There is immeasurable satisfaction in the personal conviction that one is saved and sure of heaven. Many think they are saved who are not, and the disappointment of a multitude who regard themselves as sure of heaven must be viewed as appalling. Jesus expresses a warning along this line. “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 who is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name, and by thy name cast out demons, and by thy name do many mighty works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.” (Matt. 7:21-23) Human speculation cannot point the way to heaven, nor can human feeling or opinion carry reliable assurance that one is saved. Divine assurance is based on the promises of God, and a man should heed the divine admonition “be not foolish, but understand what the will of the Lord is.” (Eph. 5:17)

It is important that the information revealed to guide an honest man into a state of blessed assurance should be both simple and clear. The New Testament is not disappointing in this respect. The Lord’s will is expressly stated in words that are immediately understandable by all who have any appetite for assurance. “And he said unto them, 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) “Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Brethren, what shall we do? And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.” (Acts 2:37, 38) There is nothing in this that all should not easily understand, and he who obeys has the promise of God that his sins are pardoned. He is saved. “Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord.” (Acts 3:19) It must be clear that a sinner thus forgiven is saved only from his past sins. It is both unscriptural and unthinkable that this pardon absolves him from the guilt and the consequences of sins he may commit after his baptism into Christ. Provisions, both ample and divine, are made to insure the Christian’s entry into heaven but these provisions are conditional and call for cooperation on his part. The apostle John has something to say about this. “If we say that we have fellowship with him and walk in the darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: but if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin.” (I John 1:6, 7) “My little children, these things write I unto you that ye may not sin. And if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world. And hereby we know that we know him, if we keep his commandments.” (I John 2:1-3)

The Christian must walk in the blood-sealed commandments of the Lord or else sin will conquer him and keep him out of heaven. As an aid, he has constant and instant access to a throne of grace through Jesus our Advocate. It was to Christians Paul wrote: “Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey the lusts thereof.” (Romans 6:12) “So then, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh to live after the flesh: for if ye live after the flesh, ye must die: but if by the Spirit ye put to death the deeds of the body, ye shall live.” (Romans 6:12, 13)

There are some strange and harmful ideas afloat regarding the sins that Christians commit: A Dr. Pettingill has a “Bible Questions Answered” column in a Chattanooga daily paper. A querist approached the doctor with a hypothetical question on divorce and declared that “the Scripture says that she commits adultery. Will that be a sin and keep her from being saved and going to Heaven at the end of time?” The doctor’s answer will bear some looking into. He says in part:

“The question of ‘being saved and going to Heaven at the end of time’ is not settled by such considerations. Every one who is born again is saved and is sure of Heaven.”

That is, if I understand the matter, the contention is that if one has been “born again” and “is saved” and commits adultery he “is sure of Heaven” anyhow. I take it that “such considerations” would not be limited to adultery. There are other sins besides adultery, a long list of them. If “Every one who is born again is saved and is sure of Heaven”, even though he commits adultery, why should he not be equally “sure of Heaven” even if he commits some or all of the other sins catalogued in the scriptures? This certainly gives a saved man plenty of latitude in the way of sin.

The doctor must have sensed that this needed some sort of qualification so he remarked that “God will doubtless deal with them in chastening. For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth.” Incidentally, his use of this text is a perversion of it. The implication is that a Christian suffers the consequences of his sins only in this life. Doesn’t a sinner suffer the same consequences for the same sins (Cont. on page 13)
Our idea has been and is that the way to unity should be pointed out by preaching and practicing what the New Testament teaches. We have freely and sharply criticized the Murch-Witty unity meetings because we honestly believed they encouraged a unity by a compromise or surrender of principles to which we cling most tenaciously. Personally, I do not like Brother Witty’s attitude. He seems to have only kind words and tender looks for Brother Murch and his digressive associates while he thinks the rest of us who will not smile and smile and smile on digressive and premillennialists should be ashamed of ourselves and expresses the opinion that the Lord is ashamed of us. He has aimed some sharp arrows of criticism at “conservative” brethren of late because we do not share his emotional enthusiasm for digression, or at least that is what it looks like to me, but if you can find anything he has written currently that would afford any offense to the organ crowd, send it to me. I would like to see it. He hopes that his new paper, “a brotherhood” enterprise, whatever that is, is destined to introduce a new era of greater fellowship. Candor demands that he employ some emphasis on the point of whether that greater fellowship will result in more or fewer organs and the like in the worship of the churches. My impression is that he steps along too gingerly in some places to know where he is going, if he is going where I think he ought to. His querulous complaints because some of us are not pussyfooting along with him is not too reassuring but serves only to deepen our suspicions that when he arrives where he is going, he’ll be at the wrong place. If he keeps on being too soft on things we think are wrong and too hard on things we think are right, he may eventually find it expedient to inaugurate some new unity meetings, even if they are not “national,” to reestablish a lost fellowship between us. It is already evident that he is more in love with some digressives than he is with some of us.

We have from time to time urged some practical demonstrations of what has been accomplished in these “national Unity Meetings.” Brother Don Carlos Janes, who is nearly as close to Brother Witty as he is to Brother Boll, if I have things straight, is pointing the way to the pot of gold at the end of the Murch-Witty rainbow. The following is taken from a recent report from Brother Janes in the Firm Foundation.

“From July 13th to 29th, Brother S. S. Lappin, a Christian church minister from Bedford, Indiana, held a meeting in his own church. When I heard his magnificent speech at the Lexington, Kentucky, unity meeting in 1940, the thought was publicly expressed that such preaching would be desirable in our congregation. After he was again heard both in the semi-closed instrumental music discussion and in the public sessions of the Columbus, Ohio, unity meeting of this year, he was invited for this work. The meeting, held in a 40 by 70 tent on the church lawn, was well attended and yielded eight or nine responses (eleven just before the meeting) and should contribute something toward the slow and difficult process of restoring unity at least in some measure among alienated brethren. Were all the Christian church brethren possessed of the same attitude towards organs and societies that Brother Lappin has and if all the ‘conservative’ brethren had as much of the spirit of Christ as he has, the difficulties would be very largely removed. And if those who refrain from going to the unity meetings could bring themselves to the point of attending with open minds and open ears they could acquire some helpful information about present attitudes and views.”

