was worth more than all the world. If the approach was wrong or the psychology bad our "salesmanship" brethren will have to charge it up to God!

Josiah burned the sacred things of his father and mother and stamped them to powder. Ezekiel was commanded to "prophesy against" the errors of the people. (Ez. 13:2,17) There never has been more blistering and withering verbal chastising than was delivered repeatedly by John the Baptist and Jesus to the Scribes and Pharisees of that day. (Matt. 3:7; Matt. 23) Contrasted with this the New Testament speaks of false teachers as follows: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." (Rom. 16:17, 18)

Paul's instructions to a young preacher reads thus: "Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught,

that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers. For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision: whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake" (Titus 1:9-11) Psychology or no psychology, that is the proper method of approach! Paraphrasing Thayer's definition of the Greek word here translated "convince" we have: *refute, confute, convict, bring to light, expose, find fault with, correct, reprehend severely, chide, admonish, reprove, to call to account, show one his faults, demand an explanation, to chasten, to punish.* Other scriptures of similar import should be noted here.

"And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them." (Eph. 5:11.)

"Wherefore rebuke them sharply that they may be sound in the faith." (Tit. 1:13).

"These things speak, and exhort, and rebuke with all authority. Let no man despise thee." (Titus 2:15).

"Them that sin rebuke before all that others may fear." (I Tim. 5:20).

"I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." (2 Tim. 4.1-4).

Many now speak of religious discussions as "dog fights." Those who engage in religious discussion are lambasted, roasted, and flayed, and these implications, insinuations, and innuendoes condemn Jesus and the apostles just as much as they do any man now living! When Jesus meant Pharisees and Sadducees, he said, "Pharisees and Sadducees," but the sweet-spirited ones who venomously criticize the critics would not think of doing such an "unchristian" thing! All this silly sentimentalism is merely an effort of the devil to dehorn the gospel. The gospel "is the power (Greek: *dunamis*, from which we get the word *dynamite*)

of God." It is "mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds" (2 Cor. 10:4).

Sometimes it is said that the Old Testament said, "Thou shalt not," but that it is bad psychology and that the New Testament does not say, "Thou shalt not." If that were true, it would only mean that God made a mistake for fifteen hundred years! But it is not true. Read the 13th and 14th chapters of Romans for a sample of the "Thou shalt not" method of the New Testament! To reprove and rebuke is to say in substance, "Thou shalt not." I will produce just about as many commands of the New Testament that are stated negatively as can be found in the same number of pages of the Old Testament. But if only one negative statement could be found in the New Testament, away goes the absurd assertion. Paul was chosen to do two things: "to turn them from darkness to light." To *turn men from darkness* is just as much the duty of a preacher of the gospel as to *turn them to light*.

Without all modern inventions of communication and travel, and being compelled to do everything the most expensive and laborious way, Paul could exclaim after a few years that the gospel had been preached "to every creature that is under heaven." (Col. 1:29). By controversy in their own places of worship (Acts 15 and Gal. 2), in the public places (Acts 17:17), and in other fellow's place of worship (Acts 6:9—Acts 7:60; Acts 9:20; Acts 13:5, 14, 41-51; Acts 14:1; Acts 17:1,10, 17; Acts 18:4, 18; Acts 19:8), they "persuaded and turned away much people" from the false to the true, and, so their enemies said, "turned the world upside down." A contest of any kind focuses interest, and this is especially true of the contest between false religion and true religion. After a discussion that lasted for two years and three months in the city of Ephesus (the longest discussion on record) it is said, "so that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus." It would have the same effect today. What could Paul have done with amplifiers, radios, and newspapers?

Invariably false teachers, who are feverishly endeavoring to avoid exposure, seek refuge in a perversion of Romans 1:29 and 2 Cor. 12:20. There, they piously tell us, debating is condemned as one of the worst of sins. Is it not

a little strange that they did not find this out until they tried a few times to uphold their doctrines in public discussion? They pervert these passages who make the word "debate" mean "discussing religious questions in public," for that sort of definition makes malefactors of Elijah, Gideon, John the Baptist, Jesus, Stephen and Paul. "Debating" is condemned but "disputing" was highly indulged in by all the preachers of the Bible, therefore I am very much in favor of disputes! Bigger ones and more of them! Let all Christians learn how to lead their neighbors out of darkness into light, and not confine this matter of teaching to a part of the church sometimes called "preachers." Why not make every Christian a preacher as in the Jerusalem Church (Acts 8 :1-4) ? I once helped to tear a big hole in my neighbors roof not because I wanted to harm my neighbor, but because I wanted to do him good. His house was on fire! When a Christian endeavors to discredit his neighbor's religion, he is attempting to do him a favor, just as if he were rescuing him from a burning or a sinking ship. A Christian's love will not allow him to stand idly by and see his neighbor drink poison by mistake.

This, my friends is the spirit of the New Testament preaching and we feel that this volume of sermons conforms to this ideal. With a prayer for all honest seekers for the old paths we send it forth on its mission.

O. C. LAMBERT.

Nov. 11, 1937.





## CHAPTER II

## THE CERTIFIED GOSPEL

**TEXT:** *"But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man."*—(Gal. 1:11).

My Friends and Brethren: It is with deep reverence for God and His holy Word of Truth that I appear before you. Whatever may have been your anticipations awaiting it, they could not have exceeded my own. I am happy to join my friend and brother, O. C. Lambert, in this gospel work and the personal sentiments he has voiced for me are altogether mutual. With an eye single to God's glory and the salvation of Port Arthur's unsaved population we shall, with you, labor together as one, seeking divine guidance in all things done and said.

Your attention is now directed to the first text of the meeting: "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man." (Gal. 1:11).

My theme is "The Certified Gospel." We are living in the day of certified things. We demand certified food and certified clothing, and sometimes, certified checks. But I wonder if people think as much of their religion as they do a bottle of milk?

Along the highways we read the billboards, advertising certain products, warnings against substitutes and frauds and such as, "watch for the trademark" and "take no substitutes." But in religion the masses yield to the flimsy sentiment that it makes no difference what one believes just so he thinks it is all right. As well say that it makes no difference what one eats or drinks so long as he thinks it is all right. Would it be safe to eat rat poison if one should believe it to be salad dressing or dessert? It is not eating that imparts and sustains life, but what one eats. So it is not believing that saves the soul but what one believes. The One who knows what it takes to save said: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Error can-

not be made a substitute for the truth in the saving plan.

My friend, you had better look for the trademark on your religion. Has it ever occurred to you that your religion may not be certified? Let us examine the general features, or characteristics, of this gospel which Paul certified to be not after man, but of God.

#### THE ORIGINAL GOSPEL

First of all, it is the original gospel. Paul marveled that some had so soon removed from Christ's gospel "unto another gospel." So there are many gospels today, but they are not the original, and they cannot save. The certified gospel is the ancient gospel. Anything in religion that has had its origin this side of the New Testament, or outside of the New Testament, is a human product and is not the certified gospel. Every creed written by man or any set of men falls under this indictment. Men are engaged in a nefarious business who write a substitute creed for the original apostle's creed—the New Testament.

What do these men think they are doing? Do you, my friends, who have subscribed to various creeds, believe in your hearts that these men have improved on the New Testament?

But we are living in a world of changes. The world demands something new. No longer do the masses ask, Is it true? but rather, is it new? Thus the church so-called, has come to be looked upon as a sort of a cult to keep people attracted by novelties and entertained with innovations. But the true gospel is of necessity the old gospel. It has an unmistakable trademark.

Heed my warning, friend, and take no substitute. If already you have had such imposed upon you, cast it away, lest it cost you your soul.

#### THE PURE GOSPEL

Another mark of the certified gospel is purity—it must be the pure gospel. He who certified it said: "But there be some who trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ." A perverted gospel is an adulterated gospel. It

cannot save.

Did you ever hear a preacher pray for God to send down Holy Ghost saving power upon sinners? It would be just as sensible to pray for God to send down power to quell the hunger or quench the thirst. If one so ignorant, should so pray, a child could show him a loaf of bread or a glass of water. And why preachers who pray for direct saving power do not have the plain intelligence to tell men terms of the gospel which Paul declares to be "the power of God unto salvation" is mighty strange to me. Therein, my friends, you may all at once be instructed in what to do to be saved.

But we were speaking of perversion. Power can be perverted. Bread is God's power to satisfy hunger, but a measure of poison intermixed will destroy its power. Water is God's power to quench thirst, but a portion of salt will destroy that agency. The gospel is God's power to save the soul but when men's doctrines and human opinions are mixed up with it, the adulteration destroys its agency. It takes the truth preached, the truth heard, the truth believed, the truth obeyed, to make a Christian. Error preached, error heard, error believed, error obeyed, cannot make a Christian. No man can accidentally obey God. And the man who adulterates the gospel is a far greater enemy to your soul than the man who would pollute a drinking fountain or poison the source of food is to' society. Paul said: "Let him be accursed."

#### THE ADEQUATE GOSPEL

There is another word that describes the certified gospel. It is the adequate gospel—adequate for all time, every tongue and clime. The inspired man who certified it continues to say: "If any man (though we, or an angel from heaven) preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." What a curse! This gospel was delivered for all time to come. It was not made subject to alterations and changes. The pattern was perfect. The cloth out of which it was made was divine and Divinity cut it. Human hands dare not change

it. The man who does perishes under the curse

And then—this certified gospel is the glorious gospel. With all his human learning and attainments, Paul was not ashamed to preach it. "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ," he said. He had preached it in Athens; he was ready to bear its glad news to Rome. He would pit it against the consolidated power and pomp of Rome and Athens. He was unashamed of the message and its Author, and never afraid to preach its rigid but righteous demands. It is sad that such cannot be said of all preachers today—even some who profess to be gospel preachers but who halt and hesitate, falter and fail, in preaching all that the gospel demands in the charge "reprove, rebuke and exhort." To preach truth (part of it) but not the whole truth (all of it) is a poor alibi for men who call themselves preachers. The certified gospel is the saving gospel, friend, and your only hope of salvation lies in obedience to its commands.

#### THE BEING OF GOD

Having discussed the outward characteristics of the gospel Paul certified, let us now take a look inside its principles. What are its elements? Let Paul define it.

It is first, the gospel of God. "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God." There is the very first principle stated—the Being of God; yes, God versus evolution. Who wants the gospel (?) of evolution? The evolutionist would have us suppose that life originated in the depth of the sea, a primordial protoplasm, and through millions of years developed (probably) into the sea mammal, which chanced one time to be left out on shore (perhaps) when tides receded where he was, and in new environment he squirmed for survival (supposedly) in process of which friction developed four warts in the right places to make probable legs; and while that was being done the sun also (very likely) created a friction on the upper side that started two freckles in just the rights spots to make eyes which supposedly they probably did; and when this animal, after no telling how long could perhaps see and walk, it had also developed a caudal appendage (known to us as a tail), which somehow

got twisted around a limb or bough of a tree and the forest became the home of this animal for a thousand millenniums or so, and his diet was coconuts (being most likely that kind of an animal) ; but when the spirit of adventure possessed this animal of the trees, he one day left his forest home descended to the ground and in process of time, lost his tail—so we are here!

Read the textbooks of evolution, their "outline of history" and their "science of life" and see that their groundless theories are just that wholly unintelligible and absurd—yet they boast of "knowledge" and sneer at credulity! Who would accept such consummate and unmitigated nonsense as that in exchange for the majestic and sublime first sentence in the Bible—"In the beginning God."

With David we exclaim: "Know ye Jehovah that He is God; it is He that made us and we are His." Let us have the gospel of God.

#### THE DEITY OF JESUS

The next element of the certified gospel is the Deity of Christ—Jesus Christ versus Modernism.

We have heard much of Jesus of Nazareth, the Galilean, the moralist, the teacher, his methods, ethics, and examples—but what is needed is more of Paul's first sermon as recorded in Acts 9:20: "And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God." And that fact depends on his Virgin Birth, his Vicarious Death, his Victorious Resurrection, his Triumphant Ascension and his Glorious Coronation. The God who created Adam and Eve and placed within the pair the potentiality of reproduction, could transfer that power to one person instead of two—and that is the meaning of the Virgin Birth. It is just a matter of believing that God could send his Son into the world through the instrumentality of human motherhood without a human father, and that he did.

The further fact is that Jesus Christ died for our sins—the innocent for the guilty—He, the Son of God, the unoffending victim of man's transgression, died to save the race. His cross declares God's infinite hatred of sin, and God's infinite love for the sinner. It took the sinless soul of

God to atone **for** the sinful soul of fallen man. God so loved the world.

Then, there is the mighty arch of Christian faith—his resurrection from the dead. He arose from the dead as a bodily fact—raised for our justification—and by his resurrection "declared to be the Son of God with power." (Rom. 1:4).

He ascended to heaven. There the coronation ceremonies were held—and he is King, not to be, but now, in act and in fact, and he offers full citizenship in his kingdom, the church, to all earth's denizens who will take his yoke (government), and learn of him (obey his will), with all the blessings belonging to such as inherit his kingdom. The certified gospel is "the gospel of Christ."

#### THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH

But Christ cannot be separated from the institution purchased with his blood—so the certified gospel is that of Christ and the Church. It is God versus Evolution; Christ versus Modernism; the Church versus Denominationalism.

If we have traveled together this far, friends, let us not separate now—the church, one church. With me it is *the* church, or no church. Remember, the one who certified the gospel—Paul, the apostle—said that "there is one body" (Eph. 4:4), and that the body is "the church" (Eph. 1:22), and that there is "but (only) one body."

That is putting it plainly enough—one body, but one body; one church, only one church. Why beat the devil around the bush—just beat the Old Scratch over the head, where he needs it!

Scripturally considering the matter, I would as soon have one ask me what God I worship, or what Christ I believe in, as to ask me what church I belong to. Considering the fact that Christ built one, died for one, purchased one, and is the head of but one—deep down in your heart, what church do you, yourself, think one should belong to, friend? Leaving out everything but this inside honest question—what is your answer?

The certified gospel is the gospel of Christ and the church

versus men and their movements.

#### SALVATION VERSUS SENSATION

Finally, the certified gospel is "the gospel of our salvation"—the gospel plan of salvation versus the sensationalism of modern "revivals."

For years every union evangelist has had his patent method of conversion. Billy Sunday shouted "hit the sawdust trail." Gipsy Smith pleaded "sign a decision card." But Jesus said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" and his keynote speaker of Pentecost, who had the keys of the kingdom, imbued with the Spirit, infallible in all his utterances, declared to several thousand inquirers: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." What preacher today can do better than tell unsaved people to do these things? The divine plan is the same—faith to change the heart, destroying the love of sin; repentance to change the will, destroying the habits of sin; and baptism to change the state (or location), seeing that such a one is baptized into Christ; by baptism translated from without to within, and thus destroying the guilt of sin.

Friends, this is the certified gospel. We ask you now if you will not now receive it, promptly obey it, and stand upon its promises. Will you not come this, the very first night of the meeting, while we wait and sing?

### CHAPTER III

## WHO WROTE THE BIBLE?

*TEXT: "I have written to him the great things of my law, but they were counted as a strange thing."—(Hosea 8:12).*

My Friends and Neighbors and Brethren in Christ: We come before God to resume the study of his Word. I am grateful to God for his providence and to you for your presence. One of God's prophets said: "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth: for the Lord hath spoken." When God speaks it is time for the earth to be silent; when God speaks it is the time for man to listen. I shall address you tonight on The Word Of God—The Bible. My particular text is Hosea 8:12: "I have written to him the great things of my law, but they were counted as a strange thing."

The Bible needs no defense and the purpose of this sermon is not to defend the Bible; it is rather to promote faith in your hearts for the sake of your souls. We live in a skeptical age. Time was when most everybody would say, "I believe." Now they say "Do I believe?" Once nearly everybody said, "This is true." Now nearly everybody says "Is it true?" In school and in society our young people are being sneered out of their faith. A campaign of sneering and scorn and ridicule far beneath the ethics of education is being waged against the Bible by certain professors of science and philosophy in our colleges today, even in our high schools. But Christian young people, "Let no man despise thy youth" nor thy faith. If it be grounded on the Bible, it is well grounded. Stand firm and waver not.

#### THE CLAIMS OF THE BIBLE

The Bible claims that God is its author. If that is hot true, then the Bible is the greatest fraud ever perpetrated on the human race. Its claims are true, or the Book is false—which do you believe? We shall examine its claims.

In what sense does the Bible claim to be the Word of



God ? Not in the sense that all the words in the Bible were at the time they were spoken the words of God, for the devil said *some* of the things recorded in the Bible; and bad men said some things that are recorded in the Bible. Disputes between teachers of truth and of error arrayed one against the other are recorded in the Bible. So not all of the words of the Bible were the words of God when spoken—but it is all nevertheless the Word of God from Genesis to Revelation in the exact sense that God caused to be written everything that is in the Book; it is an inspired record in all of its statements, and everything in it from Genesis to Revelation is the object of belief in the exact setting in which the statements occur, and the circumstances to which they are attributed.

We therefore believe that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. 3:16,17).

#### THE GROUNDS OF FAITH

Do you ask what the grounds of faith in the Bible—how we may resolve doubts and know that the Bible is the Word of God? That is what I propose to tell you tonight. I have never doubted the Word of God. I have always believed it.

The first ground of my faith was parental—my parents believed and imparted their faith to me. My mother read the Bible to me before I could read it for myself. She prayed with her children, and the sweetest prayer that ever ascended to God's throne was hers. In the words of a popular song, "My Mother's Prayers Have Followed Me." But I do not believe the Bible tonight merely because my mother believed it or because my father before me has preached it. There are other reasons now—other grounds of belief.

The character of my teachers could be named as a vital and definite factor in the growth of the faith that dwells in my soul. In early years, thanks to a wise and benevolent father, I went to school to Christian teachers. They were not infidels, nor even doubters. But they were scholars. I am glad infidels cannot lay claim to all scholarship. Im-

pressed with their integrity and their ability to remove the objections and answer the cavils of infidels, my faith was anchored and it held. But I do not believe the Bible tonight merely because my parents and my teachers believed it.

The further ground of my faith is personal and independent—a knowledge of its contents, the scope, the breadth, and the depth of which could not have been ancient wisdom in its writers, but Divine Revelation that guided their tongues and pens.

I propose to show that the contents of the Bible bring it outside the range of human production and vindicate its claims to be the inerrant Word of God.

#### THE BIBLE AND SCIENCE

It is repeatedly charged that the Bible is unscientific. May I revise the term and say that the Bible is not unscientific, but pre-scientific? It anticipates scientific discovery long before the mystic, magic word science was coined. Really, the word "science" means to know—and there is not anything that any man can prove that he knows that contradicts the Bible. But does the Bible anticipate science? Yes, with wonderful preconception and divine foreknowledge.

I will specify a few items. Take first, what is known as the five facts of science: Time, Space, Matter, Force, and Motion. Were these facts known to men of ancient day? No, they were unknown as scientific factors; they belong to the parlance and vocabulary of modern science and not to ancient wisdom. Yet the first sentence in the Bible, penned by Moses, recognizes in principle these unknown facts. Hear the passage: "In the beginning (Time) God created the heaven (Space) and the earth (Matter). ... And the Spirit of God (Force) moved (Motion) upon the face of the waters." Hidden in the first sentence of the Bible, to await the development of human knowledge, is the definite proof that man never wrote it unaided. Moses by ancient wisdom could never have written such a sentence enfolding such knowledge, yea, foreknowledge. God wrote it, my friends,

through Moses, his amanuensis.

References to things then unknown to man are numerous in the first chapters of Genesis. Moses referred to the "waters under the heaven" and called them seas when as a matter of fact he knew only one sea; and he said that God gathered the seas (plural) into one place (bed.). The seven seas of the earth, unknown to Moses, are all connected with their own mighty waters and are hence, literally in one place, or bed. Such instances of divine foreknowledge even in the writings of Moses are too numerous to mention in this sermon.

But take another witness. Job lived before the law of Moses was delivered—he was a patriarch, of the patriarchal *age*. He knew nothing of what we now know as gravity, nor did any other man of his day. Yet he said in an amazing sentence bearing the marks of inspiration, "He that stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing." (Job. 26:7). Ah, my friends, there is science before there was any science. There is gravity before men knew gravity. He hangeth the earth upon nothing—the earth poised in space, a matter of science, a fact of the solar system that men, all men, never knew until centuries after the Bible was written. Did Job possess such ancient knowledge, or shall we not rather ascribe it to divine revelation?

Then, the accompanying facts of the solar system, the rotundity of the earth and its rotation on its axis, are also set forth before their scientific time—in the Bible. Referring to the shape of the earth, Isaiah said, "He sitteth above the circle of the earth." (Isa. 40:22). Jesus referred to the three divisions of the day, stating that his second advent would occur at the dawn, in the day and in the night (Lk. 1:7), which would be utterly impossible if the earth is flat, but Jesus knowing the scientific fact of the earth's rotundity, a *thing the world did not know, was able to make a statement scientifically accurate, but which his hearers were unprepared by limited knowledge to receive. It brings his teaching outside the range of human knowledge also.*

Referring again to Job, he said: "Canst thou send forth

lightnings, that they may go and say unto thee, Here we are?" (Job 38:35). The human voice can girdle the globe today in a second, as fast as our words can be spoken. All forms of electricity, telegraph, radio, are lightnings. Job did not know that men's voices and words could be transmitted across continents in flashes of lightning speed—but it can be done, and he said it before he knew it, another proof of inspiration.

Again, he said—Job, the patriarch, said this—"Who shut up the sea with doors . . . and marked for it my bound . . . and said, Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed." (Job. 38:8,11). All the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full. We are told that 280,000 cubic miles of water flow into the seas every year—yet thus far and no farther, they go. Their bounds are appointed, their proud waves are stayed.

Evaporation carries the clouds to the mountains, the rivers carry their waters back to the seas, again they rise, and again they return. Before such matters were within the range of human knowledge, before men had access to such sources of information, the divine writers freely mentioned them with amazing, yea, inspired accuracy.

Other instances of the foreknowledge of the Bible on matters of science and invention are such statements as made by Isaiah: "Who are these that fly (through the air) as clouds, and (settle) as the doves to their windows?" There is modern aviation, even beyond its present advancement or perfection.

Paul anticipated the atom theory in Heb. 11:3 "By faith we know that the world was framed by the word of God, so things visible did not evolve from invisible atoms or entities" Paul thus answered the infidel evolutionist. Moses gave instructions to Israel in the wilderness along lines of prophylaxis, sterilization, and sanitation, even ahead of present day conditions, and his instructions indicate the knowledge of the germ theory which only in recent years has been determined by medical men of down-to-date information. (Lev. 13 et. al).

Paul discoursed to the the Athenian philosophers on the

much discussed subject of modern evolution as related to what is known as Anthropology, when he said, "And he hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell upon the face of the earth, having determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation. (Acts 17). This is purely a scientific question, so far as human knowledge goes, which Paul introduced. Scientists admit that without the aid of modern instruments for blood analysis, Paul could not have known the truth of such a statement. It is a known fact that blood analysis reveals the difference between the blood of animals and that of human beings but cannot distinguish the blood of various human races, whether Anglo-saxon, Caucasian, African or Mongolian—it is just human blood! How could Paul make a statement which only the instruments of modern science could have demonstrated—except by divine revelation?

Friends, though the Bible is not a text-book on science, all that it says on the subject is scientifically accurate; though it is not a text-book on geology, when it touches that subject its statements are geologically correct; though it is not a text-book on astronomy, when it refers to that branch of science, what it says is astronomically true. Such facts cannot be accounted for on any other basis than the integrity of its claims to be the inerrant Word of God—verbal inspiration. Much more could be said, yea, volumes—but attention is called to some other matters before our time is elapsed.

#### THE BIBLE AND HISTORY

Did you ever know of a man who could write history in advance? Can men record the history and destiny of nations before they are founded? Can men mention the names of men, and foretell what they will do before they are born? Can men pronounce certain destruction and desolation upon cities centuries ahead? Men have no such omnipotent vision and power—yet the Bible is replete with instances of all such.

Moses wrote the history of the Jews before they became a nation, while they were yet only an emancipated race of slaves in the wilderness of their journey to Canaan. Their

type of government, and its many changes, timed to their history; the character of their kings and the events of their administrations, good and bad; their final conquering by the foreign nation that subdued them; and their permanent end as a nation in their scattered state, yet not a mongrel race, for they would not be consumed, though their name should ever be a hiss and a byword. The fulfillment of it all is so obvious that no argument is needed to sustain it, yet some of these events were named by Moses as far as fifteen hundred years before they even began to take place.

The prophets of the Old Testament predicted the destruction of certain cities—Tyre and Sidon, Nineveh, Avalon, Babylon—centuries ahead, and with the boldness that only an inspired man of God can give to the touch of the pen, they predicted that certain of these cities should remain in utter desolation. Their destruction came according to the word of these prophets—and to this day they remain in the dust of their ashes. Besides all this, God's prophets called the names of kings and rulers before they were born. Isaiah named Cyrus, the Persian king, a hundred years before he was born and cited his proclamation liberating the Jews from their Babylonian captivity, and even referred to his benevolence in supplying the money and material with which they should lay the foundation for the rebuilding of their temple in Jerusalem. (Isa. 44 and 45). These and other similar facts are the indubitable evidences of the divine inspiration of the Bible. No amount of perverted genius or diabolical ingenuity can overturn such a bulwark of proof and authenticity.

But in matters of prophecy, the Messianic prophecies excel—those referring to the coming of the Redeemer, the Saviour of man. From Genesis to Malachi, in the Old Testament, these prophecies occur, and from Matthew to Revelation, in the New Testament, their fulfillment is recorded. Every event of his life from Bethlehem to Nazareth and from Nazareth to Calvary, are matters of Old Testament prediction and New Testament fulfillment. It furnishes the climax of all evidences that the Bible is the Word of

God, and is the most bewildering array of inspired documentary evidence that ever an unbeliever or infidel has attempted to disprove. Why should men oppose God? "Hear, O heaven, and give ear O earth: for the Lord hath spoken."

#### UTILITY OF CERTAIN PASSAGES

But, friends, let me say, before we close, that infidels and unbelievers are not the only ones who need to be convinced that the Bible is right. The infidel is not the greatest enemy of the Bible—rather it is the professed believer.

There are the abominations of Rome—the long history of Roman Catholicism—on the one hand, and the discords and contradictions of Orthodox Protestantism on the other hand, that have paralyzed the faith of nations today, and have made infidels of countless millions. Men have pledged the Bible to these human systems—but the Bible is against them all. A further evidence of its inspiration lies in the fact that it has foretold and anticipated all of these forms of error existing today with ample warnings against their fatal deceptions.

Every cardinal doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church has been anticipated and divinely refuted in the Bible. Likewise the creeds of the Protestants have been relegated to the devil by the inspired apostles.

The Catholics dote much on the Primacy of Peter, but the New Testament is very specific in its various statements exposing this fallacy which has papal assumption as its only proof. Their doctrines of papal infallibility, the inspiration of the pope's encyclicals, their pagan ordinances, and everything that identifies their worse than human organization, are matters of foreknowledge and forewarning in the Word of God.

As for the Protestants, all their denominations being "plants which the heavenly Father hath not planted," they too, shall be rooted up, and the Bible does the work in advance. If you chance to be, by misguidance and delusion, a member of such, we beg you in the name of all that is

divine to "come ye out from among them and be ye separate."

The Bible, friends, is the only divine standard of authority. Will you not lay aside party creeds and names, human doctrines and ordinances, and strike hands with us across God's only and holy Word—the Bible? If such is in your heart—then "do not let the word depart," but come tonight while the audience shall stand and sing.



## THE CERTIFIED GOSPEL

### CHAPTER IV

## CHRIST AND THE CHURCH

*TEXT: "Can a maid forget her ornaments, or a bride her attire? Yet my people have forgotten me days without number." (Jer. 2:32).*

Friends and Brethren: By the grace of God we are able to continue the study of his divine word. I know you realize that we have assembled in His presence, and I am conscious of the fact that I stand before Him. Your presence in such numbers indicates your interest in plain Bible teaching, for no bid has been made for your presence based on offers of entertainment. We are therefore the more blessed with your hearing and enter the sermon tonight with the fervent prayer and the ardent hope that we may be led by God's holy word into the light and liberty of truth.

The subject tonight is "Christ And The Church," and our text is Jer. 2:32-37: "Can a maid forget her ornaments, or a bride her attire? yet my people have forgotten me days without number. Why trimmest thou thy way to seek love? . . . Why gaddest thou about so much to change thy way?"

Mankind is eternally prone to forget. We forget the things that should be remembered and we remember the things that should be forgotten. And the tendency is to drift away from those things that have anchored us to the right and shielded us from the wrong. Politically there is a definite trend away from our true and tried constitution. Socially there is a casting down of sacred standards. Religiously the drift away from the Bible has turned into a tide. Things once sacred are being forgotten and abandoned. Once upon a time a divorced person would hardly be admitted into respectable society; but to marry and remarry several times is now the surest and quickest way to be galvanized into social notoriety and public attention. Once a cigarette smoking, liquor drinking woman would have been scorned; today in public places, hotel lobbies, restaurant,

drug store and street, we behold our women with a cigarette in one hand, the liquor glass in the other. We can but pity the next generation. It is time to pray, "God save our children."

Remember—that is a word of frequent mention in the Bible. Moses said to the children of Israel when he brought them out of Egypt—remember. Through forty years of wilderness wanderings he lifted up his voice of tearful pleading against their departures—but they were forgetful, and drifted. God raised up prophet after prophet to call them back through all their national life—yet they wandered. And today God calls upon the church to remember.

#### THE GADDING BRIDE

In the Old Testament Israel was God's bride. God loved and cherished Israel—but Israel forgot God and became an unfaithful bride. Jeremiah rebuked her infidelity. "Why gaddest thou about so much to change thy way?" he said. "Why trimmest thou thy way to seek love?" he asked.

One of the most forbidding things a woman can do is to gad about. Everybody knows that a gadding, skylarking woman is bound to lose interest in her husband and her home, and not satisfied with interest and affection of her husband, she trims her way to seek love in new adventures. Beware of the gadding bride! She is up to no good thing.

So it is with the church. Has the church gone gadding—left God for worldly things? As Israel was God's bride in the Old Testament, the church is Christ's bride in the New Testament. Paul says, for Christ, "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 Cor. 11:2). Jeremiah charged that God's bride had forgotten him. Can the maid forget her ornaments? Never did. Does a flapper forget her vanity case? Does a bride forget her attire? Who ever heard of a woman, no matter how long married, who has forgotten her wedding dress. She may want to forget the man she married, but she does not want to forget the dress in which she married. When does the church forget her attire—in fact, what is the attire of the church? Why, friends, the attire of the church

consists of those characteristics that make a scriptural New Testament church. The church forgets her attire when she by gradual departure abandons these New Testament characteristics. Let us name them.

#### DIVINE ORGANIZATION

We are living in a world of organizations. In religion, they are called denominations. But in the New Testament the church is the one and only divine body Christ is the Head and all the saved in the aggregate, those who have been baptized, who have obeyed the gospel, are the members.

The church is referred to in the New Testament in two senses: first, the whole church composed of all the saved on earth—"Upon this rock I will build my church" (Matt. 16:18) ; second, the local church, composed of all the saved in a certain place—"Unto the church of God which is at Corinth" (1 Cor. 1:2)

Now, a denomination cannot qualify for either of these definitions. A denomination has been properly defined to be a religious organization smaller than the whole church but larger than the local church. Now, is that not correct? No denomination claims to have in its fold all the saved. They tell us that there are saved people in all the denominations. Well then, the denomination is smaller than the whole church. But the denomination is made up of all the local churches of its particular faith and order. One Methodist church would not be called the Methodist denomination. It is rather made up of all the local Methodist churches tied into the General Conference. The Presbyterian denomination is likewise made up of all Presbyterian churches tied into the synod or General Assembly The Catholic ecclesiastical order is made up of all Catholic churches the world over tied into the Vatican. And the Baptist fraternity is made up of all such churches of like faith and order holding affiliation with the Association.

Thus a denomination is larger than the local church and smaller than the whole church; and since the New Testament presents the church only in the whole sense or the local sense, and the denomination is not the church in either

sense, it must follow that the denomination is not the church in any sense. It is both too large and too small to be scriptural.

The church is not a denomination—they are human organizations unknown in the New Testament. They are "plants which the heavenly father hath not planted" and they shall be "rooted up."

A preacher was heard to say one time that there is more than one church because the Bible mentioned "the seven churches of Asia." Can you feature a preacher that ignorant ? Who does not know, even a mere tyro in scripture knowledge, that the seven churches of Asia were but congregations of the same faith and order, one in each of the seven different cities of Asia that were named. Yet, friends, there are preachers, yes, actually, preachers (and they are still running loose) who would have people believe the seven churches were seven denominations.

I rode through a mountain town in Tennessee some time ago and observed a large placard in the windows of the stores announcing a "union meeting" with the slogan printed in large letters: "JOIN THE CHURCH OF YOUR CHOICE AND BE BAPTIZED AS YOU PLEASE." And that in the name of religion! Join the church of your choice—as though God has neither church nor choice! Be baptized as you please—as though Jesus Christ never said a word on the how or what of baptism!

Friends, such as that is religious profanity. It is a rebellious declaration of independence against the revealed will of God. Yet it is the spirit of denominationalism.

The church is the divine organization founded by Jesus Christ. Denominations are human organizations founded by men. The man who wants to be a Catholic needs the Catechism; if a Mormon, the Book of Mormon; if an Episcopalian, the Thirty Nine Articles; if a Presbyterian, the Confession of Faith; if a Methodist, the Discipline; if a Baptist, the Standard Manuel for use in Baptist Churches. But the man who wants to be only a Christian needs only the New Testament. Let us remember the "bride's attire"

in the matter of organization—there is only one in the New Testament.

#### SOUND DOCTRINE

There is a light, flimsy sentiment that somebody put into circulation, that it makes no difference what one believes just so he thinks it is all right—just so his heart is right. It is about as rational as saying that it makes no difference what disease one has so long as his health is good! It is not even rational, much less scriptural. According to that, let one be a Mohammedan in Turkey, a Lutheran in Germany, a Catholic in Italy, a Protestant in America—anything according to country or clime. What a religion! Yet that is the essence of Protestantism—it is the definition of nothing. Orthodox Protestantism is nothing.

Jesus said "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." It takes the truth to make men free; and more than that—it takes the knowledge of the truth, for "ye shall know the truth." Then it takes the belief of the truth, and the love of the truth and obedience to the truth.

Friends, error will not do—it cannot save. That is why we condemn it so stoutly. A brother said to me, one time, that we should apply the principles of salesmanship in preaching (he was a salesman) and never "knock" or "pan" the other fellow's product, for instance an automobile or a refrigerator, but rather sell the particular one we represented. So he thought we should not condemn other doctrines and things—but just preach the gospel! But he loses his illustration—because the other automobile will run, the other refrigerator will refrigerate and the other stove will cook—but a false doctrine and a human church cannot save. The illustration breaks down.

Paul told Timothy to "reprove, rebuke, exhort"—two-thirds of what Timothy was commanded to preach was negative—against what is wrong. Reprove error and rebuke the one who teaches it, is the divine charge, and it takes a preacher with more than a jellyfish's backbone to do it.

Sound doctrine means that it takes the same thing to make a Christian today that it took in the New Testament.

Jesus said "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mk. 16:15) ; and Peter said, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38) ; and Luke said those who "gladly received the word" and "were baptized" were added to the church. (Acts 2:41). Man obeys, God adds. And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved" (Acts 2:47).

Do you ask if one cannot be saved out of the church? I reply, not unless he can be saved when he should not be—for all who "should be saved" were added to the church. But only those who receive the word and are baptized are added (Acts 2:41). God adds only those who should be saved; but he adds only those who are baptized; therefore only those who are baptized should be saved. Don't blame me with that, friends, for I did not write the second chapter of Acts. The Holy Spirit had that done.

No man can be in Christ and out of the church, for they are one. (Eph. 5:30-3). No man can be saved out of Christ (Acts 4:12) It follows, therefore, that no one can be saved out of the church. "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the saviour of the body." Friends, Christ and the church are one and you should not advertise how little you think of his body, the church, by the manner in which you ignore it. Christ and the church! You cannot have one without the other. Now, that is doctrine—sound doctrine—and it is a part of the bride's attire which we should not forget.

#### PURE WORSHIP

Ordinances of worship are as divine as items of doctrine. The church is God's temple and he has not appointed me an interior decorator of it—I must accept it as he designed it. The simple ordinances of worship prescribed by the Lord for his worship are: (1) The assembly of the first day of the week; (2) Edification by preaching, teaching, exhortation; (3) The Lord's supper; (4) Prayers; (5) Giving—the contribution; (6) Singing. Vocal music alone characterized the worship of the New Testament church.

It is a well known fact, to all informed on the subject,

that instrumental music among those who claimed to be Christians, was introduced by Pope Vitalian in the year A. D. 670. Martin Luther called the organ in worship "an ensign of Baal"—a sign of Satan. John Wesley said that he had no objection to it in Methodist chapels provided it would be "neither heard nor seen." John Calvin (Presbyterian) said that it was no more suitable than burning incense, and other things of the law, and that "the Catholics foolishly borrowed it from the Jews."

Yes—Calvin was right on that. The Catholics did borrow it from the Jews, and the Protestants borrowed it from the Catholics, and the Christian Church (who went out from us) borrowed it from the Protestants—and the New Testament Church never had it. It does not belong to the bride's attire, and we are not at liberty to add either an item of worship or a codicil of doctrine to the divine pattern.

May we pause here friends, to ask if the church has gone gadding? Is she trimming her way to seek love in things the Lord has not commanded? Let us remember the bride's attire in worship.

#### NAME AND LIFE

The name of the bride is important. The church is Christ's, why call it after another? We have heard so much of men, their movements and their names, their churches and their creeds, that the world must have begun to wonder whether Jesus Christ ever had a church or not. Obviously, the church should not be called after any man or thing—but after Christ himself. Christ said: "Upon this rock I will build my church"—and John, the Baptist, was dead when he said it. John, the Baptist, not only never built a church, but he was not even in the church. Herod took off his head before Jesus told the disciples that he would build it. Why name the church for John? Whose name should a bride wear? Ah, friends, don't forget that the church belongs to Christ—it is his bride; let us not forget her attire.

But wearing the name of Christ, the Head of the church, brings the solemn responsibility of a life consistent with the relation. What man wants an impure bride? No wonder

Paul said that Christ is jealous of the chastity of his church. And Paul in similar vein exhorts us to "adorn the doctrine of God, our Savior, in all things." God has sanctified the church and cleansed it "with the washing of water by the word" that it might be presented to his Son "a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."

So let us remember the bride's attire in the dignity of the Christian's life. The church is as dear to Christ as the apple of his eye. May her character remain unsullied; may she shine with pristine glory until he comes to transport us from earth to heaven where "the righteous shall shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."

Friends, will you be among the number then and there? If so, you must be among the number here and now. Then linger no longer, but come tonight, while mercy intercedes, and while we sing.



## CHAPTER V

## HOW AND WHEN THE CHURCH BEGAN

*TEXT: "And it shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem." (Isa. 2:2-3).*

Brethren and Friends: It gives us all no little pleasure to observe the upward movement of this meeting. Your continued presence is indicative of deepening interest which cannot fail to yield results in a harvest of souls. Brother Lambert's devoted and consecrated efforts, as the God fearing man that he is, on behalf of the meeting, Brother Bass's efficient leadership in the songs we sing, and your own tense interest in the sermons, impart to this meeting the spirit that pervades it—that of a Bible meeting—for it is a Bible meeting and our very slogan is "Plain Bible preaching."

We covet your presence in every service in the hope of winning souls to Christ. To this end we invite your attention now to the text for this evening.

"And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem And he shall judge among the nations, and shall

rebuke many people, and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they war any more." (Isa. 2:2-4).

This, friends, is my text on "How And When The Church Began."

#### IN THE LAST DAYS

There is a school of religious thought which is known as premillennialism, which concerns certain theories of an earthly millennium (a thousand years reign) which some have imagined, or dreamed that the Lord will inaugurate at his second coming. The theory is a combination of wild ideas advocated by Scofield, Russell, Rutherford and Boll, with a lot of stray notions from many sources. There is an edition of the Bible which is called "The Scofield Bible"—it is named right, for it is his, the man Scofield's; it is not God's Bible at all, but Scofield's edition and interpretation of the Bible. If you have one, you just think you have a Bible. It is in reality just a text-book on the materialistic theory of millennialism. Don't give it away, and thus deceive others, just discard it and get yourself a real Bible.

The theory of these millennialists is that our text, Isa. 2:2-4, refers to a future time when in their scheme of things the Lord will reign on earth in Jerusalem on David's literal throne, when as a world ruler, they think, he will "judge among the nations," which time will, they think, be in another dispensation than this, referred to as "the last days." The theory skips over the actual fulfillment of this passage in the New Testament and hitches to mere vagaries of speculative dreams.

The Son of God made direct reference to Isa. 2:2 in his statement of the Great Commission as recorded by Luke. Hear him: "It is written \* \* \* that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things. And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with the power from on high."

Now the only place in the Old Testament where "it is

written" that the things specified would begin at Jerusalem is Isa. 2:2 and the duplicate chapter of Mic. 4:1-3—so the reference to Christ was a quotation of this prophecy and he said it was to be fulfilled immediately (on the day of Pentecost) and that the disciples would be "witnesses" to its fulfillment.

The present dispensation is "the last days." It began on Pentecost of Acts 2. On that occasion the word of the Lord went forth from Jerusalem, the law of the Lord was promulgated from Zion, the Spirit was poured out upon the ones to whom it was promised, the disciples, who were witnesses of these things, and upon that occasion "the mountain of the Lord's house"—the church—was established, since which time "all nations" have flowed unto it.

By the law of the Lord which went forth from Jerusalem on that day, and which is the standard of all divine judgment, the Lord is now judging among the nations, as the prophet said, for according to Luke's commission (Lk. 24) "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem."

The enmity between the two nations—Jew and Gentile—was thus broken down and in the church the nations made peace ' and became one.

This uniting of Jew and Gentile into one new nation—the church—was referred to by Isaiah as beating swords into plowshares and spears into pruninghooks. It is figurative language descriptive of the peaceful reign of the kingdom of Christ in the hearts of all men whether Jew or Gentile, and the nations once at enmity, but now one in the church, would thus "learn war no more."

It does not refer to carnal warfare. The whole passage is but a prophetic picture of the establishment of the church in Jerusalem and the promulgation of the law of the Lord, the fulfillment of which (all of which) is set forth in the commission as given by Christ according to Luke's record, and the effect of which would be the conversion of the world.

Let us turn then to the second chapter of Acts and ob-

serve the circumstances under which the church began—how the church began.

#### THE DAY OF PENTECOST

It is worthy of note that Pentecost was the first day of the week. Pentecost always came on the first day of the week. It was counted from the Sabbath of the Passover week—seven sabbaths and the morrow after (Lev. 23). Of course, "the morrow after" the seventh sabbath would be the first day of the eighth week—Pentecost.

So, friends, notwithstanding the fact that some Seventh-day-sabbath-keeping people continually say that "there is nothing in the Bible about Sunday," it actually happens that the church itself was established on "the first day of the week." All the events of the second chapter of Acts were first day of the week events. It was Sunday morning about nine o'clock (the third hour of the day) when they began to occur. Yes, the church was established on the first day of the week—why shouldn't it be? Jesus Christ arose from the dead on the first day of the week.

Sabbath keepers are Judaizers of the deepest dye. The sabbath was national, given to Israel in celebration of her emancipation from Egypt. Moses said that it was a sign between God and Israel (Ex. 31:13) ; and also a covenant between God and Israel (Ex. 31:16). If all nations were commanded to keep the sabbath—how could it have been a sign between God and one nation? And a covenant is a contract between two parties, the party of the first part and the party of the second part. In the sabbath covenant, God was the party of the first part and Israel was the party of the second part—and nobody else was ever included.

The sabbath belonged to national Israel and when that nation ceased, so did the sabbath along with the whole legal system of the Jews.

The prophet Amos predicted the end of Israel and said the sabbath would end when the sun should go down at noon and the earth darkened in the clear day. (Amos 8:2-9). His whole description pictures the end of the Jewish nation, their law and their sabbath, all of which ended at the cross when the **sun** did go down at noon at the crucifixion of

Christ. (Matt. 27:45) It was the sixth hour (high noon) and darkness prevailed until the ninth hour (three o'clock afternoon). The earth rocked and quaked, the veil of the temple was rent, the soldiers near the cross cried, "surely he is the son of God," the tombs of the dead shivered and split, and amid the darkness of Calvary the sinless Son of God, dying for the sinful soul of man, bowed his stately head and said "it is finished"—and died! There the grandest drama ever enacted was completed. It began in Eden with the fallen pair and ended in the horrors of Golgotha and the tragedies of Calvary. There the remedial system was finished, the scheme of human redemption effected, and the law, having been fulfilled, ended.

Hosea, the prophet, also said: "I will cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts." (Hos. 2:11). And Paul said they did cease. "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross . . . Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days" (Col. 2:12-16). The whole law ended at the cross, friends, sabbath and all. There is no question about it. The prophets said it would cease, and the apostles said it did cease, and therefore it ceased.

Why the sabbath today? It carries no meaning to the Christian. We have a new covenant; a new institution, the church; a new feast, the Lord's supper; a new set of ordinances and commands; a new day, the first day of the week; and a new hope, not of an earthly inheritance, but the eternal one beyond "Jordan's stormy banks" where we "cast the wishful eye, to Canaan's fair and happy land, where my possessions lie." There is no place for Judaism in the gospel of Jesus Christ, and no place for materialism in the hope of the christian.

#### THE EVENTS OF PENTECOST

Let us advance to the things that occurred on the eventful day of the second chapter of Acts.

First, Jesus Christ was for the first time preached as the

Son of God and Saviour of man. True, he had been confessed, but not preached. When Peter said "thou art the Christ" (Matt. 16:18), Jesus charged them "that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ." And when from the vaulted sky the voice from heaven said "this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him (Matt. 17:5), Jesus charged the disciples to tell it to no man "until the Son of man be risen from the dead." Christ was not preached until Pentecost.

If the church was set up before the death of Christ, as some contend—it was without the preaching of Christ. Can you imagine a church of Christ without the gospel of Christ? That might be a Baptist church (though John the Baptist had no such thing) but certainly could not be a Christ church.

Second, it was on Pentecost that the Holy Spirit began his work of conversion through the apostles—their preaching. The Spirit was not given until Jesus was glorified—until he ascended to heaven. (Jno. 7:39). And Jesus said plainly that the Spirit would not be sent until he went away. (Jno. 16:7-9). Pentecost marks the coming of the Holy Spirit and the beginning of the Spirit's dispensation of conversion. If the church existed before Pentecost, it had neither the work of the Holy Spirit nor the gospel of Christ. That, I think, is true of the human churches founded by man, but it is not a characteristic of the church of Christ which began on Pentecost.

Often someone tells me that I leave the Holy Spirit out of conversion. They think that because I do not preach that conversion is a convulsion, and that repentance takes place in a nightmare, that I leave the Holy Spirit out. It seems to me, friends, that the man who has the church set up before the Holy Spirit began his work is the man who leaves it out. The only way to put the Holy Spirit into conversion is to begin with the second chapter of Acts where the Spirit instructs men how to be converted.