Now, there are a few points I am ready to concede and be done with them. Brother Lappin is “A Christian church minister” and can make a “magnificent speech.” He is a prolific writer on the staff of the Christian Standard and an advocate of instrumental music in worship and defends the same societies the Christian Standard endorses. In other words he is a first-class digressive preacher and a smooth one at that. If attending the unity meetings results in making loyal brethren think that such men should be called for meetings in churches of Christ, then I think they should “refrain from going” even if Brother Janes does think otherwise. Brother Janes went and I take it that he carried along a couple of “open ears” and he no doubt would contend that he had an “open mind,” although that would introduce another subject for controversy, and look at the result! He thinks a digressive preacher with Brother Lappin’s “attitude toward organs and societies” should be called and used in meetings by the churches. What is Brother Lappin’s “attitude toward organs and societies?” He advocates them and uses them in the Church where he is pastor. If Brother Janes thinks the churches generally are going to follow the lead of the Highland church in Louisville in calling digressive preachers for their meetings, a “slow and difficult process” is too mild to describe the results along that line. It just isn’t going to happen, that is at all! Any church that does it will be a marked church as Highland already is. It is well known that the Highland church is unsound in addition to what is really the matter with it. Digression and premillennialism have found their true affinity there. They should call Brother Witty next and then Brother Murch. Brother Witty would look about right sandwiched in between Lappin and Murch in the Highland church. Incidentally, the action of the Highland church in this matter justifies about all that we have said in recent years about the subversive influences of premillennialism among the brethren. It is a symptom of general and fundamental unsoundness.

Brother Janes thinks that Brother Lappin has more “of the spirit of Christ” than some of the rest of us who refuse to compromise the true principles of either doctrine or worship. When Foy Wallace whipped Charlie Neal in Winchester, Ky., Jorgenson and Boll said he did not have the “spirit of Christ.” Neal did, and since he has quit the church, I suppose he still has! Brother Janes thinks “the difficulties would be very largely removed” if the churches would call men like that for their meetings. What “difficulties?” I’m a little curious to know whether or not Brother Witty thinks Brother Janes should be just a little ashamed of himself. He probably will not tell us but I think I know the answer anyway. If I did not think the Lord is ashamed of both of them, I might at-
tend the next unity meeting and learn something about the “spirit of Christ” from a lot of digressive preachers who will be sure to be there.

Since Brother Janes has told us what he thinks, I’m going to tell you how I feel for what, it may be worth. I’m a little more than tired of hearing a few soft-headed brethren brag on the digressives and throw spoiled eggs at conservative brethren who are both too smart and too loyal to be taken in by digressive tricks as old as the first organ that was ever slipped into a church over the protest of brethren who did “not have the spirit of Christ.” “It makes me sick,” as Brother Brewer would say, to hear it brayed around that digressives, premillennialists, and a handful of their sympathizers have a virtual monopoly on “the spirit of Christ,” and I’m about ready to “suit the action to the word.” The silly airs they are putting on is getting under my skin. I know them well enough to know that they are not any better, and some of them are not any smarter, than I am even. “This thing has got to stop,” as Winston Churchill would say, or else. A negro preacher arose to address his audience. Somebody in the audience hurled an over-ripe tomato which landed right in the middle of his black face. He patiently wiped away the remains and calmly remarked: “My deah brethren. Ise gwine ter women wid you-all a spell frum de scriptouhs, den Ise gwine ter ast de deah Lawd to beles us, and den de outdoinst fight a crap-shootin’ niggal even seen’s agwine ter kum off.”

Brother Janes and the Highland church are giving us some idea of what these unity meetings are trying to do to us. Reporting it in the Firm Foundation will not fool anybody. It will the more quickly shock the brethren into a sense of the danger that lurks in such compromising movements. The way they will make up their minds about it will be a “slow and difficult process.” It looks as though Brother Janes, not Brother Witty, has thrown the tomato which will start a real fight, and we propose to be right in the middle of it. I wouldn’t miss it for the world. Brother Janes should cling closely to Brother Kurfees’s coat-tails during the fracas, so he can be insured an abundant supply of “the spirit of Christ.” He is likely to need it. It is my conviction that Brother Janes is doing the cause of digression more good where he is and by what he is doing than if he were to join them outright. I think they feel the same way about it. The restraint that keeps me from saying the same thing about Brother Witty is not much of a handicap and may not be any by the time for the next issue to appear.” The digressives always lose a pitched battle on the issues involved, so they propose to win by strategy what they cannot win by fighting. Witty and Janes are ready-made Quislings for furthering their schemes. All the talk about “the spirit of Christ” in connection with the campaign to open the doors of the churches to digressive preachers is just “smooth and fair speech” designed to “beguile the hearts of the innocent.” There is nothing new about it. Appeasers mouthed smooth words in the name of unity when this organ fight first started and every mother’s son of them went digressive. The aggravated case of alienated affections afflicting Brother Witty and Brother Janes will not result in the promotion of the sort of unity the Bible teaches, even if it does temporarily fool a few of the brethren and pleases the crowd who caused the trouble in the first place. Better take warning from Paul. “But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve in his craftiness, your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity and the purity that is toward Christ.” (2 Cor. 11:3) Brother Janes is fond of the adage “When the brethren are taught better, they will do more.” Now, he thinks we ought to import some digressive preachers with the “Spirit of Christ” to teach us. Ugh! - C. E. W.

CONCERNING CHURCH NAMES

On page 5 will be found an article entitled “About Church Names.” Brother John W. Kurfees, whose zeal for the New Testament order of things is generally recognized and approved, is having a pretty hard time keeping some of us from “stereotyping one particular designating term” when we are talking about “the church.” He thinks we are “sectarianizing the church” if we call it “church of Christ” too often and something else too seldom. Now, I am some-what of a stickler for calling the church anything and everything it is called in the New Testament and have said so over and over again in these and other columns. Much that Brother Kurfees says is true, but I’m inclined to think he is carrying this thing to an erroneous extreme. I am certain that the expression “church of Christ” has been used in a sectarian sense, but not when it is applied to the right thing, however often it may be used. It is mis-used, only when it is employed to cover too little or too much or applied to something that is not it at all. For in-stance if you call something “the church of Christ” which is smaller than the entire body of Christ and larger than a local congregation, then you have employed the term in a sectarian sense. Brethren keep me more uneasy sometimes by what they mean by it, than they do by how often they say it.

The term “the church” which Brother Kurfees seems to prefer and regards as fool-proof as far as any “danger of ever sectarianizing that institution” is concerned, has no religious significance whatever aside from the “qualify ing designations” either expressed or implied in the New Testament. Without such qualification it might be a mob in Ephesus or a Roman court. “Church of God,” “my church,” “the church of the Lord,” “kingdom of Christ and God” and like “designations” identify the character of “the assembly.” Of course any and all of these “designations” may be abused by applying them to the wrong sort of assembly or church and they often are. That is not my fault however and I’m doing all I can to stop it without universal success.

Brother Kurfees should be pleased to note that brethren generally in their conversation and their writing often refer to “the church” and employ a variety of terms about as extensive as we find in the New Testament. He seems to be particularly concerned about what brethren write on their bulletin boards and over the doors of their meeting houses. Of course a meeting house is not the church at all. Let him tell us what we should write there. It would be rather awkward to "use some dozen or more qualifying, or designating terms" on a sign-board or over a meeting-house door. Should the sign be changed each week or so to keep from "stereotyping one particular designating term"? Should one church use one “designation” all the time, while another church employed another for full time? Would it help any if all should uniformly use “the church” without any “qualifying designations”? We are told that this term was used far more often than any other in the New Testament. But even the apostles did not use it all the time. And we must not use one “to the practical ex clusion of all the others.”

“The church is what the Lord established, and he didn’t establish but one.” Which one? What “church”? “My” church! Well, why not say so, over the meeting house door or anywhere else and as often as the need may be?

Along with his many other virtues, Brother Kurfees is persistent, and he will probably want to give us a little more light on this question. - C. E. W.
Under the above heading in the September number of Word And Work, E. L. Jorgenson endeavors to assuage the chagrin of some of his embarrassed co-workers and apologists by explaining why he and the Highland church in Louisville selected a digressive preacher for a revival meeting. He says his explanation is for the benefit of "those we have not had the privilege of attendance at the annual 'Unity Meetings.'" He got his sentence a little mixed up, but he means to say that those who attend the Witty-Murch Unity Meetings understand why he exchanges pulpits with the digressives, and those who do not attend such "Unity Meetings" might question his conduct.

In his "brief resume" he gave four excuses for inviting S. S. Lappin for the Highland tent meeting. I shall give a "brief resume" of the persons, places and events involved before considering the excuses contained in his apolog.

E. L. Jorgenson is minister of the Highland church in Louisville and Don Carlos Janes is one of its leaders. Both are avowed premillennialists. They and the Highland church "withdrew fellowship" from C. A. Taylor and others about twenty years ago because they objected to Jorgenson's sermons on Premillennialism. Those turned out of the Highland church were some of the best people in Louisville as the passing years surely have proved. They were never guilty of anything except raising a protest at Jorgenson's continuous harping on his speculative theories. But this evidently rendered them unfit to hold membership in the same congregation with Janes and Jorgenson, the great promoters of unity and the marvelous advocates of brotherly love.

S. S. Lappin is a digressive preacher and never was anything else. He is minister of the Christian Church in Bedford, Ind., and a regular writer for the Christian Standard. But he does not publicly oppose Jorgenson's theories of a millennium, and therefore according to Jorgenson, he is "a capable helper for evangelism" at the Highland church of Christ.

On the Sundays that Lappin was in Louisville, Jorgenson went to Bedford, Ind., and preached for the Christian Church there.

A gospel preacher who opposes Jorgenson's sermons on his future kingdom theory cannot preach for the Highland church, nor even be a member of it very long; at least C. A. Taylor and some others could not. But a digressive preacher who does not oppose premillennialism can occupy the pulpit of the Highland church, and Jorgenson and Janes will tell the world he is one of their "capable helpers for evangelism"; at least that is what they did for Lappin. Perhaps some of those who have "had the privilege of attendance at the annual 'Unity Meetings'" may wonder about that.

In the Lappin-Jorgenson revival, in the Witty-Murch unity meetings, in the Wallace-Norris debate, and on many other occasions some of the premillennialists of Louisville have convinced me that the plan of salvation and the true worship mean but very little to them when their divisive speculative theories are at stake. Now let us notice one by one the excuses which Jorgenson gave in his "brief resume" of his "thoughts and intents in connection" with his exchanging pulpits with the digressives.

1. He says it was "a step toward unity". Unity with what and whom? Would it not also be a step toward the same kind of unity if the Highland church would call a Methodist preacher for a revival meeting? It was not only "a step toward unity" with the Christian Church, it was a step into unity with the instrumental music crowd.

What were Jorgenson, Janes and the Highland church "stepping toward" when they withdrew fellowship from C. A. Taylor and others? With whom do they want unity? Not with Taylor, for they cast him out; not with Haldeman Avenue, for Don Carlos Janes has advised new-comers to Louisville that "Haldeman Avenue is a good place to stay away from".