Third, it was on Pentecost that the law of pardon was: announced unto all men for all time, and the full and complete gospel for the first time preached. Hear Jesus:

"Thus it is written . . . that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem" (Lk. 24:47).

So that settles it—there was no church of Christ before the day of Pentecost.

#### THE FIRST GOSPEL SERMON

The audience of Pentecost was the greatest of its kind ever gathered to hear a gospel sermon. They were "devout men, Jews from every nation under heaven"—what an audience! Attracted by the sound of the Spirit's descent upon the apostles to speak with other tongues—languages which they had never learned.

These Holy Ghost tongue-speaking, poison-drinking, snake-biting, holy-rolling, holy hollering, jumping-jitters, cult of preachers claiming these original apostolic powers ought to be able to give us a demonstration by speaking languages they have never learned. Some who claim to speak in tongues can't even speak or write good English—the Holy Spirit does not make mistakes, and when men's tongues are guided by the Spirit there could be no error.

Why do these tongue-preachers have to learn the language of foreign countries when they become "missionaries"—the apostles didn't. The apostolic word, friends, was handed down to us; but apostolic powers were not.

But the audience was devout—yet devoutly wrong; it was honest, but honestly wrong; it was sincere, but sincerely wrong; it was religious, but religiously wrong. Has it occurred to you that such may be your own situation, friends ?? Better check your religion.

Then take a look at the preacher—Simon Peter. He was authorized by Christ, who gave him the "keys of the kingdom." The imagery is that of the gateman to Caesarea's walls, in which city Jesus then spake to the disciples. The gateman had the keys to the gates and the authority therefore to open for admission. Likewise to Simon Peter the Lord delegated the authority to first declare the terms upon which men are admitted into the kingdom, and it was this authority that Jesus called "keys."

I have heard and read some sermons on the keys of the

kingdom in which the preacher had quite a number of keys for Peter to carry. Keys for Pentecost, then keys for Cornelius, then the seven keys of the Christian graces, and Paul mentioned some keys to Timothy—enough keys to run any hotel in Texas!

Jesus delegated authority to Peter to do what he did on Pentecost and called it giving him the keys—that is all. And the Holy Spirit qualified him to speak what he spake. So he was authorized by Jesus Christ and qualified by the Holy Spirit—and I would suggest, my friend, that it is important that you listen to what such a preacher has to say.

The facts of this sermon are outlined between verses 22 and 86 of Acts 2. It is a great document. It is the keynote gospel address, and all the principles of the gospel are embodied. He preached the life of Christ, the death of Christ, and the resurrection of Christ, the ascension and exaltation of Christ, the throne of Christ (David's throne in heaven), and the reign of Christ. Yes, all of that in Acts the second chapter.

Jesus began his rein on David's throne in heaven on the day of Pentecost, fulfilling David's prophecies, according to Peter. David's throne was once on earth, but now in heaven. It was once in Jerusalem below, but now in Jerusalem above. David once occupied it and it was temporal, but Jesus Christ now occupies it and it is spiritual. Yes, the throne has been transformed from temporal to spiritual, and transferred from earth to heaven. The pet notion of some people that Jesus Christ will reign on earth in person on David's throne in Jerusalem is a mere fabrication without foundation in scripture fact or feasible fancy. The Bible teaches that when we leave here, we are going to heaven if we do not go the wrong way. And, friend, you would do well to consider where you are going before you get started in the wrong direction.

#### THE SUPREME QUESTION

The one question remaining is the effect of the sermon on Pentecost. When they heard it they were "pricked in their heart" (Verse 37)—that is, they believed. It was



conviction; it was faith—and they cried: "Brethren, what shall we do?"

Theology has said, do nothing; for there is nothing to do; one who believes is saved, says theology, saved already—but these believers did not know that, nor did Peter tell them that. He rather answered their question by telling them what to do. "Repent and be baptized every one of you"—he said—and why? For the remission of sins."

They were told to do two things for the remission of sins—repent and be baptized. These two verbs are joined together by the coordinate, copulative conjunction, and what one is for, the other is for. Repentance by itself is not for anything in Acts 2:38; but repentance and baptism are, together, for the remission of sins. What the Holy Spirit joined together, let no preacher put asunder.

And, friends, I want to ask you a question—how many denominational preachers are there in Port Arthur who ever did, or ever will tell people to do exactly what Peter told these people on Pentecost to do? There is a Ministerial Alliance, a Pastor's Conference, in this city. Sometimes they decide to hold "union revivals" to tell sinners what to do to be saved. Now, did any of you ever hear any of them tell anybody anywhere, anytime, what Peter told these people of Pentecost to do? Well, friends, remember that it was Peter who had the keys, and there is no record of where he ever turned them over to a president, chairman or secretary of a Ministerial Alliance. I suggest that you had better listen to Peter and do what the man with the keys has commanded.

Did they do it? Indeed, and without delay. "They then that gladly received the word were baptized" and the Lord added them to the church. How can anybody improve on that? It's the Lord's way and there is no other way.

Finally, the most wonderful scene ever enacted is told in Acts 2. Jesus Christ is king. When he ascended heaven opened her gates to receive him. The inaugural ceremonies of heaven were held. Amid angelic acclaim the Son of God is enthroned. He wears the crown; He holds the sceptre—what is the first act of the new king? When a new pres-

ident is elected the nation waits for his first word, his first act But the destiny of Adam's race depends on this—the first act of the new king—and it is pardon. Yet more wonderful is the fact that he offers the same pardon, upon the same terms, to you and me now, even now, and he will add us to the same church. Who can resist such proffers of heaven? None but the unbelieving and the disobedient.

Your soul's greatest tragedy, dear friend, is to reject Jesus Christ. The career of all such is bound to end in hell. Be persuaded to abandon your course of senseless resistance to the appeals of divine mercy before you are lost. But while mercy lingers, while Jesus pleads, while heaven waits, while Christians sing—won't you come? Standing, let us sing.

## CHAPTER VI

## THE LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT

*TEXT: "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." (Heb. 10:9-10).*

Brethren and Friends: We come again into God's presence to pursue further the earnest investigation of *His* word. Your deep interest is evident; your desire to know God's will is manifest. We have no other thought or desire than to tell you in a plain and straightforward manner what the will of the Lord is, believing that when you know it, you will obey it.

Our subject tonight has to do with the New Testament—The Last Will And Testament Of Jesus Christ. We find our theme in numerous passages. Referring to the gospel as a will, Paul said: "He taketh away the first that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified" (Heb 10:9,10). In the preceding chapter the apostle said: "And for this cause he (Christ) is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they that are called might receive the promise of an eternal inheritance. For where a testament is there must of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth." (Heb. 9:15-17).

It will not be difficult for anybody who understands the simple legal processes that go into the making of a will to apply this illustration of Paul's to the gospel.

## THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS

Not many people know the difference in the Testaments, called the first and the second, the old and the new. Many

preachers talk of the identity of the covenants or testaments, and give the same authority to the Old Testament scriptures in the present dispensation as they give to the New Testament. In reality many practices in religion of about all the religious bodies are brought over from the old dispensation, thus ignoring altogether the distinction between the Testaments made in the New Testament itself. Paul said: "But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in oldness of the letter." (Rom. 7:6). Again he said. "Who also hath made us able ministers of the New Testament" (2 Cor. 3:6). And again, "For God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the gospel of his Son." (Rom. 1:9).

These passages, and many others like them, show plainly that we do not serve God now in the precepts and ordinances of the Old Testament but in the new and living way—the will or testament of Christ.

But the common run of people are very slow to learn this fundamental lesson and when we try to teach them the difference between the testaments they usually say: "That cuts out half the Bible; we believe all of the Bible; we want all of the Bible." Well, I believe all of the Bible, too, but I would not attempt to do all of it. I believe that God told Noah to build an ark, but I would not attempt to build one. I believe that God commanded Abraham to offer his son on an altar, but I shall not attempt to offer my son on an altar. I believe that it was absolutely necessary for the Jews to offer their animal sacrifices, burn their incense, circumcise their children the eighth day, keep the sabbath, observe the Passover and the day of Pentecost, none of which should be preached or practiced now. Yet people say that they want all of the Bible, when everybody knows that they would not have it all if it were preached to them, even by their own preachers, and the preachers, themselves, know it.

There is only one basis upon which to determine the right division of the word of God, and that is in the distinction between the two dispensations and the two testa-

ments. We cannot be under both: "He taketh away the first that he may establish the second." The second (the new testament) could not even be established without taking away the first. That is the meaning of "that." If a young couple obtains a marriage license "that" they may be married—it means the license is necessary to the marrying. When Paul said that "we are buried with him by baptism" *that* we should "walk in newness of life"—it means the new life depends on burial in baptism. So when Paul said that Christ took away the first testament *that* he might establish the second, it simply means that no new testament was possible without the first one being taken away, and if it is taken away we are not under it, are not subject to *it*, and no part of it is binding on us today. It seems to me, friends, that anybody who is "at home" should be able to see that.

Have you noticed that when people try to adopt practices in the Old Testament, it results in a sort of an offshoot? The Adventists, for instance, love their sabbath day, so they go back and bring it over. The Catholics likewise love their incense, and they go back and bring it over. The Methodists and Presbyterians love their babies (infant membership) and they go back and bring them over. The Mormons love their women (polygamy) and they go back and bring them over—that is, they tried it, but Uncle Sam put a stop to it. And there is another class of Judaizing offshooters—the Christian Church—they love their music (David's instruments), and they go back and bring them over. How much better are they than the rest of them? None; they are worse, for they teach the difference in the testaments, whereas the others do not, and they are therefore downright inconsistent.

If the Christian Church preacher should argue with an Adventist on the sabbath question, or a Methodist on the infant question, or a Catholic on the incense question or a Mormon on the polygamy question—that Christian Church preacher would know where to make them stay. Ah, he would keep them back in the Old Testament; he would not let them cross the line between the testaments. But

when he wants his mechanical instrument in the church—what does he do? Why, he jumps clean over the cross backwards and lands right in the middle of David's old testament goat pen and digs out an old rusty Jewish harp and plays it in the church.

He says David did it! Well, David had eight wives, and took more, the Bible says. Yes, their names and addresses are in 2 Sam. 3, and concubines besides.

God would not let David build the temple in the old Testament because of some things he did, but there are preachers today who think it is all right for him to order the worship for the church of Jesus Christ!

The fact is, friends, that instrumental music in worship is the relic of an abrogated age and there is no authority for its use in divine worship. In Hebrews 10 we are told that the first covenant also had ordinances of divine service, "which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." The "time of reformation" is the new dispensation—the New Testament. The "carnal ordinances" of the Old Testament were only "until" the New Testament came. They were "imposed on them," the people that were under it, but they are not to be brought over into the New Testament church. The man who brings them over does so without divine authority, and sins.

#### THE ESSENTIALS OF A WILL,

Let us look into the gospel will a little further. We all know that certain things are essential to a will. There is first, the testator, the man who makes it; there is second the gift, the thing bestowed; there is third, the conditions, the terms upon which its benefits are to be received; there is fourth, the death of the testator, and it is never in force while the testator lives; there is fifth, the probation of the will, the court must approve it; there is sixth, the executors, those who administer the will; and seventh, there are heirs, or the beneficiaries of the will. But we all know that during the life of the man who makes the will that will does not bind him; he is free to do as he chooses in all

things. The will is effective only upon the death of the testator.

Now, that is the apostolic application to the gospel, as it is Paul's illustration not mine. First, Christ is the testator," second, salvation is the gift; third, the condition are those gospel commands set forth in the Great Commission of Christ to the apostles; fourth, Jesus Christ must die, the will was not in force during his life and ministry on earth, for he lived under the law; fifth, after his death the will was probated in heaven, when he ascended to heaven and "appeared before the throne of God for us"; sixth, the apostles became the executors, qualified by the Holy Spirit on Pentecost to administer the terms of the new will (Acts 2) ; and seventh, all who obey the terms and the conditions of the gospel become the heirs of God and joint-heirs with Jesus Christ.

If this seems legalistic, friends, remember that it is Paul's argument, not mine. Furthermore a legal will does not eliminate grace. It is by grace that a man makes a will in favor of its beneficiaries, and they by grace are his heirs. It is by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ that, under the will we are heirs of salvation. So do not think for one moment that we are legalizing the grace of God out of the plan of salvation. His grace has been legalized into the gospel, and not out of it.

#### BEFORE AND AFTER THE CROSS

If you are following me, you will remember that during the life of the testator the will is not in force, and the testator acts, independent of the will, as though it had never been made. But when the testator dies, his only power henceforth is in the will and not in himself personally—he acts through the will. During the lifetime (the personal ministry) of Christ, the will was not in force. "For a testament is of force after men are dead." Paul did not have to tell us that for we know it, but that's his way of making you believe the gospel—it is just as true of Christ as of men, that his will was not in operation while he lived on this earth.

There are many instances during the personal ministry

of Christ where he blessed men, forgave sins, and saved sinners—but they are not cases for us to settle our own case by, for the simple reason that we are under the will and they were not. "By the which will we are sanctified (saved)"—and that's Paul telling you on which side of the cross you live.

A palsied man was forgiven and healed in Mark 2; Zaccheus, the publican received salvation in Lk. 19; the sinful woman, a harlot, was saved and made virtuous in Lk. 7; but these do not represent gospel conversion for the simple fact that they were not under the gospel. In each instance the circumstances and the conditions varied. The testator was on earth with "power on earth to forgive sins." Thus before the cross there was a diversity of conditions upon which men received the dispensations of the living testator's blessings; but after the death of Christ, there is a uniformity of conditions upon which men are saved—the terms of the will, sealed by the blood of the testator.

#### WHAT ABOUT THE THIEF ON THE CROSS ?

There is a book in the New Testament designed especially to show men how to be converted. It contains many cases of conversion, under the preaching of the apostles. It not only tells us how to be converted, but by actual example shows us how to do the things that we are told to do. Yet men—even preachers—will ignore this book entirely, the express purpose of which is to execute the will of Christ, and try to make a model case of conversion out of the thief on the cross, when it was not in any sense a gospel conversion.

Wherever we go, whenever we tell anybody what Jesus said in the Commission: "Go preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned"—people instantly say, preachers and all, "Well, what about the thief on the cross?" If by that, friend, you mean that you aim to put yourself in the place of the thief and be saved like the thief, I must say that you may be a thief, but if you are, you still cannot be saved like that thief.

Granting that the words of Christ to the thief, "Today



shalt thou be with me in Paradise," mean that he was saved (though Paradise was not heaven) still his case is no model for us. A simple question or two should be all that is necessary to clear the matter up. When did the thief die, and get his blessing—before or after the death of the testator, before or after the will? Was the will in effect, in force, in the case of the thief? "For where a testament is there must of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead; otherwise it is of no strength at all while he that made it liveth." Now, just apply that to the thief and anybody who can see through a ladder can see that the case of the thief is not a gospel conversion, not being under the will.

But we are under the will. Jesus died, arose from the dead, delivered the will to his apostles, commissioned them to preach, but ordered them to tarry in the city of Jerusalem until they received the Spirit to qualify them as executors ; then he ascended to heaven, probated the will and sealed it with the authority of heaven's court, and sent it in the power of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost (Acts 2) to the twelve who waited for their qualifications, and upon that eventful occasion for the first time the terms and conditions of the new will were declared and executed. And "by the which will we are sanctified."

#### THE GREAT COMMISSION

The Great Commission is the Lord's own statement of the terms of the new will. He made it, died for it, and then delivered it to the twelve for execution, after the Spirit should come. His instructions to them were specific, and their execution of his orders were divinely ordered. The Commission exists in three specific records, Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Matthew records the command to teach and baptize. Mark records the command to preach, believe and be baptized, with salvation following. Luke puts down repentance and remission of sins in his name. Taking the witnesses and their testimony in due order it follows that wherever the gospel is preached, men must believe it,

repent of their sins, and be baptized in order to become heirs to the blessings of salvation.

After this commission was given and executed on Pentecost, there were no exceptions to it. On Pentecost Peter said: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins"—every one of them were commanded to do the same thing and for the same purpose. Through the book of Acts the story is uniform—the gospel believed and obeyed and the promise of the new will enjoyed.

It does not make void the blood at all, my friend. We are saved by the blood, but Jesus said "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," (Mk. 16:16). We are cleansed by the blood, but Paul said that we are "cleansed with the washing of water by the word," (Eph. 5:25). We are sanctified by the blood, but Paul also said that Christ sanctifies us "by the washing of water with the word" (Eph. 5:25). We are washed in the blood, but we are commanded to "arise and be baptized and wash away sins" (Acts 22:16). We have remission of sins in his blood, but the inspired executor of Christ's blood-sealed will, said on Pentecost, "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins."

So friends, you cannot separate the blood from the will, nor the will from obedience. "By the which will we are sanctified." Then, won't you obey it? Truly, there is a fountain filled with blood and it's drawn from Emanuel's veins. It is opened for you, it is opened for all; yea, sinners plunged beneath its flood lose all their guilty stains. Come friends, while we sing.

## CHAPTER VII

## WHAT IT MEANS TO PREACH CHRIST

*TEXT: "Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them." (Acts 8:5).*

My Friends and Brethren: As we approach the close of the first week of this meeting, we feel a genuine delight in the deep and ever deepening interest that has prevailed, and which we hope to maintain throughout the meeting. We are gratified, yet not satisfied, as there is much before us to do through the coming week. Many people should obey the gospel, which we confidently expect them to do and we are anxiously awaiting their decision and action. With this as our united and fervent prayer, we approach the evening's lesson.

Philip, the evangelist, holds a great meeting in Samaria—rather I should say—several great meetings and many people were baptized. In all of these meetings he preached only one thing—Jesus Christ. Notice the text: "Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria and preached Christ unto them." (Acts 8:5). Now, just what does it mean to preach Christ? What do we include, and what do we exclude? What do we say something about, and what do we say nothing about?

Often people will remark—"I think you should just preach Jesus and say nothing about so and so or this and that." Well, is that the way Philip did it? Did Paul do it that way? *How did the apostles preach?* That is a question for some of my own preaching brethren to ponder over—for some of them have the speak-softly, tread-lightly, step-carefully, method-of-approach kind of soft-pedal preaching, too. I would not call it "soft-soap"—it slanders soap; for soap is a mighty good thing, but I have never found that kind of preaching good for anything except to spoil the brethren,

and please the sectarians. The apostolic way of preaching is the only right way to preach.

How, then, did Philip preach Christ? Take this passage: "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). Don't you suppose Philip should have just preached Jesus and said nothing about the "kingdom," or "the name," or about being "baptized" ?

#### PHILIP PREACHED THE KINGDOM

There were many theories about the kingdom of Christ then—and there are many now. The Jews then thought that Christ would be king on earth, and they rejected him because he did not establish the kind of a kingdom they expected. Now, Philip preached *the kingdom* to these Jews whose materialism was the ground of their rejection of Jesus Christ. When he preached Christ—he did not preach the Christ to come, but that Christ had come. Then when he preached the kingdom he likewise preached the kingdom that had come, and not a kingdom to come.

Some today are making the same mistake the Jews made in their speculations concerning a future kingdom of Christ on earth, when as a matter of fact he has only one, the present one, and the one Philip preached.

John, the Baptist, preached: "The time is fulfilled, the kingdom of God is at hand." During John's time the kingdom was "at hand"—approaching. It was then that Jesus told his disciples to pray "thy kingdom come"—praying and preaching should always be consistent. If it is still right to pray "thy kingdom come" then we should still preach as did John that the kingdom is "at hand." But we should now preach, not what John preached, but what Philip preached, and should adjust our praying to fit the preaching. John's preaching and the disciples' prayer were both before the establishment of the kingdom, and the simple principle of the right division of the word of God should be applied.

Still later, Jesus said to the disciples: "Verily I say unto you, that there be some of them that stand here, which shall

not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." (Mark 9:1). John said that it was "at hand," the disciples prayed for it "to come," and Jesus said they would live to "see" it come. Evidently it has come, or Methuselah was just a baby compared with some people living, since they were to live until it came.

Well, when Jesus died on the cross a man by the name of Joseph asked for his body and Luke said he was among those who "waited for the kingdom." So it still had not come when Jesus died. The Lord arose from the dead, fulfilled his forty days on the earth, and when he was ready to ascend the expectant disciples asked him when he would restore the kingdom to them—when they might expect that kingdom—and he told them to wait for the power which should come with the Spirit. (Acts 1:6-8) They waited in Jerusalem. The Spirit came on Pentecost, and the power came with the Spirit. (Acts 2:1-4). The kingdom came with the power. (Mk. 9:1). Thus the preaching before the cross and the prayer of the disciples and the waiting of Joseph and the expectancy of all the disciples found reward on Pentecost in the fulfillment of all these prophecies and promises concerning the kingdom.

After Pentecost the kingdom was preached, and all things concerning it, as an existent thing, and not a future thing. Thus it was that Philip preached Christ on the kingdom question by preaching that Christ is King (not a crown prince) ;and has a kingdom (not just a vestibule) ; and is on his throne (not sitting in his Father's arm chair in the parlor).

To preach Christ is to preach all that Christ has and all that Christ is. Yet, after so many years of preaching on the establishment of the church, or kingdom, some brethren now, under the influence of, a late obsession concerning a future earthly kingdom, will object to such preaching.

I know of a case in one church where a certain brother (a leader) took exception to the reading of Luke 22:29-30 at the Lord's Supper. "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." When it comes to pass that

what the Lord himself said about his table in his kingdom cannot be read without objections, more preaching is needed on both the kingdom and the table (the Lord's Supper), which is the kingdom. If we do not have the kingdom, we do not have the supper, and in that case, we do not even have Christ. No wonder Philip preached the kingdom when he preached Christ. So should we.

#### PHILIP PREACHED THE NAME

Now, many people say that "there is nothing in a name." Then Philip preached "nothing"—or something in which there is "nothing" (take it either way) ; for he preached the name. What name did he preach, friends? Did he preach the Baptist name? Did he preach the Methodist name? Did he preach any human name, Catholic or Protestant? Verily no, for no such things or names existed. The text says Philip preached "the name of Jesus Christ." Well, if men preach only the name of Jesus Christ today, as Philip did then, will it—can it—make Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Nazarenes, Pentecostals, Mormons and Catholics—or a lot of other stray what-nots?

Friends, the world has heard so much of this name and that name, some church or what church, that it is beginning to wonder whether Jesus Christ even has a church or not. There is only one name under heaven whereby men may be saved. "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." (Acts 4:12). When men preach any other name, they are not preaching Christ, and they are not preaching salvation.

Since no movement could become a human thing, bearing a human name, without that human name being preached, it simply follows that if only the name of Christ should be preached, there would not be a human denomination on the face of this earth today—exactly as it should be. For men to say that "there is nothing in a name," and "one church is just as good as another," and "it makes no difference what one believes"—all such is a lot of religious profanity that

the devil has put into circulation.

Philip preached the name of Jesus, the only saving name.

#### PHILIP PREACHED BAPTISM

Now, why didn't Philip preach Jesus and say nothing about baptism? For the same reason that Jesus did not say "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel" and say nothing about it. Jesus said something about baptism—yes, enough about it that every sectarian debater today is trying to get Mark 16:16 out of the New Testament by telling people that it is not inspired but interpolated.

When a preacher has to use an "interpolated" argument to get around passages of scripture in the way of his doctrine, he is getting in a mighty bad way. It is an unbelief that borders on infidelity. It is getting too close to blasphemy for a man to be comfortable, and I don't believe they are comfortable. Who could be, trying to defend false doctrine? It is the hardest thing a man ever attempted to do and will make an infidel out of him if he keeps it up. That is exactly the reason we are having to fight modernism in religion today—preachers have turned infidel and do not themselves believe the Bible.

Why, friends, Jesus himself could not even tell the apostles to preach the gospel without mentioning baptism—it reads, "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." But I hear somebody say (a preacher) : "It doesn't say 'he that believeth not and is not baptized shall be damned.'" No, for the reason that the man who does not believe could not be baptized. He couldn't if he would, he wouldn't if he could and it wouldn't do him any good if he did! Don't oppose the Lord's words, friends, and don't turn infidel and say that Mark's record of it was not inspired. Believe what it says and do it—and be saved.

But how did Philip preach baptism? That story is in the eighth chapter of Acts also. Read the story of Philip and the eunuch. The angel directed Philip to leave his work in

Samaria and go southward "unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert."

What was the purpose or ministry of the angel ? Simply to put the preacher to his task. It did not enter the law of pardon, nor the man's conversion.

The miracles of the New Testament never became a part of the law in any case of conversion. When the word of God was in the man, it required miracles and signs to confirm it; but now the word of God is in the book, revealed and confirmed, and the miracle gives place to the law. In the beginning God created the world by the miracle. Adam was created. He was not an improved monkey nor a glorified ape—he was created; but the next man was born. The miracle of creation did not become a part of the created world in any part, but only the means of creating the world. So the miracles and signs of the New Testament do not become a part of the revealed word of God. We should not magnify the miracles attending cases of conversion, and repudiate the law.

So the angel performed the special purpose of all such, and we hear no more about the angel. But the Spirit directed Philip to join the chariot. What is the office, or work, of the Holy Spirit in the case?

If you will observe that the direct influence of the Spirit was on the inspired preacher, and not on the unsaved man, it will not be hard to see. The influence of the Holy Spirit in conversion is through the word of God—rational, intelligent, through testimony. The Holy Spirit never makes anybody act idiotic, conversion is not a convulsion, and repentance does not take place in a nightmare.

Philip, then ran unto the chariot—why the preacher, if the Holy Spirit operates on the sinner direct?

What then was the task of the preacher? Ah, "he preached unto him Jesus"—that's God's only plan—preaching. It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." By man the gospel shall be preached to man—that is the divine plan. But what did it mean to preach Jesus? It meant just what preaching Christ meant back in Samaria where Philip had closed his other meeting. Did



he preach baptism? He must have—as the man wanted to be baptized in the first water he saw. But he preached something before baptism.

The man was reading Isaiah 53, and Philip began at the same scripture, and "preached unto him Jesus." He preached the incarnation of Jesus (his life in the flesh) ; he preached the humiliation of Jesus (his chastisement for the iniquities and transgressions of man) ; he preached the atonement of Jesus (his death on the cross, his resurrection from the dead, and the offering of his blood for man's redemption) ; and he preached the commands of Jesus (how Jesus commanded the gospel to be preached as stated in the three records of the last commission). When the man heard it, he believed it, and announced his faith in the simple confession: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." The chariot was stopped. They went into the water. He was baptized. He resumed his journey rejoicing, while the preacher departed for other fields to preach Christ.

#### HOW THE EUNUCH WAS BAPTIZED

But how was the eunuch baptized? Let the text speak. 1. They came *unto* a certain water. 2. They both went down *into* the water—both Philip and the eunuch. 3. He was baptized—and came *up out of* the water. Did you do that when you were baptized ? If you did not, then you were not baptized. No amount of objecting can destroy the simplicity of the narrative.

It is often insisted that "into" just means "unto." Well, just kindly refer to your text and observe that it reads that they came "unto" the water, and then went "into" it. If "into" means unto, then what does "unto" mean just above into? And if "down into the water" means that they stayed out of the water, then when it says "they came up out of the water," does that mean they stayed in it? It is harder to get around the simple narrative of this conversion than it is to believe what it says. If it be argued that they were in the middle of a desert and could not have had water sufficient for a case of immersion—be reminded that the text says, water, unto the water, down into the water, and

up out of the water. And furthermore , it was the town of Gaza which was desert—deserted—and not the country around, a desert. Anybody who thinks that it was *a desert* ought to study geography as well as the Bible.

Then what did the man do—what was the duty of the man? It was plain and simple: 1. He heard the word. 2. He believed the word. 3. He confessed his faith in the Christ. 4. He was baptized, 5. He was saved and rejoiced.

What church did he belong to? The one to which the Lord added people. (Acts 2:47). What denomination did he belong to? Try to classify him and witness a failure. He obeyed the gospel, was saved, added to the church, without "joining a denomination." Then, if you will do what he did, you will be what he was.

Friends, these gospel narratives are in the divine text for the exact purpose of telling us *what* to do and *how* to do it. They are too plain to be misunderstood and only unbelief could keep you away. Why not come to take the Lord at his word and do what he says? It is a plain issue tonight—obey or rebel—which will you do? We plead with you to accept Christ while the audience sings.

## CHAPTER VIII

## THE GOSPEL IN OLD TESTAMENT EXAMPLE

*TEXT: "Now Naaman, captain of the host of the king of Syria, was a great man with his master, and honourable, because by him the Lord had given deliverance unto Syria: He was also a mighty man in valour, but he was a leper." (2 Kings 5:1).*

Respected Friends: By the grace of God we are here again in goodly numbers, though Saturday evening and inclement weather; yet an unbroken interest prevails. This bespeaks an interest in gospel themes deeper than mere curiosity. It flatly reverses the assertions so often heard that the Bible is on the wane and interest in religion is running low. If any so think, at least as respects Port Arthur, they may "come and see," as the woman of Samaria said to the people when she invited them to hear Jesus.

We speak tonight of the gospel in Old Testament story. Our particular text is 2 Kings 5:1: "Now Naaman, captain of the host of the king of Syria, was a great man with his master, and honourable, because by him the Lord had given deliverance unto Syria: he was also a mighty man in valour, but he was a leper."

Someone has complained that we do not have any use at all for the Old Testament, because we have shown that the Old Testament ended at the cross. There is a lot of difference in saying that "ye are not under the law" (which is the very thing Paul said in Rom. 6:14), and in saying that we have no use "at all" for the Old Testament. The same Paul who said that we are not under it, also said, "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope." (Rom. 15:4). The proper use of the Old Testament scriptures is in the fulfillment of its wonderful

prophecies in the New Testament; and in seeing the Old Testament type, shadow and metaphor in the light of New Testament antitype, substance and reality.

#### THE OLD TESTAMENT

Some people become alarmed when they hear us say that no part of the Old Testament is binding upon Christians. They think that since the Old Testament says "thou shalt not kill," if it is done away then it would mean that we may kill, commit adultery, steal, and disregard the "moral law." But that does not follow.

The United States was once under the law of England, and Texas was one time under the law of Spain. Today we are under neither. Yet in the statutes of those countries there were laws prohibiting things such as named. Does it mean therefore that our people may now do such things, seeing that we are no more under the laws forbidding them? No, is the answer, but why? Because our new constitution prohibits the doing of such things also.

On the same principle the New Testament becomes unto us a perfect law and itself forbids the doing of all those things that were in themselves wrong to do. The prohibitions and inhibitions of the new covenant (or constitution) are therefore independent of what was in the old, and they are obligatory upon us, not because they were in the old, but because they are in the new.

Paul said of the Old and the New "He taketh away the first that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified (saved)." (Heb. 10:9). So we are not under the Old Testament. It is not our law; it is not our system. It does not contain the things we are to do in obedience to God, nor the gospel commands we must obey in order to become a Christian and live a Christian. Neither does it contain the ordinances of worship for the New-Testament church. As a law, we are not under it, nor any part of it—for Paul said, "But now ye are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held (that law being dead) ; that we should serve in newness of the spirit and not in oldness of the letter." (Rom. 7:6). These, and

a hundred more, clearly show that the Old Testament has been abrogated, and we have a New Testament.

Of what use, then, is the Old Testament? Simply the use that Paul made of it, and the use that I propose to make of it tonight—the things in it are for our examples. The principles of obedience to God are the same—but the elements of obedience (the things we do) are not the same because the law has changed. "He taketh away the first that he may establish the second." Since it is impossible to have two testaments in operation at the same time—which one do you say we are under, friend, as we cannot according to Paul, be under both of them?

We bring nothing over from the old. Christ who made the new, and is its mediator and minister, put in it all that it was God's will to include, and all else is excluded. This, however, does not mean that in the history of Old Testament things there are no lessons for us to learn—yea, they are written for our *learning*, for our *patience*, for our *comfort* and for our *hope*. Do you ask why? My answer is, in applying the lessons we learn, in examples of faith, on the part of those who obeyed God under the old covenant, to the commands and duties the New Testament binds upon us in the new covenant. "For if the word spoken by angels was stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience (in times past) received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him." (Heb. 2:2-3).

Thus we may teach by example from the Old Testament, but the New Testament alone is our law.

#### FACTS VERSUS FABLES

There are those who claim to believe the Bible—but not all of it, they say. They would delete it, blue-pencil it, and cull out certain things they call fables and relegate these to the realm of myth and tradition. They tell us that they accept the teaching of Christ, but not such Old Testament

stories as Noah and the flood, Jonah and the whale, and of Naaman the Leper.

It so happens that it is so fixed that you must believe all or none, for the integrity of the New Testament is linked with the truth, veracity and authenticity of the Old Testament. For instance, Jesus said concerning the flood, "For as in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." (Matt. 24:38-39). Now, how can a man believe in Jesus Christ and deny what he said about the fact of the Old Testament record of the flood? The divinity of Jesus Christ is therefore made to depend on the accuracy of the Old Testament record.

And that is not all. Regarding what is called "the big fish story" the Son of God said, "For as Jonah 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." (Matt. 12:40). If Jonah was not in the belly of the whale the period of time named, Jesus Christ was not in the earth the same period of time, nor did he arise from the dead. It means that you believe it all or none. No man can believe that God raised Jesus from the dead, according to the Lord's own statement and reject the Old Testament record of Jonah and the whale.

As to whether a whale can swallow a man, the record says that God "prepared a great fish." We believe he did, and are not interested therefore in the scientific argument. The same God that made them all surely "prepared" the one that swallowed Jonah.

Friends, when a modernist gets through with the Bible, we have no Bible, for he takes out of it every single, solitary, mark and evidence of its divinity and reduces it to a human book, written by man. Believing the Bible is a matter of believing all of it, or none of it.

Then, what about this man Naaman getting his leprosy cleansed by washing seven times in the Jordan river? Well that is just what happened—now, do you say that you be-

lieve in Jesus but don't believe that? Then hear Jesus: "And many lepers were in Israel in the time of Elisha the prophet; and none of them was cleansed, saving Naaman the Syrian." (Lk. 4:27). Thus Jesus puts the stamp of credibility on the story of Naaman. The cleansing of Naaman was a fact, not a fable.

#### LEPROSY AND SIN

Here is a very striking analogy. What leprosy is to the body, sin is to the soul. It is loathsome in all of its effects. It is beyond the power of man to cure. It has in its sound the hiss of the serpent and in its glamour the gleam of the fang—S-I-N. As in the case of Naaman, great men are not exempt. Naaman was a *great* man. Naaman was a hero. Naaman was honorable, a "mighty man in valour."

We love to talk of great men, heroes and of deeds of honor and valor. But there was one overshadowing fact—this great man was a *leper*. He was physically and socially disqualified. Many people appear to think that there can be nothing wrong with great men—but they are sinners before God. Greatness is not a synonym for salvation, and if men of greatness have not obeyed the gospel of Christ they are sinners unsaved "for there is no respect of persons with God." Often we appeal to people through flattery to come into the church. We would compliment their position of power and mention what they would be worth to the church. That is the wrong appeal. No man can be brought to Christ through flattery or any appeal to pride. The church needs no man (in that sense) ; the man needs the church. You may be great, my friend, but if you are in disobedience to God you are a leper—a loathsome leper in need of cleansing.

The redeeming thing about Naaman is that he *realized* he was a leper. All the flattery of his admiring people could not minimize his trouble. He knew it was leprosy. He could not have persuaded himself that it was a minor skin trouble, perhaps, rash or roseola, eczema or that other skin trouble that everybody has had; he knew he couldn't scratch it out in seven years! Men are prone to minimize sin and

mitigate disobedience. "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper: but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy." (Prov. 28:13). Until convicted of his sins, no man can be saved.

Such a realization, or conviction, humbles men. Naaman was *humble*—realizing his condition, he was willing to receive instruction even from humble sources. It was the maiden in his household who told him what he did not know. When men will not be told, they are hopeless. "Pride goeth before destruction and an haughty spirit before a fall." (Prov. 16:18). The Son of God "humbled himself and became obedient" (Phil. 2:8) and it was He who said, "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls." (Matt. 11:29-30).

#### SINCERITY SEEKING THE WAY

When Naaman reached the land of Israel he went to the wrong place—he became *misguided*—he went to the king instead of the prophet. The maiden said the prophet, but Naaman went to the king. He made a mistake. The king knew as little about what to do with Naaman as the average denominational preacher knows about telling sinners what one must do to be saved. When you go to men and creeds, friends, instead of the word of God, you are misguided.

But many people say that it makes no difference what one believes just so he thinks it is right—that did not seem to work in Naaman's case; he thought he was going to the right place when he went to the king. I have never understood how anybody could think that wrong is right because one believes it is. Jesus called the religious teachers of his day "blind guides" and "blind leaders of the blind" and said, "both shall fall into the ditch." They will not escape the ditch merely because they are blind and cannot see it, nor because they think no ditch is there. It simply means, friends, that you cannot be right if you are wrong.

But this man Naaman was *sincere* and when he found out that the king was not the prophet, he went in search of the prophet. Many people do not search for the truth; and



when their credulity has been once imposed upon in religion, often they will give it all up and wander into unbelief, rather than sincerely seek the way.

So Naaman comes to the prophet. It is here that his faith must stand its test. The prophet did not come out to see him—Naaman is at his door—but the prophet remains inside. Why does he not come out? This is Naaman, "my lord Naaman," whose chariot and horses stood at the door. But he is no more to the prophet Elisha than any other leper. Presently a servant comes out to the chariot with the terse orders of the prophet: "Go wash in the river Jordan seven times." It knocked the breath out of Naaman. There he was the Generalissimo of the Syrian army, who had come in great array to the prophet of Israel, only to be told to dip himself in the river. He went into a rage. To him it sounded as though the prophet had said "go jump in the river"!

Naaman said, "Behold, I thought" the prophet would do this or say that—it was not as he had *thought* it would be. And men are still putting what they think up against what God says.

Naaman was *biased*—bias, that enemy of one's soul that will steal away your power to think—that thing called *prejudice*. Naaman was prejudiced—he would not wash in the murky Jordan. If rivers and waters were necessary, he would choose his native streams.

But one cannot *substitute* when God commands—God said the Jordan, and no matter how pure their streams, Abana and Pharpar would not do. You must come to the Jordan of obedience, friend. When God says do one thing, you cannot do another, nor can you dispense with what he commands. It must be done.

Naaman turned and went away in rage. Many people have done that when they heard a gospel sermon—but when they "think it over," as Naaman did, they return to obey God. His servants interposed, "If the prophet had bidden thee do some great thing, wouldst thou not have done it?"

How much rather then when he saith to thee, Wash, and be clean."

Naaman turned toward the Jordan. He had conquered pride and prejudice; he was ready to do the prophet's bidding. He washed in the Jordan. He washed seven times. *Complete* obedience was necessary. Partial obedience cannot save—partial obedience is disobedience. There is not a line, not a word, not an inference in all the word of God that encourages partial obedience. All that God commands must be obeyed. When Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized" it does not mean "he that believeth and is *not* baptized"!

#### THE SIMPLICITY OF THE GOSPEL

God's word has never been what men would have it be. His word is of marked simplicity. What the prophet commanded Naaman to do was *simple*—so simple that he did not want to do it. But the servants said: "How much rather then when he saith to thee, Wash and be clean?"

Friends, there is never the slightest connection between the thing that God commands men to do and the reason for which it should be done. "For we walk by faith and not by sight." It is when reason rebels that faith accepts. Faith *accepts*—obeys the command. When a command is left unobeyed there has been no acceptance of faith.

Faith never blesses a man until it expresses itself in action. By faith Abel *offered* his sacrifice; by faith Enoch *walked* with God; by faith Noah *prepared* the ark; by faith Abraham *obeyed* when he was called. By faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they were *compassed* about seven days as God commanded; by faith the children of Israel were healed of the bites of the fiery serpents when they *looked* on the serpent lifted on the pole—the command was to "look," and faith without looking was not a saving faith. Neither was it "snake salvation" when they looked.

It is true that man must exercise faith to be saved, but his faith must also exercise him. When Jesus Christ said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"—if one

does not have faith enough to be baptized, he does not have faith enough to be saved.

Another illustration of faith coupled with obedience is in the story of the blind man who came to Jesus. Jesus spat on the ground and made clay out of the spittle, and said: "Go, and wash in the pool of Siloam." Now, there was nothing in the water of this pool to heal the eyes of the blind—if so, all the blind men in the country would have been there ere this. The blind man goes. Can you imagine that someone meets him on the way, and says to him: "Where are you going?" He answers: "I am going to the pool of Siloam to wash this clay off my eyes." His neighbor says: "Who told you to do that?" The blind man replies, "Jesus told me to do it." His interrogator again inquires: "*Wei*, do you believe in Jesus?" And the blind answers: "Yes, I believe in Jesus" Whereupon his gratuitous friend says: "Well, don't you know you can see already, if you believe in Jesus." Ah, friends, do you think you could have the blind man *see* it? No, he knew he was blind, yet he believed, yes, he believed when he came to Jesus, but he was not healed until his faith expressed itself in obedience.

Yet preachers will strangely tell men that the moment they believe in Christ—that very moment they are saved—for which there is no example under the gospel of Christ. I say again, Jesus having said "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," the man who does not have faith enough to be baptized does not have faith enough to be saved. Is it faith, or is it unbelief, when men do not obey? Really, what some of these preachers call faith is actually a lack of it—plain unbelief.

Naaman's faith blessed him when? Why, when he washed as the prophet commanded. How many times? The number of times commanded—seven. Obedience must be *complete*, never partial. But a Methodist preacher said one time that Naaman did not have any faith, it was a mere experiment with him. That's news, isn't it?—saved by an experiment instead of an experience! Well, he had seven times as much faith as that preacher had—he had faith enough to be dipped *seven times*, with no promise of healing

save the word of God's prophet, and that preacher didn't have faith enough to be dipped *one time* with all the teaching and examples in the New Testament to induce it. There is little telling what creed bound preachers will say when they are trying to evade the commands of God. Jesus said of them, "Ye are blind guides" and "if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch." Don't let them lead you, my friend, unless you are willing to be ditched.

#### THE POWER OF GOD

With final reference to the cleansing of Naaman—the question comes: Where was the *power*? When Naaman ascended from Jordan's waters, standing on the bank, did he look back into the rolling river and praise the Jordan? Did he say, "The Jordan river has healed my leprosy; I'll praise the river and worship its fountain"! No, no, friends. Naaman knew better than that, even if some preachers do not. Then what did he say? Here it is: "Behold, now I know that there is no God in all the earth, but in Israel." Naaman knew that God healed; but he also knew that he had to do what God commanded in order to be healed.

Friends, faith is not our saviour; Jesus Christ is our Saviour—but we must believe. Repentance is not our saviour; Jesus Christ is our Saviour—but we must repent. Baptism is not our saviour; Jesus Christ is our Saviour—but we must be baptized. For the Saviour said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" and if you believe and trust the Lord you will do it. The man who will not do it is a rebel against God, and there will be no rebels in heaven.

We beg you, friends, to continue not in senseless resistance to the demands of the gospel until you are lost. The career of the disobedient ends in hell; divine vengeance is the end of all who know not God and obey not the gospel. There is danger and death in delay. Your decision to wait may decide your fate. O, the hardihood that rejects God and rebels at his word; heaven and earth will pass away, but his word will not. It will judge you in the last day. Why not bow to his will, as did the leper, and receive his saving power, and stand on the promises of God? Heaven bids you come while together we stand and sing.

## CHAPTER IX

## WHY SEND FOR PETER?

*TEXT: "And he showed us how he had seen an angel in his house, which stood and said unto him, Send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter; who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." (Acts 11:13-14).*

Brethren in Christ, and Friends: The occasion that brings us together is providential and we should regard it with all the solemnity that respect for God and his word binds upon us. The Lord has said "take heed how ye hear" and also "what ye hear." We should therefore take heed *how* we hear *what* we hear. I am ever conscious of the responsibility that weighs upon me as a preacher, knowing that I am to be judged by the things I preach. But there is also your responsibility as hearer; we have a mutual responsibility and my prayer is that we may discharge these our solemn obligations before God tonight without reserve.

We shall study tonight the case of Cornelius, the Roman soldier. Our text will be Acts 11:13-14, worded as follows: "Send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter; who shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved."

This particular text is taken from Peter's account of the conversion of Cornelius. It should be observed that the 10th chapter of Acts is Luke's record of these occurrences, which are not given in order, but only as a general statement of the things that occurred. But in the eleventh chapter, Simon Peter relates *in order* the events connected with the conversion of Cornelius. This fact furnishes the ground for important arguments refuting some false doctrines that have grown up around this gospel narrative, and I ask that

you mark this fact and keep it before you.

#### THE GOSPEL, TO THE GENTILES

There is a remarkably strange fact in connection with this conversion—the fact that the gospel commission had been in operation some ten years and yet no Gentile, as such, had been extended its blessings. The apostles themselves had not understood the scope of the commission. The words of the commission seem clear enough, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them" (Matt. 28:19), but the apostles thought it meant Jews of all nations. Not even Mark's words, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," were any better understood, for their conduct toward the Gentiles proves that they understood it to mean the Jewish world.

Now, it took a series of miracles to remove this impression from the minds of the apostles and all the Jewish church, and because of these miracles some have become confused on the conversion of Cornelius. We must consider the miracles apart from the conversion, for in no instance did they become a part of it. The circumstances are one thing and the law governing salvation entirely another thing. We ask that you also keep this fact well in mind until it is further developed.

It is timely to say that if the Holy Spirit ever operates on any man by direct saving power, independent of the preaching and hearing of God's word, here is one time when the circumstances would seem to demand that very thing. Cornelius is a Gentile, desirous of being saved. Because of their ideas of the restrictions and limitations of the gospel, based on their former relation to the Gentile world, the apostles would not preach the gospel to such. If ever the Holy Spirit should discriminate and operate on a man's heart, without the word of God, it seems this should be such an instance. But that did not occur.

There is a reason—a very definite and permanent one—it is not God's plan. The gospel commission ordained that by man the gospel shall be preached to man, and it is this

plan that God puts into operation in this case instead of another plan, for God has but one plan.

#### CHARACTER DOES NOT SAVE

Another thing, if character saves a man, Cornelius did not need the operation of the Holy Spirit, or the gospel, or anything else—for he had the *character*. Let Luke tell us what kind of a man he was. He gives a sketch of his character in Acts 10:1-2.

You will first note that he was a soldier, "a centurion of the band called the Italian band." This fact adds interest to the next statement, "a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God always." Why should such a man send for Peter to tell him what to do to be saved ?

The common idea is that such a man is saved because of being such a man. First, he was morally devout; second, he was religious in his fear of God; third, he was benevolent in his deeds of charity; and fourth, he was consistent in his worship, and prayed to God with such regularity that the text says "always."

Was Cornelius saved? Hear the angel: "Send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter; who shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." Rather singular language to use to a saved man, isn't it, friends? No Cornelius was not saved.