2. As his second excuse Jorgenson says he was only following a principle advocated by M. C. Kurfees many years ago; that Kurfees once offered to work with J. B. Briney and others of the Christian Church if they would abandon their organ and societies. When did M. C. Kurfees become E. L. Jorgenson's authority in religion? Jorgenson has no more respect for M. C. Kurfees and his views than he has for C. A. Taylor and his views. He sacrificed the Christian fellowship of Taylor, Reuble, Kurfees and a host of other good men rather than cease his speculative teaching. In view of this, Jorgenson cannot deny that premillennialism is more precious to him than unity with loyal brethren.

There is a gulf of difference between Kurfees' proposition to Briney and the swapping of pulpits by Jorgenson and Lappin. Let us notice that difference:

First, Briney and all other digressive preachers in that meeting refused to accept Kurfees' proposition. WHY? Because the Christian Church would have to forsake its organ and societies to do so. When Lappin and Jorgenson united in their recent efforts, Lappin did not forsake his organ and societies, nor did he show the slightest intention of ever doing so. He was called to hold a meeting for a church that did not use the organ, and he answered the call. As soon as his meeting with Jorgenson was over he went right back to his organ and societies at Bedford. If Kurfees had made the same proposition to Briney that Jorgenson made to Lappin, then Briney would have joined hands with Kurfees as quickly as Lappin joined hands with Jorgenson. The very fact that Briney refused to work with Kurfees makes it quite clear to all fair minded people that Kurfees was requiring something of Briney, which Jorgenson did not require of Lappin.

Another difference: During the Highland meeting Lappin reportedly told his prospective converts that they could unite with either the Highland church of Christ or the Eden-side Christian Church near by. Is that the ground on which Kurfees offered to work with Briney? Jorgenson knows it is not. While Jorgenson was at Bedford what congregation did he advise his prospective converts to unite with? Did he warn them that the Bedford Christian Church is a "good place to stay away from"? That is the advice his co-worker Janes gives regarding the church where M. C. Kurfees
preached for nearly half a century. When did Kurfees ever offer to make an agreement with anyone, which would compel him to extend an invitation to the unsaved at the close of his sermon with the understanding that the new converts were to unite with a digressive church? That is what Jorgenson did at Bedford, Indiana. Kurfees demanded that Briney and others leave off their organ and societies. Jorgenson at Bedford invited people to unite with a church that had the organ and societies. That is one difference between the "principles" of Kurfees and Jorgenson; and it seems to me that Jorgenson ought to be able to see it; others can.

3. In his "brief resume" Jorgenson further says he invited Lappin for the Highland meeting because the old Campbell Street church had a certain Brother Cappa who turned out to be a digressive to lead the singing. He says this man Cappa was a "professional" Christian Church singer. Even if Campbell Street (later Haldeman Avenue) made the mistake, many years ago, of employing a "professional Christian Church" singer, I do not see how that would justify Jorgenson in making a similar mistake. Is Jorgenson trying to repeat all the sins that have ever been committed in Louisville? Does he think one sin justifies another?

I have asked some of the brethren here about this man Cappa, and gathered the following facts: That he did lead the singing at Campbell Street and Haldeman Avenue many years ago; that the brethren were too tolerant with him and used him as a singer longer than they should; but after they were fully convinced that he was digressive, they dropped him forever. One brother also tells me that they made another mistake; that they continued to use E. L. Jorgenson as song leader even after he was tinctured with premillennialism; that they were too tolerant with Jorgenson and kept him longer that they should; but after they became fully convinced that he was a "professional Premillennial Church singer", they dropped him just like they dropped Cappa. The brethren here should have dropped both Cappa and Jorgenson a long time before they did, and some frankly confess it.

4. Jorgenson's fourth excuse for exchanging pulpits with Lappin is because "Brother Showalter wrote in Firm Foundation: 'He (Lappin) is one of the sanest and most clear-thinking men in the Christian church.'" What an explanation! Is he trying to leave the impression that Showalter endorses Lappin as a gospel preacher? If so, he is deliberately misrepresenting Showalter, for Jorgenson knows that Showalter would not endorse Lappin for the office of Janitor in a church of Christ, much less for the pulpit. If he is not trying to leave such impression, why did he quote Showalter?

The very fact that Jorgenson and the Highland church are compelled to send out leaflets explaining their conduct should convince the brethren that something is wrong; for something is wrong, the church where Jorgenson preaches is as digressive as the premillennial church at Korse Cave. They operate on the same principle. They both have restrictive clauses in their deeds and cannot install the musical instruments and legally hold their property, but they both exchange preachers with Christian Churches.

The Premillennial churches and churches are losing their identity about as rapidly as any apostate people ever lost it. They are joining up with everything from the Holy Rollers to the Witty-Murch Unity Movement. More than a dozen of R. H. Boll's former students have severed all connections with churches of Christ. Others are following them about as fast as they can get through the gap. At the rate they are now going they will all be gone in a few years.

Janes and Jorgenson write as though they are very anxious to take a "step toward unity". If they want unity with the loyal churches of Louisville, I can tell them on a post card how to get it.

ABOUT CHURCH NAMES

John W. Kurfees

In your issue of May 1941, you have a two page article, one paragraph of which is headed: "Names-Designations of the New Testament Church."

Under that heading you speak of the "religious nomenclature of the day", using church designating terms which are "foreign to Bible parlance."

Why should it not be foreign to it, when they are speaking, and writing about religious institutions which are, themselves, foreign to the Bible?

Then you say some claim that it "sectarianizes the church to call it church of Christ."

Sectarianizes what? "the church", you say. So that is the thing we are talking about.

Yes, it is the "church" about which we are speaking, and there is no danger of ever sectarianizing that institution when we call it the church.

It is the qualifying designations we use, and the manner in which we use them, that makes it sectarian.

If we would use the designating, or qualifying, terms as they are used in the New Testament, that is without any preference, for one above the others, it would not be sectarianizing at all.

The church is what the Lord established, and he didn't establish but one; But the Holy Spirit, through the inspired writers, saw fit to use some dozen or more qualifying, or designating terms, when speaking of that institution.