So here is a moral man who was not saved; and here is a religious man who was not saved; and here is a benevolent man who was not saved; and here is a praying man who was not saved. Can it be that a moral, religious, benevolent, praying man was *unsaved*? It must have been, since the angel told him to "send for Peter" who should tell him what to do to be saved. It simply turns that little idea that one is saved if he is honest and moral and religious into a tail spin.

Since the moral and religious character of Cornelius will compare with that of any of Port Arthur's best citizens, it follows as a fact, no matter how unwilling some may be to admit it, that moral, devout and religious people (even some

of you) may also be unsaved. Then it behooves you, honest friend, to look into your own case and see how it checks with Bible conversion.

#### SENDING FOR PETER

In connection with the sending for Peter there were three miracles wrought. Let us observe them in order.

First, the angel appeared to Cornelius and told him to send for Peter. That was miracle number one. It should be remembered that the New Testament in written form did not exist at that time; it was in the making; the word of God was in the man (the inspired man) and not in the book and no man therefore had access to the written word of God, save only the Old Testament Scriptures—they did not have access therefore to the written gospel. For this reason there were certain circumstances attending the development of the plan of salvation, that did not become a part of the plan or gospel, and which were not handed down to us. The circumstances were provisional, not permanent; the law is permanent and perfect. The purpose therefore of miracle No. 1—the appearance of the angel to Cornelius—was to inform Cornelius where to get the preacher. That is all. And the angel retires from the case and we hear no more of the angel; still Cornelius is unsaved.

But why did the angel not tell him what to do to be saved? Because that is not God's plan. Angels cannot preach the gospel to men. Cornelius might have said to the angel: "Now, I am ready to do what God commands, why send for Peter, when you are here already; just let Peter stay in Joppa, and let me stay in Caesarea, and avoid three days delay—just tell me what God would have me do."

Friends, if ever the gospel plan should vary under any circumstances, would this not have been *one time* when it should have varied enough for an angel to tell a man what to do to be saved? It is the law of God as unchangeable as any law of the Medes and Persians that the gospel must be obeyed in order for men to be saved and that God, Christ, the Holy Spirit and angels do not intercept or suspend the plan—not since that gospel commission was given has there



been an exception to it in the divine record. Cornelius must send for Peter.

But let us shift the scene to Joppa. There another miracle is needed. Peter is on the housetop—in modern parlance, "the sun porch"—at the noon hour to wait for his meal to be made ready, and meanwhile to pray. A vision from heaven appeared; a great sheet was let down on which there were all manner of animals, fowls and creeping things; and Peter was commanded to kill and eat.

It was not according to Jewish custom to eat all kinds of meat. Peter therefore said, "Not so, Lord, nothing common or unclean has ever entered my mouth." The voice said, "What God has cleansed call not thou common." And that is miracle No. 2. Its purpose was to show Simon Peter that the Gentile nation was not to be regarded common, but as equal with the Jews, henceforth gospel subjects and entitled to all the blessings of the gospel, and privileges of the church.

In short the purpose of miracle No. 2 was to convince Simon Peter that he should preach the gospel to the Gentiles; and at that moment the men from Cornelius stood at the house where he was, and the Spirit bade Peter go with them. He went, but he took with him *six Jewish brethren* as witnesses to the things that were about to occur. Two miracles, and still Cornelius is unsaved, not having yet heard the "words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved."

We now return to Caesarea with the company, the servants of Cornelius, the six Jews, and Simon Peter. Cornelius was ready to receive them—"Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped him." This showed his humility before a man who was called to tell him the words upon which his salvation depended. But Peter restrained him, he "took him up," according to the record and said: "Stand up; I myself am a man."

Peter was evidently not the Pope, Lord God the Pope, His Holiness the Pope! He was not even a reverend D. D.—but just a man. If Peter, an inspired apostle could be just a man, why, O why, do preachers today pretend to be more

than men, just men. The Protestant clergy is as much a perversion of Christianity and the New Testament church as the Roman Catholic priesthood ever was. I would as soon "kiss the Pope's big toe" as to call a protestant preacher "Reverend." It violates the same principle. Just let me be your *brother*, if you are in Christ, and your fellowman if you are in the world, and that is enough for me if it was enough for an apostle of Jesus Christ, like Simon Peter.

The third miracle now takes place. When Peter entered the house and began to speak to Cornelius the words for which he was waiting, "the Holy Spirit fell on them." That is miracle No. 3.

#### WHEN THE SPIRIT FELL

Now, here is the place where the "Holy Ghost preachers" go for an example of the direct operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion. Their argument is this: The Holy Ghost fell on Cornelius before he was baptized in water; therefore he was saved before he was baptized in water! This is their Holy Spirit direct operation fortress—their very citadel of direct converting power—and we are now ready to take it from them and leave them with not one thing to stand upon.

Let me ask, first—when did Cornelius believe? In the effort to get Cornelius saved before baptism, these preachers get him saved before he believed the gospel. When did Cornelius believe? Let Peter answer—he ought to know since he was there. Sometime later, speaking before the church at Jerusalem, he says: "Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel and believe." (Acts 15:7) Now when did these Gentiles believe? (1.) Peter's "mouth" had to function; (2) they should "hear;" (3) the "word of the gospel;" (4) and believe. Now you see where faith is put—the fourth item down the line. Well, when did the Holy Spirit come? Let Peter tell you, he knows: "And as I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them, as on us at the beginning." (Acts 11:15). When did the Spirit come?—"as" Peter began to speak—as he began to speak—not in the middle of his speech

nor at the close of it—but AS, the very moment he began to speak. But when did they believe ? After they had heard the words of Peter—the order was: Peter's mouth; they heard; his words; and believed.

Now since the Spirit came upon them "as Peter began to speak," but they did not believe until after they heard the words he spoke, it simply follows, because it has to follow, that the Holy Spirit fell upon the house of Cornelius before he believed the gospel. So if it proves that he was saved when the Spirit fell, and therefore before he was baptized, it also proves that he was saved before he believed the gospel. O, the predicaments a preacher gets into, and the extremes he will go to, trying to evade a divine command to be baptized!

If any effort is made to show from the latter part of the tenth chapter of Acts that the Spirit did not fall on Cornelius until after Peter's sermon—remember that Luke merely states that the Spirit fell "on them that heard the word" but does not give the *order* of the occurrence. Acts 10 is Luke's record, not in order, but a general statement; while Acts 11 is Peter's own account which he rehearsed before the church at Jerusalem "in order"—as the events occurred. Luke says "while he spake" the Spirit fell; and Peter says "as I began" to speak. Hence, the eleventh chapter must explain the tenth, instead of the tenth chapter explaining the eleventh. Any other view would force a contradiction between Luke and Peter. The fact simply stated by Peter is that the Spirit fell on Cornelius before he heard the gospel, and therefore before he believed. It proves too much for the direct operation theory.

#### WHY THE SPIRIT FELL

Then the question remains—why did the Spirit fall on the household of Cornelius? The answer is that it is another miracle that does not become a part of his conversion. Its purpose was not to benefit Cornelius, but to prove to the Jews present, and to the whole Jewish church, that the Gentiles were acceptable to God as gospel subjects. There had not been a case of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in

that manner since Pentecost as shown by Peter's statement, "as I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them, as upon us at the beginning"—there had not been a case of its kind since "the beginning," since Pentecost. It was therefore *special*, not general, and being special, it was not a part of the law of conversion, for that is general.

As a further proof that the manifestation of the Holy Spirit in miraculous form to Cornelius and his house was for the special purpose of convincing the Jewish church that they were gospel subjects, I call your attention to the use that Peter made of the incident. Now, no one will charge Peter with a wrong use of this miracle. For what purpose did Peter use it? Kindly refer to the first verses of the eleventh chapter of Acts and you will find Peter defending himself before the Jerusalem Church in the matter of preaching to these Gentiles. He related the whole story—and then to convince them that the Gentiles were gospel subjects, he cited the miracle of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (verses 17-18). The church was then convinced, and Peter had gained the argument.

Now, did Peter make the right use of the incident? If he did, then the preacher who makes another use of it (the direct operation in conversion use of it) makes the wrong use of it. Which will you take, friends? There is not an instance in which Peter ever used this miracle as an example of how Cornelius was saved—he used it only to convince the Jews that the Gentiles were gospel subjects—that therefore was the purpose of it, and any other use made of it is a perversion of the case. It was simply a miracle that did not enter the law of conversion.

We have now learned the purpose of all three of the miracles in this case. First, the appearance of the angel to Cornelius—that was miracle No. 1, and its purpose was to inform Cornelius where to find the preacher. Second, the vision at Joppa—which was miracle No. 2, and its purpose was to show Simon Peter that he should go and preach to the Gentiles. Third, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the household of Cornelius—Miracle No. 3, the purpose of

which was to convince the whole Jewish church that the Gentiles were acceptable to God as gospel subjects.

We are now ready to learn exactly what Cornelius was required to do to be saved—having settled all the miracles and circumstances, let us now see what the elements of his conversion actually were.

#### THE WORDS WHEREBY

The angel had told Cornelius that Peter would tell him "words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." (Acts 11:14). Then it was not any of the miracles that saved him. What then, were the words that Peter preached to him?

Friends, after all the special happenings Peter simply preached *to this* Gentile the same gospel commission *given* by Christ as recorded in Matthew and Mark. Luke says that Peter preached to him "that word . . . which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached." Well, anybody who knows enough to come to Sunday School should know that the great commission "began from Galilee" after John's preaching was over, and after the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Turn to Matthew 28, verse 16: "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them." That is the right place—Galilee. Now, note verse 18: "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in (into) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Now, that as a matter of fact included the Gentiles, and it was what Peter preached to Cornelius, according to Luke's record in Acts 10. The commission by Mark reads: "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." Then, there is Luke's record of the commission, Luke 24:47: "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all the nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

It can be readily seen that in all these records of the gospel commission the Gentiles (all nations) were included.

This commission was carried "to the Jew first, and also to the Greek (Gentile)." (Rom. 1:16). It went to the Gentiles next when Peter preached it to Cornelius. The same elements of gospel obedience that were required of the Jews in Acts 2, were also required of Cornelius in Acts 10, for it is the same gospel, and he "put no difference between us and them," Peter said. So all the terms of the Gospel in the Great Commission were preached to Cornelius. Let us itemize them.

First, Peter preached *faith in Christ* to him. (Acts 15:7). Second, Peter preached *repentance unto life* to him. (Acts 11:18). Third, Peter preached *baptism in the name of Jesus Christ* to him. (Acts 10:48). This baptism was "water baptism," for it said: "Who can forbid water that these should not be baptized . . . and he commanded them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ." But this baptism was *for remission of sins*, for that was the purpose of baptism "in the name of Jesus Christ." Turn to Acts 2:38 and read: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for remission of sins." There it is, the first time it was ever preached—Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ—for what? "For the remission of sins." Repentance and baptism in the name of Jesus Christ are for the remission of sins. Cornelius was baptized in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 10:48). He was therefore baptized for the remission of sins.

There is only one baptism, friend, not several; and it is one thing, not two or three. It has but one purpose, or design—salvation, remission of sins. The conditions upon which men receive it are faith and repentance. Will you not believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, turn in repentance from all the ways of sin, be baptized as was Cornelius, and all others who under the preaching of the apostles obeyed the gospel, and receive as did they all the blessings that the gospel secures for those who obey it?

While for your convenience and encouragement we sing our invitation—come and stand with us on the promises of God. Standing, let us sing.

## CHAPTER X

## WHAT TO DO TO BE SAVED

*TEXT: "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" (Acts 16:30).*

Christian Friends and Honest Hearers:

We experience a pleasure beyond words because of your presence in these services so consistently. Such interest is bound to yield its fruit in obedience to God. Already people are obeying the gospel; but we confidently expect a great harvest ere this meeting draws to a close. We invoke God's blessing upon the preaching of his word and upon the hearing of it tonight, as we now invite your usual good attention to an important question.

Brother Lambert is doing a super-excellent work in answering the questions that are being handed in each evening. But I have a question to answer—now.

My sermon tonight will be an answer to a question—a great and grave question, the world's greatest question. It is found in Acts 16:30: "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" And the seeming strange and puzzling and perplexing thing to many people is that there is found in the Bible more than one answer to this question. There are, in fact, *five answers to one question*, and stranger still they are all exactly the right answers and should be obeyed.

## A STUDY OF THE QUESTION

The world is interested in trivial questions—questions that concern this short life and little world in which we live. But this is not a trivial question, nor does it concern merely this present world and the life that now is. It is as infinite as the soul of man and as important as his eternal destiny. Will you not so consider it as we proceed to study the question?

Let us first study the words of this question—*What Must I Do to Be Saved?*

Take the word "do"—What must I *do*? Now the general

denominational idea is that one cannot do much of anything, if anything at all; for theology assumes that man by his very nature is hereditarily totally depraved, and is therefore a helpless passive recipient of direct saving grace without any power of his own to act. This was the old theology, and not much of the new is any better. Hereditary means "inherited;" depraved means to be "bad;" and total means "whole." If man is hereditarily totally depraved, he is wholly bad by nature, born that way. Yet the creeds affirm it; it has touched practically all creeds, though some have attempted to revise certain parts of that doctrine out. The Baptist Manual says: "Utterly void of good, positively (wholly) inclined to evil"—and that by birth. The Methodist Discipline said, prior to 1910 that "all men are conceived and born in sin." The Methodists got ashamed of the doctrine and their article now reads: "All men are conceived and born in Christ"—a great difference since 1910! When were you born, friend? That shows just how much business a set of Bishops have writing creeds, and just how much business good people have subscribing to them. You are subscribing to a lot of man-made doctrine when you do it, my friend.

But let me show you what the Bishops did when they revised the creed. It was written to harmonize with another man-made doctrine—namely, the direct operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion of sinners. Assuming, you see, that sinners are by nature totally depraved, it was then assumed that a direct divine power of the Holy Spirit was necessary to remove it, hence the doctrine of direct operation of the Holy Spirit. But now that the Bishops took the human depravity article out of the discipline, and have all men born *in Christ*, their Holy Spirit has nothing to operate on, and hence in taking depravity out of their creed and leaving the direct operation in the creed, they have a direct operation without a subject—for *why* and *how* operate on one born *in Christ*?

The two doctrines are like Siamese twins, you cannot take one away without killing them both—and the Bishops can't see an inch in front of their noses! Listen, friends, the best



thing you can do is to drop these human things—people who believe the New Testament and accept it as their only creed do not get into such tangles as that.

But the Baptists still cling to the total depravity doctrine, their debaters still fight for it, and their Manual in all editions retains it. What a doctrine—hereditary total depravity—it sounds about like a "cuss-word" to me. It is not a Bible doctrine.

The Bible says that man was made "upright" and sought out his evil inventions. Furthermore, that his spirit comes from God, and not from the devil. "Shall we not rather be in subjection to the Father of our Spirits, and live?" Is God the father of a totally depraved spirit? If it is born that way, he is! And remember Jesus Christ was *born* into this world with exactly the same nature as man—watch your step on that doctrine, or you will have a totally depraved Saviour.

The Bible also says men "go astray" after they are born. Well, which way do they go? If they are totally depraved, they could not go toward the devil—but they *go, go, go*, where? Say, friend, the preacher is about to have men going astray when they are going away from the devil—toward God!

But wicked men "wax worse and worse"! And again, it says that the devil "seduces men"—could the devil seduce a totally depraved man—or rather could that kind of a man seduce the devil?—yet theology, old and new, affirms that men are born in that state, "utterly void of good"—no wonder the Methodists weeded it out of the creed, but they didn't weed long enough, they should have chopped it all out while at it.

The doctrine is just a relic of Rome's abominations that Luther, Calvin and Wesley were unable to shake off when they emerged from the dark ages. Of course not many of you good people believe it, but my point is, why do you stay in these denominations that are founded on such creeds, and teach so many other things just as false?

The very question—what must I do—reverses the doctrine that the sinner is a passive recipient in salvation. He is an active agent, friends, and is called upon to act—to do

something. Then take another word—What must I do—"I"—that very personal word. Not what the thief on the cross did not do; not what my grandfather, uncle or aunt did not do—but what does the New Testament say in answer to the question—that is the point, with the question mark at the end of it.

A man said to me, "Brother, I can't take the doctrine you preach that one must be baptized to be saved, because it damns my father and mother who were not baptized." Well, let us see. Do you think one must *believe* in Jesus Christ to be saved? "Oh yes," he answers. Very well, I will just change my subject from baptism to faith in Christ. A Jew comes around and says, Mr. Preacher, I can't accept the doctrine you preach, that faith in Jesus is necessary to salvation, because my father and mother died without believing in Christ. The Jew thinks as much of his father as you do of yours. By the same argument with which you eliminate baptism, because perchance it damns some of your ancestors, he also eliminates faith in Christ. Then I preach that the *knowledge of God* is necessary to salvation, and a Chinaman comes around, and says, "I can't take the doctrine you preach, because it damns my poor father and mother, who died without the knowledge of God"—and there you see the whole plan of salvation in nullified by contingencies.

Friends, I suggest that we leave the matter of clemency to the judge (a judge only has the power of clemency) and let us observe the law. I have no authority to preach clemency—I must preach what God commands men to do to be saved—and I know what the law says.

Then notice the other words of the question—What *must* I do—"must"—it simply must be done. Again, *What* must I do—"what"—just anything necessary, Lord, name it, and the man who knows he is lost and wants to be saved will do it. Then, the word "saved"—what must I do to be *saved*? And there is the climax of the question—the word that gives the all-importance to the question. If that word was great enough to cause the Son of God to die in order to get this

question answered, it ought to be important enough to you to consider in view of eternity.

Let us then advance to the answers to the question—five answers to one question.

#### A CROSS-EXAMINATION OF TEXTS

As the circumstances under which the question was asked in the New Testament vary with each case, it is necessary that the cross-reference examination of the texts be made, which comparison will reveal a perfect harmony in all the answers given. But may I say here, and now, that no preacher has any right to withhold any one of the answers or any part of one. When he does so he becomes an arch-perverter of God's word, and a thief of men's souls. Not for ten million worlds like this would I tell men to do less or more to be saved than God in his own word has declared. Let us follow the answers—the inspired answers that we may be infallibly right.

Take, first, the case of the Philipian jailor of Acts 16. He was a heathen unbeliever—had never heard Christ preached. The slave girl with soothsaying powers had pointed Paul and Silas out to the public as "servants of the Most High God, who show unto us the way of salvation." Seeing that his preaching was about to be identified with the activities of a fortune-telling maiden, Paul divested her of the peculiar powers she possessed by commanding the evil spirit to depart. It made her masters mad. Paul and Silas were hailed before the magistrate, beaten and cast in the dungeon of the Philipian prison. At midnight they prayed and sang—started a gospel meeting in jail. The prisoners listened. God also listened; the earth quaked, the prison shook, the doors twisted open—and every man's bands were loosed. The jailor was awakened, and seeing the doors open thought a firstclass jail-break had been accomplished and was about to end his life by his own hand. Paul intercepted by calling, "Do thyself no harm, for we are all here." Then thought the jailor, these men are truly the men of God, preaching salvation—and he went in, brought Paul and Silas out, and trembling and falling before them he said, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?"

Now there is the question—and here is one answer: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." Now that is answer No. 1. Here we drive down a peg for a moment.

Shift the scene to the second chapter of Acts. Peter preaches the first sermon to several thousand Jews. They heard, were "pricked in the heart"—believed it. From their depth of conviction they cried: "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Now, there is the same question, and here is the answer to it: "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 (blessings) of the Holy Spirit." The question is the same, but the answers do not seem to be the same. Why the difference—both Peter and Paul are inspired, and why are not the inspired answers the same? We shall see presently. But that is answer No. 2—and we drive down another peg for a moment.

Take another case—Saul of Tarsus. Let him tell it, he ought to know his own case, and if he does not, I'd be slow to let some preacher try to tell it for him. Read Acts 22, with verse 16. Saul heads for Damascus to arrest Christians—but Jesus arrests him. It was on the highway. The light shone upon him; he fell to the earth. He heard the voice, "Saul, Saul" and asked, "Who art thou, Lord?" The answer came, "I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest." And Saul said: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Jesus replied: "Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do" (Acts 9:6; Acts 22:10). He went into the city, a believing, penitent man—and for three days he waited in blindness, fasting and praying, for the one who should come to tell him what to do. Ananias came, and he was told to "arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." (Acts 22:16). Now, there is answer No. 3, and another peg is placed for a moment.

It has been urged by some preachers that Saul of Tarsus was saved in the midst of the light on the highway and before he ever went into the city. Well, that makes a strange

conversion out of it, for if that was the case Saul himself did not know it, for he asked the Lord what he must do; and if that was the case, Jesus did not know it, for he told Saul to go into the city and there he would be told what to do; and if he was saved on the highway in the light, Ananias, the God-sent preacher, did not know it, for he went to the house where Saul was to tell him what to do; and if he was saved on the highway, he was the most miserable saved man anybody ever read about because for three days after he was still blind, fasting and praying! Friends, the preacher who tells you that does not even believe it himself. Well, when was he saved? Why, when he did what he was told to do, of course. And what was that? Just read the 16th verse of Acts 22, and you won't even need a preacher to tell you. "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Friends, when did you ever in all of your life hear a denominational preacher, Baptist, Methodist, or Presbyterian, or any other shade, tell anybody those very words?

But you are waiting for me to tell you, *why* these different answers? Well, we are ready to show you that they begin at different points, but all come out at the same place. First, the jailor was an unbeliever—and he was told to believe. Then Paul "preached unto him the word of the Lord," so that he could believe; and believing, the jailor took them and washed their stripes—he repented, there's the evidence—and "was baptized the same hour of the night" (in quite a rush to attend to a "nonessential," don't you think?) and came back into the house "rejoicing having believed." There is the whole story.

On Pentecost, Peter preached before the question was asked, and therefore we have believers asking the question, instead of an unbeliever. Hence they were told to "Repent and be baptized every one of you . . . for the remission of sins." And in the case of Saul he had both believed and repented when Ananias came and told him to "arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins." So it is just a matter of the starting point, for the terminating point is the same. Summing it up: The *unbeliever* was told to believe. The

*believer* was told to repent. The *penitent believer* was told to be baptized. Therefore before salvation is reached all of it must be done as we advance from the first condition until the point of salvation is reached.

#### SOME OTHER THINGS TO DO

Having learned that there are three harmonious answers to the question, let us proceed further.

Baptism is not the end of obedience, it is but the beginning. In Baptism past sins are forgiven, pardoned. But salvation must be continuous. Thus Paul exhorted the Philippian church, among whom was the jailor himself, to "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." (Phil. 2:12). After being baptized we must still "work out" our salvation. So the apostle again says, "We are not of them who draw back unto perdition, but of them who believe unto the saving of the soul." (Heb. 10:39). Jesus referred to those "who for awhile believe." (Lk. 8:13). And Paul says, "now is our salvation nearer than when we first believed." (Rom. 13:11).

These passages refer to that continuous faith of the Christian's life of works and service necessary to his final salvation in heaven. It is argued by some that if one is once saved there can be no falling away—if you get it you cannot lose it. The old version of it is: If you seek it, you cannot find it; and if you find it, you cannot get it; and if you get it, you cannot lose it; and if you lose it, you never had it!

Friends, if one cannot fall away and be lost, how do you account for the fact, first, that the Bible warns us against falling; second, that the Bible instructs us how to keep from falling; third, that the Bible informs us what to do when we fall—and yet we cannot fall!! Somebody has either made a doctrine that doesn't fit the Bible or else God made a Book that doesn't fit the doctrine. Then what must people who have believed, repented and been baptized do to be saved? They must *continue*. "Then they that gladly received the word were baptized . . . and they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." (Acts 2:41-42).

One answer more remains. When a Christian backslides

—what must the backslider do to be saved ? This answer is found in Acts 8. Simon the Sorcerer believed, was baptized, and continued with Philip. Later he was tempted to go back to his old life. The apostle rebuked him severely and said to him: "Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thy heart might be forgiven thee." And Simon said: "Pray ye to the Lord for me, that none of these things which ye have spoken come upon me." (Acts 8:22-24).

It is sometimes argued that "old Simon never had it"—well Peter thought he did, for he did not go back beyond the one act of wickedness in telling him what to do. Peter said, repent of *this thy wickedness*, showing that all before that had been acceptable. Furthermore, Simon's faith and baptism are recorded as being identical with that of all the others whom Philip baptized. The record states that "they were baptized both men and women"—then it says, "Simon *himself* believed *also*"—wonder why so much emphasis on "himself" and "also"? It shows that his faith and his baptism were exactly what all the others had been. And being baptized he *continued*, but later *fell*, and was told to *repent and pray*—and that is God's law to the backslider.

And in conclusion, friends, you can classify yourselves and answer the question accordingly. If you are an unbeliever—you must *believe*. If you are a believer—you must *repent*. If you are a penitent believer—you must be *baptized*. If you have done all of those things—then you must *continue*. And if you have failed to continue for a time—then, before it is too late, *repent and pray* God, and he will pardon. Yea, friends, all of you who are gospel subjects—come now, while we sing the invitation.

## CHAPTER XI

## GOD'S CALL TO REPENTANCE

*TEXT: "At the time of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent: because he hath appointed a day, in which he will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." (Acts 17:24).*

Brethren, Friends And Honest Hearers: We appreciate the disposition of heart and purpose of mind that bring together such audiences as this in such uniform and regular attendance, unaccountable on any other basis than a pure interest in the gospel. No other attraction has in it the power to bring people—the same people—together twice a day in the numbers attending this meeting. Circuses and shows and performances have their crowds—but for one appearance only. Political speakers appear for one appointment to present the plea of their parties. But with gospel themes one speaker may hold the people over a period of weeks—when nothing else will. It proves that the gospel is still "the sweet story" and finds willing hearts and listening ears.

We speak tonight of the command to repent. Our text is taken from Paul's sermon on Mar's Hill—Acts 17:24: "At the time of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent: because he hath appointed a day, in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."

It has been said that we put too much stress on baptism, and not enough on repentance. Some people think that because we do not preach some direct, incomprehensible, inconceivable, unintelligible, intangible, mystical, mystified,



better-felt-than-told sort of an operation that we "leave the Holy Spirit out" and do not preach repentance. Their trouble lies in not knowing what repentance is nor when it is preached.

As for baptism, I have never been able to put *as much* stress on it as Christ and the apostles did. There is not a case of delayed baptism in the Bible—not one on record—after the subject was commanded to be baptized. On Pentecost "about three thousand" were baptized that day. In Acts 8 the eunuch was baptized by the way, without waiting until he reached his destination; he did not even wait for a church to vote on him! In Acts 9 Paul "arose, and was baptized" forthwith upon being told. In Acts 16 the jailor was baptized "the same hour of the night."

The apostles evidently put much stress on the command to be baptized, to have obtained such ready response. As hard as I try, people will often delay their baptism for a time, even when convinced, and sometimes after the good confession has been made. Perhaps I am not putting *enough stress* on this important command after all.

But if it seems to some that too much is said on the subject, let it be remembered that it is the one command that people so universally oppose, and that preachers so unanimously ignore, hence it requires much stress on our part. You see, friend, it is necessary for us to do our part of the preaching on the subject and make up for what all the other preachers fail to do! If they would all preach baptism, as they do faith, we would not feel bound to give so much attention to it; and if the situation should be reversed, and all the preachers should begin preaching baptism and ignoring faith (even branding it as non-essential) then we would feel impelled to put the stress there. In the midst of this skeptical, doubting, unbelieving, impenitent age I must concede, friends, that much more preaching on both faith and repentance is in demand.

#### THE HARDEST COMMAND

Repentance is the hardest command to obey. Do you wonder if this is true? Well, it is—for it has to do with the will of man. The obstinacy of the human will has always

been, and yet is, the greatest obstacle in the way of his salvation. Faith is not hard to induce unless one is determined not to believe, and in that case it becomes one of obstinacy again.

Someone said, "If weak thy faith why choose the harder side?" Unbelief is the harder side. Faith is easily imparted and "groweth exceedingly" in those who are not obstinate. Neither is baptism a hard command. When one has believed, actually, and repented, truly, he will readily be baptized. "Then they that gladly received the word were baptized." (Acts 2:41). Impenitence is the trouble. "And thinkest thou this, O man . . . that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? Or despiseth thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his deeds . . . for there is no respect of persons with God." (Rom. 2:2-11. God says stubbornness is as bad as idolatry, and rebellion is the same as witchcraft in the Lord's sight. The impenitence that will reject all warnings of a righteous judgment is plain hardihood.

It has been said that infidels live but do not die. That is likely the truth, for infidelity is a poor rod and staff in death. Someone else said that there will be no infidels in hell. The renowned French infidel, Voltaire, is reported to have screamed in his death. "O God if there be a God, save my soul if I have a soul, from hell if there is a hell." It is also said of the bold and brazen Ingersoll that he shrieked out in the clutches of death: "O, what shall become of my poor soul!" As the unbelieving and impenitent face a leap into the dark caverns of eternity where "tribulation and anguish" await "them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth," they reach for a hand that can save. But God has said, "Because I have called and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded; but ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof:

I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh . . . then shall they call upon me, but I will not answer." (Prov. 1:24-28).

These are solemn words, impenitent friend, and you should heed them to "seek the Lord while he may be found" and "call upon him while he is near." The time will come, and that soon, when you will renounce your unbelief and sue for mercy, but mercy's day may have passed you by. "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation."

#### WHAT REPENTANCE IS

It is not enough to merely call upon people to repent; they must know what repentance is, in order that they may repent. Theology has obscured the subject and blurred the eyes of those who otherwise might see. It has been preached as something that God gives, a weird something from an unknown source, something a sinner should pray for and receive in strange sensations and inexplicable experiences. Now, friends, let us see if we cannot get an intelligent definition of repentance—just try to find out what this thing is that God "commands all men everywhere" to do. Men cannot do a thing unless they know what it is; nor can they do the thing that is done for them. Since repentance is commanded, it is an act of man and not of God. It is done by man and not for man.

Repentance is not *fear*. Many preachers seem to think so, for in their preaching they use the "fear psychology." They take you to the sick room, then to the death chamber, then to the undertaker's parlor, then to the cemetery, then to the land of ghostdom; and they tell you many creepy stories that make the hair stand on ends, and the knees knock, and the teeth chatter, and the blood run cold, and all sorts of creepy feelings play up and down the spine—and they think they are preaching repentance, when in fact they are preaching nightmares! No, repentance is not fear.

Repentance is not *regret*. Many have regretted their sins who never once repented. Men are sorry for their sins because they have been caught; because they suffer

the shame or humiliation of being exposed; because they suffer the penalties of its retributive justice—but mere regret is not repentance.

Repentance is not *prayer*. Some prayers are an abomination in the sight of God. "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." (Prov. 28:9). And David said, "If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me." (Psa. 66:18). But there are people who think that all who pray have repented and will be saved. Jesus said: "Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my father which is in heaven." (Matt. 7:21). It takes more than mere prayer to define repentance.

Repentance is not *conviction*. Now, all of you have heard the preachers talk about being "under conviction"—and they don't know what it means themselves. On the day of Pentecost, when the first gospel sermon was preached, the people were "pricked in their hearts"—they were convicted, whether they were "under" it or not. Convicted—but they had not repented. For when these convicted Jews said to the apostles, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter told them to "repent and be baptized." So they had not repented—it takes more than conviction to make repentance.

Repentance is not sorrow. Paul says, "godly sorrow worketh repentance. Hence, sorrow—the right kind of sorrow—is the cause and repentance is the effect. When regret turns into sorrow, then sorrow turns into repentance.

Repentance is not *reformation*. It produces reformation, just as sorrow produces repentance. Reformation is the fruit of repentance. A man regrets his sins to the extent of sorrow, he repents and reforms. Hence, repentance stands in between the time that a man becomes sorry for his sins and when he abandons his sins, and begins the better course of life. "For I am ready to halt, and my sorrow is continually before me. For I will declare my iniquity; I will be sorry for my sins." (Psa. 38:18).

Then *what is repentance?* Friends, repentance is a

mental act—the act of the mind that determines to quit sin. It is resolution; it involves the function of the human will. Hear Jesus: "But what think ye? A certain man had two sons; and he came to the first and said, Son, go work today in my vineyard. He answered and said, I will not: but afterward he repented, and went." (Matt. 21:29). This short parable defines repentance. The impenitent son said, "I will not." The penitent son said, "I will." The difference between repentance and impenitence is the difference of one word. It is the word "not," and that is the word that spells the difference between rebellion and disobedience on one hand and submission and obedience to God on the other. When a man who is living in sin determines to abandon his life of sin, when he says, "I will quit sin—I will sin no more," he has repented.

How long does it take one to repent? Just long enough to determine to quit sin. So repentance, friends, is that resolution, determination, that decision to obey God. Faith precedes it, baptism follows it. Hence, "repent and be baptized every one of you."

#### THE NECESSITY OF REPENTANCE

The absolute necessity of repentance is seen by its prominence in the divine text. Enoch, the first preacher mentioned in the Bible, preached repentance. He preached "judgment upon all" and sought "to convince them of all their ungodly deeds." (Jude 14, 15). Noah preached repentance. For about a century he thundered forth the coming judgment of God upon a world utterly wed to evil and incorrigible crime. But the world was in the grip of universal apostasy; they gave no heed and God "spared not the old world, but saved Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly." (2 Pet. 2:5). Had the world repented at the preaching of Noah, the story might have been a different one. The prophets all preached repentance. Isaiah said, "though your sins be as scarlet, I will make them white as snow; though they be red like crimson, I will make them as

wool." Ezekiel said, "turn ye from your transgressions, for why will ye die, O house of Israel."

And the first preacher that appears on the scene in the New Testament is a fearless preacher of repentance. John the Baptist preached the "baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." (Mk. 1:4). He did not preach the kind of baptism preached by those preachers today who call themselves Baptists. Let it be observed, in the first place, that Baptist was not John's name, but his work; and in the second place, that the Baptists today do not preach John's baptism. He preached the "baptism of repentance (growing out of repentance) for the remission of sins."

Modern Baptist preachers could not fellowship John, and he could not fellowship them. Moreover, John was not a Baptist—but "the" baptist—the only one, and there was never another who was called such. He started no church, and belonged to no church, and was beheaded by Herod before Jesus Christ built the church—yet the effort is made to identify the Baptist church today with the New Testament. It is a vain effort. Their own translation of the New Testament some years ago by their own Baptist scholars ruined that effort—for their scholars translated the word baptism "immersion" and the word baptize "immerse," and translated "John the Baptist" in the term "John the Immerser." They later discarded the translation because their scholars had taken out their name! We have a copy of this translation and will be glad to show it to any Baptist who might like to see it.

So Jesus preached repentance—but not repentance only; he preached the *baptism* of repentance. And John preached baptism—but not baptism only—he preached the baptism of *repentance*, and it was for the remission of sins.

One day Jesus came to be baptized of John—and John hesitated. He was preaching repentance and baptism for the remission of sins, and he knew that Jesus could receive no such baptism, as he had no sins. Jesus said "suffer it to be so now." That means that John was preaching it exactly right—but Jesus was an exception. He said "suffer" it. We suffer an exception, not the rule. And Jesus further said,

Suffer it to be so—*now*; that one time only—and He (the Son of God) was thus the only exception to "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Jesus did not receive John's baptism—he received an exception to it.

But Jesus went forth preaching "that men should repent"—the Son of God preached repentance. He put it in the Great Commission which, as worded by Luke, reads: "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all the nations beginning at Jerusalem." Then, beginning at Jerusalem, Peter preached repentance on Pentecost, commanding the Jews to "repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Paul preached it on Mars Hill to the men of Athens, and told them that "at the time of this ignorance" (Gentile ignorance, when God had not given them his Oracles) God had "winked at" or overlooked, but under this gospel age none is excused or excusable, and "all men everywhere" must repent.

Yes, repentance is necessary. Jesus said "repent or perish," and there is no alternative. It is repentance here or perdition hereafter. It means—turn or burn. In the very nature of things, and in the stern commands of God through all of his preachers in every dispensation, repentance is imperative.

#### THE COMING JUDGMENT

Upon one occasion certain Jews came to Jesus and called his attention to a tragedy in which eighteen men had lost their lives. They appeared to think these men were sinners above others and that it was God's judgment sent upon them. There are yet preachers who take advantage of every calamity that occurs, from cyclones and tornadoes, to blasts (such as occurred at New London) and floods, to preach tirades and diatribes on the judgment of God sent upon the people for their particular sins. If such were true, floods would not be confined to the Ohio and Mississippi valleys but we would have one like Noah's, for sin is not a local commodity. It shows just how little the ordinary preacher knows or has to preach about.

Jesus answered the question by saying "I tell you, nay"

—that is, no, God does not send judgments upon men in such disasters and tragedies. But "except ye repent, ye shall perish." There is coming a time when God will judge the world, not by cyclones and floods, but by the judgment of the last day. His command is to repent—or perish.

The judgment is coming. It is certain, for "God has appointed a day," to judge the world. There are two billion people that inhabit the globe today, and they will be there. The teeming millions of the past, and the unborn future will be there—he will judge *the world*. What a stupendous occasion it will be!

The issue will be "righteousness"—he will judge the world in *righteousness*. The gospel (for all of his commandments are righteousness), will be the sole standard of judgment.

There will be a separation—for the line will be drawn, sad to say, right through the families of the earth. The first family that ever lived will be divided in the judgment, because Cain will be on one side of the line and his good brother Abel on the other. Wives will be on one side and husbands on the other; parents on one side and their children on the other. Let us save our children!

Repent—because he has appointed a day in which he will judge the world. Ample warning has been made. Every motive and incentive consistent with the moral and spiritual nature of man has been placed before the race.

There is the *love of God*—matchless love—infinite goodness, that "leadeth thee to repent." There is the *fear of judgment* that calls men to repent. And there is the *hope of heaven*, the climax of all incentives and inducements to lead men into the life of obedience to God. Thus your soul stands, my hesitating friend, squarely in between the divine charms of God's love and the divine terrors of God's wrath. Repent or perish!

If you will turn from the downward way, and say tonight—"I am resolved no longer to linger, charmed by the world's delight; but things that are higher, things that are nobler, these have allured my sight," while this song we sing, if it is in your heart to obey we join in heaven's welcome.



## CHAPTER XII

## RESTORING THE ANCIENT ORDER

**TEXT:** *"Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said, We will not walk therein." (Jer. 6:16).*

Brethren, Friends and Interested Hearers: We are grateful to God for His providence in permitting us to assemble for the purpose of a further investigation of His Word.

The text of scripture which will introduce our lesson tonight is found in Jeremiah, chapter six and verse sixteen: "Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the way, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said, We will not walk therein."

The figure of the Prophet is that of a traveler who finds himself where a number of roads lead in different directions. He has a definite destination in mind but only one of the roads leads to it. He does not say it makes no difference which road you take just so you are satisfied. He does not say that the wrong road becomes the right road if you think it is! The word "stand" means to *stop*, "see" means to *look*, and "ask" is about equivalent to *listen*. Too, there are many *ways* to be wrong but only *one way* to be right. The ways of false teachers are many, but the Lord has but one way. Peter speaks of the "pernicious ways" of "false teachers" and calls them "damnable heresies" and in the same connection speaks of "the way of the Lord" (2 Pet. 2: 1,2).

There are three things here that determine our attitude toward God, to which I would direct your attention at the very threshold of such an investigation as this sermon proposes.

First, God has taught man his way. "Who is wise, and he

shall understand these things? prudent, and he shall know them? for the ways of the Lord are right, and the just shall walk in them, but the transgressor shall fall therein." (Hos. 14:9).

Second, God forbids man's way. "O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." (Jer. 10:23).

Third, God curses perversion. "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 than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." (Gal. 1:7, 8).

These solemn warnings from God mean that it is a hazardous thing to trifle with his word.

The discussion of "the ancient order" of things in connection with so many modern departures involves a certain amount of history—religious and secular. The Bible sets forth the ancient order, and history puts on record man's departures from it. Thus the Bible and history blend and can be profitably viewed together. Our plan of procedure tonight is to trace the history of the church through several epochs or periods:

First, the period of perfection—the apostolic era.

Second, the period of departure, immediately after, which indeed began even during the apostolic day.

Third, the period of apostasy, when human ecclesiasticism reigned through dark and dismal ages.

Fourth, the period of reformation, when noble men sought to shake off the shackles of superstition that fettered them and at least *start* back in the direction of the Bible and divine authority.

Fifth, the period of restoration, when the restoration of the ancient order was actually accomplished through men who had the courage of heart to preach the Word of God.

Believing that you will follow along in this plan of investigation, we shall proceed to discuss these things in biblical and historical order.

#### PERFECTION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

When Adam was created there was not a cloud over his

path, not a jar in his whole nature, no fear of evil and no dread of death. He fell away from this state by breaking through the restrictions of divine law. "Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions." (Eccl. 7:29).

So man in his primeval state was perfect. Adam was a perfect man, made in the "image of God"; he was God's model, God's design. But he fell. Centuries of degeneration separate man as he is from man as he was. Yet we can span the space of time and see man as God created him, not man as sin corrupted him and strive to regain his lost perfection.

It was also in the beginning of the new creation that God formed a perfect church. Paul calls it the "new man," which he says God created when Christ became "our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." (Eph. 2:14-16). Thus it was that out of the two nations—Jew and Gentile—God created the church.

This *new man*, which is the body or church of Christ, mentioned in the second chapter of Ephesians, was also made perfect in every respect, but apostasy set in, just as it was predicted so many times in the New Testament Scriptures.

The second Thessalonian letter says there would be a great "falling away" and states that in this falling away one would arise, "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

It is further stated here that, "the mystery of iniquity doth already work," which means that a great departure from the truth had already begun to show itself in Paul's day.

Paul says again, to Timothy, "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from

the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats" (I Tim. 4:1-3).

John also says: "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: for many false prophets are gone out into the world" (I John 4:1).

Paul, when giving his last warning to the elders of the church at Ephesus, makes this statement: "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them" (Acts 20:29, 30).

This ought to be enough to prepare the student of church history for the departures from Christianity there revealed.

Moses was commanded to "make all things according to the pattern shown thee," and Paul quotes this to emphasize the same caution to those who would be Christians. (Heb. 8:5). The New Testament is our pattern and everything must conform to it. "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." (I Thes. 5:21). The church outlined in the New Testament was perfect in government or organization; perfect in doctrine; perfect in its worship.

#### A GRADUAL DEPARTURE

The departure began in Paul's day with the eldership or government of the church. It is admitted by all scholars of all denominations that the only government in the New Testament was local. There were no synods, councils, conferences, conventions, nor associations. Catholics say of their system of church government, "Some parts of the governmental system of the Catholic Church are of divine origin; and many of them are human institutions." (*Externals of the Catholic Church*, page 19). And again, "The divine institution of the three-fold hierarchy cannot, of course, be derived from our texts; in fact, it cannot in any way be proved directly from the New Testament; it is a Catholic dogma by virtue of a dogmatic tradition, i. e. in a later period of ecclesiastical history the general belief in the divine institution of the episcopate, presbyterate, and

diaconate can be verified and thence be followed on through later centuries. But the dogmatic truth cannot be traced back to Christ himself by analysis of strict historical testimony?" (Cath. Ency., VIII, 334).

These are samples of hundreds of admissions that the Catholic system is foreign to the New Testament.

This departure was gradual through several centuries. Soon after the apostolic era, one of the elders of each congregation began to assume a place above the other elders, a sort of "chairman" elder. In a century or so the affairs of congregations began to be administered by only one man and he began to be called "the bishop" by the church. Those in larger cities began to assume control over smaller churches nearby, and this gave rise to the "Diocesan Bishop." Those in larger cities soon began to usurp control over a greater territory and were called "Metropolitan Bishops." After a few centuries of struggling for the supremacy by five great cities of the world the contestants were at last reduced to two, Constantinople and Rome. In the year 1054 the world was divided by them into Roman Catholic and Greek Catholic churches.

As their government evolved their doctrines took shape, or rather accumulated. Practices were borrowed from pagan religions from the ends of the earth. None will dare deny it. Their scholars freely admit it!

#### THE FULL SCALE APOSTASY

The departure began in the days of the apostles but the permanent division resulted when the Nicene creed was formed. Where the New Testament had been the only creed, the Nicene Council substituted therefor a human creed, and a new body had its beginning. A new name was needed and we meet for the first time "the Catholic Church," as the term is now used.

The church with a new name and a new creed was the new church. This begins the infancy period of Catholicism. She did not reach her present dimensions and character until about the thirteenth century. Her seven sacraments are a creation of the thirteenth century. They have apostatized until there is not a vestige of Christianity to be

found in their system.

In lieu of the New Testament practices, pagan ceremonies were adopted. A Catholic authority admits it. "It is interesting to note how often our church has availed herself of practices which were in common use among pagans." (Externals of the Catholic Church, page 156).

#### THE REFORMATORY MOVEMENTS

Not only was the Bible rejected as a book of authority by the Catholic Church, but her political yoke became so galling that her overthrow was inevitable. The printing press was invented, the Bible began to be read again, and a new day was dawning. The blood of the martyrs she had slain was crying from the ground! To read the article on the Inquisition in the Catholic Encyclopedia, of how they sealed men in dungeons, roasted them on the rack, burned them at the stake, for no other crime than thinking, speaking, and worshipping contrary to the Catholic system, makes us revolt at the thought of Catholicism but to rejoice in the courage of Luther, Calvin and others who arose to break the power of Papal Rome.

The first Protestant denomination to break away from Romish rule was the Lutheran Church, about the year 1530. But instead of disregarding her human doctrines and practices Luther proceeded on the platform of retaining everything not expressly forbidden. He knew he was not on scriptural ground, for he said: "The Pope in condemning Huss has condemned the gospel. I have gone five times as far as he, and yet I greatly fear I have not gone far enough." (Martin Luther, D'Aubigne's History, page 173). So the Lutheran Church is not the New Testament church.

The Church of England was the next to begin. King Henry VIII, in order to marry his wife's waiting maid, severed the portion of the Catholic Church in his dominions from the Pope, about twenty years after the Lutheran Church began. In this country it is known as the Episcopal Church. At first there was no difference between it and the Catholic Church and it has made but few changes until this day. Both these denominations have human names, human

creeds, and human practices and neither of them is the New Testament church.

The Methodist Episcopal Church was established by John Wesley in 1729, but like Catholics, Lutherans, and Episcopalians, has a human name, a human creed, and human practices. For instance the Catholic Church legalized sprinkling in 1311, and when the Episcopalian Church came out of Catholicism they carried it with them. When the Methodist Church came out of the Episcopalian Church they retained it. But it is no more scriptural in the Methodist Church than in the Catholic. In fact, the Catholic Church taunts the Protestant denominations for the many things they have borrowed from Rome, which Rome admits are not scriptural!

The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, began in the city of Louisville, Kentucky, as a result of a split over the slavery question.

Nobody every read of a Baptist Church in the New Testament. The Baptist creed is no better than the Catholic creed because it is human also. Their scholars do not pretend to find the Baptist Church in history before the seventeenth century. Immersion began to be practiced and the name Baptist Church came into general use about 1641 and 1644. Not only do they have a human name and a human creed but they, too, admit that their practice is not according to the New Testament pattern. (Standard Baptist Manual, Page 22).