They call it the "church of God" six times in the singular; and three times in the plural, they refer to it as "churches of God." They refer to it, in the plural, one time as "Churches of Christ."

They also speak of the church as "The household of the faith." "The church of the first born," Etc., Etc.

It can readily be seen that the Lord's body is the church; but as as stated above, the inspired writers used several qualifying, or designating terms in referring to it.

So who are we, that we should single out, and paramount one of these terms, and so use it as to practically exclude all the others?

Then too, it should be noted that, in the New Testament, our Lord's spiritual body is referred to just as "the church" far more often than any other way: as in Acts 13:1, and Rom. 16:1.

In this modern day of ours, some even go so far as to say we are dishonoring Christ, unless we say "Church of Christ." Would any one be willing to say Paul was dishonoring Christ when he referred to the church as "the church of God"? Surely not.

I hope the time may soon come when the brethren, preachers and all, will cease sectarianizing the church by stereotyping one particular designating term, to the practical exclusion of all the others.
Under the above caption, in "F. L. R.'s Notes," Christian Leader August 5, 1941, we have the following correspondence.

**DISMISSED CONFIDENCE**

In every business concern there are matters of varied importance that are known only to the ones in charge or their agents. Prices discounts and special information is furnished from the home office to all such representatives and all these matters are matters of strict confidence. Many times confidential matter is printed, sometimes typewritten, but always confidential.

This same strict confidence is observed in newspaper management. Publishers and editors are in strict accord. Woe to any who betray that confidence. The traitor would be branded and if connected with a religious house would be a traitor to a sacred cause.

Covering 53 years of close contact with editors and associates it has been a joy to all that never once had this confidence been betrayed. And this group of editors has included outstanding men like J. W. Shepherd, J. A. Bradley, Jesse P. Sewell, Ira C. Moore, T. Q. Martin, H. H. Adamson, I. B. Bradley and six or more who were all men of God and true as friends.

In the 55 years it has been my custom to write confidential letters to the editors on any matter of special importance concerning the Leader. This confidence has never been betrayed in all these 53 years until now.

Friday, July 3, I was the invited guest in the home of Ben F. Taylor at Bowline Green, Ky. I was there for the big day with the orphans; July 4. I was entertained in the same cordial manner as of old. In fact, they have a sleeping room for me called Brother Rowe's room.

I left for home early Saturday morning, July 5th. Monday morning the mail, at the office, brought the June issue of the Bible Banner, edited by Foy E. Wallace, Jr. One of my clerks opened the six same size volume with the full confidence in him kept moaning, "Who can you trust?" Yes, it cast a gloom over the office that has not been lifted yet.

I immediately had photostats of the Taylor letter made and mailed one to each of the three loyal editors. I asked them what to do? I wanted their reaction. It came quick and positive. Here are their letters.

T. Q. Martin
McMinnville, Tenn., July 18, 1941.

Dear Brother Rowe:

Yours of the 15th received yesterday. Any unpleasantness that arises between or among my brethren is a source of great distress to me, in my declining years.

I have ever held Brother Ben Taylor in highest esteem, and my relations with Brother Wallace has always been cordial. You inquire as to my reaction to the unfortunate matter.

I believe Brother Taylor greatly erred in submitting a private letter for publication, and I believe Brother Wallace likewise erred in printing a private letter, without the consent of the writer.

This is my calm, unprejudiced, impartial judgment. I deplore this betrayal of confidence. Come soon.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) T. Q. Martin.

II. ADAMSON

Lewisburg, Tenn., July 1, 1941.

Dear Brother Rowe:

Your letter of July 11 is before me. No, I did not see the June issue of the Bible Banner and I am greatly surprised to know that your letter of Jan. 8 to the Leaders editors had been given to the public through the pages of that journal.

I have no way on earth of knowing nor of even making a sensible guess-how the Banner came into possession of that letter. Not only did I not show it to a living person, but I did not so much as tell any one about receiving such a letter, and for the simple reason that I felt it was nobody's business. And furthermore I would regard any man as a traitor to the Leader that would with intent place the contents of that letter in the hands of the Banner or any other journal.

The whole matter is a profound mystery to me and I deeply regret it.

Fraternally,
(Signed) H. H. Adamson.

I. B. Bradley
Dickson, Tenn., July 9, 1941.

Dear Bro. Rowe:

I was surmised to see the "confidential" letter in the Bible Banner, which I received Monday. How a confidential letter could have gotten into the hands of the editor of another paper is a token to me of traitorism. Someone has either betrayed a confidence, or has been betrayed.
I see no way by which this could have gotten into the hands of the Banner, unless it was shown to a supposed friend, and this friend copied it; or someone took to himself the liberty of looking through the letter files of another, and then, and not a little bit after, sent the letter, and sent it on to the Banner editor. Either of which is too reprehensible to be thinkable of any one who is a FRIEND—much less a brother.

The letter you sent me has never been seen except by my wife and myself; nor has it ever been spoken of to any one else. It has not been out of the files, so far as I know, since it was put there in January, until it was taken out for comparison after getting your letter yesterday.

I will be under the sod. I thought I had gone through enough sorrow and heartache during the past two years. But this betrayal is the heaviest of all. One more experience like this last and I will be under the sod.

I think that copies of the Banner have been sent to every preacher in the brotherhood. This paper should also go to Davidson, and to Brother Taylor. This paper should also go to Brother Taylor. This paper should also go to Brother Taylor. This paper should also go to Brother Taylor.

The substance of his correspondence was, "as you read do not allow the words "misplaced confidence," to confuse you, and cover up the diabolical suggestions. made to Brother Rowe, and published in his "confidential" form letter "to Leader Editors." In his "confidential letter" Bro. Rowe says:

"Dear Brother:

About three weeks ago, Brother Davidson called up from New Jersey about 8:30... The substance of his conversation was that if I would go after Foy E. Wallace and expose him in every way that I could and in every way that would be proven to me that such a work on my part would be financed by a Brother in Detroit." Brother Rowe has been an editor, publisher, and gospel preacher for nearly a half century. Each one to whom he confided this brotherly (?) suggestion is a gospel preacher, an editor, associate editor, or in some way connected with a religious paper.

The suggestion was that Brother Rowe use his name and influence to destroy the name and influence of a fellow editor, and one of the outstanding gospel preachers of our day. Brethren forget the words "misplaced confidence," and substitute the words—character assassin. That is what Brother Rowe was asked to lend his name and influence to—to assassinate the character, and destroy the influence of Foy E. Wallace, Jr., as an editor and gospel preacher.

More than forty years ago Brother T. Q. Martin and I were school mates in the old Nashville Bible Institute, and then on South Spruce Street. He was a man of family, and a gospel preacher. I was just a green country boy just off the farm trying to work may way through school. I learned to love and respect Brother Martin then and my love and admiration for him have grown with the passing years.

Brother I. B. Bradley and I were co-laborers in the City of Birmingham for several years. I never had a truer friend, and one that is as true to the Book as the needle is to the pole. In 1904, on my way to Meaford, Ontario, Canada, I stopped off in Cincinnati, Ohio and spent a very pleasant night with Brother F. L. Rowe in his home. I have been in his office a few times since when passing through his city. I was a subscriber for the Christian Leader, and his staff of strategists, to whom he had turned over the Christian Leader—over the Christian Leader—over the Christian Leader. The letter you sent me has never been seen except by my wife and myself; nor has it been shown to any one else. It has not been out of the files, so far as I know, since it was put there in January, until it was taken out for comparison after getting your letter yesterday.

I will be under the sod. I thought I had gone through enough sorrow and heartache during the past two years. But this betrayal is the heaviest of all. One more experience like this last and I will be under the sod.

I think that copies of the Banner have been sent to every preacher in the brotherhood. This paper should also go to Davidson, and to Brother Taylor. This paper should also go to Brother Taylor. This paper should also go to Brother Taylor. This paper should also go to Brother Taylor.

The substance of his correspondence was, "as you read do not allow the words "misplaced confidence," to confuse you, and cover up the diabolical suggestions. made to Brother Rowe, and published in his "confidential" form letter "to Leader Editors." In his "confidential letter" Bro. Rowe says:

"Dear Brother:

About three weeks ago, Brother Davidson called up from New Jersey about 8:30... The substance of his conversation was that if I would go after Foy E. Wallace and expose him in every way that I could and in every way that would be proven to me that such a work on my part would be financed by a Brother in Detroit." Brother Rowe has been an editor, publisher, and gospel preacher for nearly
as the Christian Leader, would not accept such a challenge from the Scriptures.

But I must get back to Brother Rowe’s “confidential letters to Ledger Editors”. The second paragraph reads as follows: “Then this week, Monday, Claud F. Witty came to Cincinnati and called on me and talked to me privately about lending my name and influence to a paper for a few months at least whose purpose would be to expose Foy E. Wallace because of his bitter attacks upon Witty and others. I told Brother Witty I could not lend my name to any such a proposition and I suggested that he get some small town printer to get the paper out for them and that they mail it themselves. I told him I was through with all that manner of contention among brethren. I asked him why he came to me. His answer was: He wanted my name and reputation. I told him he would have to find some one else that I would be no party to it.” If I am capable of reasoning there is a vast difference between “bitter attacks” upon one’s teaching and practice in religious matters, the only kind of “attack” I ever knew Foy E. Wallace to make upon anybody, and a “bitter attack” upon one’s character, for the sole purpose of destroying his influence and usefulness as an editor and gospel preacher. The kind of “bitter attacks” that were made upon Wallace a year or so ago when the brotherhood was blanketed with anonymous, scurrilous letters against his character. That campaign was an abortion, so their next effort was to find some docile Brother, who would use his “name and reputation” to accomplish that which the anonymous campaign had failed to do-to destroy the influences of Foy E. Wallace, Jr. Of course they knew that such efforts would not be rewarded in heaven, so they suggested to Brother Rowe “that such a work on his part would be financed by a Brother in Detroit”. If Brother Rowe had said: ‘One of my first thoughts and prayer was, why didn’t the Lord take me before I had to know’ that anybody would make such suggestions to me. I could have understood and appreciated his outraged feelings. But I am stunned to know that instead of resenting the suggestions, Brother Rowe rather acquiesced in them by suggesting “that they get some small town printer” for the job. My idea is, they could more easily find a large “town printer” for such dirty work than they could a “small town printer”. I would hate to live in either a “small” or a large “town”, with such a “printer”. I can understand why Brother Rowe would pour out his vials of wrath upon Brother Ben F. Taylor’s head for letting the brotherhood know that he would connive in such ungodly efforts, than try to seal them up in “confidential” files. Ben F. Taylor is the kind of man that I would not be afraid to hitch my cart to. As to “business concerns”, I have enough confidence in them to believe you would search their “confidential” files in vain to find suggestions that they use their “names and reputation” to destroy the business of a fellow business man. Ought gospel preachers and editors be less honorable? Brethren if you want to locate me, you will find me in Ben F. Taylor’s class in matters like this.

I am publishing this correspondence because Brother Rowe says: “I think that copies of the Banner have been sent to every preacher in the brotherhood. This paper should also go to all of them but I haven’t the money to send it, as it would cost about $50.00”. So you now have it all without cost to Brother Rowe. I hope this generosity upon the part of the Bible Banner will please Brother Rowe, Davidson, and Witty.

F. L. Rowe, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Dear Brother Rowe:—

I have this morning received a copy Aug. 5 issue of the Christian Ledger, and note your article on page 10, under the heading: “Misplaced Confidence.” I presume you sent me the paper because of your suggested desire that every preacher in the brotherhood receive a copy of this issue.