The Presbyterian churches in similar manner grew out of the work of John Calvin. Time would fail us to picture fully the rise of a host of smaller denominations during the nineteenth century. Instead of diminishing in number, they increase with the passing years, until there were 238 different religious bodies reported in the last federal census.

#### THE RESTORATION PLEA

The Catholic Church blames the multiplying of Protestant denominations on the unrestricted use of the Bible in the hands of the people. But this is not the case. It is caused by their disregard for it. We do not need a reformation of human religions but a return to the divine one. We

do not need to write better creeds than those of the existing denominations but to discard them. We do not need to invent a new name but to wear the divinely given names of the New Testament. *We do not need reformation but restoration!* Let us do away with popes, archbishops, presiding elders, stewards, and all governmental machinery except the local congregation. The words "elder," "bishop," "pastor," presbyter," all refer to the same person, one of the rulers of a local congregation. No church of the New Testament had just one. There was a plurality in every congregation.

Let us not teach that we are saved by faith only when our pattern, the New Testament, says "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified and *not by faith only.*" (James 2:24). Let us not contend that children are under condemnation, because of the mistakes of their parents and contradict the Bible, which says, "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father." (Ezekiel 18:20). The pattern says that baptism is a burial (Romans 6:3, 4; Col. 2:12), so let us teach it and practice it. There is no record where water only was ever sprinkled upon anybody or anything for any religious purpose, from Genesis to Revelation. The pattern says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and a puny, frail, human being should be afraid to teach that he that believeth and is not baptized shall be saved.

If we worship according to the pattern we will sing and not play and he who plays adds to the word of God. We will give of our own means instead of trying to get money out of some one else and this will be done on the first day of the week. (I Cor. 16: 1, 2). One who follows the pattern does not forsake the assembling together (Heb. 10:25) for the breaking of bread on the first day of the week.

As for instrumental music, it was David's invention in the Old Testament among the Jews and since that time it became the adopted child of the Roman Catholic church. John Calvin said that "the Catholics foolishly borrowed it from the Jews," and let us once more add that the Protestants borrowed it from the Catholics. The Christian Church (self-styled and so-called) borrowed it from the Protest-



ants, and the New Testament Church never used it. You may read every passage in the New Testament bearing on the subject from the time that Jesus and his disciples, at the institution of the Lord's Supper, "sang a hymn and went out," through the book of Acts, through the epistles to the church, and all the instruction the Holy Spirit has given on how to worship God in the church of Jesus Christ, and the word "sing" exhausts the command on the subject. That is the limit of the command, friends, and we simply insist that it should be the limit of our practice. Instrumental music was thus a relic of Judaism until Rome adopted it, and Protestants have not learned to leave Rome's relics and images in Rome. Her daughters imitate her ways, and so do her stepchildren—but the Bible says "Come ye out from among them, and be ye separate, and touch no unclean thing"—that was Paul's exhortation to the church to abandon every human practice in religion, and it is our plea to you tonight.

Some think that because there was probably no person on earth for a long period of time who worshipped exactly according to the New Testament that the church Jesus established ceased to exist, and, that the best thing we can now do is to find a denomination which suits us and join it. But the word is the seed (Luke 8:11), and the church or kingdom is not destroyed until the seed is destroyed; and since the word is the "incorruptible seed" (I Pet. 1:23), it cannot be destroyed. Therefore: the church or kingdom cannot be destroyed. Paul said, "Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end." (Eph. 3:21).

The church of Christ is here and will be here as long as man inhabits the earth. Those who believed, repented, and were baptized in that day were *added*. They did not join the church. The same commands obeyed today will bring the same result. (Acts 2:41,47; 1 Cor. 12:18). There will be no uncertainty about it. If all would do that which the Lord commands, the same thing, the Lord would add us to the same church.

Obeying the Baptist Manual makes one a Baptist, obeying

the Methodist Discipline makes a Methodist, obeying the Catechism makes a Catholic, and so with all the denominations ; but obedience to the New Testament will never make anything but a Christian. Will you not be just a Christian by obeying the gospel of Christ?

Through all history, down the surging stream of time, friends, there has been the ever present trend away from God's word. It was so in the Old Testament. Israel wandered; she was ever froward and wayward. Moses lifted the voice of tearful pleading against her deviations and God raised up prophet after prophet to call her back. But hers was a history of rebellion and of its inevitable result—her final rejection.

To the call of Jeremiah to "ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein," Israel replied: "We will not walk therein." Is that not the spirit of all innovation and departure from God today? Do we not see and hear such in our very midst these days ?

Friends, the word of God is divine, His commands are immutable, His law is inexorable, His authority is supreme, and He will not hold you guiltless who trample it under your feet. We call upon you to lay down your party creeds and your party names, your human doctrines and dogmas, your denominational affiliations and all that is of no higher authority than men and their movements, to come and strike hands with us across the Bible—the word of God. For your soul's salvation and for heaven's hope, will you not come tonight? Shall we all sing.

## CHAPTER XIII

## FAITH AND BAPTISM

**TEXT:** *"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."*  
(Mk. 16:6).

The person whom the Bible designates a believer is one who having been persuaded that Jesus is the Christ, accepts him in implicit trust as his Saviour. (John 20:31) He is not one who has merely assented to gospel truth or fact, but one who has believed with all the heart; a belief that involves every faculty of his intelligent being—his reason, his sensibilities, his will (Rom. 10:9,10). The noun "pistis," (faith) means confidence, trust. The verb "pisteuo" (believe) means adherence to, reliance on. The nobleman's (Acts 8) belief with all his heart meant his reliance on what Philip had preached unto him as essential elements of salvation. His faith in Jesus and his confession of that faith meant nothing less than his acceptance of all terms and conditions of salvation laid down in the preaching of Philip. (Acts 8:12). And the conviction of those "pricked in their hearts" on Pentecost (Acts 2) was a faith that yielded the willing spirit of obedience in the pleading question, "What shall we do?" Such a faith implies and embraces all necessary conditions named in God's law of pardon.

## SALVATION

The commission according to Mark says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." This salvation is the forgiveness of past sins; pardon, the complete absolution of guilt; remission of sins. But this pardon is an executive act. It takes place in the mind of God in heaven; not in the heart of man on earth. The thing we know as inner consciousness cannot determine by inward feelings that pardon has been granted. Pardon can be known only as God declares it. The man in the penitentiary can know

that he is pardoned only as the executive, the Governor, declares it. No warden of such an institution would release an inmate of it on the ground of an "inner consciousness" that the Governor had pardoned him. Inner consciousness cannot measure or weigh any outward thing. There must be a standard for all such. And God has a law of forgiveness—the sinner is not pardoned until he has complied with it.

#### BY FAITH

The issue is not whether one is saved or justified by faith—to that we all agree. The issue is in the degree of faith—when is one saved by faith. The Baptist order is repentance before faith, but they do not mean salvation by repentance *before* faith. The Bible order is faith before baptism—why should a Baptist insist that salvation comes by faith *before* baptism seeing that they will disavow salvation by repentance *before* faith in their order of things. True, faith comes before baptism, but one is not saved by faith before baptism any more than one would be saved by repentance before faith in the Baptist order of things. This one thing answers every argument that can be made by a Baptist against baptism on the ground that one is saved by faith and that faith precedes baptism. All passages that declare justification by faith (Rom. 5:1) and others of like import we accept and believe and claim. But we deny that any of these passages teach or imply that one is saved by faith before he is baptized. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

#### BY FAITH WHEN

The eleventh chapter of Hebrews lists the men of faith in the former dispensation. By faith they were approved—but faith plus what? By faith Abel offered his sacrifice and was justified by it. By faith Noah prepared the ark. By faith Abraham obeyed when he was called. Try faith alone on any of these examples of justification by faith and see how it works. "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, in that he offered up Isaac his son upon the altar? Thou seest that faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect." (Jas. 2:21, 22).

In further proof that it requires an active faith to pro-

duce justification, contrast the cases of the priests and rulers who believed. In one case (Acts 6:77) a great company of priests became obedient to the faith. In the other case (John 12:42) many of the rulers believed but would not confess. Both of these companies of Jewish officials believed; but only one company was justified. It proves that faith only does not save, else both companies would have been saved, seeing that they both believed. "Ye see, then, that by works a man is justified and not by faith only." (Jas. 2:24).

#### FAITH PLUS

If a man exercises faith but his faith does not exercise him, either the subject has a poor faith or the faith has a poor subject. Some plain passages from the New Testament suggesting some pointed questions will serve to show that mere faith does not save.

First: "But as many as received him, to them gave he the power to become sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." (John 1:12) Question: How does a believer exercise the power to become a child of God?

Second: "And the hand of the Lord was with them: and a great number that believed turned unto the Lord." (Acts 11:21) Question: What did these believers do when they turned unto the Lord ?

Third: "Repent ye, therefore, and turn again (be converted) that your sins may be blotted out." (Acts 3:19) Question: What did these penitent persons do when they turned?

Fourth: "And without faith it is impossible to please God; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is." (Heb. 11:6) Question: What does one who has believed do when he comes to God ?

Becoming a child of God does not consist in mere faith, for in the first passage above it is stated that the believer is given the power to become a child of God. One cannot be given the power to become what he already is, therefore, the believer as such is not a child of God.

Turning to God does not consist in faith for the second passage above states that they believed *and* turned.

The turning followed the believing. What was the turning act?

Again, turning to God does not consist in repentance, for in the third passage above the Jews were told to repent *and* turn. What was the turning act in this case? Moreover, coming to God did not consist in faith, for in the fourth passage above it is stated that one cannot come before, or without faith, the coming, therefore, must follow believing. Then what is the coming act? The turning act in Acts 11:21 is not faith, for they believed and *turned*. The turning act in Acts 3:19 is not repentance, for they were told to repent and *turn*. The coming act in Heb. 11:6 is not faith, for there it is said that one must believe *in order to come* to God.

If one is saved at the point of faith—by faith without acts of obedience—then he is saved (1) before he comes to God (Heb. 11:6) ; (2) before he becomes a child of God (John 1:12); (3) before he turns to God (Acts 11:21; 3:19).

The Bible order in these passages is this: The persons who believed—turned to God; the persons who turned to God were pardoned; hence, faith, turning, pardon. It follows just as certainly as day follows night that the faith that saves is the faith that obeys.

#### THE TURNING ACT

It is evident that the turning act is not faith, nor repentance, for in the passages cited they believed and repented and afterward turned to God. There is but one act left in which the turning can consist. Baptism is that act. Baptism is the act in which faith obeys. It is the turning act.

Who shall be saved? "He that believeth and is baptized." It is the command that points out the man who is saved. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be"—what? Shall be saved ? not if he is already saved before he is baptized, in the exact sense that the passage says he "shall be saved." If one is saved before he is baptized the whole construction of Mark 16:16 is a fallacy.

The doctrine of salvation before baptism changes the

order and tenses of the verbs in Mark 16:16. The passage reads: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." To fit the doctrine of faith salvation without baptism it would read: "He that believeth and is saved shall (or may) be baptized." But Jesus did not say is saved nor shall be baptized He said "is baptized" and "shall be saved." The change in the order necessary for a Baptist to get salvation before baptism involves a change in the tenses of the verbs the Lord used. That is simply too much change for anybody to make who has an ounce of respect for the word of God.

Belief and baptism are joined together by the copulative conjunction "and"—the coupling pin. To both thus united is annexed the promise "shall be saved," which is conditional upon complying with both belief and baptism.

Respecting salvation—the whole matter of salvation depends on faith—the exercise of it, "and is baptized."

Respecting damnation—the whole matter of damnation depends on faith—the lack of it, "he that believeth not shall be damned."

If it be urged that the text does not say "he that believeth not and is not baptized shall be damned," we answer certainly not—the disbeliever cannot be baptized. It all depends on which way the man is headed as to the conditions necessary to his destination. If he is headed toward perdition, disbelief is enough to damn him. If he is headed for salvation, it requires every condition named to reach it. When God appoints two things for the accomplishment of one end, it takes both of those things to accomplish that end. Is there anybody who will dare to say "he that believeth and will not be baptized shall be saved"? And does any preacher have the authority to say "he that believeth and is not baptized shall be saved?"

#### SOME ERRORS COMPARED

The Romanist says: He that is baptized shall be saved—without faith.

The Baptist says: He that believeth is saved—without baptism:

The Bible says: He that believeth and is baptized shall

be saved. Which shall we take ?

Paraphrasing further, suppose it should read: He that believeth and is baptized shall receive five thousand dollars—there is not a person who could not understand it. Or, if Noah had said "he that believeth and enters the ark shall be saved"—would it have meant that one who believed could have been saved without entering the ark? What the Son of God joined together, let no preacher put asunder.



## CHAPTER XIV

### REPENTANCE AND BAPTISM

*TEXT: "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." (Acts 2:38).*

The battleground of the design of baptism has been Acts 2:38. Yet if Acts 2:38 were not in the New Testament the divine design of baptism is amply set forth in many other passages. On the other hand, if there were no other verse in the Bible on the design or purpose of baptism Acts 2:38, free of perversion, clearly sets it forth. Indeed, we would be willing to stake the issue on a single passage. It is of distinct value, a value that should be emphasized, in any controversy over the place of baptism in the gospel plan. It is the most conspicuous passage in the New Testament on the subject of baptism and the text should be freed of the withering influence of sophistry.

In deference to readers who may not be able to quote the passage, it reads: "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."

#### A VIEW OF THE TEXT

The passage presents an inseparable connection between repentance, baptism and remission. The preposition "for," being *eis*, means necessary to; in order to. It makes remission of sins depend on baptism in the same sense in which it depends on repentance. An application of the simple rules of grammar will make this fact clear. For instance, transposing the sentence it reads: "Every one of you repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Here two things—repentance and baptism—are related to a third, the remission of sins. The two things are connected with the one thing by

the particle *eis*. The one particle *eis* cannot express two relations. Whatever relation repentance bears to the remission of sins, baptism bears that same relation. Is repentance essential to remission of sins? So is baptism.

#### AN ANSWER TO A QUESTION

The words of Acts 2:38 were spoken in answer to a question. The question was: "Men and brethren what shall we do?" The answer was: "Every one of you repent and be baptized." Now, when were they forgiven? Not when Peter began preaching; not when they were convicted; and not when they cried, "what shall we do?" The question itself implies the necessity for an answer. And the answer itself implies its essentiality. But the answer to the question was: Repent and be baptized. That alone would make it essential, with no design expressed—it was the answer to their question.

The object of the question was what to do. For what—if not to be forgiven? Then did Peter tell them something to do *because of it*? A strange answer to a question, indeed! And a strange question, searching for something they already had, but did not know it! Yes, as an answer to their question, the command to repent and be baptized, if no design had been expressed, would still link repentance and baptism together as essential to the object of the question asked. The object of that question being forgiveness, the answer to it makes repentance and baptism together essential to forgiveness.

#### THE ANSWER ANALYZED

The copulative conjunction "and" couples two verbs. "Repent" is one verb; "be baptized" is the other verb. They are joined together by the Holy Spirit—and what the Holy Spirit joins together, who will dare to separate?

The phrase "for the remission of sins" modifies both verbs, sustaining equal relation to both. Repent and be baptized for—what? For precisely the same thing. Eliminate one verb, make it a sentence with a simple predicate instead of a compound one, and read it: "Repent every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of

sins" Or, eliminating the verb "repent," and retaining the verb "be baptized," read it again: "Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." There is no good sense in the passage if remission of sins is not the purpose of both repentance and baptism. In fact, in Acts 2:38, repentance by itself is not for anything; and baptism by itself is not for anything; but repentance and baptism are, together, for the remission of sins.

#### THE GREEK PREPOSITION "EIS"

It is often urged that the clause "be baptized for the remission of sins" is susceptible to different interpretations. But let it be remembered that it is not baptism for the remission of sins in Acts 2:38, but repentance and baptism for the remission of sins, and two interpretations cannot be made of that.

The preposition *eis* never meant "because of" nor "on account of" and was never so used in all of the New Testament. Baptists sometimes use such examples as, "He was arrested for (on account of) stealing;" and "He was paid for (because of) his labor." In such instances the English word "for," which comes from the Greek word *dia* and which means "on account of," is used. The sentences, for that reason, are not parallel. Informed Baptist preachers know it, and if honest will not resort to the dodge—yea, the deceit.

Compare the uses of *eis* in some other passages.

1. Acts 3:19: "Be converted *that (eis) your sins may be blotted out*"—"That" is the preposition *eis*, and it means in order to the blotting out of sins.

2. Romans 10:10: "Believeth *unto (eis) righteousness*"—in order to righteousness..

3 Acts 11:18: "Repentance *unto (eis) life*" in order to life.

4. 2 Cor. 7:10: "Repentance *unto (eis) salvation*"—in order to salvation.

5. Matt. 26:28: "This is my blood . . . shed *for (eis) the remission of sins.*"

Does Matthew 26:28 mean that his blood was shed *because of* or *in order to* the remission of sins? Let some

Baptist preacher tell you.

6. Acts 2:38: "Repent and be baptized . . . *for* (eis) the remission of sins." The preposition *eis* in acts 2:38 means *in order to*. The word "eis" *never* meant "on account of" and was *never so used* anywhere in all of the New Testament. Baptism is, therefore, in order to remission of sins.

#### BELIEVE—REPENT—BAPTIZED

The Bible order of gospel conditions is *Believe, repent, be baptized*. But we believe *eis* salvation—unto, or into salvation. So Baptist are wont to say that since we believe *eis* (into) and one believes before he is baptized, one is, therefore, saved before he is baptized. But what is the Baptist order? Here it is: *Repent, believe, baptized*. And what about the word *eis*? Here it is: Repent *eis*; Believe *eis*; Baptized *eis*. So if here "believe *eis*" puts salvation before baptism—then "repent *eis*," in the Baptist order, would put salvation before faith—because they tell us repentance comes before faith! The facts, shorn of sophistry, are simply that the word "eis," which is the word "for" in Acts 2:38, means in order to, in view of, toward, etc., and the context shows when it is the final act of entering into; therefore, the translators knew when to render the word *unto* and when to render it *into*. But one thing is very certain, it never meant because of, or on account of, being always prospective and never retrospective, and was never so rendered. Thayer's Greek lexicon defines the word "eis" as follows: "A preposition governing the accusative, and denoting entrance into, or direction and limit; into, to, towards, for, among"—and that together with the Bible use of it, ought to settle it.

#### TWO ANSWERS COMPARED

The third chapter of Acts records the second sermon of Peter in Jerusalem. With the same object in view he said to these Jews: Repent and be converted (turn again) that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord." (Acts 3:19).

This answer compares with Acts 2:38 as follows:

1. Acts 2:38: Repent—be baptized—remission of sins—gift of Holy Spirit.

2. Acts 3:19: Repent—be converted—sins blotted out—seasons of refreshing.

No man can study this comparison honestly without seeing that "be baptized" is just as much connected with "remission of sins" in Acts 2:38 as "be converted" is connected with "sins blotted out" in Acts 3:19. And it definitely proves that baptism is the converting, or the turning act. Repentance is not the turning act—for Peter said, Repent and turn. But "turn," or "be converted," occupies exactly the same place in Acts 3:19 that "be baptized" occupies in Acts 2:28. Then baptism is the turning act. It is in order to the remission of sins. To oppose plain passages of scripture is but a waste of ingenuity.

#### SOME OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED

It is after the opponents of truth on baptism are routed by these plain scripture facts that they resort to the effort to nullify the word of God with certain supposed conditions and contingencies. But it can be shown that every contingency introduced to eliminate baptism will under similar circumstances eliminate faith in Christ.

It is argued that if baptism is essential to salvation it puts salvation in the hands of the administrator. But there is nothing that does not depend upon a contingency of some sort. True, one cannot be baptized without an administrator, or without water, or without a contingency of extrinsic help from another. But apply the same objection to the knowledge of Christ that men must possess to be saved. What about remote countries where such knowledge depends on the missionary? Is belief essential to salvation? Then since Paul said, "how shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?" does not the same contingency carry the same weight in the matter of belief, or the knowledge of Christ, as in the case of baptism? If allowances are made for such, and yet the essentiality of faith is preserved, then why not apply the same principles to the

command of baptism?

Another instance is in the oft-heard sigh that such a doctrine damns some person's father or mother, and hence cannot be true. But every one since Adam and Eve has had a father and mother, so by contingencies every condition of the gospel can be eliminated, and we will have universal salvation. A Chinaman or a Jew hears this same preacher who makes this objection against baptism, preach that faith in Christ is essential to salvation. He will say: That doctrine damns my father and mother who did not believe in Christ. How will the preacher dispose of the contingency? Ask him. There is no account of any conversion without the third party. The great commission itself required the third party. Read the book of Acts.

It is said that we would condemn those who cannot be baptized. Apply the same argument to faith. Countless millions have died without the knowledge of Christ. He who tries to prove that baptism is not essential by one who cannot be baptized is a failure as a teacher. At best it would only exempt infants, idiots and those who cannot do it. To weak minds such contingencies are objections against a divine command, but thoughtful persons can see at a glance that such reasoning will eliminate **all** conditions of salvation with the same stroke.

As to those cases often urged about certain ones dying without baptism, there are three points involved: (1) the physical impossibility (2) the moral impossibility (3) the wilful neglect. All such are without the law, outside of its provisions and promises. Clemency belongs only to the judge, and it is not within our power to grant it. The case has gone to the judgment.

Finally, it is urged that to make baptism necessary to salvation contradicts numerous passages on faith. The objection rests on the assumption that these numerous passages on faith suspend salvation on faith only—the thing not one of them says. It will drive the objector back to the doctrine of salvation depending on no act of his own, in which case he would be no more to blame for his damnation than a dead man is for not rising from the dead. It

would mean that naked Omnipotence saves or damns!

All objections to God's commands originate in and proceed from hearts that lack faith. And it is just the sort of preaching that is being done by preachers who berate baptism that encourages people to disregard the word of God and die in disobedience.

## CHAPTER XV

## BAPTISM IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

*TEXT: "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized . . . And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved." (Acts 2:41, 42).*

The commission according to Luke commanded the apostles to preach remission of sins in the name of Christ to all nations—beginning at Jerusalem. Under this deputation four things were to be done: 1. Remission of sins should be preached; 2. It should be preached in the name of Christ; 3. It should begin at Jerusalem; 4. The same things should be preached to all nations. The disciples appointed to the task were ordered "not to depart from Jerusalem" until plenary power, as divine delegates, had been received. The Lord said: "Ye shall receive power when the Holy Spirit is come upon you" (Acts 1:8). Pentecost came. The twelve were "together in one place" waiting. With startling suddenness in the eventful moment the room resounded with the divine presence and overwhelmed the apostles and filled them. Bearing the credentials of heaven, the inspired commissioners were ready in obedience to the divine fiat to begin preaching remission of sins in the name of Jesus Christ.

How did the remission of sins begin to be preached at Jerusalem? Upon this question hangs the entire New Testament story; for the apostles either preached the same thing everywhere they went or they disobeyed the commission. The second chapter of Acts is the answer. The keynote gospel address on Pentecost, by the man authorized by Christ and qualified by the Holy Spirit to announce and bind the terms of remission, commands sinners to "repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." This being the design of baptism and the terms of remission as defined by inspiration, the same design and terms must be understood in all other places where



they are not specifically mentioned. Being informed in one place of the design of the Lord's supper, everywhere it is mentioned afterward it carries the same design—if not expressed, that design must be understood. So when the remission of sins and the design of baptism were defined in the beginning, whenever and wherever thereafter the people received remission we know the terms upon which it was received; and when people were baptized we know why they were baptized.

#### PHILIP IN SAMARIA

"And Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them."—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). The case of Philip and the Samaritans shows plainly that whenever Christ was preached, baptism was preached. Since the commission commanded that remission of sins should be preached in the name of Christ, "beginning at Jerusalem," when Philip preached the name of Christ, and salvation through it, he either preached the same thing in Samaria that was preached in Jerusalem or he disobeyed the commission. Hence the people of Samaria were baptized for the same purpose, and received the remission of sins on the same terms, as on the day of Pentecost. The proposition stands that the design of baptism being defined on Pentecost (Acts 2:38), its design must be understood in all other places where baptism occurs, though the design be not specifically mentioned.

Immediately following the great gospel meetings in Samaria, an angel of the Lord directed Philip southward into the desert region between Jerusalem and Gaza. Here is recorded the most simple narrative of conversion in all the chronicles of conversion. An honest sinner and an inspired preacher meet. The result is a gospel sermon and prompt obedience to it. The gist of the sermon was put in one sentence: "and he preached unto him Jesus." The scope of the sermon was indicated by the question of the hearer: "Behold, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" Why this bid for baptism as they approached the

place where there was water, seeing that Philip had preached nothing but Jesus? Simply because preaching Jesus included all that the apostles were commanded to preach "in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." The proposition stands, that wherever Christ was preached, baptism was preached; and wherever baptism is mentioned without the design expressed, the design must be understood, having been defined at Jerusalem in the beginning. So when "they both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch:and he baptized him," the eunuch's baptism was the same as defined in Acts 2:38 on Pentecost. It is a significant statement that after they came up out of the water (not before they went down into it) the eunuch rejoiced. He had no experience of grace to relate before baptism; he had no confession of pardon received before baptism; remission was beyond baptism, and that is why, after baptism, he went on his way rejoicing.

#### CORNELIUS

Sectarians cling tenaciously to the case of Cornelius as an example of salvation before baptism. They assert that Cornelius received the Holy Spirit before baptism and must, therefore, have been saved before he was baptized. That proves too much. According to Peter's account of the case in Acts 11, the Holy Spirit fell on the house of Cornelius before he believed. It should be observed that there are two records of the events connected with this conversion—the record of Luke in Acts 10 and the record of Peter himself in Acts 11. Luke does not claim that his account was given in the order of events, but he does say that Peter "expounded the matter unto them in order. (Acts 11:4). Hence, Peter's own account of the happenings "to those of the circumcision" at Jerusalem represents the order of occurrence. In the order of occurrence Peter said that the Holy Spirit fell on Cornelius before he believed. Does that prove that he was saved before he believed? No denominationalist will allow that it does; hence, their argument is lost. The fact is that the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the house

of Cornelius did not effect the salvation nor affect the issues involved in it.

The elements entering the conversion of Cornelius are set forth in three passages in the record. First, the angel said to Cornelius: "Send to Joppa, and fetch Simon, whose surname is Peter; who shall speak unto thee words whereby thou shalt be saved." (Acts 11:14). Second, Peter said to Cornelius: "To him bear all the prophets witness, that through his name every one that believeth on him shall receive remission of sins." (Acts 10:45). Third, Peter "commanded them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ." (Acts 10:48). The casual reader cannot fail to observe that remission of sins was promised to Cornelius in the name of Christ began at Jerusalem, as defined in baptized in the name of Christ, and that remission of sins in the name of Christ; and that he was commanded to be Acts 2:38; and that the same thing that began at Jerusalem should be preached to all the nations—all of which means, because it must mean, that Cornelius received the same remission in the same name, and on the same terms as stated in Acts 2:38 on Pentecost. Since baptism in the name of Christ is for the remission of sins (Acts 2:38) and Cornelius was commanded to be baptized in the name of Christ (Acts 10:48), it follows that Cornelius was baptized for the remission of sins. Indeed, remission of sins in the name of Christ, and baptism in the name of Christ for remission of sins, represent one process.

#### THE PHILIPPIAN JAILOR

The question "What must I do to be saved?" asked by the jailor, and the answer "Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved," given by Paul and Silas, have been the chief stock in trade of sectarian revivalists—from the frothing holiness and shouting Methodists on up the scale through the unconventional Billy Sunday type of evangelists to the frocked and formal dignitary—who fervidly exhort supplicants for salvation to "only believe." They aver that Acts 16:31 is the answer—the one and only answer—to the question what to do to be saved. True, they have not explained why Peter, Ananias, and others equally inspired, gave oth-

er answers, but they cannot be bothered with troublesome explanations. "Believe on the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be saved"—that, and that alone, we are told, is all that is necessary to the sinner's salvation. When reminded that this answer does not mention repentance, with a slight hitch we are assured that repentance must be included. Believing on the Lord Jesus can be stretched to include repentance which is not named in the connection, but its elasticity gives out before it gets to baptism, which is named in the immediate connection!

When Paul and Silas told the jailor to "believe on the Lord Jesus," without even a break in the story, the narrator states that "they preached unto him the word of the Lord." He evidently had not believed upon merely being told to; he must be told what to believe—or, in what believing on the Lord Jesus consisted. Having heard the word preached, the jailor washed their stripes (repentance, change of attitude), was baptized the same hour, and rejoiced with his house, "having believed in God." When had he believed in God? When he had done all that the gospel narrative tells, including his baptism, then he had "believed in God." So baptism in the case of the jailor has the same place and the same design as on Pentecost.

#### SAUL OF TARSUS

The sixteenth verse of the twenty-second chapter of Acts is Paul's own statement of his baptism in Damascus. "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord " This was Ananias' answer to Saul's question, "What shall I do Lord?" and to which the Lord replied: "Arise, and go into the city and it shall be told thee what thou must do." (Acts 9). But with some people the word "must" appears to have degrees in meaning. The word in Hebrews 11:6, "must believe," means that faith is essential. But in Acts 22:16 when Ananias tells Saul what he "must do"—commands him to be baptized—the word loses most of its must, and deprived of its absoluteness, it degrades into a meaningless, empty, vacant non-essential.

When was Saul saved? If he **was** saved before Ananias

came to him, he was a miserable saved man—blind, fasting, shut-up, praying—a miserable saved man, indeed! If he was saved when Ananias laid hands on him, he was saved before he was told what to do to be saved. If he was saved before he was baptized, he was saved before his sins were washed away, for he was commanded to "arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." In short, if he was saved in the flash of the light on the road, as the sectarian preachers dogmatize, then he was saved when he did not know it, for he asked what to do; and he was saved when Ananias did not know it, who came to tell him what to do; and he was saved when the Lord did not know it, for the Lord sent him into Damascus to be told what to do; and if he was saved then, he was saved contrary to all the so-called experiences of grace required by these preachers themselves, before peace came to his soul, and while yet in his misery. What a strange conversion and a peculiar salvation the preachers make of it!

In the precept of Ananias three commands are joined together by the copulative "and"—Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins. No matter in what sense the word "wash" is used, the fact stands out that baptism stands squarely between the sinner and the washing away of sins. The question of efficacy does not change it. If it be urged that water cannot literally wash away sins, neither can blood literally wash away sins. Whatever washing away of sins may be, or wherever it takes place, the passage plainly puts baptism before the washing away of sins.

In a final effort to escape the plain statement of the passage some objections are resorted to. It is said that Ananias addressed Saul as a brother—"Brother Saul"—hence, he must have been saved when so addressed. But Peter addressed the murderers of Christ in Acts 3:19 as "brethren" when he told them to repent. Were they saved at the time they were so addressed? Saul like those whom Peter addressed, was a brother Jew, according to the flesh—that is all. Again it is urged that Saul received the Spirit before he was baptized. But the text does not say it—it does not mention the time of the Spirit's reception at all—but

merely states that he would receive it. Whether before or after baptism the passage does not state. Granting the miracle of the Spirit's reception, however, still would not change or alter the command. It would only make the miraculous part of it special, having no bearing on the thing commanded. Still further, it is claimed that "the scales fell from his eyes" before he was baptized, as evidence that he received salvation before baptism. But the scales fell from his eyes—not his heart. That affected only his blindness—not his salvation.

When was Saul saved? There is only one answer: "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." When did a sectarian preacher, under any circumstance, give this answer to any candidate for salvation? Yet it is written down in the eternal record of conversion.

## CHAPTER XVI

## BAPTISM IN THE APOSTOLIC EPISTLES

*TEXT: "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." (Eph. 4:4-6).*

Other texts on baptism—by that we mean the abundance of teaching in the New Testament besides Mark 16:16 and Acts 2:38. If sectarian debaters were able to prove that Mark 16 is spurious (which they are not) and that Acts 2:38 means "because of" (which they cannot) they would yet be confronted with a formidable array of "other texts," which, indeed are just as decisive as the two against which all denominational genius has for generations been concentrated. Having followed the subject through the Acts of Apostles in a previous article we now advance to other texts in the apostolic epistles.

The Roman Christians had "died to sin" and should "no longer live therein." To impress this lesson upon them Paul said: "Know ye not, that so many of us 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 walk 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: knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin."

The subject "we"—"we are buried with him by baptism"—includes Paul; hence, the baptism of this passage is linked with Saul's baptism of Acts 22:16. They are, in fact, twin passages. Whatever Saul was baptized for—the Romans

were baptized for also. And the form of the Romans baptism was the form of Saul's baptism.

Taking the two passages together, therefore, by Paul's own words, we have both the how and the what of baptism definitely settled. Ananias told Saul to "arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins"—that is the what of it as to design. "We are (R. V. were) buried with him by baptism"—that is the how of it as to form.

Observe further that the text says very plainly what baptism does: "So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death." Baptism puts one into Christ, and in so doing it puts one into his death. The word "into" is a preposition that denotes motion, out of one state into another—from without to within. Baptized into Christ—previous to baptism one is out of Christ, after baptism he is in Christ, by baptism he is brought from without to within. And there are no degrees in a state ;one is either in or out of Christ, just as he is either married or unmarried, or as he is either a citizen or an alien. Hence, to the Galatians (Chap. 3:26-27), Paul again says: "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.' Thus baptism, preceded by faith, is God's appointed way of bringing men into Christ.

Still not satisfied with the emphasis, the apostle further says that we are baptized "into his death." Baptism stands between the sinner and the death of Christ—it stands between the sinner and the blood of Christ, the merits and the benefits of his atoning death. Baptism is the recapitulation of the death of Christ; there the sinner being buried with Christ into death is made in the likeness of his death, his burial and his resurrection; there is death with Christ, and in Christ, he loses his sins, for "the old man is crucified with him" and "he that is dead is freed from sin." No stronger figure could be employed by which to set forth the design , form and benefits of baptism. It is the reenactment of Calvary.

But the capstone of the argument is yet found in the clause, "like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the



glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Baptism stands between the sinner and newness of life.

This statement is embellished in the Colossian passage (Chap. 2:12), "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." In baptism there is a burial and a resurrection with Christ through faith in the operation (working) of God. In baptism God performs an operation. The comparison begins with verse 11. Circumcision was a physical operation, made with hands; the circumcision of Christ is a spiritual operation, without hands. One was the putting off of the flesh; the other is the putting off of sins. In baptism God performs an operation—the putting away of sin by the power of God. And the same power that God exerted in raising Christ from the dead is the power that is exerted when in baptism we are raised up with Christ—"wherein ye also are raised up"—and the one baptized is baptized through faith in the operation of God. But if one believes he is saved before baptism, hence, has already had the operation—how could he be baptized through faith in the operation here required? It is mighty strong indication of the faith that qualifies for baptism. But having been buried and raised, concluding his effort to edify the Colossians on the subject of baptism, the apostle adds: "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God." (Col. 3:1). Baptism thus stands between the Christian and the risen life with Christ.

Returning to the Roman letter there is yet another reference to baptism in the sixth chapter following closely upon the declaration that "we are buried with him by baptism." It is verse 17: "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." Obedience to the form of doctrine stands between the sinner and freedom from sin. But baptism is the form of death, burial and resurrection, which Paul says is the doctrine de-

livered. (I Cor. 15:1-4). Being baptized then is obeying the form of the doctrine—and Paul says, being then made free from sin. When do you say? Paul says then, and then means when, and that means freedom from sin comes when one is baptized.

#### THE ONE BAPTISM—EPH. IV

One frequently hears the expression "modes of baptism." There is no such thing. As well talk about shades of white! White has no shades and baptism has no modes. Baptism, being a noun, stands for one thing; and baptize, being a verb of action, cannot denote several actions. Grammatically, it is impossible for the noun "baptism" and the verb "baptize" to denote several things and actions. But Paul settles the argument scripturally when he says: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." That cannot mean two in kind (Holy Spirit and water) nor three in form (sprinkling, pouring and immersion). As to the form there being but one, if sprinkling is baptism, pouring is not, if pouring is baptism sprinkling is not; and if either is baptism, immersion is not; and if immersion is baptism neither sprinkling nor pouring is. The process of elimination will decide the point, since all the world has admitted that immersion is baptism. Paul, knowing the how and the what of it all, said: "We are buried with him by baptism."

It is often argued that these passages on baptism in the epistles refer to Holy Spirit baptism. This is done in an effort to escape the apostolic teaching on the design of baptism—that it puts one into Christ. If that be true, the antecedent admission is the elimination of water baptism, for Paul says there is one baptism (which cannot mean two) and if Holy Spirit baptism prevails, there is no such thing as water baptism, and all such has been but a wet, meaningless ceremony without New Testament authority or sanction. But most of those who preach Holy Spirit baptism, practice water baptism also. We wonder why. When water baptism is established, Holy Spirit baptism is eliminated—Paul being the witness.

It should not require a tedious or devious argument to arrive at the right conclusion. If the Great Commission is

now in force—water baptism is in force. Jesus commanded the apostles to teach and baptize men. (Matt. 28:19). The apostles could not administer Holy Spirit baptism. Paul preached to the Corinthians and they were baptized. (Acts 18:8). Paul baptized some of them, and other men baptized the others. (I Cor. 1:14-16). So the Corinthians were baptized by men: but men cannot baptize with the Holy Spirit; therefore, the baptism of the Corinthians was not Holy Spirit baptism. Hence, when Paul said to the Corinthians, "For by one Spirit are (R. V. were) we all baptized into one body," the Spirit was the agent and not the element. By one Spirit, by the authority of, as commanded by Christ in the commission.

To the Ephesians in chapter four, Paul said: "There is one baptism." But in chapter five, he said: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." Surely, Paul would not tell the Ephesians that there is but one baptism in chapter four (if it refers to the Holy Spirit), and then enjoin water baptism in chapter five! The one baptism of chapter four, therefore, is the water baptism of chapter five. This baptism is said to be "by the word" in Eph. 5 :25 and "by the Spirit" in I Cor. 12:13. The word is not the element of baptism in Eph. 5 and the Spirit is not the element of baptism in I Cor. 12. It is "by" the word and "by" the Spirit that men are baptized "with the washing of water." This being the one baptism in Ephesians, it is the one baptism in all the book besides. Holy Spirit baptism was special, never general; its purpose was inspiration, never obedience. No man was ever commanded to be baptized with the Holy Spirit. But the Bible commands men to be baptized; and there is but one baptism; it follows, therefore, that Holy Spirit baptism does not prevail today.

Then is the one baptism essential or non-essential ? Read Ephesians 4:4-6 and pick out the non-essentials: "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism,

one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Out of these seven things, is there but one non-essential? This ought to expose the weak and feeble claim of denominationalists that baptism is non-essential.

#### THE LIKE FIGURE, BAPTISM—I PET. III

As Paul in I Cor. 10 compared our baptism into Christ with Israel's passing through the sea, so Peter compares our salvation by baptism with the deliverance of Noah's family by water. He said: "Wherein (the ark) few, that is eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Leaving out the parenthetical clause, the passage simply states that "baptism doth now also save us by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." That should be plain enough.

First, it is argued that baptism is just a figure, because Peter said "the like figure." But when Paul referred to Israel passing through the sea as a figure of our baptism into Christ, and the drinking of the rock in the wilderness as a type of Christ—"and the Rock was Christ"—does that make Christ figurative? The text says that "baptism doth now also save us by the resurrection of Christ." The salvation is actual, and the resurrection of Christ is actual—why not baptism? The comparison is that God used water to deliver Noah and his family from the old world, its corruption, and environment; and God uses water, even baptism, to save us, to deliver us from sin. The figure is in the comparison—not in the thing done. The meaning of the passage must be evident—that as water delivered Noah, so baptism saves us—and any explanation that says baptism does not save is not an explanation, it is a contradiction.

But we are told that Noah was saved by staying out of the water! Then, if that be the point of comparison, the antediluvians were lost by getting into the water. That sinks the Baptist church, preachers and all, for no one can be a Baptist and stay out of the water! According to such sophistry the great commission should read, He that be-

lieveth and is baptized shall be damned—like the antediluvians! And Peter was wrong—for baptism damns, instead of saves, per the conclusion of the objector. Such objections serve only to reveal and to expose a class of arch-perversers of the word of God.

## GOD'S LAW OF CONVERSION

### CHAPTER XVII

*TEXT: And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, by hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive : For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them. (Matt. 13:14-15).*

#### 1. The Word Conversion Defined.

The elementary meaning of *conversion* is to change a thing or a person into something else. Corn is converted into bread—*sometimes!* Rags are converted into paper, and paper into books. Biblically, conversion is the mental or moral change in man which begins with belief of the gospel and ends with obedience. It is a synonym for the whole plan of salvation. Man has never been able to frame a system which could purify the sinner's heart, sanctify his soul, restore his character, and save the perishing race. His creator alone could do it—and did it. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." (Ps. 19:7).

#### 2. The Process Of Conversion Stated.

Conversion stands between the sinner and the kingdom of God. "Except ye be converted, and become as little children (in character), ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. 18:3). It is the important and supreme work of the church. "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 5:20).

Conversion, then, is simply the gospel process of turning men to God. It is not a *convulsion*, and does not take place

in a nightmare; nor is it the operation of the Spirit in strange, distempered dreams. It is accomplished through obedience to the truth—the agent, or vital power, through which the Holy Spirit effects conversion.

There is no necessity for any other power than the truth in effecting this change; any other, in fact, would be an infringement upon man's freedom of will. Man is either willing or unwilling to receive the truth. If he is willing, no other means of conversion is necessary; if he is unwilling, any other means would be coercion rather than conversion. The motive power of conversion is, therefore, the truth—and it is an immense power. "For I am not ashamed of the gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation." (Rom. 1:16).

### 3. Theories of Conversion Refuted.

Certain theological theories of conversion have their setting in two fallacies—in fact, three—they are theological triplets. First, is the doctrine of inherent human depravity; Second, direct converting power; third, the impossibility of apostasy. Assuming man's hereditary total depravity, it follows that he is unable to do anything at all to be saved; he is a passive recipient and not an active agent; therefore, in this helpless, hopeless state the Holy Spirit must exert a direct influence upon his heart to enable him to obey God, after which the divine nature so completely destroys the depraved nature that thereafter and ever he can no more fall from grace! So false is the theory that it stands virtually self-refuted; and so abundant are the scriptural arguments against it that the task is not one of finding the arguments, but of selecting the ones to cite.

Jesus represents the seed (God's word) as falling into the "holiest and good heart" in order to produce conversion and its effects. But if man is hereditarily totally depraved, his heart is neither honest nor good, and could not receive the word, nor even understand it if he received it, nor obey it if he understood it.

The parable of the sower alone rejects the theory in all of its points. It shows that the sinner may have an *honest heart*, therefore not totally depraved. It shows that when

one hears *the word*, the devil seeks to steal it away lest he "should believe and be saved," teaching that faith is produced by the word and not a direct operation. It shows that some who "receive the word with joy" in time of temptation "fall away," thus proving the possibility of apostasy.

#### 4. The Nature Of Conversion Requires Understanding.

In the very nature of things—every thing—redemption involves the understanding. "Understandest thou what thou readeſt?" inquired Philip, an inspired preacher, of the eunuch, an average gospel subject. But if conversion is the direct work of the Holy Spirit—a direct operation—it can neither be explained nor understood.

If the Holy Spirit converts, or begets, without the word of God, what seed does he plant to produce it? If a different seed, then the theory falls to the ground.

If the Spirit operates without the word, why preach? And if we do not preach, on what does the operation depend? If it depends on preaching, the theory falls to the ground; and if it does not depend on preaching, the gospel falls to the ground.

Furthermore, if conversion is wrought by the direct operation of the Holy Spirit, independent of the word and gospel conditions, why are not all people converted? Man can resist arguments, appeals, and exhortations, but not Omnipotence !

If it is without the word, and obedience to it, and the sinner cannot act until the divine influence comes, who is responsible? The sinner cannot act until the power acts, and he cannot do anything to cause the power to act! Yet if the Spirit does not come he cannot be saved, and there he is—a *man* with neither volition nor ability, helpless and passive, his salvation or damnation a matter of naked Omnipotence !

What becomes of the conditions of the gospel, the law that declares that men must hear, believe, repent, and be baptized in order to be saved ? A mere theory, mingled with the cobwebs of tradition, would set the law aside.

#### 5. The Influence Of The Truth In Conversion.

The apostle James ascribes conversion to the influence of



the truth alone. "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth.' (James 1:18). It is as much the law of God that conversion is effected by "the word of truth" as that an oak shall spring from an acorn. No man has any more right to imagine that the Holy Spirit is absent from the law of conversion than he has to suppose that the Creator is absent from the law of reproduction.

The fact that in no land or age has conversion ever been effected without this "word of truth" is corroborative evidence that James meant the statement in all of its import—"by the word of truth" alone. He did not say the word of truth and something else, but only the word of truth. Then whatever the word of truth requires or commands is what the sinner must do to be saved.

But Paul corroborates James. "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." (I Cor. 4:15). The statement provides for the the word only as the cause of conversion. It allows for nothing distinct from it, above it, or without it, but simply the gospel itself as the unaided cause of conversion. There were many instructors and many influences among the Corinthians, but only one *cause of their conversion*— the gospel preached by Paul.

Everything said to be a condition of salvation is produced by the word. Faith is produced by the word. (Rom. 10:17). The new birth is produced by the word. (I Pet. 1:23). Salvation itself is produced by the word. (James 1:21). How mighty is the gospel! How availing is the word!

#### 6. The Examples Of Conversion.

All of the conversions in Acts of Apostles—the book of conversions—were produced by the word. Begin in Acts 2 with the conversion of the three thousand and go through it until the last chapter, where Paul "expounded the matter" to the chief Jews, and some believed and some believed not. There is nothing else on record. Any one who thinks otherwise is at liberty to find a case, and we promise to examine it with all candor.

Once we know that the process of conversion is plainly

that of obeying "the word of truth," the rest is simple and easy. Jesus, the lawgiver, said: "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). Fulfilling his commission on Pentecost, Peter said: "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." (Acts 2:38). On the occasion of his second recorded sermon Peter said: "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." (Acts 3:19). So the command to "be baptized" in Acts 2:38, is put "be converted" in Acts 3:19. They are equal to each other. Both passages say "repent." In place of "be baptized" in the first we have "be converted" in the second; in place of "remission of sins" in the first we have "sins blotted out" in the second; in place of "gift of the Holy Spirit" in the first, we have "seasons of refreshing" in the second. Incidentally, therefore, Acts 2:38 and Acts 3:19 interpret each other, even to telling us in the latter what the gift of the Holy Spirit is in the former.

If baptism, along with faith and repentance, is not a condition of salvation, or conversion, can any one tell us why we have Mark 16:16, Acts 2:38, and a dozen other such passages? Deny that these passages teach that baptism is essential to conversion, and the passages are robbed of their *sense* and *essence*. May we all "receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls."