I had already seen the Bible Banner that published the “Confidential Letter” you wrote your editors. The matter of “confidence betrayed” by its publication, or by some one giving it to Foy Wallace, did not strike me so forcibly as did the moral turpitude revealed by its publication.

Maybe I am not skilled in the niceties of journalistic confidences. But I can see the wickedness and ungodliness that is behind plots, such as that revealed by the publication of the letter that has so upset you. Why are you so “stunned”? Was Clinton Davidson also “stunned” by the publication of your “Confidential Letter” because you had “in confidence” betrayed him? And did you fear that Claud Witty might be “stunned” by its publication, because you had in “confidence” betrayed Witty too? You did just that. At least, it is presumed that Davidson’s telephone talk was in confidence, from the fact that you wrote about it in a “confidential letter” to your editors. And there is the same evidence to show that you regarded Witty’s conversation in your office as confidential. Yet, you betrayed that confidence to your editors. What will Witty and Davidson think about you? Is it a great sin in Ben Taylor to do the very same thing that you do yourself? Instead of playing the “baby” and whining about Taylor’s betraying your confidence, you should have exposed those plots of Davidson and Witty. You will listen to plots and schemes by conscienceless gangsters to injure or destroy a brother in the Lord; you write “confidential letters” to editors about such. But you refuse to expose such notorious schemes. When Ben Taylor is confronted with the seemingly conflicting duties of “being loyal to a friend” on the one hand, and “warning a brother” of the efforts of character assassins against him on the other hand, he chooses the higher duty and warns his brother. That plot is exposed, and the writer of “confidential letters” is shown to have knowledge of such plots; he has had conferences with the plotters.

I have never met Ben Taylor. But I thank God for such a man. If people want secrets kept they should keep such secrets as involve matters of that kind away from men like Brother Taylor. Brother Rowe, don’t you feel guilty because of your conferences with Davidson and Witty? Didn’t you give Davidson a wee bit of ground for hoping they might use you in their scheme? If not, why did Witty make a trip to see you and have his conference with you? You know they were plotting together, did you not? One good solid no would have ended the matter, had there been no equivocation in connection with that no. But you listened; and you wrote a “confidential letter,” but you did not expose the gangsters. The exposure is made, but the exposure involves you in an unfavorable connection with the plot. Taylor betrayed you, and you betrayed Davidson and Witty. If Taylor is bad, you are twice as bad; he betrayed one man and you betrayed two. I don’t feel sorry for you, Brother Rowe. I am sorry you had the weakness to be mixed up in such a matter.

Faithfully yours,

C. D. Crouch, Christopher, Illinois.
WHO IS RIGHT ON THE MILLENNIUM

JOHN T. LEWIS

When two teachers teach the opposite on any Scripture both may be wrong, one must be. To illustrate, if I teach that Eph. 5:18, 19, and Col. 3:16 prescribe only vocal music in the worship, and some one else teaches that both vocal and instrumental music are prescribed, one of us must be wrong. Again, if I teach that only a burial is included in the term baptism, and some one else teaches that sprinkling, and pouring are included in the term, one of us must be wrong, and neither goodness, morality, piety, nor humility can change this self-evident truth.

Brother Armstrong says, he is forced to class the Bible Banner as "bad, and divisive literature," and therefore does not subscribe for it. I would like for him to tell me how he classes The Word and Work, and if he subscribes for it? The teachings of these two papers, on the Millennium, are antipodes; and if he will answer my questions we will know whether he considers both papers wrong, or whether he considers The Word and Work right. I believe Brother Armstrong will give me a frank answer to the above questions, because he told me what he thought of The Bible Banner without being asked. It will be interesting, and instructive to read the antipodal teaching of J. M. Armstrong, and R. H. Boll on the millennium. So here we go.

"Some Things I Do Not Believe"

1. Though many Bible students believe in the return of the Jews to Palestine, Bible students far superior to me, I do not believe it: I see no indication of it. -J. N. Armstrong.

I wish Brother Armstrong had mentioned some of those "Bible students for superior" to him, who taught the return of the Jews to Palestine, none of the Pioneers ever taught it. After giving scriptural arguments to show that the Jews would not, and could not be converted as a nation, and returned to Palestine, Dr.' T. W. Brants says: "It requires a greater degree of credulity than we can command to believe this will ever occur." Therefore Robert H. Boll teaches, in unequivocal language, that "The scriptures do with abundant clearness and fullness teach" the restoration of fleshly Israel to Palestine. Brother J. N. Armstrong says: "I see no indication of it." To be true to its name I think Harding College should have as "Dean of the Bible" the best in the brotherhood not only in teaching ability, but in humility and piety. I am sure that Brother Armstrong himself would not hesitate to declare that R. H. Boll combines all the qualities. It seems to me therefore that "J. N. Armstrong, President Emeritus and Dean of Bible" at Harding College could well afford to take leave of absence, go to Louisville, Ky., and take a special course under Bro. Boll. Maybe then he could see some "indication" of what "The Scriptures do with abundant clearness and fullness" teach.

We continue with Bro. Armstrong's limited (?) knowledge of the Bible. He says:

"3. I do not believe that Christ will ever sit on the literal throne of David, but I believe he is now sitting and reigning on all the throne on which he shall ever sit." -J. N. A.

We will now hear R. H. Boll on this point. In his book, "The Kingdom of God," page 59, Brother Boll quoted Acts 2:30, 31, then asked, "Does He Now Sit On David's Throne?" His answer follows: "It is this passage, that demands our especial examination; for it is relied upon as the positive and final proof that Jesus is now sitting and reigning on David's throne. We shall consider it carefully, and impartially, to see if that is so. I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, that such is the meaning-or whatever may be the meaning of these words I am well pleased to have it just as it is. Having no position to force or creed to defend we feel free to take all God has said and just as he said it. (Has Brother Armstrong" a position to force or a creed to defend," or does he feel as free in this matter as R. H. Boll? J. T. L.) But if upon examination we see the passage does not say what is claimed for it, of course no human authority and no consideration of the general views of the brotherhood should weigh in the matter.