## CHAPTER XVIII

## BROKEN CISTERNS

*TEXT: For my people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water. (Jer. 2:13).*

If history repeats itself in the rise and fall of empires and in the destinies of nations, it is none the less true in the development and the declension of the church. This antecedent thought dates back to Israel, God's Old Testament church, whose mistakes have been repeated in the history of the church of his Son through the ages of its existence. Israel's was a history of gradual departure, the end of which was rebellion against God's way. Moses lifted up his voice of tearful warning against any deviation from the oracles of Sinai, but the feet of Israel wandered from the way. God raised up prophet after prophet to guide their wayward feet, yet Israel wandered. The end of the story was national decline, captivity and exile, forfeited promises—and rejection.

This Biblical record is not mere ancient history. It was written for the learning and the admonition of those upon whom the ends of the ages are come. The lesson is aptly put in the words of Jeremiah: "My people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water." (Jer. 2:13).

Israel's improbity was compared to the bride's infidelity. "Can the maid forget her ornaments or the bride her attire? Yet my people have forgotten me days without number. How trimmest thou thy way to seek love! Therefore even the wicked ones has thou taught thy ways." (Jer. 2:32-33). No virgin forgets the ornaments that adorn her; a bride, no matter how long married, never forgets her wed-

ding attire. But in her conduct Israel had cast off and forgotten the righteous ways that adorned her as God's bride. When women gad, it is the outward sign of an inward inconstancy, of changing desires, of a capricious attitude, in short, a seeking of interest other than in the palace of her own home and in the contentment of her husband's love.

That was Jeremiah's diagnosis of Israel's trouble. She was gadding about. She had gone after strange lovers. She said, "I have loved strangers and after them will I go." (Jer. 2:25). In Israel's folly God's people had "changed their glory for that which doth not profit" and in their unexampled backsliding the prophet's only hope for them in their extremes was that "thine own wickedness shall correct thee and thy backsliding shall reprove thee." (Jer. 2:19)

Has the church, like Israel, gone gadding about? Is it not possible that some of the trouble we are having with certain issues is due to a general attitude of softness toward all questions of doctrine? Any weakness in the attitude of the church toward sound doctrine, or a let-up in its defense of the truth, is but a repetition of Israel's folly. It is going after strange lovers. "Hath a nation changed its gods, which yet are no gods? But my people have changed their glory for that which doth not profit." (Jer. 2:11).

Jeremiah, the weeping but brave, lion-hearted prophet, struck the vital cause of Israel's exile. God touched the prophet's mouth and his message flamed forth: "My people have committed two evils." In their idolatry Israel had not committed one evil merely, like the heathen idol devotees who knew no better. Besides the evil of idolatry Israel added the sin of forsaking the living God whom they had known. Forsaking God, "the fountain of living waters," for idol nonentities was like taking cracked and leaky cisterns, hewn out by men, in preference to the ever-flowing supply of fresh waters that a natural fountain could give. In turning from God to idols, Israel had abandoned fountains for tanks—man-made, broken cisterns that could hold no water.

Can we not see the application in our own deviations? The denominations, like the heathen idolaters, know no

better; but in our departures from the way, the church like Israel commits two evils: first, the evil of the thing done; second, the evil of forsaking what we have known in the doing of it.

#### I. AUTONOMY—THE CHURCH AS A DIVINE ORGANIZATION

The provisional organization of the New Testament church was the order of super-naturally endowed men, for the guidance and edification of the church while the will of God was in the process of revelation and completion. This order of apostles, prophets, pastors, evangelists teachers, was designed to safeguard the church against error in the absence of the revealed word, that the church be not "tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, in craftiness, after the wiles of error." These endowments were to continue only until the church should "attain unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God." (Eph. 4:1-16). The word of God was then in the man—the supernaturally endowed man—and not in the book; and being in the man was what Paul called "knowing in part," as no inspired teacher revealed the whole of God's word; it was fragmentary. But when "that which is perfect" (I Cor. 13) was come, that is, when all the parts and the fragments of God's revelation were put into the perfect whole—the New Testament—then that which was "in part" ceased—the supernatural provisional order ended.

The permanent organization of the church is that of elders, deacons and members. Elders, with the qualifications set forth by Paul to Timothy and Titus, to rule by enforcing the teaching of the word of God; deacons, as assistants to the elders, to serve the church in benevolent ministries; members, subservient to the divine arrangement, to work out their salvation, God working in us "to will and to do" as we keep ourselves useful. As for preachers, their humble God-fearing task is to faithfully proclaim the gospel of Christ, leaving the executive administration of the affairs of the church with the elders where God put it. If this divine plan fails to function, the fault is not with the plan,

but with our failure to respect it and work it. The plan is perfect because it is God's, and any substitute will prove a failure because it is man's.

The organization argument has been concisely stated in one sentence, which is eminently true, and is a safe rule of action, namely: Any organization larger than the local church or smaller than the local church is an unscriptural organization through which to do the work of the church. Indeed, there are methods of doing what is commanded, but they must be the church's methods, and within the scope of the thing commanded. The church has no right to do anything, as a church, that God has not commanded the church to do. Nor does a Christian have the right to do through another organization that which God has commanded the church, as such, to do. Organizations are not methods. The missionary society is not a method; it is an institution. A Sunday school, a class or classes on Sunday, may be a very effective arrangement for teaching; but they often extend into organizations. It seems that nothing can be done these days without being overdone. It is not infrequent now that we find classes in the churches organized; children's classes, young people's classes, women's classes, men's classes, all with their presidents, secretaries, treasurers, operating as organized groups in performing the precise functions of the church. This perverts the very purpose of a class from that of teaching to a financial auxiliary, a miniature organization. It becomes an infringement upon the divine arrangement. As a matter of fact, if one group has a right to so function, every group has the same right, which if exercised would destroy the oneness of the church and its unified work. For the same reason that there can be no outside organizations to vie with the church, there should be no inside auxiliaries of like nature to function in the same way from within. The church, like the human body directed by its head, should function in unison.

The autonomy of the local church—its free, independent, self-government—is opposed to all forms of ecclesiastical control. Nor can congregations be scripturally tied together by inter-organization. If churches of Christ were

so tied together, the mistakes and errors of one would affect the whole body. But in the autonomy of the local church, the mistakes and errors of one church affect only that church, and the others remain free. The wisdom of God so ordered it. The fallacy of man changes it.

## II. TEACHING—THE CHURCH AS THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH

Being the pillar and support of truth (2 Tim. 3:15) the church cannot be too careful to maintain soundness in doctrine. So important is sound doctrine that Paul told Timothy to preach it "in season; out of season." That evidently means all of the time for it is either in season or it is out of season all of the time. There is doctrine, or teaching, that fits every occasion, and while its application should be made according to the fitness of things, the preacher who preaches on baptism at a funeral is to be preferred to the one who does not preach on it when he should.

Indifferentism is the order of the day. People are unconcerned about doctrine. They think that gospel preaching is only "questions about words and names" (Acts 18:14, 17), and like Gallio, who "cared for none of these things," they are indifferent. This sentiment not only prevails in the world, it gains currency in the church. When Paul said "the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine" he did not refer to the world; but to those who "having itching ears, will heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts." Who heaps the teachers? That is evidently the church. Then Paul forecast conditions in the church, when the ears of the members would itch for something other than sound doctrine, who would seek teachers whose teaching would have the same soothing effect on their desires that scratching has on the spot that itches.

The strength of the churches of Christ has been in the fact that all error to us has looked alike, from infidelity to every false way. Owen, the infidel; Purcell, the Catholic; Rice, the denominationalist, all looked alike to Alexander Campbell. And he took them all in their turn.

Do we unchristianize people? We cannot if they be Christians nor can we make Christians of those who are not

by merely recognizing them. To recognize as Christians those who have not obeyed the gospel is but to break down the very barrier that exists between the church and the world. The church is undenominational, because it is not of them; and it is anti-denominational because it is against them. The idea of Christian unity implies that those united are Christians. Imagine one becoming a Christian and entering a denomination at the same time by the same act—and it will be no more than a mere imagination!

It requires the same thing to become a Christian now that it required in the New Testament era—the same faith, the same confession, the same baptism, by which one is added to the same church. Denominations are not backdoors nor side entrances into the church of Christ.

When God touched the mouth of Jeremiah, he said, "I have set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, to pluck up, to throw down, to destroy, to build and to plant." Yet there are those who cry for "affirmative" preaching and decry "negative" preaching. Go back and read that verse again. God set Jeremiah over the nations in that kind of preaching and that kind of preaching will still influence nations.

If the non-combative policy some brethren urge in the pulpit and press should be generally adopted—where would the church drift within a single generation? The Christian Church furnishes an example. They got where they are by pursuing that very course. And who wants to be where they are?

The need of the hour is straight live-coals-from-the altar gospel preaching, with the fire of Stephen, the boldness of Peter *and* John (John still had thunder then)—and with the invincible spirit of Paul; preaching that will start people to talking, even arguing. The people will hear it, if the brethren will bear it. Let us do it.

### III. ORDINANCES—THE CHURCH AS A TEMPLE OF WORSHIP

Contrary to the general idea, worship is divine, not human. The object of all true worship is God; its acts are the commandments of God. To the woman at the well Jesus



announced the two elements of acceptable worship. "God is a spirit: and they that worship him must worship in spirit and in truth." (John 4:24). There must be first, the right manner—in spirit; there must be second, the right act—in truth. Neither without the other is acceptable to God. The wrong act in the right manner is void. The right act in the wrong manner is vain. To worship truly, one must perform the right act in the right manner.

Ask an innovator, Why do you want instrumental music in the worship? Did one ever reply, "Because it pleases God" ? They have said everything except that.

Some say that it is enjoyed at home, why not in the church? But there are any number of things that are morally right, to be utilized at home, which would be religiously wrong. Anybody can name them.

And some have not quit saying that there are instruments of music in heaven. They are uninformed, not only on the nature of the church, but also on the nature of the place called heaven, that it is a spiritual realm. What could a spiritual being do with a material harp? Really, does anyone think that there are, or ever shall be, actual mechanical instruments of music in heaven? The argument is too far-fetched to even be interesting.

Still it is argued that the use of them was permitted in the Old Testament, which can only be taken as an admission that proof for them in the New Testament is lacking. Occasionally yet, some will turn so visionary as to see its use foreordained in the prophecies, another admission of the lack of a single plain precept or example.

If it is thought to be only an expedient, it must first be shown to be lawful; then expedient. (I Cor. 6:12) Nothing is expedient that is unlawful and some things that are lawful are not expedient.

If it is to be adopted as an aid, let it be known that God's commands are not crippled and need no crutches.

If an attempt is made to class it with lights, seats, and song books, be advised that in those articles of equipment no element is added to any item of worship, but in the use

of an instrument another element of music exists. They are, therefore, not parallel.

If the final effort is made to "psallo" the instrument into the church, the fatal question is why the one hundred and forty-eight translators, the world's ripest scholars, did not know that the word had any such meaning.

Who wants the instruments—and why? Those who have gone gadding about so much as to "change their glory for that which doth not profit."

Instrumental music in the worship is the relic of an abrogated age. The Catholics borrowed it from the Jews; the Protestants borrowed it from the Catholics; the Christian Church borrowed it from the Protestants—but the New Testament church did not use it.

#### TV. NAMES—DESIGNATION'S OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH

In the religious nomenclature of the day one hears a volume of terms and titles which are wholly foreign to Bible parlance. There is every sort of a church—Catholic, Episcopal, Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, Evangelical, Reformed, Ad Infinitum—the world must surely wonder whether Jesus Christ ever had a church or not. While making and taking names for the church—why not call it after the Head of it?

Some will say that it sectarianizes the church to call it "church of Christ"—but can it be sectarian to call the church what it is? It would not help that problem any to call it "Christian Church." Besides, the term Christian is used only as a noun in the New Testament, applied to the individual, and never as an adjective, applied to the church. That fact alone should restrain its use as a proper name for the church.

If it be asserted that the expression "church of Christ" is not in the New Testament, try Rom. 16:16 on any other name. For instance, the "Baptist Churches salute you." Or, "The Christian Churches salute you." Would that constitute a designation? It is a weak attitude that assumes it to be sectarian to designate the church as the church of

Christ, and it indicates a fear of unchristianizing somebody who is not a Christian.

If Christ is jealous of the church's purity (2 Cor. 11:2-3) and if he is solicitous of her unblemished glory (Eph. 5:25-26), the unspotted life must be worth attaining. If, then, the church has been gadding about, seeking strange lovers, "Go and proclaim these words to the north and say, Return, thou backsliding Israel, saith Jehovah; I will not look in anger upon you; for I am merciful, saith Jehovah."

The fearful consequences of forsaking God and turning from his way in the history of Israel should serve as a perpetual warning to us.

## CHAPTER XIX

## THE SIN OF SECTARIANISM

*TEXT: But we desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest: for as concerning this sect, we know that every where it is spoken against. (Acts 28:22).*

The word "sect" very early and rapidly descended into unpopularity. So unwelcome is the word now that no body of people accepts such a label to their party. It is regarded a stigma and its application is resented. It has the ban of public sentiment, and the very mildest view taken of the situation is that sectarianism is a grievous misfortune, and antagonistic to the spirit of Christianity.

Sects as we know them today are our inheritance from honest but misguided men in their imperfect struggle to shake off the shackles of Roman tyranny with all of its resultant corruptions. Under the papal yoke there was a compulsory absence of strife. The emancipation from this mandatory obedience had its twofold result. First, an exercise of freedom that headed into lawlessness; and, second, a rebound to human authority in the setting up of human creeds, human parties, or sects. Escaping from the tyranny of one resulted in the establishment of the other.

## THE ORIGIN OF SECTS

As commonly used there is a vagueness attached to the word "sect," making it rather difficult to determine who and what is sectarian. Webster defines the word to mean "a part cut off; a body separated from others by special doctrine; a school, etc."

In Roman Catholic countries to dissent from the Roman Catholic Church is sectarian. Romanism there is orthodoxy. In Denmark, Sweden, and such countries, dissent from Lutheranism is sectarian; hence, there the Roman Catholic Church itself is a sect. In the U. S. A. where we have not

suffered the misfortune of an Established Church, dissent from established sects, called the circle of orthodoxy, is sectarian! All denominations, we are told, are "branches of the true church" and one who denies it, dissents from such views, is heterodox and sectarian!

But the true conception of a sect and a sectarian is dissent, not from Romanists and Protestants, who are themselves sectarian, but from the true New Testament church.

Among the Jews there were sects, parties, denominations. There was the large and respectable denomination, the Pharisees, to which Paul belonged—the largest church in existence then. There were others such as the Sadducees. There were *churches* among the Jews, even if they were not so called. They were sects. And when some of the Jews believed the gospel, and became Christians, the church was, in the language of the Jews, called the sect everywhere spoken against—they regarded it as a fragment cut off from the main body of Judaism, a heresy.

In the church, the church of Christ, there have always been sectarian tendencies which when they were not checked ended in sects. "For first of all, when ye come together in the church, I hear that there be divisions among you; and I partly believe it. For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you." (I Cor. 11:19). When divisions exist, the *heresies* become known, which are behind the divisions, and that is necessary to place the blame where it belongs, making manifest the truth, approving those who hold to it, and condemning the teacher of heresy.

In the development of sects and parties in the church there is a gradation. "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." (Gal. 5:19-21).

Observe the direction, from bad to worse, until the end

is reached—and the end is *heresy*. Enmities, strife, jealousy, anger, hatred, seditions (the party spirit)—then *heresy*, the full-fledged sect. That is the way sects come.

The present heresy in the church has come in exactly that way. Those who know can recognize the gradation. Out of jealousy came strife; out of strife came anger and hatred ; out of that came division, then the party spirit—and the emergence of a new sect, a crossbred sect within the church, crossbred between Scofieldism and Russellism, with barely enough of the elements of the gospel left in its folds to distinguish it from those systems—the millennial sect. It is certainly a decline, a complete letdown, from the pretended non-sectarian plea of those who now head this new party. Verily, the cap and the gown, and all, are grandmother's, but the teeth, and the ears, and other marks of visage belong to the wolf!

#### THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH

The primitive church was universal in character. There was no hierarchy. No ecclesiastical machinery. The local church, with elders whose jurisprudence and jurisdiction were local only and never extended beyond congregational lines, was the only organization. No man was called master, there was no lordship save that of the Lord Jesus Christ. The rule of elders was, and is, under Christ, that of exhortation or teaching and enforcing the will of Christ in the church of Christ. Submission to the elders as rulers was and yet is, submission to the apostles' teaching.

But advantage has been taken by teachers of error, and their heresies on this very point. Because there is no ecclesiastical court in the church of Christ, and no creed save that of the apostles' teaching—the New Testament itself—these errorists are wont to cry out that we are creed makers and ecclesiastics when their errors are exposed and the line of truth is drawn against them. With equal consistency, however, could every sect or party, Adventist, Russellite, Rutherfordite, Norrisite, or What-not, charge them with creedism or sectism if they withhold fellowship from such groups. So, in order to avoid becoming a sect, according to themselves, they must fellowship *every sect!* The fact

is, sects in the church are no more to be fellowshipped than sects out of the church. And heresies are sects.

Our creed is the New Testament. To the early church it was the apostles' word. Myriads were made Christians before the New Testament was written. They believed what the apostles preached and taught, and that was their creed. When men came among these early Christians claiming to teach with the same authority that the apostles had, they "tried them which say they are apostles . . . and hast found them liars," and expelled such from their midst. Was it sectarian to thus bar these men and ban their teaching? If not, then to place the ban on such teachers in the church today, no matter what their prestige otherwise may be, nor what their pretensions of piety may appear to be, nor what their protestations of sweet innocence may assume to be, when their teaching is tried and found false, and they will not give up, they should be expelled as heretics. *Not to do so will make the church a sect*, rather than in doing so, for to keep the church unsectarian, its pure apostolic creed must be safeguarded and defended. That is the only scriptural attitude toward error. The hue and cry about division over *an attitude toward error* is a weak alibi for not defending the truth. It is mainly for effect. If such men as these had been in the church at Ephesus there likely would have been a division over the attitude toward error for they would have opposed the action of the Ephesus church in expelling the teachers of error from their midst.

#### THE SECTARIAN CHURCH

The primitive church was imperiled by many human developments. So Paul warned the elders at Miletus, "Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch . . ." He did not say "to draw away" the people of the world—he said *disciples*, "to draw away disciples after them." And there is the hurt of the church today—the drawing away of disciples, many uninformed members after *them*, after these *men*—for indeed, their followers profess loyalty to the men themselves, even when they reluctantly admit that their teaching is wrong. This is the very thing, in

principle, that Paul warned the elders of the church against.

The existence of parties from Paul's day has been in multiplied form. He himself fought the effort to add circumcision to the terms of admission into the body of Christ. Later he fought to the finish the party spirit in the Corinthian church, even to administering a stinging rebuke to his own personal followers who would wear his name rather than Christ's. In this crisis Paul spoke with imperial sternness against human creeds and names and parties. Afterward, however, human leadership subverted divine authority in the development of the man of sin—the papacy. Apostasy was followed by efforts at reformation. Protestant sects became the order of the day. They are still sects—mere sects—lacking all essential features of the New Testament church.

None of these sectarian denominations accepts the original, primitive creed—the word of the apostles. None admits persons to baptism on the simple faith and its expression in the good confession. They require tests and terms not laid down in the divine creed. None preserves the integrity of baptism. None holds to the New Testament organization, but they all offer ecclesiastical organizations. None practices the items of New Testament worship without subtractions and additions. None wears the scriptural names without the prefixes and suffixes of denominational parlance. None proposes apostolic work through the church without human auxiliaries. They are therefore human sects, lacking all essential features of the New Testament church.

The restoration of the primitive church was accomplished by the rejection of all these human elements and by a complete return to the New Testament. The determination to "speak where the scriptures speak and be silent where the scriptures are silent" was not human—it was, and is yet, divine; for the divine creed says "if any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." Upon this basis alone can the true church exist. The New Testament alone must be accepted as the creed. Admission into the church can be had only upon the plain terms of the gospel, immersion in water to all penitent believers, upon the confession of faith, in the



name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, which is for the remission of sins, and the condition of being added by the Lord to his church. To fellowship any who have not thus obeyed the terms is to ignore God's law; to do so extends fellowship to those whom God has not added. Such a fictitious fellowship would destroy the integrity of the gospel and of the church as a divine institution. It is not man's prerogative to fellowship where God has not made a basis for fellowship—and the only divine basis is the apostles' creed—the New Testament. Therein alone is unity. All else is sectarian, whether in or out of the church.

All this being true, Roman Catholics and Orthodox Protestants are not the only sectarians, nor do they have all the sects. *A sect is any body of people separated from the New Testament church by teaching and practice.*

#### THE EMERGENCE OF SECTS

When a certain contingent became dissatisfied with the work and worship of the church as prescribed in the New Testament, and corrupted the church with innovations, instrumental music, societies, auxiliaries, organizations as "adjuncts" to the church, their new and unscriptural practices became the ground of division. They loved their party more than they did the church, therefore they "went out from us, but they were not of us" and are in every sense of the word a sect. Their organic name is Christian Church. It is a sectarian institution.

When another contingent began to promote certain strange prophetic doctrines, the consequences of which dethrone our King, deny his present reign, postpone his kingdom, destroy its character, minimize the gospel and belittle the church (by making it a substitute and an accident in lieu of a kingdom that did not come), nullify the Great Commission, make God false to his promises, and assume that the scheme of redemption as foretold by the prophets is yet unfulfilled—when such a faction in the church makes these borrowed relics of Russellism and Scofieldism the rallying ground of a party and thus rides out of the fellowship of the church by acts of their own which make it impossible for the true church to longer fellowship their deeds and doctrines,

that party thereby becomes a sect. Therefore the premillennial party within the church for all the reasons named, and more, is a sect and forfeits the fellowship of the church by the very tenets they teach.

To say that their teaching does not affect the practice of the church or obedience to the gospel is too thin. Their teaching vitiates the gospel to the very core. Their kingdom postponement theory makes the Lord's Supper impossible, inasmuch as the Lord placed it in the kingdom "that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom."

The basis of fellowship is not found merely in baptism and the Lord's Supper. Paul disfellowshipped some men in the New Testament church, and "turned them over to Satan," because they taught the resurrection was past already. There is no evidence that the teaching of these men had any more effect on outward ordinances, such as baptism and the Lord's Supper, than is had today by the Russellite teaching of R. H. Boll and his party. But Paul said such teaching "overthrew the faith of some;" it made "shipwreck of the faith" itself—he charged the consequences of the doctrine against them. He said "their word will eat as doth a gangrene"—that is what this false doctrine will do in the church, and gangrene ought to be cut out. He said the teaching of such doctrine was "blasphemy," and so is the doctrine of these modern Hymenaeuses, Alexanders and Philetuses in the church today.

Some of their friends and admirers, perhaps some who had been schoolmates of Philetus and Hymenaeus, doubtless protested that they were good men and should not be "ostracized," that their teaching did not affect the worship of the church. But Paul said their teaching was as *gangrene* in the church, that it would *proceed further into ungodliness*, and he delivered them unto Satan to teach them not to *blaspheme* the word of God. It is a living New Testament example of what our attitude toward error and teachers of error should be. Contrast Paul's language and attitude with that of apologists among us today.

The spirit of faction will continue to breed sects if it is not checked. Already the church has suffered from two

major defections in worship and teaching—the cleavage of the Christian Church and the blight of Bollism, alias pre-millennialism. In the offing there are rumblings of disorder and division over matters of organization that can be speedily galvanized into another general faction if preachers do not preach the truth, and with consistency practice it, on matters of organization and church government. Elders of the church also must deal firmly with situations which in the past they have allowed to break loose and run riot.

#### MAJORITY RULE DEFECTIONS

Political revolution and economic anarchy are contagious. Members of the church who belong to political industrial unions and clans imbibe the spirit of such organizations and through these members that spirit gets into the church. Democrats in politics have tried to "make the world safe for democracy," and some seem to be trying to make the church a democratic party also. It is really surprising how many people there are in the church who think that the church should be run like the democratic party or a labor union. Thus we have in so many churches now the "majority rule" defection.

The history of these cases is nearly always connected with preacher trouble. A preacher comes to "take charge" of the church. When in a critical hour the elders insist on having charge, it becomes a case of preacher versus elder, often a young preacher versus old elders. For wisdom the old elders who were there before the young preacher was born, would be the better choice by far. But the preacher calls meetings; the scheming begins; petitions are circulated to remove the elders and elect new ones, a sort of a "cabinet" for the preacher—and the sequel is a divided church. In a sense the elders are to blame for going to sleep on their job and having such a preacher. But in it all, the preacher pleads that he is as innocent as Mary's little lamb—he never did a thing except to follow the dear people and stayed to save the church!

Splitting the church is a wonderful way to save it! I dare say that most any preacher of average personality can

visit among the members of the church for a time, build a party around himself, dissatisfy enough people with the very best elders, and muster strength enough to divide any congregation in the land, if elders give him time enough to do it.

The mistake of the elders has been in not dealing as firmly with preacher situations as they should. Too many members do not know when a preacher is right and when he is wrong. If they like him, he is always right. It is the duty of the elders to guard the church and protect it from designing men. Often a factious element is permitted to select an elder and the other elders acquiesce in his appointment as a peace measure. Such an elder does not really become an elder of the church but of only a fractional and factional part of it, because he becomes the tool of factionists from the start. A fairly good worker in the church is often spoiled when a preacher succeeds in getting a zealous novice appointed to the eldership. And usually from the day of his appointment he becomes *a cat's paw* for those who have promoted the spirit of faction and rebellion. Such men are not in reality elders of the church, but rather appointees of the preacher, mere cabinet members on the preacher's "staff of officers"!

It is just from such sources as this that the good names of real and long time elders of the church in some places have been defamed and efforts made to destroy their influence with the world and the church. Such malicious and pernicious practices in a church cannot be exposed too openly or severely.

The point in this connection is simply this: When a majority rule faction in the church takes charge, ousts the elders, nominates and elects others at their will; whether that faction controls the building and property of the church or not, that faction becomes a sect. Such a course in itself separates it from the New Testament church in organization and government. Thus we have in some places a majority rule sect calling themselves a church of Christ.

Denominations may thrive on it—but a wild democracy will wreck any church of Christ on earth.

#### THE CURE FOR THE CONDITION

Is there no cure for these defections? Yes; a return to the New Testament order of things. The professional preacher complex is largely responsible for these disorders. It is gravely feared that the training young preachers are getting in some of the colleges is responsible for their professional ideas. A most reliable informant has said that the president of one of the colleges explained the value of a certain preacher on the board of trustees because of his ability to "locate" with the churches the student preachers who graduate from that college. The danger of that conception of things ought to be seen at a glance by a blind man at midnight. Yet these colleges where such tendencies exist resent any suggestion that they are headed toward ecclesiastical control in the churches. It is quite a common thing to hear student preachers talk of "getting a church." They do not see the wide harvest fields, stretching out over whole continents of unevangelized people of native tongue and the ambition to preach the glorious gospel of Christ to these unsaved millions apparently never stirred within them.

They want a church! But the boys are not to be too severely blamed. It is the system under which they are being trained. Witness the scrambling for churches! Every "vacancy" is literally besieged with applications. Is it a New Testament picture? Verily nay. The New Testament mission of the gospel preacher is gospel preaching. Nine-tenths of the work expected of the located preacher should be done by elders, deacons and women of the church, and the members in general. It is no wonder that the pastor idea is developing so rapidly among us when the churches have made pastors, instead of evangelists, out of the preachers. Young men, especially, should devote their time to active evangelization; older men of wisdom and ripeness should be engaged in such "ministry of the word" as is required with the congregations. The return to the New Testament order of elders that rule, deacons that serve,

preachers that preach, congregations that congregate, members that work, would revolutionize the cause of Christ and the horizon would glow with a brighter day for the gospel. And to thus put the preachers to preaching would put an end to many "a shameful situation" in specters of division taking place all too often among the churches.

There is the growing inclination to settle church problems by division. Instead of congregational troubles being handled by the elders of the church, the members resort to a sort of referendum and recall vote, take matters into their own hands under a revolutionary leadership, and the sequel is division—hateful, fateful division! Later when the parties to it become worn out by the grind, and time heals an element of the bitterness, the white flag is raised, a truce is declared, hostilities cease, and the announcement comes that an "understanding" has been reached—but why not have understanding before the division and spare the plight?

It is all in a lack of respect for the word of God. The divine will is ignored and the human passion rules.

Respecting congregational government it is simply reduced to this question: Shall we have law and order in the church or majority rule—and chaos?

Regarding the Christian Church innovations—the question is whether we shall yield to the grandstand, melodramatic play for pseudo-unity, or like Nehemiah refuse negotiations with religious Sanballats on the plains of Ono, while we rebuild the wall of Jerusalem.

Concerning the premillennial sect—the danger lies chiefly in a sob-sentiment attitude toward teachers of error, and is a question of whether we shall listen to the voice of neutrality pacificists instead of militant leadership.

The time has come for the re-promulgation, with all the intensity of the gospel restorers, of all the principles of the New Testament church, to save the church itself from the throes of sectarianism.

## CHAPTER XXI

### WHAT THE CHURCH MUST DO TO BE SAVED

(Preached in War Memorial Auditorium, Nashville, Tennessee, under auspices Chapel Avenue Church of Christ)

*TEXT: "For the hurt of the daughter of my people am I hurt: I mourn; dismay hath taken hold on me. Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no physician there? Why then is not the health of the daughter of my people recovered?" (Jer. 8:21-22)*

The prophet Jeremiah in these words pictures the condition of Israel in a lurid light. Doubtless he was regarded a pessimist; soured on society; a disgruntled prophet. But the fact remains that the trouble was in Israel, not in the prophet. His burning words describe the people of God today. The church is sick. And the sad part is, as with Israel, without reason; because the Physician of Gilead and the healing remedy are available. "Why then is not the health of my people recovered?" Because they will not come to the physician and they will not take his remedy.

#### I. ELEMENTS OF STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS

The health and strength of the church are to be found in the truth and the defense of it; its infirmity and weakness are manifest in compromise. Of the mighty host of Old Testament valiants a New Testament writer remarked, "Out of weakness they were made strong." Through the fewest and weakest of all nations on earth, God made Israel the strongest, and through them he championed the cause of universal righteousness against empires of iniquity and defeated the most powerful nations of antiquity. Standing for the truth, the church has nothing to fear. But when we compromise with error, we become of all people the most vulnerable.

The history of Israel repeats itself in the church today.

Observe what the strength of the Church was a few generations ago and compare it with the present. Their plea was the Bible itself. Today we hear much of "what the church believes and teaches." The church was brought to us in an undenominational, non-denominational, anti-denominational spirit. The spirit of the early gospel crusaders was antagonistic to denominationalism. The attitude toward error was consistent—all error looked exactly alike. Bishop Purcell's Roman Catholicism looked to Alexander Campbell about like Robert Dale Owen's socialistic atheism—he debated and defeated them both. But Nathan L. Rice's denominationalism did not look any better; he debated and defeated it. Nor did error within the church receive more toleration, he squelched the menacing speculative movement of Jesse B. Ferguson—in the church.

The strength of the church has ever been in the maintenance of distinctive, New Testament principles. It loses its strength and is reduced to utter weakness when it loses sight of these things, raises the white flag to the foe and signs truce with error.

## II. THE PRINCIPLE OF PECULIARITY

Israel was a peculiar people—a separate people. They had a separate origin. God called Abraham out of Ur of the Chaldees that he might raise up a separate family. Get thee out, God said. Later when the posterity of Abraham settled in the land of Egypt God demanded that Pharaoh should let the people go "that they may worship me." He required of Israel a separate nation. Today God demands a separate church—"be ye separate, saith the Lord." A separate family in Abraham; a separate nation in Israel; a separate church in Christ.

### 1. The church must be kept separate.

We must keep the church separate in speech. The nomenclature of the denominations can have no place among Christians—such as, "our church," "our pastor," "Doctor Blank, LL. D.," "our institutions," "our organizations," "our Young People," and "Lord, may Brother Eloquent 'bring us a message,'" *ad infinitum's* string of borrowed



sectarian Ashdodic language, which is fast becoming the common vernacular of professed Christians.

We must keep the church separate in doctrine. It is not a matter of what "the church believes and teaches"—it is wholly and solely a question of what the Bible teaches, the all and only divine creed. There is a crying need for Bible preaching today, instead of "canned sermons" filched from sectarian sources.

We must keep the church separate in worship. Unscriptural innovations are sinful and invalidate the worship. If it is wrong to use instrumental music in worship, it is wrong to worship where it is used. In fact, in so doing the effort would be in vain—"in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrine the commandments of men."

Between Christians and innovators there is no basis of fellowship, nor even negotiation. Nehemiah refused Sanballat's unity-meeting proposal which he wanted to hold on the plains of Ono. He wanted to stop Nehemiah's work. Digressives today are modern Samaritan Sanballats—that is all. They would love to lure us to let the sound of the hammer cease and come to the plains of Ono (which extend from Detroit to Cincinnati) and talk unity. To do so is to virtually sign temporary armistice. Nehemiah knew exactly what to do with Sanballat and his wily proposition but a few brethren recently have let digressive modern Samaritans get them into conference.

No matter if a few strong speeches have been made—Nehemiah could have made a strong speech. The affiliation itself is wrong, the negotiations are wrong; it can only weaken the church and serve to dim the lines which should be the tauter drawn. All the advantages in such meetings, even if some loyal preacher "tears the rag off the bush," are gained by the digressives—and they know it. We have neither time nor place for pseudo-unity conferences.

2. The church must be kept evangelistic—not missionary. There has been over-emphasis on missions and missionaries and an under-emphasis on New Testament evangelistic work. Let a gospel preacher announce this week that he sails to Japan, China or Timbuctoo, and he is no longer

a preacher—all at once he has become a missionary! The apostles did not establish missions—they preached the gospel; people obeyed it, and in doing so became Christians, and that is the church. "Once a mission always a mission." Fifty years in Japan and China, and hundreds of thousands of dollars spent, but still no churches! Why? Because the procedure is wrong, the set-up is sectarian. It was borrowed from the sectarians and has proceeded along sectarian lines. So-called "mission work" has been in charge of human missionary agencies as unscriptural as human missionary societies. The one-man missionary societies (of Louisville and Nashville) are as unscriptural as the better organized societies of the digressives—between the two the latter would be the more preferable and expedient, because they are better organized and operated. Churches need to return to the New Testament basis of direct evangelistic work.

### 3. The church must be kept militant.

The spirit of pacificism (pa-cif-i-cism) is taking the fight out of the church. But the conflict between truth and error is unending. Victory does not come by truce. God's terms are unconditional surrender. A questionnaire and survey, to determine what kind of writing and preaching a "brotherhood" wants, bear on the face of them a total lack of knowledge of the spirit and genius of the gospel, or else a gross disregard for it on the part of the promoters. To receive such a thing is an insult to a gospel preacher; and its circulation in the name of gospel preaching and writing is a travesty on the spirit of Christ, Peter and John, Stephen and Paul.

The church grew when the fight was waged and the battles raged. When the let-up came in the fight, the let-down came in the church. It is said that the denominations do not fight any more. That is because the church has quit fighting and they have nothing to fight. If gospel preachers will fight now as gospel preachers fought then, the denominations will fight now as they fought then—and truth will triumph now as it triumphed then. Shall we

yield to the line of least resistance, or shall we challenge error in its strongholds and citadels?

m. SOME IMMEDIATE] DANGERS

In summing up the immediate dangers around the church, we should name the following things:

1. The marked tendency toward Institutionalism.

Today any man or group of men can start any institution they please to start, put it in a benevolent basket, label it "Your Baby," and place it on the doorstep of the church with the appeal "Please, take care of it"! That is taxation without representation. Again, I say, the delegate system of the digressives is better than that, for in that case there would be a voice in what is started.

The church is about to become the unwitting and unwilling victim of Institutionalism, and Institutionalism is about to become a racket. Where is the scriptural precept or precedent for scouring the country for orphans, transporting them from sections far and wide to an institution that was not created by reason of orphans in that particular community, but which a promoter created by searching for orphans?

Am I against taking care of orphans? I am not. But I am against the institutional racket. It is the duty of the church to care for their dependents—and they should provide the means of doing so under their own supervision. If individuals wish to operate hospitals, inns, homes or schools, it is their right to do so but the church cannot operate institutions. If the church can do its benevolent work through a board of directors, why not its missionary work through a board of directors? If one is a society, why not the other? There is therefore no such thing as "our institutions," if by "our" you mean the church.

Institutionalism was the tap-root of digression. It has always been the fatal blow to congregational independence. It destroys the individuality of both the congregation and the Christian as Nazism and Fascism destroy the individuality of their citizens in Germany and Italy. Back of institutionalism is party pride. People say: "Your church does not have any great institutions; it is not missionary

and benevolent." We would say: "O yes it does!" and "yes we are!" And we come to love the institutions more than the church. Schools, for instance—and this is the test: Criticize the church, and it brings no rise from these devotees of certain institutions; but criticize their school and they will have a fit, and your name thereafter, henceforth and forever is a hiss. But, brother, the college is not the church nor can the church own and operate it. It is private and secular and belongs to the man or group of men to whom it belongs. It is an adjunct of the home, not of the church; auxiliary to the family, not to the congregation; parents and interested individuals, not churches, should sponsor and support them.

Recently in a popular American magazine, the publisher, said: "Because of my frank and sympathetic criticism of labor, publications devoted to union interests have declared I am an enemy of unions. This statement is false, absolutely ! But I believe in Americanism to the *nth degree*. That means, if a worker wants to join a union he should have that right; but if he desires to depend on his own efforts and does not want to join a union, he should have that privilege."

With equal force the words of this publisher can be applied to the present criticisms. Because we have criticized the course and conduct in the teaching and the practices of certain schools, we are branded as an enemy of the schools. With the same vehemence of Liberty's publisher we say: "This statement is false, absolutely"! We merely insist that the schools stay in their place, keep their hands off the church, cease trying to control preachers and form dominating influences in churches. The church must be kept independent and free.

2. Another definite danger in the church today is modern Judaism.

There is an unaccountable sympathy for theorizers and their theories on the part of some who disavow any belief of the theories as such. Why the sympathy? They condemn drastic measures against these false teachers but employ drastic measures against those of us who oppose these

false teachers. They preach gentleness toward the false teacher, and practice harshness with us.

It is an old symptom. It was in the early church. Paul rebuked it. Concerning ancient Judaizers Paul said to a church afflicted with them: "To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you." (Gal. 2:5) The Judaizers among us today have been exhorted for thirty years, and still we are urged to forbear, yea, organize a "brotherhood committee" to arbitrate the question! Paul said, "No, not for an hour." And why? "That the truth of the gospel might continue with you." Give the premillennial Judaizers right-of-way in the church today and the truth of the gospel will perish with us. "A little leaven, leaveneth the whole lump," Paul continued, on the same point, in the same chapter, in the same argument to the Galatians that Judaizers should not be given place for an hour. Then thirty years is considerably too long and it is high time to draw the line on these modern "izers" and their "isms."

We have always had neutrals. They are all alike. When the music controversy raged, the neutrals went with the digressives as their party increased and became large enough. If and when, if ever, the Boll party should become large enough, without the credentials of a prophet I predict that the neutrals among us will go with them, just as the neutrals in the other fight went with the innovators. That is the history of it, and they are running true to form to date.

3. Still another danger in the church now is the pseudo-unity movement.

On the very threshold of unconditional surrender, after hard-fought battles over the innovations, we now face the effort on the part of some to sell the church down the river by a truce with digression. The digressives have lost in the battle. They now seek victory in strategy and negotiation. But the victory truth has won in debate should now be sealed in the unconditional surrender of their innovations and errors and a complete right-about-face which will bring them back to the New Testament in all things. That would

be unity in accomplishment. It would be automatic. New Testament unity comes not by resolutions, conferences, mutual admiration meetings, handshakings and backslapping. It exists in the church now which is loyal to Christ, and those who left unity can return and find it here—where they left it. There is no basis for compromise. "They went out from us because they were not of us; for if they had been of us they would have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they all are not of us" (I Jno. 2:19).

4. The steady inflow of worldliness constitutes another ever-present danger to the church.

We are living in an intensely secular age. There is an all-absorbing pursuit after the things of the world. The pulpit and the press are all but subsidized by the secular spirit. Newspapers reek with crime; churches seethe with worldliness. The masses in the church and out of it are going to hell on the pleasure route. There are no danger signals anywhere to check the crazed victims of fun and frolic in their frenzied rush to the resorts of sin. Neon signs flicker "welcome" at places where red lanterns should swing "danger here—keep out." The public mixed swimming resort is the nursery of promiscuous conduct. The salacious movie is the doorway through which the slime and slush of Hollywood gains entrance to our parlors. The dance is the preparatory school of prostitution. Card-playing is the kindergarten for gambling. Liquor drinking and cigarette-smoking are first steps in the course which blunts the moral and spiritual sense of boys and girls. The woman or girl with a cigarette in one hand and a liquor glass in the other drops to zero in the eyes of any gentleman. The church that harbors all such within its membership ceases to be a spiritual power in any community. Preachers who refrain from preaching against these evils have either yielded to the line of least resistance or have been bribed by public sentiment or else popular practice has blunted their own spiritual perceptions. Thus merrily we roll along.

We believe the presence of these ills in the church are alarming and a scriptural correction of them the only thing

that will save the church, or at least salvage a remnant from a new tidal wave of digression.

#### IV. THE REMEDY

##### 1. The rejection of false teachers is necessary.

Paul said: "The factious man after the first and second admonition reject." (Tit. 3:10). But after thirty years of admonition, it is now suggested that we should appoint an arbitration committee for the brotherhood! Paul said, Reject them. John said, Let them go out. The sooner the group of Bollites and Premillennialists go out, and cease to disturb the church, the better off the church will be. The only reason they have not gone out is because their party would be too small and insignificant. They are waiting and working within until they can gather strength, like the digressives, in the hope that they may draw away a large contingent with them. And they may succeed—if the new movement is a success they will.

##### 2. The renovation of the schools is an essential.

From attic to cellar the schools should be emptied, swept and garnished of premillennial teachers, sympathy and influence. This is due the brethren to whom these schools look for support. It is not enough to ascend to the housetop and shout "We do not believe premillennialism." There are different types of premillennial influence. First, the premillennialist—the one who accepts the theory as a party tenet. Second, the Boll sort—those who hold and teach the premillennial views but do not actually join a premillennial sect. They prefer to stay in the church and disturb the brotherhood. Third, the sympathizer—those who deny the doctrine but sympathize with the personnel of the party. That looks suspicious. They are Bollites. The premillennialist is one who believes the doctrine. The Bollite is the Boll-sympathizer. He is the chronic mourner over disfellowship. He stands at the Boll wailing wall. Fourth, all the neutrals. Their kind went with the digressives when the tide went that way. They are waiting for the tide on this question, and will go with it. They are the soft-pedalers among us, and are by far the largest class of the ones

mentioned. They are in the schools. They are in the churches. They are everywhere.

It is not hard to locate any of the foregoing types of individuals. One of the first indications is their reaction toward criticisms. They will criticize men who oppose Boll's teaching, but resent any criticism of Boll or of his sympathizers. The infusion of this spirit into the student body of several schools is an immediate danger. These young people are potential leaders, teachers, preachers, elders. They carry this attitude back into the churches, and though they are taught against *marking* anybody, they are taught to *mark every preacher who does not have the indorsement of their school*. Therein lies the danger of college domination and control of the churches. It is more than a tendency—it is the developed thing itself.

3. The repudiation of soft-pedal journalism is another necessity.

The freedom of the people lies in the freedom of the press. The populace in Germany, Italy and Russia know and read only what their dictators decree. It is the same principle in religion when a man in New York (Clinton Davidson) who has been with the digressives twenty years making money, undertakes to buy all the papers in the brotherhood and put them under the padlock of a copyright in order to control the religious thinking of the masses through suppression. The press must be freed, and the church spared of such domination.

Personalities in journalism, which means naming teachers of error along with systems of error, are not any violation of "courageous, dignified religious journalism." Naming the men who teach error and practice deception in religion, even in the church, "can be done in a courteous and Christian manner"—but it should be done.

To talk and write of courageous, dignified, courteous methods of religious journalism is to deal only in broad generalities. For some of our old landmarks as gospel papers to recede from former drastic policies and retreat behind the verbiage of carefully worded resolutions of editorial committees to restrain the power of pens, is a keen



disappointment to many of us who have looked to these papers to take the lead in a major fight, without generalities, getting personal when necessary, in relentless offensives against false movements and the men who promote them.

Whether some "temptation or scheme of intimidation" has "seduced" and "provoked" the editors and publishers to modify policies we cannot say, but it is obvious that something has caused them to seek retrenchment. Our only point here is that it is no time to be saying pretty platitudes and dealing in generalities. We are in a fight for the truth and the cannon-fire cannot cease until the enemies of the church stack arms.

Calling names of false teachers and their aides and sympathizers is neither undignified nor discourteous, because Paul did it—and he was courteous, dignified and *educated*. He said: "Demas forsook me having loved this present world." It was hard on Demas for Paul to say that publicly. He should have taken that up with Demas privately! Again, he said that Hymenaeus and Philetus had shipwrecked their faith and were overthrowing the faith of others by their theory of the resurrection and he wrote it down in the New Testament (a rather dignified book) that he had turned those brethren of his over to Satan. He clashed with Barnabas upon one occasion and withstood Peter to his face and rebuked him publicly. Neither incident ruined the church, nor marred the dignity of the New Testament. He further said that Alexander the coppersmith did him much evil and declared that the Lord would reward him for what he did. Paul did not seem to covet the kind of a reward he intimated Alexander would get. He told a perverter of the truth one time that he was full of guile and villainy, called him a son of the devil, and asked him if he ever intended to quit perverting the way of the Lord. When a paper develops better manners than the New Testament and a preacher becomes more dignified than the apostles, neither is worth anything to the defense of the truth nor to the cause of Christ.

4. The renouncement of compromise in preaching and practice.

A mere innovation in teaching and practice is seldom the real trouble. Rather is it the symptom of the trouble. Back of the instrumental music innovation was the change in attitude toward the authority of the New Testament in matters of worship, the majority rule and political views of church government, guided by a dominant spirit of worldliness in the church.

The same is true of premillennialism. It is but the symptom of the real trouble. Back of this false theory is the general doctrinal softness afflicting the church. There has been a softening of the brain, and also of the spine, of preachers, elders and teachers in the church. There has been a let-up in that type of sturdy sermons of the positive and negative character of earlier days. Today our "ministers" are joining the "Ministerial Alliance," and have been the President and Secretary-Treasurer of these pastor organizations in various towns and cities. These organizations not infrequently give banquets in honor of one of our resigning and departing ministers. It simply stands to reason that when a gospel preacher does his duty in a community the ministers of sectarianism will not give a banquet in his honor. They would, on the contrary, hold a jubilee over his departure. That is one of the pronounced evidences of the doctrinal weakness developing among churches and preachers.

Then there is the growing practice of giving recognition to sectarian preachers and calling on them for prayer in our meetings. It shows definitely that a general doctrinal weakness is back of certain issues which are seized upon, like instrumental music, premillennialism, and other hobby horses they always ride out on.

I have yet to find the first premillennialist or premillennial sympathizer, Bollite or Boll sympathizer, that is not weak on doctrine, the fundamentals of the gospel, yes, the first principles. They have the sectarian sympathy and complex. Therein is the trouble. When they get into the schools, and they are in them from California to

Tennessee, including Texas and Arkansas, it is bad. But when they take leadership in the churches it will be *too bad*.

5. The rejuvenation of the spiritual life of the church must be had.

To be saved, the church must retrieve its spiritual life. New Testament discipline must be enforced. We must wage war on worldliness as well as on error. In short, the complete return to the New Testament standard in our attitude toward error, in maintaining the peculiar features of the church of Christ, and in the rejuvenation of its spiritual life, is the only hope of salvation for the church in our secular and sectarian society. We must wage war on everything inimical to the essence of the gospel of Christ.

## CHAPTER XXII

## THE LORD'S DAY

(Delivered at Tenth and Austin Sts. Church of Christ, Wichita Falls, Texas. Recorded and transcribed by W. W. Foster, an elder of the congregation.)

*TEXT: "I will praise thee; for thou hast heard me and art become my salvation. The stone which the builders refused is become the headstone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvellous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." (Psa. 118:22-24).*

Brethren in Christ and Friends: We are gathered this Lord's Day morning to render worship to God in honor of his Son. We are profoundly grateful for the providence that has guarded us by night and guided us by day, and for the return of this new day, the glorious day of our Lord. May our worship upon this eventful morning be to his praise and glory and to our mutual edification.

Our text for the hour concerns this day—the Lord's Day. A thousand years before the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, David swept the harp of prophetic psalmody and sang of a new day. His was the prayer for the human race; he spake of himself as representative of the race of man, sighing for salvation, in the hope of the long-promised coming of the Messiah. "I will praise thee; for thou hast heard me and art become my salvation." In this prophetic psalmody the Singer visualizes the Redeemer as having come. He contemplates his rejection, and delineates his triumph and coronation. "The stone which the builders refused is become the headstone of the corner." Then in sweeping exaltation he exclaims with all the exuberance of his soul: "This is the Lord's doing; it is marvelous in our

eyes. This is the day which the Lord has made; we will rejoice and be glad in it."

We are familiar with the nature of monumental institutions, commemorative days and memorial occasions. Near three centuries ago our forefathers came over on the historic Mayflower and settled this country. About a century later that immortal political document, the Declaration of Independence, was signed and sealed, and a nation was born. It stands for the liberty and freedom purchased by the blood of our sires, and from ancestry to posterity this day—the Fourth of July—has been handed down as a holiday occasion, a day of celebration. Once a year the nation is thrown into the clutch of festal sentiment and the nation lives anew its history in the celebration of the event that gave it birth.

In the Bible there are days of religious history connected with sacred events which lent significance to those days. To separate such days from the people and the events that signalize them would render meaningless the days. An attempt to celebrate the fourth of July in Old Mexico would probably start a revolution instead of a celebration. There is no event connected with this day important to the Mexican people; and without a significant event, there could be no intelligent celebration. The same is true regarding these days of sacred history. It takes the event to lend significance to the day. Let us note some of these days of Old Testament mention, and the events which signalized them.

#### THE SEVENTH DAY SABBATH

Prominent among the days of the Old Testament was the seventh day. It was on this day that God rested "from all the work which he had made." (Gen.2:2-3). Referring to it Moses said that God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because on it he had rested. It has been argued that "the sabbath" has been observed from creation, and that it is therefore a universal institution. But there is neither command nor example on record to show that Adam or Abraham, or any other patriarch kept the sabbath. The word does not even occur in all the record of the first

twenty-five hundred years of history. The text says that God hallowed and blessed the seventh day because in it he *had rested*. That is past tense, friends, and the hallowing therefore could not have been done *on the day* that God rested, but sometime subsequent thereto. Now, how long afterward was it when God hallowed the seventh day and made it a sabbath? When and where did the blessing of the seventh day take place, and to whom, and for whom? I suggest that we let Moses answer these questions, and we now turn to his own record of these things.

It should be remembered that Moses wrote the book of Genesis 2500 years after the events it records. The posterity of Abraham had settled in Egypt—a chain of circumstances too long to follow now. The nation of Israel had been delivered from Egypt. This connection with chronology is necessary in order to make the proper application of the passage. In Deut. 5:15, referring to the bondage of Israel in Egypt, Moses said: "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: Therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day." We know the force of the word "therefore." It is a logical word. It means "for this reason." "Therefore," he says, "The Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath." They were once servants in Egypt but God had brought them out of "the house of bondage"—*therefore*, for this reason, the Lord commanded them to keep the sabbath.

If the sabbath had been observed from creation Moses could not have said God commanded them to keep the sabbath *because* they had been delivered from Egypt. He could not have used the word "therefore" as he did. The people would have said, "Moses, you are wrong. Do you not know that our fathers have kept the sabbath from creation? Why do you tell us that God commands us to keep it *because* he brought us out of Egypt. God commanded it *before* he brought us out of Egypt, yea *when* he created man and rested on the seventh day, and he would have commanded it had we never been in Egypt at all." Thus Moses would have

been convicted of assigning the wrong cause for sabbath observance—a wrong premise and a wrong conclusion.

#### THE SABBATH GIVEN

There is no record of the seventh day ever having been observed before God brought Israel out of Egypt. In Deuteronomy 5:3 Moses said, "This covenant the Lord made not with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us alive here this day." The sabbath was not therefore a patriarchal institution. The seventh day was not observed as a sabbath by man until Israel was delivered out of the bondage from Egypt.

When God gave Israel a day to observe he gave them *the same day* upon which he himself *had rested* in the beginning. He gave them that day to remember and celebrate, "throughout their generations," their deliverance from Egypt. He "sanctified" the day when it was set aside for that purpose. Hence, the blessing and hallowing of the sabbath took place 2500 years after creation—when Israel was delivered from Egypt.

In Exodus 31:13-17, Moses says: "Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you. Ye shall keep the sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto you; everyone that defileth it shall surely be put to death; for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Six days may work be done; but in the seventh is the sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord: whosoever doeth any work in the sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death. Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath, to observe the sabbath, throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed."

We know what a sign is. A young man falls in love with a young woman. He proposes to her. She accepts the proposal (and that is where stupidity greets cupidity!). He places on her hand an engagement ring. That ring

is a sign between the young man and the young woman—between *one* young man and *one* young woman. So is the wedding ring a sign between one man and one woman. A sign is special, not general. God gave the sabbath to Israel as a sign between him and them. He said: "It is a sign *between me and the children of Israel.*" Now, I submit to you the question—if *all nations* were ever commanded to keep the sabbath, how could it have been a sign between God and *one nation*?

Again, Moses said that the sabbath was "a covenant" between God and the children of Israel. We know what a covenant is. In drawing up covenants the lawyer uses the legal terms "the party of the first part" and "the party of the second part" The reason I remember that so well is because I have always been the party of the "second part" and it made an "imprint" on me! Well, in this covenant with Israel, God is the party of the first part, and Israel is the party of the second part—just God and Israel, no other nation or people included. Thus all can see that the sabbath was given to Israel, hallowed and blessed and sanctified (set apart) unto Israel, after they were brought out of Egypt.

#### THE THREE DISPENSATIONS

A simple application of the right division of the word of God will settle the sabbath question. We all know that there have been three grand divisions, or dispensations, in Bible history. There was the Patriarchal dispensation extending from Adam to Moses, more particularly from Abraham to Moses; then there was the Jewish dispensation, or the Mosaic, extending from Moses to Christ; and the gospel dispensation extending from Pentecost to the end of time. Now to which of these dispensations did the sabbath belong? The chart which I have here before you will show you.



## THE THREE DISPENSATIONS

PATRIARCHAL	JEWISH	GOSPEL
No sabbath command No sabbath example (2500 years)	The sabbath command The sabbath penalty (1500 years)	No sabbath command No sabbath example No sabbath penalty

During the first 2500 years there is not *one mention* of the sabbath day, no command, no example. Passing out of this period, out of the patriarchal into the Jewish, the first mention of the sabbath was at Sinai where the law was about to be given to Israel. From that time until the law was nailed to the cross we find repeated commands to keep it, solemn warnings against breaking it, and immutable penalties when they did.

But leaving the Jewish period, in the gospel dispensation there is no command, and no example of sabbath observance. Six times in the book of Acts it is mentioned in historical connection only. In the epistles to the churches where the apostles teach Christians to "observe all things" Christ has commanded, it is not once enjoined and there is no example of its observance. Only once it is mentioned in those epistles and there condemned. (Col. 2:14-16)

This parallel clearly reveals the particular realm of sabbath keeping. During the 2500 years *before the giving of the law*—no command, no example, no warning. During the 1500 years *of the law*—repeated commands, warnings, exhortations, and penalties. Then *after the law was nailed to the cross*, in the gospel age—no command, no example, no warning.

## THE END OF THE SABBATH

But someone will say, "How could the sabbath end since Moses said the sabbath was perpetual? A Sabbatarian preacher once asked me: "What does 'perpetual' mean? 'Perpetual motion' cannot cease—then how can a 'perpetual sabbath' cease?" It so happens that the same passages which refer to "perpetual sabbath" also mention "perpetual incense" on the sabbath day and "perpetual burnt offerings." (Ex. 30:8; Lev. 24:7-9) Adventist preachers will not

burn incense nor offer those sacrifices on the sabbath day. They say those things have *ceased*. If perpetual incense can cease, then a perpetual sabbath can cease and did cease.

The words "forever," "eternal" and "everlasting" do not always mean *endless*. These three words come from the same Greek word—*Ionious*—which is always used to mean and to include, *all of the period to which it refers*. When the words "forever," "eternal" and "everlasting" refer to a period of time they are limited by that period of time. For example, Jonah was in the belly of the whale *forever*. "The bars closed upon me forever." (Jonah 2:16) Forever—how long? Seventy-two hours. Universalists use this to show that the word forever does not mean endless and, hence, to disprove endless punishment. But why was Jonah in the whale forever? Because he was there *the full time period assigned*, seventy-two hours. If the whale had delivered Jonah prematurely on the shore, he would not have been there *forever*. But when the word "forever" refers to the other side of time there are no time limits—everlasting God, everlasting life, everlasting punishment—no finite limitations, no time boundary, therefore, infinite in application. So both Universalists and Adventists are wrong.

In the Old Testament certain ceremonies and ordinances of the law were called *everlasting* because they extended through a certain period of time. Burnt offerings forever, incense forever and the sabbath forever—"throughout your generation." How long then was *forever*, with reference to the sabbath? Just as long as Israel remained God's chosen people. But the end of Israel was the end of their law—sabbath and all.

When and where did the nation of Israel end? Hear the word of the prophet Amos to Israel: "Then said the Lord unto me, The end is come upon my people of Israel. .. when will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the sabbath, that we may set forth wheat, making the ephah small, and the shekel great, and falsifying the balances by deceit. And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord

God, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day." (Amos 8:2-9).

In verse 2 Amos prophesies the end of Israel. In verse 5 the people ask, "When will the new moon be gone and the sabbath, that we may set forth wheat?" In verse 9 Amos answered, "And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord God, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon and will darken the earth in the clear day."

When Jesus Christ died on the cross it was the sixth hour of the day—high noon. (Matt. 27:45) The sun refused to shine and darkness enveloped the earth. The Son of God cried, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" and bowing his head, he said, "It is finished," and died. The sun had gone down at noon, the earth was darkened in the clear day. It was the end of Israel, the end of their law—and the end of their sabbath.

There is another prophetic reference to the end of the sabbath—Hosea 2:11: "I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feasts, her new moons and her sabbaths and all her solemn feasts."

The feast days were annual, the new moons were monthly, the sabbaths were weekly. Hosea said they would all cease.

Now hear Paul: "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross ... Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days." (Col. 2:14-16) The prophet said the sabbath *would* cease, and the apostle said it *did* cease—where, then, is the controversy?

We draw the cross of Jesus Christ on the board. On one side we put Amos 8:2, 5, 9 and Hosea 2:11—before the cross. On the other side we put Matt. 27:45 and Col. 2:14-16—after the cross.

Amos 8:2, 5, 9



Matt. 27:45

Hosea 2:11



Col. 2:14-16

Before the cross Amos said the sabbath would be gone

when the sun should go down at noon and the earth darken in clear day. Hosea also said God would cause feast days, new moons and sabbath, with all the solemn feast, to cease. Matt. 27:45 fulfills the statement of Amos that the sun would go down at noon. Colossians 2:14-16 fulfills the statement of Hosea that God would nail all the ordinances of the law to the cross—feast days, new moons and sabbaths. The prophets *before the cross* said the sabbath would *cease*, and the apostles *after the cross* said the sabbath *did cease*, so again I ask, where is there room for controversy? It seems to me that should be enough to settle the question.

#### THE END OF THE DECALOGUE

The entire covenant God made with Israel ended at the cross of Jesus Christ. "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt,' because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord." (Heb. 8:6-9)

This covenant was the Ten Commandments—the Decalogue. "There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt" (I Kings 8:9) "And I have set there a place for the ark, wherein is the covenant of the Lord, which he made with our fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt." (I Kings 8:9) "And I have set there "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah."

Thus in Heb. 8:6-9 Paul tells us that what Jeremiah said *would* be done, *had* been done.

The following conclusions are clearly deducible from the premises:

(1) There was nothing in the ark save the Ten Commandments. (I Ki. 8:9)

(2) But in the ark was the covenant God made with Israel when he brought them out of Egypt.

(3) Therefore, the Ten Commandments were the covenant God made with Israel when he brought them out of Egypt.

Again:

(1) The Ten Commandments are the covenant God made with Israel when he brought them out of Egypt. (I Ki. 8:9,21)

(2) But God took away the covenant that he made with Israel when he brought them out of Egypt. (Jer.31:31, Heb. 8:6-9)

(3) Therefore, God took away the Ten Commandments.

The new covenant is not based on the Ten Commandments nor on any part of it. They stand annulled—not in part but in whole. Paul said, "The ministration of death, written and engraven on tables of stone," given to Israel when they could not look upon Moses for the glory of his face, "was to be done away" and it was that "which is abolished." (2 Cor. 3:7, 13)

It is true that there are moral precepts in the Decalogue which have been incorporated into the New Covenant. These are right not because they were in the Decalogue, for some of them were right before there was a Decalogue—they were in the Decalogue *because they were right*, and they are in the New Covenant for the same reason. Nothing morally right was left out of the New Covenant. It is mighty shallow reasoning for one to say that the Decalogue is still binding because the moral part of the law which it represented is in the New Covenant. As well say that the British Constitution is binding on the United States because our constitution incorporated certain moral statutes of the old government.

But the sabbath was not a moral law, never was. It required positive divine command to make it right. The one and only command therefore which was peculiar to the Dec-

alogue as such was left out of the New Covenant! How do you account for that, friend, if the sabbath is the all-important command of God as Adventists contend? There is no sort of an argument based on the New Covenant by which Adventists can bind their Judaistic sabbath-keeping on the Christian world.

#### THE LORD'S NEW DAY

The resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead is the most stupendous event of world history. It was of this that David sang in the psalm-prophecy of our text: "I will praise thee for thou hast heard me and art become my salvation. The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvelous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord has made; we will rejoice and be glad in it."

A more beautiful prophetic description of the coming of Christ and the blessings of salvation through his triumph over death and the grave could not be put in poetic or prophetic verse. We are not left to imagine its meaning. The Lord himself applies this psalm-prophecy to his crucifixion and resurrection, and subsequent coronation. It is found in the parable of the wicked husbandman (Matt.22), in substance as follows: A certain lord let his vineyard out to certain husbandmen. When the season of the fruits drew near, he sent his servants to collect his fruits. The husbandman stoned the servants and cast them out. He sent others, and they were treated in the same shameful manner. He sent his son, saying, "They will reverence my son," but the wicked husbandman said, "This is the heir; let us kill him." Jesus asked the Jews what they thought the lord of the vineyard would do to those wicked husbandmen, and they answered, "He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons." Then Jesus said to them, "Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes?" Here he quotes the prophecy of David—our text—and makes the application as follows: "Therefore I say unto you, The

kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. And whosoever shall fall upon this stone shall be broken; but upon whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder." The application was not hard for the Jews to see, for "they perceived that he spake of them" and set about to kill him.

Briefly, this parable means that God let his vineyard in the Old Testament to the Jewish nation; they were unfaithful and did not yield the fruits of the vineyard. God sent his prophets one after another to the nation, and they persecuted them. Finally, God sent his Son out of heaven—"he came unto his own and his own received him not." They crucified the Son of God. And what did God do to them? Why, he took the kingdom from them, and destroyed them as a nation. They fell upon the stone and were broken; and the stone fell upon them and ground them to powder. *When the Jews committed the national crime of murdering the Son of God, they paid the national penalty—the death of the Jewish nation.* God took their kingdom from them forever, and gave it to a new nation—a spiritual nation. Peter refers to the same prophecy and applies it to the transfer of the kingdom from fleshly to spiritual Israel. (I Pet. 2:7-9) It proves beyond all doubt that David's language referred to the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, and the ushering in of the new dispensation of the gospel, the day of salvation, in which we may all "rejoice and be glad."

It was upon the first day of the week that the resurrection of Jesus Christ occurred; and it was upon the first day of the week that the New Dispensation was inaugurated. David's language, therefore, has a double significance. "This is the day which the Lord has made" cannot be separated from the first day of the week, the day of the Lord's resurrection, for it was a resurrection psalm. It is the Christian's day and "we will rejoice and be glad in it."

#### THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK

Some Seventh-Day Adventists deny that Jesus Christ arose from the dead on the first day of the week. A rather cunning but labored effort is being made to prove that

Christ arose on *the seventh day*, and not on the *first day* of the week.

First, they demand the verse that states in so many words that Jesus Christ arose from the dead *on the first day of the week*. Suppose it should be admitted that there is no such verse to be found? The objection would work both ways, for there is no verse which says he arose *on the seventh day*. Sauce for the goose is, at least, salad dressing for the gander!

Second, they make use of a prophetic statement of Daniel that he was "cut off in the middle of the week." Making prophetic weeks literal weeks, they have the crucifixion on Wednesday and the resurrection on Saturday. But here is their inconsistency: Everywhere else a day in prophecy, with Adventists, stands for a *year* and a week in prophecy stands for *seven years*. Why not here? The ministry of Christ was three and one half years in length. He was therefore, "cut off in the middle of the week," his ministry being *one half* of the prophetic week of seven years. Their own interpretation of prophetic days, weeks and years, nullifies the argument from Daniel's prophecy, to say nothing of its palpable falsity in view of those passages showing the crucifixion and resurrection days.

But the effort is a tacit admission that the day upon which Christ arose from the dead settles the sabbath question. Therefore, if the contention that Christ arose on Saturday, the seventh day, is refuted, sabbath keepers should surrender the issue.

Fortunately the twenty-fourth chapter of Luke contains an inspired chart of days definitely fixing, without speculation, the day of the Lord's resurrection, which completely destroys the sabbath chart and shows it to be only a lot of erroneous figuring. Hear the following from the chapter named:

Luke 24:1: "Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre."

Verse 13: "And, behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus."

Verse 20, 21: "Our rulers delivered him to be condemned



to death, and have crucified him . . . and besides all this, today is the third day since these things were done."

Verse 46: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day."

Anybody can see that the "first day of the week," the "same day" and the "third day" in these four passages were *one and the same day*. So the *third* day of this chapter was the *first* day of the week. Then on what day did Jesus arise from the dead? Let Luke settle it. Verse 46: "It behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead *the third day*."

We need not go outside the twenty-fourth chapter of Luke to refute the figures of the sabbath chart. The issue turns on the third day. The four verses from the twenty-fourth chapter of Luke (verses 1, 13, 21 and 46) fix the first day of the week so unequivocally as the day of Christ's resurrection that to deny is to deny the inspired record.

We will not here discuss the crucifixion day, as that would be but a side issue. Whatever the method or manner of computing time, Jesus arose the third day after his crucifixion; and the third day after his crucifixion was the first day of the week. All the charts and figures that men may jumble together cannot offset these plain statements of scripture. He arose on the first day of the week.

#### THE FIRST DAY VERSUS THE SEVENTH DAY—A PARALLEL

The summary presented to you here in this chart was prepared to use in a discussion with the Seventh-Day Adventists in California. The Adventists backed off from their own challenges, as they usually do when they cannot select an opponent from a denomination, or the Christian Church (neither of which can meet them), and the discussion was not held. I present this chart to you as a concise summary of the day question.

If any be confused on the word "Sunday," remember that the terms "Saturday" and "Sunday" are both calendar words and do not affect the Bible issue. We are interested only in what the New Testament says about "the first day of the week" and the worship required of Christians on that day.

WHAT THE BIBLE SAYS  
ABOUT THE SEVENTH  
DAY

1. That the covenant which included the sabbath commandment was made with Israel only. (Ex. 20:2 Deut. 5:15)

2. That Israel was commanded to keep the Sabbath because they had been delivered from the serfdom of Egypt. (Deut. 5:15).

3. That in giving the sabbath, God used the same day upon which he had rested, or ceased the work of creation. (Gen. 2:3; Ex. 20:8-11; Ex. 31:17.)

4. That the sabbath was not given, or made known, until the giving of the law at Mount Sinai. (Neh. 9:13, 14; Ezek. 20:10-12)

5. That the sabbath was a sign between God and the children of Israel (Ex. 31:17; Ezek. 20:12, 20). (Note: If all nations were commanded to keep the sabbath, how could it have been a sign between God and one nation?)

6. That the old covenant made with Israel when they came out of Egypt, which included the Ten Commandments (I Kings 8:9, 21), would be abrogated (Jer. 31:31) and superceded by the new covenant. (Heb. 8:6-13, 10:9)

7. That the law which was "written and engraven on tables of stone" was done away in Christ. (2 Cor. 3:6-14)

8. That the law of "the hand-writing of ordinances" was "nail-

WHAT THE BIBLE SAYS  
ABOUT THE FIRST  
DAY

1. That Jesus Christ arose from the dead on the first day of the week. (Mark 16:1-9)

2. That on the first day of the week he was thus declared to be the Son of God. (Rom. 1:4)

3. That he met with his disciples repeatedly on the first day of the week between his resurrection and his ascension. (John 20:1, 19, 26)

4. Pentecost came on the first day of the week. (Lev. 23:15) Hence all the events of the second chapter of Acts—the birthday of the church—took place on the first day of the week. (Acts 2:1)

5. That the Holy Spirit imbued the apostles on the first day of the week and began his mission of conversion. (Acts 2:1-4).

6. That the first gospel sermon proclaiming Jesus as the Son of God was preached on the first day of the week. (Acts 2:22-36).

7. That three thousand souls—the firstfruits of the gospel harvest (Lev. 23:17)—were added to the church which began on that Pentecost—the first day of the week. (Acts 2:41, 47)

ed to the cross," and the sabbath, therefore, no longer binding upon even the Jews themselves. (Col. 2:14-16).

9. That Hosea, the prophet, declared the sabbath, with all other Jewish observances, would cease when the Gentiles should become the people of God. (Hos. 2:11, 23)

10. That the apostle Paul declared the Sabbath with all other Jewish observances, did cease at the cross, and that we should let no man judge us respecting them. (Col. 2:14-16)

11. That Christians are expressly said to be delivered from the law containing the Ten Commandments. (Rom. 7:4, 6, 7)

12. That those who would be justified by the law given at Sinai are severed from Christ and fallen from grace. (Gal. 4:24-31; chapter 5:1, 4)

8. That the church assembled on the first day of the week to break bread—to observe the Lord's Supper and other items of New Testament worship. (Acts 20:7; Acts 2:42; 1 Cor. 16:2; 1 Cor. 11:23, 33; Heb. 10:25)

9. That in the New Testament we have the following new things: (1) a new covenant; (2) a new institution—the church; (3) a new set of ordinances—commandments (1 Cor. 11:2; 1 Cor. 14:37); (4) a new feast—the Lord's Supper; (5) a new day—the first day of the week; (6) a new word to express the new day—(Kuriakos,) "Lord's day," a word which was never used before. (Rev. 1:10)

Yet in the face of all these New Testament facts, Adventist preachers will cling to the seventh day sabbath and seek to bind its observance upon the Christian world.

#### LET US REJOICE AND BE GLAD

We have shown unmistakably that Christians have a new law, the gospel; and a new feast, the Lord's Supper; and a new day, the first day of the week; and a new hope, the hope of the resurrection from the dead. So we have come to the climax of David's psalm, "This is the day which the Lord hath made. We will rejoice and be glad in it."

If there is such a thing as immortality, all normal people should be interested in the subject. If such blessings as everlasting life in an eternal home of the soul "where

"changes never come" can be procured, all intelligent beings should seek them.

The Bible teaches that such blessings will be the reward of the redeemed. The Old Testament teaches it. From the beginning there are hints of immortality, or life beyond the grave. The first indication is in the fact that man is made in the image of God. Then, what do you imagine were the sensations of Adam and Eve when they looked upon a dead son?—the first death that had ever occurred. Or what must have been the questions in the minds of patriarchs when Enoch was translated?—God thus revealing in his mysterious way that there is another life. Then later, when Elijah moved out from among the sons of the prophets and disappeared in a flight, the swiftness of which was greater than light? Those who witnessed it, and knew of it, must have felt that man shall live on.

Job believed in immortality. "If a man die shall he live again?" He looked forward to the time when his "warfare" should "cease," and for his "release" to come. Thus the patriarch Job and the faithful of his day had an uncertain belief in immortality. They lacked only the demonstration of the resurrection of Christ to establish the fact. Compare the faith of Paul. Before King Agrippa he said: "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" Job believed it, but did not have the demonstration. Paul believed it and had the demonstration.

Man is immortal. There is scientific evidence, suggested by the fact that bodily changes do not effect changes in personality. The body undergoes a complete change every few years. But the personality remains unchanged.

There is also the philosophical argument in favor of immortality. The capacity of the mind for development. The mind of a man is far superior to his body. If man is not immortal his creation was but a work begun and never finished.

Science and philosophy have arguments in favor of immortality, but the Bible *says the word*. "But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality

to light through the gospel." (2 Tim. 1:10)

Death, after all, is just God's way of calling his children home. So when the pale horse and his rider cross the threshold of our earthly homes and waft our loved ones away, through mists of tears we envision the rainbow of hope and shout in triumph, "Jesus saves! Jesus saves!"

It is hope that pierces the gloom of the tomb. The shadows of death's dark night turn into the dawn of life's bright morning, in the land where we will never grow old. It is the Lord's doing. It is marvelous in our eyes. Let us rejoice and be glad in it.

## CHAPTER XXIII

## SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM

*(Delivered in the Municipal Auditorium, Riverside,  
Calif., January, 1930, to an Audience of Two  
Thousand People Stenographically  
Reported by Ruth McQueen.)*

By the providence of God we have come together this evening, to resume our investigation of the human system known as Seventh-Day Adventism. That we are justified in so doing all who are familiar with the activities of Seventh-Day Adventists in Southern California will agree. Every community is besieged with tabernacle meetings and the people are being harangued with cut-and-dried, stereotyped, parrot-like charges that "the pope changed the sabbath" and that "Sunday-keepers" have the "mark of the beast." We are here to answer the false assertions and to expose the false teaching of this system.

I have four indictments against Seventh-Day Adventism. First, the origin of Seventh-Day Adventism is human — not divine; second, it is a heresy founded on the visions of a woman—not upon the teaching of the Bible; third, its doctrines are Judaistic—not Christian; fourth, its Bible proof-texts are perverted—not based on the right division of the Word of God.

I. THE ORIGIN OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM  
IS HUMAN NOT DIVINE

In the early part of the 19th century Mr. William Miller made a chart of prophecy and claimed that the year 1843 would be the year of the Lord's return. The year 1843 came but Christ did not. Mr. Miller reviewed his figures and 1844 was the revised date. The year 1844 came, but Christ did not appear, and Mr. Miller stepped off the stage of date setting.

Mrs. Ellen G. White, a convert of William Miller's took

up the work of Miller, tried to repair his mistakes, added the sabbath feature, and named her party "Seventh-Day Adventist."

Mr. Miller was honest enough to admit his failure and quit. But Mrs. White said God's hand was in the failure. God purposely caused Mr. Miller to make a false prophecy. Hear her: "His hand covered a mistake in the reckoning of the prophetic periods. Those who were looking for their Lord did not discover this mistake, and the most learned men who opposed the time also failed to see it. God designed that his people should meet with a disappointment." (Page 99 of "Spiritual Gifts" in "Early Writings of Mrs. White.")

So God Almighty caused William Miller to make a false prophecy! In Deut. 18:21 we are told that "when a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously." That is the divine test of a true prophet.

William Miller made a prophecy that Christ would come in 1843. He made that prophecy in the name of the Lord; that prophecy did not come to pass. Mrs. White had a vision which said that God purposely caused it to fail. But God says that when a prophet speaks in the name of the Lord, and the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that prophet is not a prophet of God. Therefore, according to Mrs. White's own admission, Mr. Miller was not a prophet of God. Neither is Mrs. White a prophetess of God by the same test. Seventh-Day Adventism originated with a false prophet and was revised and revamped by a false prophetess. It is therefore human—not divine.

## II. IT IS A HERESY FOUNDED ON THE VISIONS OF A WOMAN—NOT ON THE TEACHING OF THE BIBLE

Mrs. White claimed to be an inspired prophetess. Adventist preachers recognize her as an inspired prophetess.

I have here a book written by Mrs. White. It is called "The Great Controversy." The publishing house of Seventh-Day Adventists put this book out. Here is what the publishers say of her in the preface to the book: "We be-

lieve she has been empowered by a divine illumination to speak of some past events which have been brought to her attention, with a greater minuteness than is set forth in any existing records, and to read the future with more than human foresight." (Publisher's Preface, page (a) to "Great Controversy," by Mrs. E. G. White.)

There is the claim that Mrs. White was inspired; that she received divine illumination to write her books; that she could write with more minuteness than any divine writer before her ever did in any existing divine record; that she had "more than human foresight." But that is not the only thing said in this "preface" Here are Mrs. White's own words in regard to her book:

"Yet the fact that God has revealed his will to men through his word has not rendered needless the continued presence and guiding of the Holy Spirit. On the contrary the Spirit was promised by our Savior to open the word to his servants, to illuminate and apply its teachings." (Author's Preface, page (d) to "Great Controversy," by Mrs. E. G. White.) God gave his word but had to illuminate Mrs. White to tell us what it means! How much better is that than the Roman Catholic priest to interpret the scriptures to his laity? But hear more:

"As the Spirit of God has opened to my mind the great truths of his word, and the scenes of the past and the future. I have been bidden to make known to others what has thus been revealed." (Author's Preface, page (g), "Great Controversy.")

Mrs. White, the writer of "The Great Controversy" and author of Seventh-Day Adventism, received the "illumination of the Holy Spirit" to write her books! That is her own claim of inspiration. It is the claim that her writings are not only equal, but superior to the writings of the apostles of Christ, for she has had later revelations which they did not have. And then, perchance, God's hand may have covered some of the "mistakes" of the apostles like he did Wm. Miller's! And how do the followers of Mrs. White know that she, too, like Mr. Miller, has not made the same mistakes? Her admissions destroy the certainty



and reliability of anything she may teach. But Adventist preachers accept Mrs. White's writings as inspired, even above the New Testament itself. This is no misrepresentation. It is true of Mormons and impostor Joseph Smith; it is true of Christian Scientists and Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy; it is true of Adventists and Ellen G. White. Friends, will you be so gullible as to be thus led away from the authority of the New Testament by the visions and dreams and so called revelations of these mentally unbalanced religious fanatics?

But these Adventists are not so bold and brave as they lead people to believe that they are. They will make good their repeated challenges to debate only when they may select their opponent (one they know they can handle) and when all conditions are one-sided in their favor.

One D. M. Canright was an Adventist debater for twenty-eight years. He renounced Seventh Day Adventism and later engaged a former associate in debate at Healdsburg, California, on the following proposition: "Resolved that the visions of Mrs. E. G. White are the revelations of God." Now, a Seventh Day Adventist affirmed that proposition in debate. Just like the Mormons affirm that impostor Joe Smith was a prophet of God! God's later prophets do not seem to agree on whose "revelations" shall be accepted!

But I have here in my hand another book. It is the "Life of Mrs. E. G. White" by D. M. Canright. He ought to know the sister, as he tried to defend her for twenty-eight years. But when he renounced their deceptive system he wrote several books and pamphlets exposing every phase of the error of their doctrine and organization. That is what I would call "inside information"! On page 40, Mr. Canright quotes from Mr. Erwin's tract on "The Mark of the Beast." Mr. Erwin is an Adventist authority. Here is the statement:

"It is from the standpoint of the light that has come through the Spirit of Prophecy (Mrs. White's writings) that the question will be considered, believing as we do that the Spirit of Prophecy (Mrs. White's works) is the only infallible interpreter of Bible principles."

This Mr. Erwin, a man who for many years was presi-

dent of the General Conference of Seventh Day Adventists, wrote it with his own pen—that Mrs. White's writings are the only infallible interpreter of the Bible! Yet some people consider them smart men! No smart man can be that weak.

But in her book, "The Early Writings of Mrs. White," she "reveals" her many "visions." She claims that she was caught up into heaven, where she saw these visions. Here is a sample:

"In the holiest I saw an ark—in the ark was the golden pot of manna, Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of stone which folded together like a book. Jesus opened them and I saw the ten commandments written on them with the finger of God—the holy sabbath looked glorious—a halo of glory was all around it. I saw that the sabbath was not nailed to the cross." (Early Writings of Mrs. White, page 26.)

Now, there is something, friends. Mrs. White could not find her sabbath doctrine in the Bible, so she takes a trip to heaven to get it. Just reading the Bible it looked so much like the sabbath was nailed to the cross, that she had to get a vision to tell her that Paul was wrong in Col. 2:14-16, and that it was not nailed to the cross! Her very visions are a positive admission that the Bible does not teach Seventh-Day Adventism, and is even an admission that the Bible teaches against it. It takes "revelations" in addition to the Bible to prove the doctrines of these people, who would impress people that they believe the Bible—in reality they do not believe it, and it is not even their standard of authority.

But regarding Mrs. White's vision, which she says she had in heaven, and which God told her to come back to the earth and tell. Is it not strange that God would not let Paul tell his vision to people in this world (2 Cor. 12) but commanded Mrs. White to tell hers? Wonder why that is? Maybe, God, knowing that Mrs. White was a woman, knew she would tell it anyhow! At any rate, it does seem even stranger still, that Mrs. White would be allowed by the same God that guided Paul to deny what Paul said about the sabbath, and also that such visions would be "lawful" to tell. Paul said they were "unlawful." Mrs. White said God command-

ed her to tell it. Paul said that the sabbath was nailed to the cross, and God had Mrs. White to come back and say that it was not! Some revelations, friends!

Ladies and gentlemen, Seventh Day Adventism is based on the authoritative writings of this woman (who was hit in the head with a brick shortly before she began to have these visions; I think it was "stars" she saw instead of visions, and she never got over it) and not on the Word of God. She is their prophetess, even now. She claimed that the "spirit of prophecy" is yet in the church, and it was she—both the spirit and the prophecy! Though she is dead, her word is the law of Seventh Day Adventists throughout the world today.

Hear Paul: "I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." (1 Tim. 2:12-14) It was God's will that woman should not hold places of authority nor to exercise authority in religion. God knew why—and the statement reaches back to the beginning and makes it fundamental, and therefore not a mere temporary or local thing that the apostle referred to. Woman has a sphere, but it is not such as Mrs. White, nor any of these women preachers and teachers of today, have arrogated unto themselves. The church of Jesus Christ will always be better off if the women will be satisfied with the divine sphere that divinity has given them and cease the usurping of religious authority.

God has given to woman a different sphere. The apostles were all men; the evangelists of the New Testament were all men. There was not a woman evangelist in the New Testament. God ordained that his revelation should be given to the world through men; he inspired twelve men, made them apostles, set them in the church, and through them imparted to us the knowledge of his will. But Mrs. E. G. White is the human female pope of the Seventh Day Adventist church. Her writings are the absolute authority of that cult.

Any system in religion that is based upon the authority

of a woman is disqualified fundamentally on the first count—"for Adam was first formed then Eve," and "I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence," says Paul. If Mrs. White had stayed at home in her divine sphere she could have contributed a better service to the world.

I charge that Seventh Day Adventism is founded on the visions of a woman and not on the teachings of the Bible—I have proved it.

### III. ITS DOCTRINES ARE JUDAISTIC NOT CHRISTIAN

*First: Their attitude toward the law is Judaistic.*

I call your attention to Gal. 4:22-26. "For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not; for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman will not be heir with the son of the freewoman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free. Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage."

(1) There were two women—Hagar and Sarah. Hagar the handmaid of Abraham was the bondwoman; Sarah the wife of Abraham, was the freewoman. (2) There were two sons; Ishmael, the son of Abraham by Hagar, the bondwoman; Isaac, the son of Abraham by Sarah, his wife, the

freewoman. (3) There were two places; Sinai in Arabia and Jerusalem, in Judea. (4) There were two covenants: the old covenant delivered at Sinai in the wilderness, and the new covenant, promulgated from Jerusalem on Pentecost.

There can be no mistake about the meaning of this allegory. "For these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children."

Then, in this allegory, Hagar, the bondwoman is the old covenant. Sarah the freewoman is the new covenant. *Ishmael*, the son of *Hagar*, represents the children of the old covenant—those who keep the old covenant. Isaac, the son of Sarah, represents the children of the new covenant—those who keep the new covenant. What disposition shall we make of the two women and their sons? Paul says, "Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman." Who is the son of Hagar? One of them has been lecturing here on this platform for about six weeks. I am doing what Paul said, "casting him out," with his Judaistic doctrines. The fact is, my friends, these people who keep the old covenant are still living under Judaism. They have not come into the freedom of Jesus Christ and the New Testament.

We are not justified by the law. "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." (Gal. 5:4)

We are dead to the law. "Wherefore, my brethren, ye are also become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring fruit unto God." (Rom. 7:4.)

We are delivered from the law. "But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter. What shall we say then? Is the law

sin ? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law said, Thou shalt not covet." That unmistakably identifies it as the ten commandments. And what does Paul say about this law? Hear him: "But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." Then from what law are we delivered? The law that says, "Thou shalt not covet"—the Decalogue.

This law—the ten commandments—was done away in Christ. Paul virtually tells us in so many words that the ten commandments were taken out of the way. Hear him in 2 Cor. 3:6-8: "Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance ;; *which was to be done away*, how shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious?" Hear verse 11: "For if that which *is done away* was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious. Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech "

Verse 12: "And not as Moses, which put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of *that which is abolished*; but their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the old testament; which veil *is done away in Christ*."

Paul definitely identifies the thing that was done away in Christ and abolished. It was the law delivered to the children of Israel when they could not *behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance*. It was that covenant which was written and engraven on the tables of stone—the ten commandments. It was at Sinai that Moses' face shone so they could not look upon it. It was there that the ten commandments were "written and engraven" on stones.

It is this covenant that Paul says was "done away in Christ."

But Seventh Day Adventists say this refers to the stones set up by Joshua when the people crossed over the Jordan, and not to the ten commandments. The record of it is in Deut. 27:2-3: "And it shall be on the day when ye shall pass over Jordan unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, that thou shalt write upon them all the words of this law, when thou art passed over, that thou mayest go in unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, a land that floweth with milk and honey; as the Lord God of thy fathers hath promised thee." Now they insist that "the ministration of death written and engraven in stones" were those stones set up at the Jordan, and not the ten commandments at all.

But Paul tells us that they were the tables of stone delivered *when Moses' face shone* so that the people could not look upon his face. Moses was not there when Israel crossed the Jordan and Joshua erected the plastered stones! Moses was dead when Israel crossed over the Jordan! The tables of stone delivered at Sinai *when Moses' face shone*, are the ones to which Paul refers.

Hear Exodus 34:30: "It came to pass, when Moses came down from Mount Sinai with the two tables of testimony in Moses' hand, when he came down from the mount, that Moses wist not that *the skin of his face shone* while he talked with him. And when Aaron and all the children of Israel saw Moses, behold, the skin of his face shone; and they were afraid to come nigh him." Paul said the tables of stone which were done away in Christ were the ones that were delivered *when Moses' face shone*. That identifies the ten commandments as the law that has been "done away in Christ." It settles the argument.

But you are gravely told that if the ten commandments are done away men can steal and kill, and do all the things the ten commandments prohibit. That does not follow.

California was once under the Mexican Constitution. Murder is prohibited by a statute in the Mexican Constitution. But California became dead to the Mexican Consti-

tution, delivered from it, and is no longer under the Mexican Constitution. Does it follow, therefore, that the people of California may with impunity commit murder because they are no longer under the Mexican Constitution? Hardly. Why? Because their allegiance to another Constitution forbids it.

When the American colonies declared their independence from England they were delivered from the law of England. There were many excellent principles in that old British law, but when our forefathers were delivered from the bondage of England, they were free from the whole British law. Does it follow that the people of the United States can do all things the British law prohibits? No. We have *another law* which inhibits and prohibits certain conduct on the part of our citizens. As citizens we are free to do anything that our law *allows* and *nothing* that it prohibits. If this law tells me that I shall not kill, then I shall not kill; not because the British law has a statute against murder, but because the law I am under prohibits murder.

The Decalogue represented the old Constitution — the whole of the law of Moses. When the law was abrogated the old system was abolished, ten commandments and all. Jesus Christ gave us a New Covenant. It is not a question of what *was* in the *old* but a question of what *is* in the *new*.

Adventists make a distinction between the "law of Moses" and "the law of God." With them the ten commandments are "the law of God" and the "ceremonial law" is the law of Moses.

They agree that the law of Moses was done away but the ten commandments, they say, are not the law of Moses—the ten commandments are the *law of God*. Let us read what the Divine Record says on this point.

I introduce a series of passages showing what God gave, and what Moses gave. What is in God's law on one hand and what is in Moses' law on the other.

The first reference is Ezra 7:6: "This Ezra went up from Babylon; and he was a ready scribe in the law of Moses, which the Lord God of Israel had given." There we find that *God gave* "the law of Moses." Then what did



Moses give? (II Chronicles 34:14:) "And when they brought out the money that was brought into the house of the Lord, Hilkiah the priest found a book of the law of the Lord given by Moses." Here we find that Moses gave "the law of God." That shows the law of God and the law of Moses are one and the same thing, thus the distinction made by Seventh Day Adventist preachers that the ten commandments are "the law of God," and that the other part of the Old Testament is the "law of Moses," is shown to be a "distinction without a difference."

Let us see what was in the law of God and what was in the law of Moses. Read with me II Chronicles 31:4: "He appointed also the king's portion of his substance for the burnt offerings, to wit, for the morning and evening burnt offerings, and the burnt offerings for the sabbaths, and for the new moons, and for the set feasts, as it is written in the law of the Lord." There is nothing in the ten commandments about burnt offerings. Adventists tell us that the ten commandments constitute the law of God. Nothing else is the law of God They tell us that the "law of Moses" is the ceremonial law, containing all of those ordinances of feasts, new moons, etc. But this verse tells us that those things were in the *law of the Lord*.

What, then, is the law of Moses? Read Mk. 7:10: "For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother." That is one of the ten commandments, but Mark says that Moses said, "Honour thy father and thy mother." Therefore, the ten commandments are the law of Moses.

I am showing you that there is no scriptural distinction between the law of Moses and the law of God. The law God gave by Moses is called Moses' law and God's law interchangeably.

Another verse, Luke 2:22, 23, read with me: "And when the days of her purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord. (As it is written in the law of the Lord, every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord.)" Nothing in the ten commandments like that; but that is "written in the law of the Lord." So the "law

of Moses" is here called "the law of the Lord." Again, Verse 24: "And to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, a pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons." Nothing in the ten commandments about turtledoves and pigeons, yet that "is said in the law of the Lord," So the law of Moses is also the law of the Lord. Again, Verse 27: "And he came by the Spirit into the temple: and when the parents brought in the child Jesus to do for him after the custom of the law." Here it is call *the law*. Now, Verse 39: "And when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth." In that reading, my friends, we have "the law"—"the law of Moses"—"the law of the Lord"—all referring to the same thing.

Now turn with me to Matthew 22:35-40: "Then one of them, which was a lawyer, asked him a question, tempting him, and saying, Master, which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." The two commandments Jesus mentioned here are not in the ten commandments at all. But Jesus said they are the greatest in "*the law*." Now if there is a distinction to be made between "the law of the Lord" or "the law of God," and "the law of Moses," as Adventists assert, then Jesus named two commandments found in the law of Moses which are *greater* than the law of God. And since Adventists admit that "the law of Moses" has been taken away, by their own doctrine the *greatest* commandments in the law have been taken away and the *lesser* remain.

But Jesus said, "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." Seventh Day Adventist preachers have the thing on which the law hangs taken away, and leave the law hanging on nothing!

Adventist preachers are mistaken when they tell you that the ten commandments are "the law of God" and the rest of the Old Testament is "the law of Moses." The law

of Moses and the law of God refer to the same system, and are used interchangeably.

It was this first covenant—the entire old covenant—that was taken away. "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their inequities will I remember no more. In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." (Heb. 8:6-13.) This is a quotation from Jeremiah 31:31. The prophet foretold that God would make a new covenant *not like the covenant* he made with the children of Israel *when he brought them out of Egypt*.

Seventh Day Adventist preachers say that this covenant was "the law of Moses" and *not* the ten commandments. Let us read the Bible. (I Kings 8:9:) "There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt" Now, Verse 21: "And I have set there a place for the ark, wherein is the covenant of the Lord, which he made

with our fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt."

1. The covenant which God made with Israel when He brought them out of Egypt was in the ark.

2. But there was nothing in the ark *save the ten commandments*.

3. Therefore, the ten commandments are the covenant that God made with the children of Israel when he brought them out of Egypt.

Now, what happened to that covenant? "For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt." The covenant that was annulled is the covenant that God made with Israel *when he brought them out of Egypt*. (1 Ki. 8:9, 21) It follows unquestionably that the ten commandments are the covenant that was done away. Seventh Day Adventists preachers are wrong.

I brand Seventh Day Adventism, therefore, as being Judaistic in its attitude toward the law and the gospel. They justify themselves by the law and are, therefore, severed from Christ.

*Second: Their attitude toward the eating of meats is Judaistic*

In order to show you just what they teach on the question of meats, I will quote from Mrs. White, their prophetess:

"You have used the fat of animals, which God in his word expressly forbids." (Testimonies To the Church, Vol. 2, Page 61.) "Cheese should never be introduced into the stomach." (Page 68.) "It is just as much sin to violate the laws of our being as to break one of the Ten Commandments." (Page 70.) "The use of swine's flesh is contrary to his express commandments." (Page 96.)

Mrs. White says that it is just as grave a sin to violate the

laws that regulate our diet as it is to break one of the ten commandments. She says the eating of swine's flesh or pork is contrary to his express commandments. Therefore, Mrs. White teaches, word for word, that to eat a piece of bacon is as sinful in the sight of God as the act of adultery. That is Judaism gone to seed!

Romans 14 ought to put the meat question to rest. Begin with Verse 1: "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him." Some Christians in Paul's day had just come out of Judaism. They were "weak in the faith" regarding the "eating of meats" forbidden in the law of Moses. One believes that he may eat *all things* but another, who is weak, eateth herbs—the vegetarian. Paul said the one who "eateth not" (meats) should not judge the one who "eateth" (meats).

Again: "He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord doth he not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks." (Verse 6.) Now hear the conclusion of his argument in Verse 14: "I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself: but to him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean."

How different is the teaching of Paul from the lectures of Mr. Knox in this auditorium! When you hear a Seventh Day Adventist you would think that "the kingdom of God" consists "in meats and drinks." But Paul says, "let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him." The man who thinks he cannot eat of a piece of pork, "for conscience sake" is weak in the faith — says Paul.

I Cor. 10:25: "Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no question for conscience sake." There the

Apostle Paul settles, in a final word, the meat question. Again, "If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye be disposed to go; whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no question for conscience sake" (I Cor. 10:27.) So, friends, you have Paul, the inspired apostle, versus Mr. Knox, the great astronomer and dietetician of Riverside! Take your choice. I choose Paul.

*Third: Their teaching on the sabbath is Judaistic*

In Col. 2:16: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days." Note these things of the law — meats, drinks, sabbath days, holy days, new moons, all characteristic of Judaism. Paul lists them all together, and classes the observance of the sabbath with other features of Judaism. Paul commands that no man shall judge another by these ordinances of the law—the sabbath included.

*Fourth: Their attitude toward the tithing system is Judaistic*

We would be far from saying anything to encourage or excuse penurious giving on the part of Christians. There is more said on the subject of giving in the New Testament than of faith, repentance, or baptism. Thirteen of the twenty-nine parables of Christ are financial parables and turn on a financial pivot. Whole chapters in the epistles to the churches are devoted to the subject of giving. But it is a noteworthy fact that the apostles did not try to emphasize the duty of giving by preaching on tithing.

The method of reasoning employed to make tithing a part of the Christian system is similar to the effort of the Methodists to prove infant membership based on the covenant of circumcision, and likewise parallel with the attempt of the "digressives" to bring over the music of David and the Jews into the worship of the New Testament.

The chief argument seems to be based on Paul's statement that Christ is priest after the order of Melchizedek, to whom Abraham paid tithes. The drift of the argument is: Christ is priest after the order of Melchizedek; Abraham paid tithes to Melchizedek; therefore, Christians should pay tithes to Christ. The reasoning is fallacious and

the conclusion is not of logical sequence. Christ is priest after the order of Melchizedek only in the particular cited by the writer of Hebrews—that is, "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually" The meaning plainly is that, like Melchizedek, Christ did not come of priestly lineage, having neither predecessor nor successor in priesthood — none before him and none after him—but "abideth a priest continually." The reference to tithing in this passage was only to emphasize the greatness of Melchizedek, "to whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all." So great was Melchizedek, the king of Salem, that even so eminent a personage as Abraham paid him tithes.

The careful reader can see that Christ is priest after the order of Melchizedek because he is priest forever. "As he saith also in another place, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek." (Heb. 5:6.) An argument on tithing based on this passage is too far-fetched to even be interesting.

Another instance of poor exegesis is that Paul commands us to "walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham," and we are told that one of the "steps" of Abraham's faith was tithing! May we not ask what the other "steps" were? Tithing is not all Abraham did. What about the offering of Isaac on the altar, sacrifices, and circumcision? Shall we walk in these steps also? The plain truth is that Paul did not command us to walk in Abraham's steps, but to walk in the steps of Abraham's faith. To walk in Abraham's steps would require the doing of all that Abraham did; but to walk in the steps of Abraham's faith is simply to be guided and actuated by that same lofty principle of unhesitating faith in doing all that God commands us. "By faith Abraham—obeyed." Abrahamic faith is faith that obeys. Adventists would have us think that it is tithing!

Still it is urged that tithing was practiced many centuries before the law of Moses was given; hence, not merely a part of the old law. But the same is true of offerings,

sacrifices, and circumcision.

In the second Corinthian letter Paul devotes two consecutive chapters to the subject of giving. He talks in terms of "abounding in the grace of giving;" "readiness to will;" "a willing mind;" "it is acceptable according as a man hath;" and "as God hath prospered"—all these and more, yet not a word of tithing. Thus the principles of Christian giving as set forth by Paul are summed up in the charge:

"As a man purposeth in his own heart, so let him give."

Paul might have simply commanded the Corinthians to tithe and disposed of the question in one word. Instead, he uses two entire chapters teaching Christians how to give.

Tithing belongs to the letter and legalism of the old system and not to the spirit and freedom of the new. The new is better, and it is not tithing or tax, but voluntary, liberal, cheerful giving; and God will judge the giver.

I have shown that their doctrine of the law is Judaistic; that their attitude toward meats is Judaistic; that the observance of the sabbath is Judaistic and the system of tithing, which they bind on their members, is Judaistic. Therefore, I have proved that the whole system of Seventh Day Adventism is Judaistic. They are Judaistic in everything distinctive of Seventh Day Adventism. The only things about Seventh Day Adventism that are not Judaistic are things they hold in common with other people. There is not a single thing characteristic of Seventh Day Adventism that is not Judaistic. It is a Judaistic system from A to Z. Show me one thing in their doctrine that is not Judaistic and I will show you that other people teach it.

#### IV. ITS BIBLE PROOF-TEXTS ARE PERVERTED— NOT BASED ON THE RIGHT DIVISION OF THE WORD OF GOD

Seventh Day Adventist preachers use many Bible texts. Rather, they *misuse* many Bible texts. Their interpretations are forced, their sole effort being to read into every passage the keeping of the sabbath. Some examples of their application of certain scriptures will sustain this charge.

(1) The Law and the Sabbath.

Matt. 5:17: "Think not that I am come to destroy the



law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill; for verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled."

Seventh Day Adventists often quote this passage to prove that "the law" has not been done away, of course, in order that they may keep the sabbath. The text does not say the law *shall not pass away*. It says not one jot or tittle would pass from the law "till all be fulfilled."

The word "till" limits to a certain time. Paul said the law was added to the Abrahamic promise "till" Christ should come. (Gal. 3:19.) That limits the duration of the law till the coming of Christ. So Matt. 5:19 says, "till all be fulfilled." Luke 24:44 tells us *when* it was *fulfilled*—when Christ was crucified. There the law, having been *fulfilled*, ended.

## (2) A Perpetual Sabbath.

Ex. 31:16: "Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath, to observe the sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant."

This is a favorite text with Adventist preachers. If the sabbath is perpetual, can it be done away? If the sabbath is done away, then is it "perpetual"?

Let them answer their own question on another passage: "And when Aaron lighteth the lamps at even, he shall burn incense upon it, a perpetual incense before the Lord throughout your generations." (Ex. 30:8.) Seventh Day Adventists say that the burning of incense belongs to the law of Moses, which has been taken out of the way. But the text says *perpetual* incense. Let us substitute the word incense for sabbath in their question: "If incense is perpetual, can it be done away? If incense is done away, is it perpetual?" And we add: if perpetual incense can cease, why can a perpetual sabbath not cease also? Then what does "perpetual" mean? Why, it is qualified by this phrase, "throughout your generations." It was perpetual through the generations of Israel as the people of God. The sabbath must be kept and incense offered without suspension throughout the dispensation of the law and the regal generations of Israel. Adventists must accept this fact or else

condemn themselves for annulling "perpetual" incense and sacrifices.

### (3) Christ and the Sabbath.

Luke 13:10: "And he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the sabbath." Adventists ask: If the sabbath has been done away, why did Christ and his disciples keep it? Again let them answer their own question on another passage What is "sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." Christ and his disciples kept the passover. "Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus saying unto him, where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover? And He said, Go into the city to such a man, and say unto him, The Master saith, My time is at hand; I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples." (Matt. 26:17-18.) Now let us substitute passover for sabbath and hand their question back. Here it is: If the passover has been done away, why did Christ and his disciples keep it?

Mr. H. M. S. Richards delivered a sermon at the Adventist tabernacle in Alhambra on "Why I Keep The Sabbath." He said, "I keep the sabbath because Jesus Christ kept it." Then, why does he not keep the passover? Jesus Christ also kept the passover. The argument is not worth anything or else Adventists are inconsistent.

Why did Jesus keep the sabbath? Here is the answer: "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman made under the law." (Gal. 4:4.) During the lifetime of Jesus Christ, the law was still in force; therefore he was subject to the law and obligated to keep the sabbath, passover, and all the customs of the law. It is inconsistent for an Adventist to say, "Christ kept the sabbath; therefore, I will keep it," and refuse to keep the passover.

### (4) Man and the Sabbath.

Mk. 2:27-28: "And he said unto them, The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath: Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath."

Adventists use this text to prove that the sabbath is binding on all mankind. But Jesus made the statement to

show that man is superior to the sabbath and his needs greater. "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath." Adventists would have you think that man was made for the sabbath! They have reversed things, and would have the interests of man yield to the day, instead of the day yield to the man. Their view even enslaves Jesus Christ to the sabbath to the extent that the Son of God could not himself suspend it, or even take it out of the way, as he did the law.

Even the life of a sheep was superior to sabbath observance. "What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out? How much then is a man better than a sheep?" (Matt. 12:11.) Here is a clash between the life of a sheep and the keeping of the sabbath. One must yield—the lesser to the greater. The sabbath yielded; therefore, it was of less importance than the life of a sheep.

Compare this with the first commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." This command does not even yield to the life of a man.

The life of a sheep is greater than the fourth commandment (the sabbath.) But the life of a man is less than the first commandment to worship God only. Therefore, the first commandment is as much superior to the fourth commandment as the life of a man is superior to the life of a sheep.

1. Man is superior to the fourth commandment—the sabbath.

2. Man is inferior to the first commandment—to worship God.

3. Therefore, the first commandment is greater than the fourth commandment.

But again:

1. The life of a sheep was greater than the sabbath.

2. The life of a man is greater than a sheep.

3. Therefore, the needs of man are as much greater than the sabbath as man is greater than the sheep.

Thus Jesus taught the Jews that the rigid observance of

the sabbath was passing—yielding to man for whom it was made. And the Son of man being Lord of the sabbath had the power to take it away.

(5) The Flight on the Sabbath.

Matt. 24:19-20: "And woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days! But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath day."

Adventists urge that Jesus taught rigid observance of the sabbath would be in force even after his death. In warning his disciples concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, he said, "And pray that your flight be not on the sabbath."

Do Adventists really think Jesus meant that it would be a violation of the sabbath for the disciples to flee for their lives? Had the Lord not already taught them that they could even save the life of a sheep on the sabbath? Yet they have Jesus saying that they could not flee on the sabbath to save their own lives!

Jesus knew that the gates of the city would be closed on the sabbath, and in the sudden destruction of the city the people would be trapped on the inside.

Note the warning in verses 19-20:

1. "Woe unto them that are with child"—their flight would be impeded by heaviness.

2. "And to them that give suck in those days"—mothers with nursing babes to rescue would be at obvious disadvantage.

3. "Pray that your flight be not in the winter"—is the winter a holy season? Or, does it not refer to the fact that the flight would be hindered by cold and suffering?

4. "Neither on the sabbath day"—was it because it would violate the sabbath to flee? Such is absurd. It was because Jewish authorities still rigidly enforcing the sabbath law would have all exits closed and the flight would be thwarted.

It was hindrances to the flight that Jesus had in mind—the safety of the people—not the keeping of the sabbath.

## (6) Paul and the Sabbath.

Acts 18:4: "And he reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks."

Adventists have counted 84 sabbaths that Paul kept during his stay in Ephesus, as "he went into the synagogue every sabbath day." We need only to remind them that after *three* sabbath days, the Jews being angry at his preaching put him out of their synagogue, and Paul said, "Lo, I will go unto the Gentiles." So the number dwindles down from 84 to 3. Paul was not such a good Sabbatarian after all!

Mr. Ellis, the Adventist preacher at Alhambra, came into our meeting house there on Monday night to discuss these matters with us. Had it been on Sunday, according to their argument, we could have charged him with Sunday-keeping—the mark of the beast! What a narrow escape he had!

For what purpose did Paul go into the synagogue? Evidently to teach the Jews the same things I am trying to teach these Adventists tonight—and they seem to be about as angry with me as the Jews were with Paul.

## (7) The Pope and the Sabbath—Did He Change It?

First: What do Adventists say?

' I read from the Early Writings of Mrs. White," page 26, from the "vision" in Heaven: "I saw that God had not changed the sabbath, for he never changes. But the pope had changed it from the seventh to the first day of the week, for he was to change times and laws." Again, under "Mark of the Beast" in "Early Writings," page 55, Mrs. White says: "The pope has changed the day of rest from the seventh day to the first day. He has thought to change the greatest commandment in the decalogue, and thus make himself equal with God, or even exalt himself above God. The whole nation has followed after the beast and every week they rob God of his holy time."

In the "Great Controversy," page 574, Mrs. White says: "The first public measure enforcing Sunday observance was the law enacted by Constantine ... as the papacy became firmly established, the work of Sunday exaltation was continued . . . Eusebius, a bishop, advanced the claim that

Christ had transferred the sabbath to Sunday."

Second: What does the pope say ?

He claims:

1. That the Roman Catholic Church is the only true church. Do Adventists believe it? No.

2. That Peter was the first pope of the Holy Catholic Church. Do Adventists believe it? No.

3. That the pope today is the lineal divine successor to the apostle Peter. Do Adventists believe it? No.

4. That the pope is infallible. Do Adventists believe it? No.

5. That the Catholic Church holds the keys to heaven. Do Adventists believe it ? No.

6. That all who are outside the Roman Catholic church are heretics. Do Adventists believe it? No.

7. That Protestants are indebted to the Catholics for the Bible. Do Adventists believe it? No.

8. That Roman Catholic priests have authority to absolve sins. Do Adventists believe it? No.

9. That the pope changed the sabbath to Sunday—and do the Adventists believe that? Why, yes, they say, "That's just what he did! And it's the mark of the beast!"

Adventists deny everything the pope claims except one! And they take his word for that!

Third: What does history say ?

(1) Barnabas—120 A. D. Two hundred years before the time Constantine is said to have changed the sabbath, in chapter 15 of the "Epistle of Barnabas", he says:

"Incense is a vain abomination unto me, and your new moons and sabbaths I cannot endure." Of the first day of the week, he says: "Wherefore we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus arose from the dead."

(2) Justin Martyr—born 114 A. D.—wrote A. D. 140. In his book, "First Apology," Vol. 2, page 116, he says: "But Sunday is the day on which we hold our common assembly, because it is the first day—and Jesus, our Saviour, on the same day arose from the dead."

That was written by Justin Martyr one hundred and

eighty years before the time Constantine is asserted to have changed the sabbath.

(3) Eusebius—324 A. D. In his Ecclesiastical History, page 112-113, this historian speaks of some Judaizers of his time as follows:

"With them the observance of the law was altogether necessary . . . They also observe the sabbath and other discipline of the Jews just like them, but on the other hand they celebrate the Lord's Day very much like us in the commemoration of his resurrection."

Thus we see that believers in Christ were observing Sunday in the second and third centuries, before the time of Constantine's so called "Sunday Law."

(4) Neander, Fisher, Mosheim, Schaff — the combined testimony of church historians—with one accord render the historical verdict against the charges of Adventist preachers that the "pope changed the sabbath."

Fourth: What does the Bible say?

Acts 20:7: "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them ready to depart on the morrow; and he continued his speech until midnight." But Adventists say that according to the circumstances, they did not "break bread" on the first day of the week. The text says that they came together for that purpose—and it was upon the first day not before, not after—but upon the *first day*, and it was to *break bread*. No informed honest man will deny that this first day of the week meeting was for the purpose of observing the Lord's Supper—"to break bread." If Adventists could prove (which they cannot) that circumstances show that they did not break bread on the first day of the week, it would only prove that they failed to do what they had "come together" to do.

Thus we have the word of God corroborated by authentic history, against the bare claims of the pope and Seventh Day Adventists on the so-called "change of the sabbath."

I have proved that the origin of Seventh Day Adventism is human—not divine; that it is a heresy founded upon the teachings of a woman and her perfidious claims of inspi-

ration—not on the teaching of the one and only inspired book—the Bible. That it is Judaistic in every distinctive principle that it teaches, Christian in none; that its proof-texts are perversions of Bible passages and not based on the right division of the word of God.

These charges have been made publicly in a plain and straightforward manner. They have been published in both the daily papers of this city. If I have misrepresented Seventh Day Adventism, let Mr. Knox, Mr. Richards, or any able representative of Adventism take the platform and show us our error. They have made the attack. We have merely come to the defense of the principles of New Testament teaching. If we have misrepresented them in anything whatsoever, let them point it out. Let us come together in joint discussion of these principles that the people may hear both sides at the same time. This is the fair proposition that we have been making to Seventh Day Adventist preachers of Southern California for several weeks. As yet we have had no response. I trust that we may.



CHAPTER XXIV  
THE MUSIC QUESTION—  
PRO AND CON

*This sermon was delivered under a large tent during the Wallace-Doran Meeting with the University and Walnut Street Church of Christ, Wichita, Kansas, August 27 to Sept. 10, 1933, to an audience of 1000 people. It was stenographically reported by Miss Crystal Norfleet just as delivered, and was published by G. K. Wallace, Minister of the University and Walnut Church.*

I am aware of your discomfort. A tent is a mighty hot canopy for a summer day. I shall deliver the sermon with as much dispatch as possible. We have a special theme, however, and it will require extra time.

We are here to study the important question, the live issue, of instrumental music in the worship. I propose to give you the gist of the argument *pro* and *con*—for and against—the use of instrumental music in the worship. I would much prefer to study the question with a representative of the music side. It would please me to engage in that kind of a study. It would doubtless please this congregation. I say this not by way of issuing any challenge, but merely to let you know our sentiments.

I. HISTORY OF INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC

Departures from the word of God have centered in three major things—Organization, Doctrine, and Worship. Departure in organization came first. It was a gradual development and resulted in the Roman Catholic Church. Departure in doctrine came second. It was also gradual and finally resulted in the pope's claims of infallibility and the right to change the laws of God. Then came departure in the realm of worship.

The first organ that was introduced into the worship of

any body of people claiming to be Christians was 670 years after Christ. It was introduced by Pope Vitalian I. It threatened division in the Catholic Church. They took it out to preserve the unity of the church. Eight hundred years after Christ the organ was re-introduced into the Catholic worship over some opposition. The Greek Catholic Church refused it and still reject it. They do not use it today.

Martin Luther rejected the use of the organ. He said? "The organ in the worship of God is an ensign of Baal." John Calvin, the originator of the Presbyterian Church, and author of the Calvinistic Creed, said of the organ in the worship: "It is no more suitable than the burning of incense, the lighting up of tapers or revival of the other shadows of the law. The Catholics foolishly borrowed it from the Jews."

When John Wesley, founder of Methodism, was asked about the use of the organ, he tersely said: "I have no objection to the organ in our chapels provided it is neither heard nor seen."

Adam Clark ranks among the most illustrious Bible commentators known to the world. He was a Methodist, contemporary with John Wesley. Concerning the organ in the worship, he said: "I am an old man and an old minister, and I here declare that I have never known instrumental music to be productive of any good in the worship of God, and have reason to believe that it has been productive of much evil. Music as a science I esteem and admire, but instruments of music in the house of God I abominate and abhor. This is the abuse of music, and I here register my protest against all such corruptions in the worship of that Infinite Spirit who requires his followers to worship him in spirit and in truth."

Charles H. Spurgeon was the greatest Baptist preacher that has ever been produced. He preached for twenty years in the Metropolitan Baptist Tabernacle of London, England, to 10,000 people every Sunday. The mechanical instrument of music never entered the tabernacle of Spurgeon. When asked why he did not use the organ in worship he gave 1

Cor. 14:15 as his answer: "I will pray with the spirit and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also," and remarked, "I would as soon pray to God with machinery as to sing to God with machinery."

The great restoration movement was launched on the plea: "Where the Bible speaks let us speak, and where the Bible is silent, let us be silent." That plea embodied the simple principle that nothing shall be introduced into the worship for which we do not have "a plain 'Thus saith the Lord.'" Those men sensed the fact that worship was just as important as doctrine. The purity of worship and doctrine must be equally preserved. Thus when the question of instrumental music in worship was put to Alexander Campbell, he made this pointed statement: "To all whose animal nature flags under the oppression of church service, I should think instrumental music would not only be a desideratum but an essential prerequisite to fire up their souls to even animal devotion. But to all spiritually minded Christians such aids would be as a cowbell in a concert."

The so-called Christian Church claims to occupy the same ground that was occupied by the Campbells, and spills tears of devotion over "the restoration plea." But the facts are that they have abandoned the principles of that plea. They have departed from it in the realm of worship, and have compromised it in the realm of doctrine. They adhere to it formally only in a few items of doctrine and are not sticklers for that. The Christian Church of today is out of sympathy with the restoration movement, and out of line with it in more items than it is in line with it.

Writing on instrumental music in worship in a tract called "What Shall We Do About The Organ," J. W. McGarvey said: "We cannot adopt the practice without abandoning the only ground upon which a restoration of New Testament Christianity can be accomplished" Everybody who knows anything about the history of the restoration plea knows the name of McGarvey.

For brilliance and scholarship, these men are unexcelled. I have given their statements not to settle the question, but

to give you some information that your preachers are not calculated to give you. You need to know these facts in your study of an issue which caused the first rift in the ranks of the restoration movement.

Hall L. Calhoun succeeded McGarvey in the College of Bible. He was identified with those who use the instruments of music and society organizations. He spent many precious years of his life opposing those practices within the Christian Church, but finally gave it up as a hopeless task, and today stands with the plain churches of Christ against all departure from the New Testament in work and worship.

## II. ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC

I shall now take up the arguments that are offered in favor of instrumental music in the worship and point out their fallacy.

1. It is said that instrumental music is a natural talent like speaking and singing and, therefore, ought to be dedicated to God; that God gave some the ability to play an instrument, why not use that ability for God? Why not use it in the worship as we do the ability to speak and sing?

The fallacy in this attempted argument lies in the fact that the Bible specifies *speaking* and *singing* and did not specify the other. In Ephesians 5:19 we read: "*Speaking* to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, *singing* and making melody in your heart to the Lord " If instrumental music, as a natural talent, stands on a par scripturally with speaking and singing, why did Paul specify speaking and singing and did not specify the instrument? In fact, if natural talent is the principle of divine worship, why did Paul specify anything? In that case we would need no legislation at all—just do what is "natural".

What does the natural talent argument mean? Let us submit it to the test of logic. In logic there is the major premise, the minor premise and the conclusion. The natural talent argument for instrumental music in the worship would run on this order.

1. Anything that is natural is approved for worship.
2. Instrumental music is a natural talent.

3. Therefore, instrumental music is approved for worship.

If the major premise is right, the conclusion is right. But are you willing to accept the major premise? If instrumental music in worship is right because it is natural, then everything that is natural is right in worship. That includes everything that appeals to the natural senses. What a religion! The Jew, the Pagan and the Catholic could make the same argument for everything of an esthetic nature in their worship. On that principle Catholics burn incense in worship. The smelling of incense in the worship is based on natural sense. It is no more natural to hear than it is to smell. The Catholics have as much right to their incense on natural principles as others would have to instrumental music, unless one can prove his "hearer more important than the other fellow's smeller" I do not think it could be proved.

God has never given a religion to people which was based on natural principles. What natural principle suggests the Lord's Supper? What natural principle suggests baptism? What natural principle suggests any part of that system of divine worship set forth in the New Testament? Christians follow Christ, not their natural bent. If natural talent is the rule of worship, then Paul needed only to have said, Be natural, follow your eyes, your ears, your nose and your feet. What a religion that would be! And that is the size of the argument.

The Bible tells us to walk by faith, not by sight. Faith does not belong to the realm of natural things. "The way of man is not in himself. It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." We set that argument aside. The premise proves too much and, therefore, nothing.

2. It is said that if we can have instrumental music in the home, why can we not have instrumental music in the church ?

Just for the simple reason that in the home anything is permissible that is morally right; but in the church nothing is permissible that is not *scripturally* right. The home is

circumscribed by moral law. The church is circumscribed by New Testament law.

The church at Corinth made "a church dinner" out of the Lord's Supper. That is the only place in the Bible where I have ever read anything about "a church dinner," and it was condemned. Paul said, "What? have ye not houses to eat and drink in?" Those Christians were doing a thing in the worship that would have been permissible at home — eating and drinking. Paul told them so. But he said, "Why, do you put to shame the church of God?" Hence, a thing that would have been right at home, was wrong at church.

Some things morally right are religiously wrong. It is morally right to wash the hands but wrong as an act of worship. (Mark 7:1-13) It is morally right to eat meat, but wrong to put meat on the Lord's table. (1 Cor. 10:25, 27.) It is morally right to count beads, but when the Roman Catholic counts beads in worship, bowing to the Virgin Mary, it is an act of idolatry and is wrong.

Of course, should you assemble in the home for the purpose of worship, instrumental music would be just as much out of place and unscriptural there as it would be in the church house. It is not to be used in the worship whether it be in the home or at the church. Christians worshipped in their homes in New Testament times, hence references to "church which is in thy house." It is the worship that counts, not the *place* of worship.

3. It is said that instrumental music is in heaven, and if they have it in heaven, why can we not have instrumental music in the church?

Who told you that there are instruments of music in heaven? I used to hear that statement when I was a boy, and the usual reply was, "If God has it in heaven it is his business, but as he did not put it in the church, we have no right to do so." That would be true—but are there any mechanical instruments in heaven? What could a spiritual being do with a material harp? Heaven is the home of the soul—the place where "the spirits of just men are made perfect." As well argue that there will be Ford automobiles in heav-

en as to say there are mechanical instruments in heaven.

The Book of Revelation is a book of symbols. The record says these things were signified unto John. Signify comes from the word "sign." Signify means to "sign-i-fy." If a thing is signified it is set forth in sign. A sign cannot be the sign of itself. A symbol cannot symbolize itself. The harp, therefore, must be a sign of something else. What does it signify ? Among the things John saw in heaven were the four living creatures and the four and twenty elders who fell down before the Lamb, "having each one a harp and golden bowls full of incense, which are the prayers of the saints." (Rev. 5:8) Ask a Roman Catholic where he gets his authority for the burning of incense and he will tell you it is mentioned in the book of Revelation, incense in heaven. I have had them tell me so. They go to the same verse for incense and music. The Roman Catholics are consistent. They use both. The incense and harps are mentioned in the same verse. The Christian Church is inconsistent. It takes one and rejects the other.

In Rev. 8:3 it says that the incense was "added to the prayers of the saints." Do you add incense to your prayers here? They did in heaven, according to John.

Were there actual harps and actual bowls of incense in heaven? Or is it not the sign or symbol of something else? Read Rev. 14:2: "And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder: and the voice which I heard was as the voice of harpers harping with their harps." (American Standard Version.) The word "as" is not only in this great English version of the Bible, it is in the Greek text. I have personally checked and marked it in the Greek text. The word "as" is in the original text. It says "as the voice of harpers harping with their harps." The voice which John heard was "as the voice of a great thunder," and "as the voice of many waters," and "as the voice of harpers harping with their harps." John did not hear actual, literal *thunder* in heaven. No, what he heard was "as" thunder. John did not hear the surging of literal water in heaven. No, what he heard was "as" the sound of many waters. Nor did John hear the ac-

tual playing of literal harps in heaven. What he heard was "as harpers harping with their harps." We know the difference between saying a thing "is" and saying it was "as." The passage merely makes a comparison.

The one hundred forty-four thousand redeemed from the earth were singing a new song. In its mighty volume it was *as the voice of waters*. Have you stood before America's greatest wonder and listened to the surging waters of Niagara Falls ? The rhythm of falling waters is perfect. The volume of 144,000 voices was as thunder. The rhythm was as surging waters. And the sweetness of the melody was "as harpers harping with their harps." Thunder symbolizes volume; water symbolizes rhythm; and the harps symbolize melody. That is all there is indicated in the comparison.

I want to illustrate it. We have, perhaps, a thousand people here this afternoon. If all of us should sing with all our power, we could make the tent sway. Imagine a heavenly choir of 144,000 redeemed singers, singing "a new song." I want you to sing, "On Jordan's Stormy Bank I Stand." Everybody sing it while Doran leads it.

On Jordan's stormy banks I stand,  
And cast a wistful eye  
To Canaan's fair and happy land,  
Where my possessions lie.  
We will rest in the fair and happy land,  
Just across on the evergreen shore.  
Sing the song of Moses and the Lamb  
And dwell with Jesus evermore.

That is great. Now, do you wonder that John said the song he heard was "as the voice of thunder," "as the voice of waters" and "as harpers harping with their harps"? There is not a man on earth who can prove that there ever was, is now, or will ever be an instrument of music in heaven.

4. It is said that instrumental music was used in the Old Testament.

So was incense, so was circumcision, so were animal sacrifices, all in the Old Testament. Shall we go behind New Testament worship after Old Testament practices? David



says in Psalms 66:13-15, "I will come into thy house with burnt-offerings; I will pay thee my vows, which my lips uttered, and my mouth spake, when I was in distress. I will offer unto thee burnt-offerings of fatlings, with the incense of rams; I will offer bullocks with goats."

Let us suppose that G. K. Wallace is receiving people into the church this afternoon. Along comes a fellow with a lamb under his arm and he says, I want in the church. I want to offer this lamb as a sacrifice to God. G. K. explains that we cannot offer animal sacrifices in the church. The man insists that David did. He preaches that man a sermon on the right division of the Word, explaining the differences between the Old Testament system of worship and the New Testament system of worship, and refuses to let him come in with the lamb.

Along comes another man with incense and censor, and he says, I want in the church. I want to offer this incense to God. G. K. tells him that we cannot offer incense in the church. The man insists that he is mistaken, for "David did it," he says. G. K. tells him that we are not under David but Christ; that Old Testament ordinances have been taken out of the way, and he turns him away.

But here comes another man with a harp in his hand, and he says, I want in the church. I want to play this instrument of music to God. G. K. tells the man that we cannot have such instruments in the church. The man reminds him: Don't you know that David was a great and good man? Did he not play instruments in his worship? G. K. gives him his hand and says: I believe he did. I had forgotten about that. Come right on in, let's have the music! What would you think about it, friends? He refuses the man with David's lamb, rejects the man with David's incense, and receives the man with David's instrument! !

That is the picture of the Christian Church and their preachers. If they insist on being wrong, they should at least be consistent.

5. It is said that the fact that instrumental music, being mentioned in the Old Testament and not condemned in the New Testament, must therefore be approved.

Cannot the same thing be said of incense? The New Testament nowhere says, "Thou shalt not burn incense." There is no New Testament passage that says not to sprinkle babies. The Book does not say, "Thou shalt not kiss the pope's big toe." So let the Catholics do it! If silence authorizes the practice, then everything in the Old Testament not specifically condemned in the New Testament is permissible. What Christian Church preacher will accept such a conclusion?

In the 15th chapter of Acts, Gentile Christians at Antioch were being troubled with the question of Jewish customs. The Jews were trying to bind on Christian Gentiles the practice of circumcision on the ground that it was a custom of the law. Because Paul was not one of the twelve apostles the Jews were not inclined to accept his word as being equal in authority to that of the apostles at Jerusalem. So Paul brought them to Jerusalem to prove to them that the apostles at Jerusalem would tell them the same thing that he had told them. The case was laid before them and regarding the practice of circumcision the apostles said, "We gave no such commandment"

There is the principle of divine worship. We can do in the worship only that for which we have apostolic command. If there is no command for it, it is barred. Everything as an element of worship is barred that is not commanded.

When the instrumental music was in use under the Old Testament, it was repeatedly mentioned. In the New Testament it is nowhere mentioned. This fact proves that it was not in use. If the mention of it proves the use of it, then the non-mention proves the non-use of it. So in this case "silence" is not "consent."

When I motored from Nashville, Tenn., over to this country. I did not take every road the sign boards did not tell me *not to take*. That is not the way I travel. But it seems to be the way of many people in religion. Those who follow that method in religion are as sure to lose their way

as I would have lost my way had I traveled on that principle.

6. It is said that instrumental music is an aid, that it aids the singing on the same principle that a walking cane aids a man when he walks, or like eye glasses aid one in seeing.

The reasoning is illogical and sophistical. In the first place, a crippled man may need an aid, but God's commands are not crippled. When people begin to talk about *aiding* God's commands they wind up with adding to God's word.

The simple rule of grammar on the co-ordination of words will show the sophistry of comparing instrumental music to such aids as walking canes, eye glasses and song books. Instrumental music and singing are two *kinds* of music. Instrumental music and singing are co-ordinate—two kinds of music. Walking and riding are co-ordinate—two ways of going. The song book is not coordinate with singing. The walking cane is not co-ordinate with walking. The song book, therefore, sustains the same relation to singing that a walking cane does to walking. When one uses a song book he is doing one thing only—singing. It is the thing he is commanded to do. But when one uses an instrument of music, he is doing *another* thing — a thing not commanded. The one who uses the instrument has the same aid as the one who sings. One who sings uses notes, either in the book or in the head. But the man who plays the instrument also uses the same aid. So an aid aids the aid in the argument.

The instrument is not an *aid*, at all, it is an *addition*. The illustration does not illustrate. Instrumental music does not sustain the same relation to singing that a walking cane does to walking. A walking cane is not co-ordinate with walking, but instrumental music is co-ordinate with singing. Walking and riding are co-ordinate just as instrumental and vocal music are coordinate. If I am commanded to walk, can I ride as an aid? Then, when God commands singing may we use another *kind* of music as an aid? The illustration is out of parallel—out of the realm of co-

ordinates. It fails to illustrate.

When we sing we may use a song book exactly as one who walks may use a walking cane, but he is *walking* and we are *singing*—only. When another *kind* of music is introduced, it ceases to be an aid and becomes *an addition*.

7. It is said that we have apostolic example for instrumental music in worship, because the apostles went into the synagogue of the Jews "at the hour of prayer."

Two things are assumed. First, that instruments of music were in the synagogue worship at that time; second, that the apostles participated in the worship. There is no proof for either assumption. It is like a Methodist who tries to prove infant sprinkling by a verse of scripture that mentions neither.

If the example of the apostles going into the synagogue to preach to the Jews is proof that they participated in the Jewish worship, have you stopped to think what that would mean? Had not those Jews rejected Jesus Christ? They did not even believe He was the Son of God. Then, you have the apostles participating in the worship of a set of infidel Jews! Those infidel Jews may have had *instrumental music* but they surely were not Christians and were not engaged in Christian worship.

In the synagogue worship these Jews also burned incense, and they, observed the sabbath. So, again, the Catholics and Seventh Day Adventists have as good an argument as the music users. If the example proves one it proves it all. And since it proves too much it proves nothing.

The facts are that the apostles went into the synagogue to preach the gospel to the Jews—to show them the difference between Judaism and Christianity. The Jews opposed their teaching, cast them out of their synagogues and even put them in prison—yet they tell us it is apostolic example for music in worship. Intelligent members of the Christian Church ought to be ashamed of such attempts to justify the use of instrumental music.

8. It is said that there is no law against instrumental music, and where there is no law there is no sin, for "sin

is the transgression of law."

The word "transgression" means to go beyond certain prescribed limits. John said: "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God." (2 John 1:9.) Paul said: "That ye may learn not to go beyond the things that are written." (1 Cor. 4:6 R. V.) There is a law on how to praise God. The law says "sing." To go beyond the law is transgression. Instrumental music in worship is going beyond the law of worship. Therefore, instrumental music in worship is transgressing the law.

Transgression is sin. Instrumental music in worship is transgression. Therefore, instrumental music in worship is sin.

9. The latest and most plausible argument comes from the theologians. They tell us that there is a word used in the New Testament that is derived from a Greek word which means to "play an instrument." In Ephesians 5:19 we are commanded to speak one to another "in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your hearts to the Lord." The expression "making melody" is the Greek word "psallontes," a derivative of the Greek verb "psallo." The word "psallo" occurs in the New Testament five times. In Eph. 5:19 it is translated "making melody." In 1 Cor. 14:15 it is found twice and is translated "sing." In Romans 15:9 it is translated "sing." In James 5:13 it is "psallein," translated "sing praises."

So the word "psallo" is used five times in the New Testament. Four times it is translated "sing" and one time it is translated "making melody" But not satisfied with the English translation—not satisfied with the meaning one hundred forty-eight of the world's ripest scholars gave to the word "psallo"—some seek to find authority for instrumental music by going to the Greek lexicons. What do the lexicons say the word "psallo" means? The lexicons define it "to pluck, to twang, to pull, to cause to vibrate." Since "psallo" means "to pluck," one must have something to pluck in order to *psallo*. So the word had various uses. A hunter plucked the bow string to shoot the arrow. He *psalloed* the bow string. The workman plucked the carpen-

ter's line to make the chalk mark. He *psalloed* the carpenter's line. It was even applied to plucking the beard, and pulling the hair. That was *psalloing* the beard and the hair. (My wife has *psalloed* on my head a good many times.) But the musician plucked the chords of a musical instrument. That was *psalloing* the instrument. Now, Paul commands us all to psallo. What did he mean? Did he mean to pull the hair? When Paul tells us to psallo, did he mean twang the bow string or to twitch the carpenter's line? Or did he mean to play a mechanical instrument of music? He tells us what he meant. He does not leave us to guess. He says "singing and *psalloing* (psallontes) with your heart." Now when a man pulls back a bow string he is psalloing the bow string. When a carpenter pulls the line to make the chalk mark, he is psalloing that carpenter's line. When a musician plays an instrument, he is psalloing that instrument. But in this passage Paul says when Christians sing they psallo the heart—making melody in the heart. It is spiritual psalloing, psalloing the heart. It is a spiritual use of the word.

The Greek word "baptizo" means "to dip." You may dip one in tar, sand or grease. You can dip one in any liquid element. But the Bible says baptize with water. It names the element.

On the same principle one might *psallo* anything that can be plucked, from the hair on your head, to a fiddle or a Jew's harp. But Paul said psallo with your heart to the Lord. Baptize with water—that names the element and excludes everything else. Psallo with the heart—that names the instrument and excludes all else.

Another illustration is found in literal and spiritual circumcision. Literal circumcision was of the flesh, made with hands. Spiritual circumcision is of the heart, not of the letter but of the spirit. The difference between literal and spiritual circumcision is the difference between literal and spiritual psalloing. Literal psalloing is plucking a literal object—anything—that can be plucked. Spiritual psalloing is the plucking of a spiritual object—the heart. We

psallo the heart in singing—we make melody with the heart unto God.

I will have Doran help me demonstrate to you how it is done. Turn to the song "Rock of Ages Cleft For Me." The man who wrote this song was named August Toplady. Walking in the country one day he was overtaken by a violent storm. He sought refuge under a ledge of rock extending from an embankment. The wind blew, the rain poured, the lightning flashed, the thunder crashed, as the storm raged. Hiding from the storm in the cleft of the rock, Mr. Toplady wrote the lines of the immortal song.

"Rock of Ages, cleft for me,  
Let me hide myself in Thee;  
Let the water and the blood,  
From Thy riven side which flowed  
Be of sin the double cure,  
Save from wrath and make me pure."

Christ is the "Rock of Ages." When he died on the cross the Rock was cleft. Water and blood came from his pierced side. We are "buried with Christ in baptism," and then we reach the blood. That man understood the scriptures. I do not know what his practice was, but he wrote a song that indicates his understanding of the relation between the blood of Christ and baptism.

Now, I want us to psallo with the heart. Sing with the understanding, and that will be psalloing with the heart. Let us all sing.

(Congregation sang "*Rock of Ages.*")

Now, that is really psalloing with the heart unto God. If that song went down into the heart and you made melody in your heart to God, you psalloed with your heart. If you did not, then you are a hypocrite for singing it.

The word "psallo" in itself does not include any *particular* instrument. It is not the instrument that makes the psalloing, it is the thing you do on the instrument. Some seem to think it takes an organ to make psalloing. The organ itself is not psalloing. It is the act that you perform on the instrument. Hence if the same act is performed on something else it is psalloing. That being true it is not the

mechanical musical instrument that makes the meaning of "psallo." It may be applied to any object or instrument, or spiritually it may be applied to singing the praise of God.

Yet every little one by four Christian Church preacher who comes out of school, who would not know a Greek letter from a chicken track, tells his gullible members that psallo means to play mechanical instruments.

Where any particular instrument was intended with "psallo" it was always named in addition to the word. In the Old Testament the instrument used was always named in addition to the word. David said, "Psallo with the harp." (Ps 98:5.) In the New Testament Paul said, "Psallo with the heart." (Eph. 5:19.) One was mechanical, the other spiritual. But in either case it shows that the instrument was named in addition to the word, therefore, was not in, or a part of, the word.

If the word "psallo" in the New Testament includes the mechanical instrument of music, then the one who plays the instrument is the only one who performs the act of psallosing. The organist is the only one who obeys the command. Paul tells us all to psallo. All can do it, but none by proxy.

If mechanical instrumental music is in the word "psallo," David did not know it, for in the Old Testament, when he used the word "psallo," he named the instrument in addition to the word. (Ps 98:5.) This proves that the word itself did not include the instrument. If it did David did not know it.

If the mechanical instrument of music is in the word "psallo" Paul did not know it, for in the New Testament he used the word "psallo" and named the heart as the instrument—"psallontes (psallo) with the heart." (Eph. 5:19.)

If the mechanical instrument is in "psallo" the forty-seven ancient scholars who translated the King James Bible in 1611 did not know it, and the one hundred and one modern scholars who translated the American Standard Bible in 1901 did not know it, for they all said the word means to *sing*, and so translated it. Hence, when these preachers of the Christian Church tell us that the word



"psallo" includes mechanical instruments of music they are professing to know more about the word than David, Paul and all the one hundred forty-eight translators of our English Bible!

The word "psallo" does not teach mechanical instrumental music. In the New Testament it means to sing—and the melody is made in the heart. God has put the instrument on the inside of us. Everyone, young or old, in the church can "psallo with the heart." And I would rather hear the cracked and shattered voices of God's people "singing and making melody with the heart" than to hear the most accomplished soloist or the best trained choir with their mechanical accompaniments. When we come together to worship we come to praise and please God and not to entertain ourselves. So let us speak to ourselves "in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with the heart unto God."

### III. THE SCOPE OF NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING

This whole question involves respect for the word of God, and the authority of the New Testament in the realm of of worship. I heard one of your citizens, Victor Murdock, editor of the Wichita Eagle, make a speech at a civic club last week. He made a good speech. He talked on the NRA and had somewhat to say about loyalty to the Constitution of the United States. He said the younger generation should regard with suspicion any deviation in the principles of government from the Constitution as drafted by our forefathers. It is the most perfect human document that has ever been given to the world, he said. He warned younger men against the political disaster that deviation from our Constitution will inevitably incur. If that is true of a political document, how much more true is it of this Divine Constitution—the New Testament. If we shall not countenance deviation from the Constitution of the United States, and if we should regard with suspicion any deviation from that document to which we owe our human liberty and political freedom, then, friends, should we countenance for one moment the slightest deviation in religion from the inspired Word? Should we hold more sacred a

political constitution than we do the Divine Constitution, the Word of God?

Let us then, study the principles of New Testament worship, and of obedience to God. There are, in the Bible, generic and specific commands—commands inclusive and exclusive. The Great Commission says "Go preach." The word "go" is generic—I can walk, or ride—ride in an airplane or in an automobile. I would only be doing the thing commanded—namely, go. Any method of going comes within the range of the command to "go."

The Great Commission also says "teach." That is generic. I can write or speak. If my tongue should cleave to the roof of my mouth and I should never be able to speak again, could I not take up my pen and write? In doing so I would only do the thing commanded—teach. It may be either oral or written, or both.

Let us illustrate this principle on the blackboard, since it is scriptural to teach by writing. I may write on the board the same as on paper.

#### GENERIC AND SPECIFIC COMMANDS

WOOD	ANIMAL	MUSIC
Pine	Pig	Instrumental
<i>Gopher</i>	<i>Lamb</i>	<i>Sing</i>

God told Noah to build an ark out of wood. That is generic. If God had simply said wood, Noah might have built that ark out of either pine or gopher wood, or both. But God did not tell Noah to build it out of *wood*. God specified *gopher* wood. When God said gopher wood, that did not mean wood—it meant *gopher wood*. And all other kinds were excluded.

Take the system of worship under the Old Testament for another example. The people were commanded to offer animal sacrifices. The word "animal" is generic. They might have offered a pig or lamb, either is an animal. But in the passover God did not command them to offer an *animal*. God specified a *lamb* without spot and without blemish. That excluded the pig. They could not even use the pig as an "aid." When God said "gopher" wood, that excluded pine

wood, and the use of pine would not have been an aid—it would have been an addition—and when God said "lamb," that excluded a pig or a calf.

We come now to the system of divine worship in the New Testament. If God has commanded *music*, that would have been generic in nature. It would have included instrumental music, one kind, and vocal music expressed in the word "sing," the other kind. If God had said, "make music," we could have both kinds in worship. But God did not command "music." God specified singing. When God specified gopher wood that excluded the pine. When God specified the lamb, it excluded the pig. So when in the New Testament. God specified singing it excluded any other kind of music. Out of a co-ordinate species of wood, God named *gopher wood*. Out of a co-ordinate species of animals, God named the *lamb*. Out of a co-ordinate species of music God has named *singing* "singing and making melody with your heart unto God." To the extent that gopher wood excluded every other kind of wood; and to the extent that the lamb excluded every other kind of animal; to the same extent the specific command to "sing" excludes every other kind of music.

Begin with the first passage that bears on the subject of our worship in song. Reading through the New Testament "sing" is the limit of the command.

*Matthew* 26:30: — "And when they had sung a hymn, they went out into the mount of Olives."

*Acts* 16:25:—"And at midnight Paul and Silas prayed, and sang praises unto God."

*Romans* 15:9:—"Sing unto thy name."

1 *Corinthians* 14:15:—"I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also"

*Ephesians* 5:19:—"Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord."

*Colossians* 3:16:—"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."

*Hebrews 2:12*:—"In the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee."

*Hebrews 13:15*:—"By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips giving thanks to his name."

*James 5:13*:—"Is any among you suffering? Let him pray. Is any cheerful? Let him sing psalms."

That is the extent of precept or example in the New Testament on how to praise God. That is the limit of the command. That is the limit of our practice

I beg you lay down human practices in the realm of worship. I would as soon stand identified with people who teach false doctrine, as to affiliate with people who maintain an unscriptural system of worship. Error in doctrine is no more unscriptural than innovations in worship.

This makes the instrument a test of fellowship, but the line is drawn by the practice of the unscriptural thing. Who is responsible for the disfellowship? Should you try to compel me to tolerate the sprinkling of infants, or the burning of incense, who would be responsible for the division of fellowship that would follow? When instrumental music is introduced into the worship of God and division results, who, then, is responsible for the division? The one who introduces the unscriptural practice in any case is the one who is responsible for division and disfellowship.

Erring friends, if you will lay down human practices in religion and today step out and say that you will be satisfied with the plain teaching of the New Testament, to work and worship as it directs, we gladly offer you our hand in welcome and invite you to stand with us on the Word of God.

## CHAPTER XXV

### THE BOLL MOVEMENT

This chapter consists of a series of articles by Foy E. Wallace Jr., several months after his resignation of the editorship of the *Gospel Advocate*, written at the request of the publishers, and appearing in consecutive issues of the *Gospel Advocate* beginning August 9, 1934. The following statement was made by the publishers with the insertion of the last number of the series in the editorial section, Sept. 13, 1934:

#### The Wallace Articles

Concurring with the suggestion of certain leading brethren, the publisher and the editor of the *Gospel Advocate* recently invited Foy E. Wallace, Jr., to prepare several articles upon premillennialism within the ranks, particularly as it is related to the "miraculous trend" among some of our missionaries. Previous study and experience peculiarly prepare him for coping with this admittedly serious situation. The readers are respectfully invited to carefully read all of these articles, the fourth of which appears here."—(*Gospel Advocate*)

#### I.

### THE WIDENING BREACH

The brotherhood has been treated to another manifesto. The first one was issued, as conversant readers will remember, from the office of the *Word and Work* in Louisville, Ky., several months ago, and was carried to the preachers elders, and leaders in the churches by a special free edition of that publication.

The present manifesto issues from the same office, having the same seal. The author of these daring decrees is R. H. Boll, editor and publisher of this *Word* (of discord) and *Work* (of division.) His publication appears to be devoted to the cause of sowing discord among the churches on millennial theories. It was the issuance of the first Louisville decree that precipitated the vigorous opposition to this

new party in a series of drastic editorials in the *Gospel Advocate*. The Winchester and Chattanooga discussions followed. It was generally conceded that these debates contributed much toward retiring this system of theories advocated by this group of brethren to their rightful place—the realm of human opinion. It was, therefore, hoped that that the agitation of these theories would cease, that the churches might have peace. But now comes R. H. Boll in the June issue of his pamphlet, delivering himself of a double-flanked frontal attack on the position occupied by the plain churches of Christ as espoused by the *Gospel Advocate*. He is determined that we shall not have peace. Nearly seventy-five per cent of the space in that issue is devoted to the editor's opinions, indictments, and criticisms. No gospel paper could be true to its mission and trust and let such broadside attacks on the plea of the churches of Christ pass unrefuted. No mild treatment of such papal pronouncements could be effective, nor should the pronouncers of these manifestoes escape unscathed. Such offenses against the church deserve the severity of the reproof Paul charged Timothy to administer to promoters of unsound doctrines. "For which cause reprove them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith, not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men who turn away from the truth." (Tit. 1:3, 14.)

These periodical eruptions of the otherwise docile editor of the *Word And Work*, though tragic in the erroneous impressions they leave on the hearts of the innocent, do nevertheless serve to reveal the extremes to which he has gone and will yet go in pursuing his divisive course. It should convince all impartial people that this group of brethren in Louisville, of whom R. H. Boll is the chief and E. L. Jorgenson the lieutenant, are themselves responsible for "widening the breach." For us to piously ignore their propaganda is impossible. Such a course would be to surrender the doctrinal purity of the church to a party of would-be seers and sages that have arisen as false prophets among us.

The current issues of the *Word And Work*, now under re-

view, carried two major articles laden with error. One was dealing with the "Signs of the Times," bearing on the supposed imminence of the Lord's coming. The other was entitled "The Emergence of a Sect." It was written in the very tone of papalism. This article was reprinted in the *Gospel Advocate* of July 12 in an editorial by Brother John T. Hinds, which contained some timely and effective comments. The author, Brother Boll, has in the past made frequent reference to the fact that he was once a Roman Catholic (of German lineage), and it is apparent to many of us that his mind was evidently cast in the papal mold, and though having surrendered the actual doctrines of the Roman Church, under the influence of his former training, he yet assumes the prerogative of issuing decrees to churches of Christ. This, perhaps, accounts for his disposition to pronounce any "contingent of brethren" who reject his opinions a sect. Thus he and his own little group would assume to be the "simple church of Christ"!

#### A MIS-STATEMENT OF FACTS

For the sake of fairness and facts, let us look further into "The Emergence of a Sect," with a view toward dissecting this authoritative document. It would be difficult to imagine a grosser mis-statement of facts than it carries, both direct and implied. His bill of indictment against the brethren is that they have "drawn lines," "cast out of their fellowship other brethren" who do not agree with them on "disputed points of prophecy," and that we have become a "sectarian body"—all because we reject his heresies. These indefinite generalizations are plain perversions of the facts. The only formal "casting out" that has been done was staged by these brethren themselves when they "cast out" the brethren that now compose the Bardstown Road Church in Louisville. They were cast out because they opposed the active teaching and promotion of these theories in the Highland Church by E. L. Jorgenson and Don Carlos Janes. The brethren they cast out and disfellowshipped, and those who went away with them, were charter members of the congregation. Since that time two other congregations in Louisville have been divided. Because of this work of division,

the Boll-Jorgenson group are not held in fellowship by the Haldeman Avenue Church (old Campbell Street Church), the original and yet the strongest congregation in Louisville. The documentary evidence on file, if published, would be embarrassing to this trio of *Word And Work* brethren—Boll, Jorgenson, and Janes—should they press the question of disfellowship over their teaching. These brethren are not in fellowship with the churches of Christ in Louisville. Should churches of Christ elsewhere extend fellowship to them ? Not until they confess to the sin of division and take the proper steps to heal the breach in Louisville. Seeing that they are now so bold in the mis-statement of facts, in an effort to shift the responsibility of division and nonfellowship from themselves to others, it is but right that these facts be published in order that the brethren everywhere may know the actual truth.

Brother Boll has mis-stated the facts. We have not, and will not cast him out for *holding* certain views on "disputed points of prophecy." But it is one thing to build a party around a formulated system of theories and foster division as Brother Boll and his associates have done and are doing. They cannot shift their responsibility nor escape their condemnation by laying the blame on others. The teaching is the cause of the division; opposition is the effect; and disfellowship is the result.

The plain truth of the matter is: Brother Boll and his colleagues have simply theorized themselves out of the fellowship of the churches, and are maligning others for the plight in which they find themselves. The theory that thus begs for toleration is self-evidently wrong, and the man whose human teaching would require such charity to forbear is not deserving of consideration in churches of Christ. The church of the Lord Jesus Christ is not a melting pot for human opinion. We are commanded to preach what we can prove by the New Testament. There is no place for guessers, speculators, and opinionists in the church of Christ. From all such we are admonished in the Bible "to turn away." The course of these brethren has been such that the churches cannot trust them. They alone are respon-



sible for it, and it is within their power alone to remedy it. Will they do it? Or will they extend their work of alienation and division?

#### REV. 20 AS IT STANDS

Brother Boll laments that he and his have been cast out "because they believe Rev. 20 as it stands." But for the gravity of the situation this statement would be humorous. The talk of taking Rev. 20 *as it stands*, coming from Brother Boll, sounds about like a digressive innovator orating on "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; and where the Bible is silent, we are silent"! Really, what do Brethren Boll and Neal *teach* (not merely think) on Rev. 20? Saying nothing of their many Judaistic doctrines revolving around their prophetic dreams, their teaching on Rev. 20, in short, is that between the second coming of Christ and the "last" resurrection there will be an earthly age, or dispensation of time, exactly one thousand years in length, which they call the "millennium," during which the Lord Jesus Christ will be seated as King on David's literal throne in Jerusalem, reigning with the saints over all the earth and on the earth.

Now, does Rev. 20, as it stands, teach any such thing? Turn to the passage in question—Rev. 20:1-6—and check the following points in this theory which the passage does not even mention. Here they are: (1) It does not mention *the second coming of Christ*; (2) it does not mention *a reign on the earth*; (3) it does not mention *a bodily resurrection*; (4) it does not mention *us*; (5) it does not mention *Christ as being on earth*; (6) it does not mention *any single distinctive point of the theory constructed on it*.

Rev. 20, "as it stands," is a martyr scene. To take Rev. 20 literally as it stands will cut these brethren out of their own millennium, for only the "souls of the martyrs"—those actually beheaded—were said to have lived and reigned the thousand years. If literal, it excludes from the millennium all who are not literally beheaded. If figurative, or spiritual, then it is not a literal, earthly millennium.

It is an inadequate proof text. The passage "as it stands" does not furnish the material with which to construct a theory of an earthly millennium—and there is a *curse* pro-

nounced upon the one who *adds* to the words of Rev. 20.

All the talking and writing on believing Rev. 20 "as it stands" and taking prophecy "at face value," therefore, is just so much canting and carping. It is mere propaganda. They do not accept Rev. 20 as it stands, and they could not take all prophecy at face value if they would. In some instances they have not done so when they could—Dan. 2:44, for instance, and its announced fulfillment in Mark 1: 14, 15 "in the days of those kings." Such overtures come with mighty poor grace from the man who has himself refused to take so many passages of Scripture concerning the kingdom of Christ as they stand and at face value.

#### THE SECT HAS EMERGED

The one "view" set forth by Brother Boll that is not a vagary is found in his declaration that a sect has emerged. Verily, it is a fact. But the seat of the sect is in Louisville, Ky. The formation of the party seems very definite. R. H. Boll is head of it. E. L. Jorgenson is secretary of interior, and Don Carlos Janes is secretary of foreign affairs. Charles M. Neal is ex-secretary of war, having resigned at the battle of Chattanooga, and the vacancy has not been filled. Subject to call when the chief needs assistance in issuing a triple manifesto are Stanford Chambers and H. L. Olmstead. There is also the school to disseminate their peculiar tenets, the paper to spread their party propaganda, the missionary agency to foster their sectarian theories in foreign fields, and scattered devotees everywhere to create and promote sentiment in favor of these men around whose personalities this party has grown.

These brethren bewail being disfellowshipped, yet they have themselves virtually disfellowshipped every gospel preacher in the land who opposes their system of teaching. The fellowship they demand is one-sided. There are, indeed, numerous advantages that good standing with the churches would give to their endeavors, but it is a meager and limited fellowship they offer to any who oppose what they teach. Though no faithful preacher could lend his influence to the advancement of this party in Louisville, where they are not in fellowship with the other churches of Christ, it remains,

nevertheless, true that they are *inconsistent* in their attitude on non-fellowship and in their protests against sectism.

The Boll movement represents a definite and immediate danger before the churches. It was formed into a well-organized party. In size it is not yet large; and if gospel preachers and papers will do their duty, it will never become any larger. It should be kept where it is—in Louisville, Ky.—to die where the harm has already been done.

The millennialists have already taken the denominations, and are making inroads within the Christian Church, the *Christian Standard* having announced in favor of premillennialism. Shall we now submit to this Louisville party and let them take the churches of Christ—the one and only body of people *to* whom the world may look for a complete return to the New Testament in teaching and practice, free of human interpretations and opinionism? Our very plea is in jeopardy. The challenge cannot be ignored. Preachers and elders, schools and papers that regard the doctrinal purity of the church worth safeguarding should join in the united opposition to this party. The cause of Christ demands it. The issue must be met with courage, decision, and finality.

In another article some developments in connection with "the doctrinal tenets and human articles of faith" this Louisville party proposes will be discussed.

## II.

### MILLENNIAL HERESIES

Heresies and factions are as old as the church, for since the beginning of it false teachers and factious men have arisen in the church with each generation to destroy its peace. It was so at Corinth and Rome in Paul's day. "For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you" (1 Cor. 11: 19.) Paul prescribed the method of dealing with such men and movements: "Mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them." (Rom. 16: 17.) The method was neither com-

promise nor toleration. The intolerant Paul said that all such should be *marked* and *avoided*. Any factious contingent that threatened to secede under the pressure of such restraints were let go without compromising overtures. "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they all are not of us." (1 John 2: 19.)

We are witnessing just such an emergence of a sect at Louisville, Ky., led by R. H. Boll. In a specious plea against creedism and sectism he has himself embraced some of the rankest forms of modern sectarianism. What makes one a sectarian, if it is not teaching, practicing, and fellowshiping sectarianism? This article proposes to introduce evidence that Brother Boll and his party in *so* doing are themselves emerging into a sect.

FIRST: THE BOLL PARITY HAS EMBRACED THE  
HERESIES OF MODERN PREMILLENNIALISM

In the June issue of the *Word and Work*, Brother Boll enters a demurrer that "in order to fellowship with this sectarian body," referring to us, he must subscribe to certain negative views on prophecy—and he writes out our negative creed. That is, what we do not believe is the creed he objects to. Then, the opposite of that, or what he does believe and teach, is the creed to which he has subscribed. If not, why not? It is a poor rule that will not work both ways.

What, then, are the articles of this millennial creed? Here they are:

1. The kingdom of God on earth (Dan. 2: 44) has not yet come into existence.

2. Though announced by John and Jesus as "at hand" (Mark 1: 14, 15), this kingdom was postponed because national Israel rejected Jesus.

3. In lieu of this kingdom Jesus introduced the "church age," the present dispensation.

4. The kingdom promise having defaulted, Jesus is not now king in "fact and act," but only in expectancy.

5. Old pagan and political Rome must come back into ex-

istence to fulfill the prophecy of Dan. 2: 44.

6. The national conversion and restoration of the Jews as a prior and contingent event.

7. The complete re-institution of the Jewish system in Jerusalem.

8. The re-occupation by Jesus Christ of the literal Davidic throne.

9. The resurrected and living saints will meet the Lord in the air, accompany him "somewhere" in the heavens "for a time" to attend to "certain affairs," designated by Russell and Rutherford "the rapture," but by Boll and Neal "the first stage" of the second coming.

10. An interval between the "first stage" and the real *second coming* (believed by *most* millennialists to be *seven* years) of great tribulation on the earth, escaped by the righteous, who will be "somewhere" with Christ, who afterwards descends again with the saints to vanquish the wicked nations and start the millennium.

11. The literal thousand years' reign of Christ on the earth.

12. After the thousand years, Satan again musters his forces for a great battle of short duration (Armageddon) in the Valley of Esdraelon, to be defeated and cast down for the last time, and Christ, victorious, takes the saints to heaven.

Now, does the Boll theory actually embrace such a system of "prophetic views"? It does. The documentary evidence is available and forthcoming. But it is in order first to submit an exchange between E. L. Jorgenson and an R. H. Boll devotee at Paducah, Ky., which passed during my recent meeting there, anent these heresies. Read it:

April 14, 1934

Brother R. H. Boll,  
Care Word and Work,  
Louisville, Ky.

Dear Brother Boll: Did you review the attack made through the *Gospel Advocate* of March 29 on you in the *Word And Work*? If so, please state whether or not any position you take was fully and correctly stated in the article?

I am writing you and asking this answer for the benefit

of the very honest, conscientious brother who is laboring under false impression as to your position on several doctrinal points.

Yours in Christ,  
JESSE McINTEER.

Before Brother Boll had seen this letter, E. L. Jorgenson, his private secretary and manager, wrote the brother as follows:

April 16, 1934

Mr. .Jesse McInteer  
1017 City National Bank Building,  
Paducah, Ky.

Dear Brother: Your letter to Brother Boll was received in our office today, and I am sending it on to him at 403 Linden Walk, Lexington, Ky. He is now in a meeting at Lexington.

Brother Boll has not read the article to which you refer—in fact, he seldom reads those false accusations, and never answers them in the *Word And Work*. I have read the article, and have this comment to make:

The article is as accurate as the testimony of the scribes and Pharisees who sought the death of Jesus—including the two false witnesses (Matt. 26:60), and it is exactly as full of venom. It is as accurate as the testimony of the Jews and their orators, Tertullus, against Paul before Festus (Acts 24:5, 6), or of those men who brought charges against Paul before the magistrates at Philippi (Acts 16:20, 21.) In every case there is a semblance of truth in the testimony referred to—even exact quotation by false witnesses; but, on the whole, it was a garbled, distorted caricature—a prejudiced report that grew out of bitter enmity.

The article to which you refer is really directed against Brother G. C. Brewer, who dared to speak a kind word for Brother Boll in the Abilene Lecture Week. He, too, therefore, must be destroyed! That is the spirit of the attack on Brother Boll. The article was Brother Wallace's death throes as editor of the *Advocate*. He went too far! But how much better if he had repented!

I venture to send you Brother Boll's little booklets on "The Kingdom" and "The Revelation" that there you may see for yourself whether or not consequences that are attributed to Brother Boll and Brother Boll's teaching follow,

or whether they are disavowed by him.

Thanking you for the inquiry, we are,

Fraternally yours,

WORD AND WORK

By E. L. Jorgenson

What a *sweet* spirit and *kind* letter from such a reputedly *meeek* source! Brother Jorgenson classifies me with the scribes and Pharisees, Tertullus and the wicked Jews; but classifies Brother Boll with Jesus and Paul! The letter reveals the real source of the bitterness and in whose heart the enmity actually exists.

We are puzzled over Brother Boll's attempted replies to certain things in these *Advocate* articles, as he has been doing through the *Word And Work*, both before and after Brother Jorgenson wrote this letter—if he does not read them. Perhaps he reads more than his secretary thinks he does! His statement that Brother Boll "never answers them in the *Word And Work*" is reversed by the *Word And Work* itself. If he had said that Brother Boll never *publishes* the articles in the *Word And Work* which he attempts to answer, his statement would have been more accurate.

Brother Jorgenson's statement that there is "a semblance of truth" in the charges we have preferred against Brother Boll's teaching is a partial admission of its truth. So his letter is a partial *admission* and a partial *denial*. It becomes his duty, therefore, to suspend generalities and specify wherein we have misrepresented his teaching. Plain honesty requires that he either sustain his statements or retract them. Never mind about that imaginary specter he calls "Brother Wallace's death throes as editor of the *Advocate*." It is the "death grip" on these theories that is hurting so. And do not waste any tears over this ex-editor's need of repentance on the assumption that "he went too far!" Brother Jorgenson has not gone far enough until he sustains his accusations or retracts them.

In the interim I will submit the proof for the items of false teaching charged against this Boll-Neal party. The Boll part of the evidence is in the "booklets on 'The Kingdom, and 'The Revelation,' " which Brother Jorgenson "ven-

tured" to send to the Paducah brother. The Neal part of it is in that illuminating (?) booklet of his, which he calls "Light in a Dark Place." Perhaps, Brother Jorgenson does these books like he says Brother Boll does the *Advocate* articles. But he should read them and inform himself.

In the latest manifesto, published in the *Gospel Advocate* of July 12, Brother Boll admits the following points of my itemization:

1. The "reign of Christ with his saints on the earth for a thousand years, following this dispensation and the return of Christ."

2. A literal resurrection of the righteous, "separated from the resurrection of the rest of the dead by a thousand years"

3. The conversion and restoration of Israel to their "own land."

4. Another kingdom of Christ, more than the church, yet future, which Christ will establish on the earth at His coming.

5. Prophecies concerning the kingdom, taken at "face value," are yet unfulfilled.

6. The apocalyptic vision of Rev. 20 is literal, not figurative, and its "plain import" teaches a literal, earthly millennium.

Having thus far represented Brother Boll correctly, by his own admissions, let us now cite the proof for the other items.

From Boll's own "booklet on 'The Kingdom' " the following is sifted:

1. On page 34, last paragraph, he says that the kingdom announced by John and Jesus "has never yet appeared."

2. On page 35, first paragraph, he says "the kingdom promise was national" and "the preparatory repentance must also be national;" and since the Jews did not *nationally* repent, the kingdom promise was not fulfilled.

3. On pages 3 and 38 he says that in consequence of the kingdom postponement, Jesus introduced a new and unexpected *phase* of his teaching—the parables; and also a new



and unexpected *aspect* of the kingdom—"the church age."

4. On page 61 he says that Christ is not King "in fact and act," but his throne is now "de jure et potentia"—by right and authority only; but when Christ returns, his throne will be "de facto et actu"—in fact and act.

5. On page 81 he uses the famous "vestibule illustration" and says that the church is only the *vestibule of the kingdom*.

6. On page 71 he says that "so long as Satan's throne is on the earth, Christ is not exercising the government."

7. On page 18 he argues that old pagan Rome must come back into existence in order to fulfill the prophecy of Dan. 2: 44, which said the kingdom of God would be established "in the days of those kings," the Roman kings.

8. Then in his treatise on "The Second Coming" (now out of print), on page 21, he said: "The first stage of the second coming is when the Lord comes down to receive his saints up. Then after certain affairs have been attended to he comes with them, and the whole world sees his coming." This is what Russell called "the rapture," but Brother Boll names it the "first stage" of the second coming, and "a time" for Christ and the saints to attend to "certain affairs" in the heavens *somewhere*.

9. Finally, on page 55 of "Light In A Dark Place," Charles M. Neal orders the re-allotment of the land of Canaan to the Jews in the millennium, and locates the site in Jerusalem for the rebuilding of Solomon's temple, when Jerusalem, "Israel's capital city," becomes "the capital city and religious center of the world."

So there it is, brethren, in "black and white"—with Boll and Neal as the witnesses. I have sustained without exception every item of the charges made against them of this heretical teaching. It is now up to E. L. Jorgenson to either disprove and repudiate the foregoing quotations or retract his own statements. In either case, seeing that we have quoted from Boll's own books, he owes an apology for charging us with misrepresentation and classing us with the wicked Jews who killed Jesus and told lies on Paul.

This is some of the sectarian doctrine Brother Boll is de-

manding the churches of Christ to countenance and fellowship in order to avoid becoming a sect! By his persistent pressing of these rank theories he has forfeited his right to the confidence and respect of a charitably inclined brotherhood, has theorized himself out of their fellowship, and has made of his party a little human sect among others of like sort. He has no one to blame but himself. But for his own stubborn declaration of independence he could now be enjoying the fellowship of the churches of Christ everywhere and be doing untold good. As it is, he has "chosen to ostracize from their fellowship" himself and his party. In one of his "doctrinal manifestoes," in the very tone of defiance, he said: "If any of us must be rejected from fellowship on these grounds, I can see no other course. They will just have to put us out." Thus by their own dictum would they *put themselves out*.

So, rather than abandon their pet theories, R. H. Boll and his party are going out from us—because in heart and faith they are not of us. It is the emergence of a sect.

### III.

#### SECTARIAN TENETS

Some years ago Brother R. L. Whiteside, and some others among the wiser and more discriminating brethren, predicted that the prophetic teaching of R. H. Boll would become the rallying ground for a new party. When false teaching of any kind is framed into a system it contains the seed of a sectarian party. There is a great difference between holding a few errors and formulating a doctrinal system. A religious party is not built on a few errors merely ; it must have a system, a scheme of things. So no matter what Brother Boll thinks of parties, creeds and sects, he is himself the center of one. He has the strength of a following; his sympathizers regard him as being very pious, and he has published a system of doctrines. Opposition to his teaching and personal criticisms of his course have caused his sympathizers to play up as a martyr. Holding to his present course, the party is certain—it is here. Brother

Whiteside was right in his reflections, of which the foregoing is the gist. But Brother Boll is not as pious as his party believes him to be. We have reason to doubt any man's genuine reverence for God's word who puts his opinions before the unity of the church and who elevates himself to the head of a party. This Brother Boll has done.

Having previously shown that the Boll Movement has embraced the heresies of millennialism, along with Russell, Rutherford, Scofield, and others, we now propose to show that their attitude toward sectarian teaching in general is out of harmony with the principles of New Testament teaching for which churches of Christ have stood through the years.

SECOND: THE BOLL, PARTY HAS ADOPTED PRACTICES  
AND EMBRACED NUMEROUS TENETS OF MODERN  
SECTARIAN BODIES

(1) *They fraternize with the Christian Church.* That they connived with that body of innovators during the Winchester discussion in the effort to embarrass the negative and prejudice the public against the Fairfax church is a known and notable fact. Such connivance is also manifest in Louisville. In the recent past E. L. Jorgenson participated in a "union raspberry service" at a Christian church near Louisville. The photogravure section of the Louisville Courier-Journal carried a full page picture of the ceremonies, showing a raspberry bedecked pulpit with Brother Jorgenson standing with upraised hands before the audience "blessing the raspberries." It is generally known that G. A. Klingman, who preaches for the Highland church (the Jorgenson-Janes congregation) is ultra-sympathetic with the Christian Church. He attends their delegate conventions and makes speeches; appears with them in special services and participates in their worship, without protest or objection to their innovations; and in addition to preaching for the Highland Church, he teaches in a Christian Church seminary in Cincinnati. The explanation of all this fraternizing is seen in the fact that Brother Boll has taught his party to be "non-sectarian," so they are broad enough to let Brother Klingman divide his time between the Christian

Church in Cincinnati and the Highland Church of Christ in Louisville. In exchange for such broad liberality the Christian Church in Louisville invites Brother Jorgenson to come over and bless their raspberries!

(2) *They have borrowed the prognostications of the Seventh Day Adventists and the Russellites on the "Signs of the Times" Anent the Second Coming of Christ.* In the May issue of the *Word And Work* Brother Boll voices his resentment at the floating "rumors" that he is Russellistic in his teaching. That is no longer a mere rumor. It has become a matter of common knowledge. But he protests that such "slander" is "unfair" seeing that he has repeatedly "told" us that he "does not hold even so much as one distinctive doctrine of Russell's." That is still not telling us anything. There is nothing "distinctive" in his own system, for other kindred sectarian bodies teach either in part or in whole all that Brother Boll teaches concerning the future. There is *not one distinctive doctrine* in his system. His party has the least reason to exist of any sect that has appeared, not excepting the Christian Church. He has, in fact, become so much like the Russellites and the Adventists in these particulars that the "rumor" really represents a very small mistake.

Russell and Rutherford set dates. Brother Bolls says that he cannot fix the *precise dates*, but there is "a calculation" that so certainly indicates the "proximity of Christ's return" that he can tell us "approximately" when it will be! Yet he thinks it is "slander" to be classed with the Russellites !!

His "calculation is based on the language of Christ "if he shall come in the second watch, or in the third watch" coupled with Paul's statement that "the 'night' is far spent, the day is at hand." He sets down "cold figures"—figuring that "the 'night' had already run 4,000 years" when Paul wrote Rom. 13:12, and has run "nearly 2000 **years since.**" If the night was *far spent* then, it must have been past midnight, he says, and "the third watch was well on." The length of the watches in "cold figures being less than 2000 years," at any count, even the most conservative, we are

now away in the fourth watch! Though these figures are not *precise*, Brother Boll says they are *approximate* and the time is *very near!* Hence, the only difference between his set of figures and rank Russellism and Rutherfordism is that in not setting the precise or actual date, Brother Boll saves himself the embarrassment of missing his guess as Russell and Rutherford have done lo! these many years. To intelligent people whose minds are not warped by speculation this set of "cold figures" Brother Boll has conjured up is nothing more than a *cold trail*.

His entire argument is vague, indefinite and without even the "semblance" of proof or truth. It is an inexcusable misapplication of the Lord's illustration of the watches of the night—the unexpectedness of his coming; and an unwarranted misinterpretation of Paul's statement that the night is far spent, the day is at hand—an exhortation to faithfulness in view of the brevity of life and the shortness of opportunity. Like all other speculative aspects of this theoretical system, it is a piece of pure guessing—and not of a harmless variety—for it distorts the teaching of Jesus and Paul on essential subjects.

Referring to the "signs of the times," Brother Boll asserts that wars, earthquakes, famines, and pestilences, "have occurred within the last twenty years in a magnitude never before known in all the annals of mankind," which he thinks would portend the nearness of the Lord's return. He needs to study the "annals" more carefully. A check-up on statistics available in any standard comprehensive encyclopedia will reveal that earthquakes in Portugal, Sicily, China, Egypt, and many old countries, between the fifteenth and the eighteenth centuries took staggering tolls as high as four and five hundred thousand in human lives in one quake. Similar statistics are available from the same sources on famine and pestilence "in divers places" both before and after these dates. If such be the sign of the Lord's return how could anyone distinguish between the significance of these calamities, since they have been present in every century since the New Testament was written? At least, how can Brother Boll say that such things

"have occurred within the last twenty years in a magnitude never before known in all the annals of mankind"? It is just another sample of speculative assertion and another example of utter unreliability in dealing with facts, figures, and *scripture*.

Did Jesus teach that such calamities would be the omen of his personal return? The proof is lacking. The evidence rather points strongly toward the fulfillment of the prophecies of Matthew 24, Mark 13, and Luke 21, in the destruction of Jerusalem—the impending event before the Christian world prior to A. D. 70. It will do the interested reader good to study these chapters in connection with the comments and explanations of Adam Clarke based on the historical events and other facts notated by Josephus, the historian who witnessed the destruction of Jerusalem. At any rate, the fact that no apostle of Christ in any epistle to Christians ever used "cold figures" based on such signs is the unmistakable proof that Brother Boll's figuring is wrong and that he is not tracking apostolic precept and example in either his teaching or the course he is pursuing.

The pressing of these portentous theories has in reality placed Brother Boll and his associates on the par and plane with Russell, Rutherford, and all other such fanatics who have annoyed the world with their prognostications when they could have been doing something more worthwhile. They have no just ground of complaint when they are so classified.

(3) *They are sectarian in their views and general attitude toward the work and influence of the Holy Spirit in the world today.* In that all-comprehensive triple manifesto issued some months ago from Louisville, H. L. Olmstead, the second member of the encyclical triumvirate, handed down a made-to-order oracle on "What To Preach." He classed the preaching that we have been doing for years on how the Holy Spirit operates in the conversion of sinners—through the word of God—as a *mere theory* of conversion itself, "a human article of faith," and as "unimportant" as the setting up of the kingdom on Pentecost, or the order of repentance and faith, or how one is born of the

Spirit—all of which is *preaching a creed* and should be "thrown to the moles and the bats"! Imagine these brethren referring to the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion as unimportant! Those of us who know the errors that lurk in the sectarian dogma of direct converting power of the Holy Spirit cannot receive such a manifesto as the manifestation of sound doctrine

And now comes Virgil Smith, a missionary to Brazil, endorsed and sponsored by the Boll group in Louisville, teaching the direct operation of the Holy Spirit on some natives in Brazil, and saying that both the baptism of the Holy Spirit and the Spiritual Gifts of the New Testament era are yet in force. He appeared in Louisville recently "in three long sessions" before the *Word and Work* brethren (the "Sanhedrin" they would have called it had the meeting been held by the *Gospel Advocate* in Nashville) to testify concerning his "unusual experiences" with the Holy Spirit in Brazil. The following items are taken from Brother Boll's summary of his experiences:

1. Certain "spiritual experiences which took place among the Brazilian converts" led Smith and Boyer to believe that a *special work of the Holy Spirit was going on*.

2. A certain native named Joao Nunes attracted the attention of Smith by his weeping and groaning on the floor, and repeating "the Lord is good, the Lord is good."

3. The experiences Joao were "in the main typical of that which swept over the converts *afterward*."

4. Virgil Smith "expressed his belief that the manifestations such as in Joao's case were instances of the 'baptism of the Spirit.'"

5. He further said that he was unable to prove by the scriptures that the "gift of tongues" had passed away.

6. Though Smith believes these "supernatural demonstrations and manifestations" are the result of the "baptism of the Spirit" for the sake of *policy* he agreed to call it being "filled with the Spirit" as in Eph. 5:18!

7. Brother Boll added here that "Brother Smith is in substantial (though not complete) agreement" with the

*Word And Work.*

8. Brother Boll further goes on record by saying that the foregoing positions held by the missionaries are not sufficient as a cause to "let them go," seeing that they *claim* no creed but the scriptures and are only building up a New Testament church in Brazil!

9. Finally, anticipating criticism Brother Boll retreats behind his ever handy creedless screen murmuring "how could we cast them out and ever face the world again to say that we are not sectarian?!"

Brethren, there it is—Brother Boll has called us all "sectarian" in advance who will not support missionaries who believe, teach, and profess to practice this sectarian foolishness of the most flagrant type. Building up a New Testament church, indeed! It has every earmark of a Holy Roller church instead! Why go to Brazil for such "spiritual experiences" ? They can be found in any Holy Roller, or Salvation Army meeting anywhere in this country. But Brother Boll declares that we cannot "cast them out." Then *call them home* and put them in the primary class of a sound church of Christ where they may be taught the way of the Lord more perfectly.

Has not Brother Boll put himself in the position where it will be difficult for him to make any kind of erroneous doctrine a test of fellowship? Is there anybody he can consistently *mark* and *avoid*?

All of this talk about "creedism" and "sectism" is for effect, to cover erroneous teaching and practices these brethren have embraced and are on the eve of openly promulgating. Their cry is not new. It is as old as innovation in either doctrine or worship. Every departure from the New Testament among Christians has sought its justification in that "creed-bound" cry. No man ever uses it until he has something to teach which is objectionable. Thus came digression and all the talk about the "creed in the deed" when loyal brethren resorted to legal protection of their property rights against the innovators. It is the same spirit in these brethren who are now crying Creed! Creed! and Sect! Sect! as they encounter determined opposition to their ef-



forts to foist their system of prophetic speculation, with a lot of other sectarian practices, upon the churches of Christ. We shall not be weakened in our opposition to this or any other form of error by any such feint.

By now the brethren should be getting their eyes open to the real danger of the Boll Movement with its heresies.

#### IV.

### THE MISSIONARY SITUATION

Things are happening thick and fast in Louisville, Ky. The chickens are all coming home to roost at the same time—the millennial theories;; the kingdom-deferred illusion; Judaistic dreams concerning Jerusalem and the Jews; the doctrine of the direct operation of the Holy Spirit; the baptism of the Spirit; divine healing; tongues; spiritual gifts as in the New Testament era; the "can't-sin" sanctification of Holiness fancy; substituting prayer and piety for obedience and soundness; fellowshipping denominational and digressive preachers in church services; in short, flirting in multiple form with sectarian teaching and practice.

That this party no longer represents a mere group of dreamers, guessers, and speculators within the church, but a distinct faction, no informed person can deny in the light of the developments. The evidence is accumulative. Proof in documentary form is being furnished without request from "the four corners" of the brotherhood. It would furnish much interesting reading if space and expediency justified the publication of it all.

In Dallas, Texas, recently, R. H. Boll was advertised under the auspices of what is known as "Mount Auburn Church of Christ" (a little Boll faction in Dallas). The card announcing the meeting featured Brother Boll in bold set-up : "Premillennial In Doctrine."

R. H. Boll is actually heading a sectarian party within the church. Here it is in special feature—"Premillennial In Doctrine." Brother Boll differs in doctrine from the rest of us and *advertises* the fact. He has a distinct party tenet—except it is not distinctive—it is not peculiar to him. The

Russellites beat him to it. He is only playing second fiddle to Pastor Charles T. Russell. Premillennial in doctrine, indeed ! Instead of holding meetings for the purpose of preaching the gospel of Christ to sinners, Brother Boll fosters his party theories and disrupts the churches. It is a notable fact that where he has repeatedly preached *the churches have been divided*. Abilene, Dallas, Nashville, Louisville, Lexington, Winchester serve as examples of that fact.

The foregoing facts having been rather elaborately emphasized in other articles, we propose now to deal directly with the missionary situation as it is related to this party movement.

#### THE BOLL MISSIONARY DECREE

Concerning the heretical teaching of the Brazilian missionaries, in the July *Word And Work*, Brother Boll says that "love for these brethren, rather than agreement on disputed points, holds us to them—a love that will not let them go." He further says that "they have no interest in building up in Brazil any party, but the simple New Testament church," and "claim the Scriptures only as their creed and guide." He thinks it is an opportunity to practice the doctrine of "forbearing one another in love" and with a melodramatic flourish he concludes: "How could we cast them out and ever face the world again to say that we are not sectarian?"

Does "forbearing one another in love" demand that we forbear heresy? Is the reputed claim of heretics that they accept "the Scriptures only as their guide" sufficient ground to "hold us to them"? Does Brother Boll expect them to disclaim the Scriptures as their guide? Will he "hold," regardless of teaching and practice, every one who claims the Scriptures as their guide?

Brother Boll apparently anticipated the opposition to his sectarian liberality and the rejection of his creedal indorsement of these missionaries, so he began calling us bad names in advance. He brands all who refuse to fellowship the sectarianism of these missionaries as "sects," "creed-ists," "ostracizers," "disfellowshippers," and such like. All

of this before we even knew what his missionaries were teaching and practicing. Seeing that he himself had full knowledge of their teachings and doings, it can now be seen that his "Emergence of a Sect," and other articles that followed, were merely prophetic of the supposed prosecution (which he thinks is persecution) of his case by the *Gospel Advocate*. His guilty conscience needed no accuser, and by his own articles he has virtually entered a plea of guilty.

So now from doctrinal manifestoes on creeds the scene has shifted to mandatory decrees on fellowshipping the sectarianism of various foreign missionaries. Let us reflect on the real situation.

Some months ago, O S. Boyer, in Brazil, reported direct impressions of the Holy Spirit upon some unsaved natives. The *Word And Work* defended the report. Now come Smith and Boyer claiming unusual spiritual experiences, direct operations, the baptism of the Holy Spirit, divine healing, unknown tongues, and various miraculous manifestations of the New Testament era. Instead of a vigorous repudiation of such foolishness, Brother Boll defends these missionaries and brands those who reject such sectarianism as being themselves sectarian! Meanwhile another Smith, brother of the Brazilian missionary, in the same issue of the *Word And Work*, advocates the Holiness "can't-sin" doctrine of sanctification! And Brother Boll opposes none of it and makes no effort to "correct" those whom he avers are so willing to be "corrected by that book." So the sectarian band wagon of the Boll party rolls merrily on unopposed by himself or any other of his group, and with his apparent sanction.

God either does or does not perform the work of miracles and signs today. If he does, in what body are they represented? There are a dozen bodies who rest such claims on the same evidence and the same experiences. Has God honored all of these sectarian bodies with such signs? If so, one is as good as another. If not, how shall we discriminate between them, since their claims, experiences, and testimonials are identical? This one fact proves that no miracles exist today, for the *one* body in which miracle power existed

would put all others out of existence—the false claims could not stand the competition! When miracles, spiritual gifts, actually existed in the church, there was only one church. No other could have existed alongside of it.

It is libelous to divine revelation to allow that miracle power has lain dormant for centuries due to lack of faith when it was inaugurated in the beginning to produce faith. The faith-producing work has been done. We now have the word—the New Testament—and "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."

#### THE O. S. BOYER CATECHISM

The following excerpt from an editorial in the *Christian Leader*, by Ira C. Moore, is to the point, and reveals clearly that the source of these missionary heresies is not the missionaries themselves, but rather their training and influence under R. H. Boll in Louisville :

"Reference is had to the questions by O. S. Boyer in the *Leader* of July 10. He is an associate and companion in labor with V. E. Smith, whose erroneous position and fallacious arguments in support of the baptism in the Holy Spirit for everybody now we answered and exposed in the last two numbers of the *Leader*, and to whose questions T. Q. Martin's article in the *Leader* of July 10 was directed. They are young men trained up, as I understand, under the tutelage of R. H. Boll, of Louisville, Ky., or at least indorsed by him after he knew of their defection. They are being supported on the mission field by the church which holds to his unsupportable views on the millennium and prophecies. They and their teaching are indorsed by Charles M. Neal, Winchester, Ky., in a letter to me."

Here is concrete evidence. R. H. Boll indorses the missionaries and Charles M. Neal indorses their teaching. Put together, therefore, the missionaries stand fully indorsed by Boll and Neal.

We are glad that such able men as I. C. Moore and T. Q. Martin are leading the fight against this faction through the *Christian Leader*. Their strong articles carry weight, and should be read by all the brethren.

If the reader has forgotten the Boyer "Heart-to-Heart

Questions," turn back to the *Gospel Advocate* of August 2 for reference. They are really not questions at all. They are interrogatory arguments intended as a feeler, to get the reaction of the brethren. They are merely taking the temperature of the brotherhood on the questions involved. But the questions present nothing new in such mental delinquencies. They represent nothing more than common ordinary Holiness propaganda of the shouting variety. They are so radically opposite to the bedrock gospel elements of our plea as not to demand an answer, considering the source from which they come. A mere *airing* of the case that brethren may be informed of what is going on in the church is all that is required. If there is any debating of the Holy Spirit question, written or oral, it should be done with some sectarian representative, not with sidetracked and derailed (if not deranged) missionaries in our own ranks.

It is too late for Smith and Boyer to be writing back asking a hundred questions on the subject of the Holy Spirit's work. They should have known such plain Bible teaching before they went, or else have stayed at home. Instead of trying to enlighten them at long distance, by remote control, they should be at once discontinued as missionaries on the ground of ignorance and incompetence. And the Boll party is taking up these fads too late. Other religious zealots have already played them for all they are worth. Intelligent people have reacted against such hackneyed fanaticism with disgust. Now for Brother Boll to even countenance, much less to shield and condone, such experiments among the ignorant natives of Africa and Brazil is more than tragic—it is treason.

#### THE VIRGIL SMITH COMPROMISE

In his description of Smith's "work and experiences" in Brazil, Brother Boll says that though Smith believed the "supernatural manifestations" were the result of the "baptism of the Spirit," he would yield to Brother Boll's suggestion and call it being "filled with the Spirit in accordance with Eph. 5:18." Two things are here revealed: first, that "filled with the Spirit" to Smith means the baptism of the Spirit, and his yielding to the suggestion to call it something

else was purely political—mere diplomacy; second, that to Brother Boll, Eph. 5:18 means a "supernatural manifestation" of the Holy Spirit, and he does not regard Smith as unsound. He thus meets Smith half way, and his maneuvering is, therefore, no less politic than was Smith's compromising. A great compromise it was! He believed it was the baptism of the Holy Spirit, but agreed to call it "filled with the Spirit" as in Eph. 5:18. Why the toning down? If he believes it is the baptism of the Spirit, why should Brother Boll induce him to call it anything else? For the purpose of seeing through this compromise, let us study in proper connection passages of Scripture bearing on the question.

1. *The Spirit in Eph. 5:18.* It so happens that Paul himself tells us what the expression "filled with the Spirit" in Eph. 5:18 means. The passages are the same in scope. Here they are in parallel:

**EPH. 5:18, 19**

"Be filled with the spirit; speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord."

**COL. 3:16**

"Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord."

The passages are equal to each other, and are equal to the same thing. When the word of Christ dwells richly in a Christian's heart as in Col. 3:16, he is filled with the Spirit "in accordance with Eph. 5:18." There is nothing the Bible says that the Holy Spirit does in the heart of man, saint or sinner, that the word of God is not also said to do. It means that the word is the Spirit's only medium of influence. But Brother Boll relates how Smith and the natives "sought after" something "supernatural" in prayer and got "rigidity of muscles" and psychological convulsions! Still he says his experiences are "far different" from the Pentecostal and Holiness cults. How far? Russellites, Adventists, and Brother Boll deny their respective viewpoints. But they are all so much alike that ordinary people cannot see the difference. And now the missionaries are experimenting with these Holy-Ghost hallucinations, precisely the same in kind, and Brother Boll declares that we cannot exclude them

without being sectarian. He has it exactly reversed. We cannot fellowship such sectarianism without being sectarian. In the fear of being semisectarian, Brother Boll has in reality become multisectarian.

2. *Spiritual Gifts in 1 Cor. 13.* We see by the Boyer catechism that the gift of tongues, power of prophecy, and supernatural knowledge of 1 Cor. 13 will not cease until we see "face to face." Commenting in *Word And Work*, Brother Boll cautiously concedes that verses 8 to 10, regarding the ceasing of these gifts "when that which is perfect is come," *could be construed* to refer to the future. Thus he surrenders to the modern miracle-working cults one of the plainest proof texts in the New Testament against the presence of miracles in the church today.

The three "spiritual-gifts" chapters—1 Cor. 12, 13, 14—must be considered together. The context of these chapters shows clearly that supernatural endowments were special, and not general; selective, and not collective. 1 Cor. 13 is a contrast between the state of the church under miracles then and under the revealed word now. Under the order of miracles, knowledge was imperfect, revelation was fragmentary; hence, "in part," not complete. No one apostle or prophet delivered the whole of God's word. But in the New Testament the parts are brought together into the complete whole; hence, "that which is perfect is come"—the New Testament. The perfect will of God having been revealed, that which is "in part"—the provisional order of miracles, tongues, prophecy, supernatural knowledge—has been "done away." The condition of the church under the provisional order of miracles was compared to the state of childhood, and referred to as knowing in part and as seeing through a glass dimly. But the condition of the church under the permanent order of God's revealed will is compared to the state of mature manhood, and referred to as knowing fully and as seeing "face to face." 1 Cor. 13 is a definite proof text that the provisional order of miracles has ceased from the church and that the permanent order of faith, hope, and love remain in the church.

3. *The Unity of Faith and Knowledge—Eph. 4:11-16.* The

purpose of these special gifts, as explained by Paul in Eph. 4:11-16, was to guard the church against being "tossed to and fro . . . with every wind of doctrine" before the New Testament was perfected for their guidance. The duration of such gifts was only until the church should come "in unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man." Unity of *the faith* and of *the knowledge* of the Son of God have come—revealed in the New Testament. The church has attained unto a "perfect man" and to "fulness of stature"—to its complete state. Therefore the provisional order of spiritual gifts has ceased. The permanent order—the perfect will of God in the New Testament—is all that the church has or needs today.

It is startling that Brother Boll should concede these scriptural bulwarks to those who are advocating a present order of miracles in the church, and it leaves us to wonder just how far he and his party intend to go. It is his millennial theory that causes him to reinterpret these Scriptures, allowing them to refer to the future. His theory, in fact, causes him to reinterpret the whole Bible, and his vacillating admissions make it easier for Boyer and Smith to believe and teach their extreme views on the Holy Spirit's work.

4. *The Signs That Followed*—Mark 16:15-20. These two Brazilian missionaries think that if the "signs that followed" the apostles and early believers in carrying out the Great Commission ceased, the commission also ceased, including preaching, baptism, and all. None but a mere tyro in Scripture and logic could so egregiously err in reasoning. The fact that the provisional power of the apostles to work miracles to *confirm* their preaching was not continued could be no sort of proof that *what they preached* was not permanent. As well say that when constitutional-making power ended, the constitution also ended, or that when apostolic inspiration ceased, the inspired word also ceased. The truth is that while the word of God was *in the man* (the inspired apostle) it had to be confirmed, proved. It required the *sign* to prove that it was the word of God in them. Hence, "they went forth and preached everywhere,



the Lord working with them, and confirming the word by the signs that followed." But as the word of God is now in the book—revealed and confirmed—we prove our preaching by the book, not by signs. The sole purpose of "the signs that followed" was accomplished when the word was confirmed, and, being provisional, the miracles ceased and the confirmed word remains. A Brazilian missionary should be able to grasp that.

Brother Boll is so steeped in error himself that he cannot consistently correct these missionaries. It behooves him to lay aside his millennial theories, return his borrowed heresies to Scofield and Russell, where he found them, and stand with us on the essentials of the gospel. If he will not do it, the injury that his course has done to the church of the Lord will rise up against him in the judgment. Among us there are some apologists for these brethren who avow that they "do not believe the Boll theory," but who will not help us in the fight. They merely stand by, look on, and criticize. But the error taught by this group of factionists is too devitalizing to the gospel of Christ not to be opposed. We shall not be deterred by sentimental criticisms. We are determined that the repeated offensives launched by this Louisville group shall be each time repulsed and their line of attack pushed back to their Louisville territory. THIS SECT SHALL NOT PASS.

THE END

Copyrighted 1W8

By **Roy E. Cogdill Publishing Company**