And what do we see in Peter's statement? A declaration that Jesus is sitting upon David's throne now? That God has actually seated Him on the throne of David? If so that settles it for evermore. But what, do we find? simply that David, forseeing that of his natural descendants God would set one (the great promised son) upon his (David's) throne-spoke of the resurrection of the Christ. In other words, the promised Christ of David's line was to be raised from the dead in order that He might be seated on his father David's throne. This Son of David, this Jesus (Peter de-
read some more of Brother Armstrong's unbelief.

But that He is now already occupying that throne is precisely that which Peter does not say, still less does he say that the throne of David—which always meant simply the divinely delegated sovereignty over the nation of Israel, the throne of Israel—was never ritualized and removed to heaven. The risen Lord Jesus is indeed exalted and enthroned now. But the position of authority He occupies up there was in no sense inherited from His father David. David never occupied that throne, nor could have; just as it is equally evident that the Lord Jesus has never yet exercised the authority of David’s sphere of sovereignty. It is a position of supreme authority held by Him as the glorified God-man—until I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet.” (Ps.110:1); upon which it will be surrendered. (1 Cor. 15:25-28). It is a joint sharing of God’s throne, on which no mere creature ever yet sat nor could sit. The throne of David, however, is His own peculiarly or David’s son; the throne which is His by right of human descent as David’s righteous branch.” Thus Armstrong’s position on David’s literal throne, and Boll’s position are diametrically opposed to each other—one must be wrong.

If Boll is right, Brother Armstrong’s position is so far, from the truth I do not believe he could qualify as “Dean of Bible” over “that host of faithful disciples in the brotherhood today who hold that R. H. Boll’s position on the millennium is not vitiating, not harmful enough to be made a ground for division or strife and disfellowship.” As Brother C. M. Pullias would say: “And that isn’t all.”

Page 19 of his book, R. H. Boll says: “Here then, we see this same Beast (for it can be no other) reappearing in the future, and meeting its doom at the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ when He comes with the ten thousands of His saints to execute vengeance upon the rebellious, and to assert His authority in the earth. It is told by John by way of explanation: “The beast that thou sawest was, and is not, and is about to come up out of the abyss, and to go into perdition.” Again it is repeated, he was, and is not, and is yet to come (Greek, “shall be present”). Rev. 17:8. This is not dark symbolism but Divine interpretation, which needs no more interpreting. The Roman world power then, though now it does not exist, is to return when it returns, the Roman power will be in the form of a ten-kingdom confederacy under one dominant head; which fact is indicated by the toes of the image; more fully set forth in the ten horns of the fourth beast (Dan. 7); and clearly revealed to John in Revelations.

Although Brother Armstrong declares he does not believe this “Divine interpretations, which needs no more interpreting,” I do not believe he has turned a blatant infidel, therefore I conclude he just does know the difference between “dark symbolism,” and “Divine interpretation, which needs no more interpreting.” His understanding therefore of “Divine interpretations” is so limited (?) I do not believe he could qualify for “Dean of Bible” even in a kindergarten. I believe “that great host of disciples among us” who think so much of Brother Boll will agree with me. If Boll’s position is right, Brother Armstrong’s position is wrong, and I do not believe he should be encouraged to teach a doubtful doctrine, especially as “President Emeritus and Dean of Bible” at one of “our” Colleges. Let us read some more of Brother Armstrong’s unbelief.

“5. I do not believe that, because Christ was rejected by the Jews, the Lord turned from His original purpose and gave the church as a ‘substitute,’ and that at his coming again he will carry out his original plan and will restore, or establish, a kingdom with Christ on David’s throne in Jerusalem.” J. N. A.

Let us read some more from Boll’s book, “The Kingdom of God,” chapter VI. “When John the Baptist lifted up his voice in the Wilderness of Judea and announced the ‘kingdom of heaven at hand’ he used a phraseology which was already common and current among the Jews, and which was perfectly understood by all. John took for granted that it was understood; never a word of explanation was given, so far as the record shows; and never a question or dispute arose between John and his countrymen as to the nature of the Kingdom. To the Jews the announcement meant but one thing. The promise of the Messianic Kingdom, with all it involved—the appearance of the Great King of David’s line; the destruction of the Gentile world power; the deliverance and national restoration of Israel, and the exaltations to earthly sovereignty; the promises of God made to the fathers, and the prophets’ visions of the future glory of the people, the land, the city, and the Kingdom “in that day” had imbedded itself in the very hearts of the people. All this we mention merely to show what expectation was existing in Israel at the time of John’s announcement, and how the very words John used had their common and current meaning among the people. The burden of proof would certainly lie wholly and heavily with any man who would maintain that this Kingdom of John’s announcement was a thing entirely different from that which Israel was expecting. (Bro. Armstrong simply says he does not believe it; but offers absolutely no proof to show his announcement of a different kingdom than which Israel was expecting.” This is not the way I believe a “President Emeritus and Dean of Bible” should dispose of a doctrine he does not believe. Jno. T. L.) The very suggestion that God would so trifle with the hope of the people, and by adopting their own language without explanation would leave them under so fundamental a mistake; yes, and would base His call to repentance upon this mistake, and would so confirm them in it, is quite repugnant and unworthy of God the more so when it is remembered that their kingdom expectations were legitimately derived from the language of their scriptures.” Therefore, according to R. H. Boll, Brother Armstrong’s teaching on this point “is quite repugnant and unworthy of God.” I wonder what “that host of faithful disciples in the brotherhood today who hold that R. H. Boll’s position on the Millennium is not vitiating, not harmful enough to be made a ground for division or strife and disfellowship” think of J. N. Armstrong’s teaching? It seems to me that teaching “quite repugnant and unworthy of God” would be “harmful enough to be made a ground for division and strife and disfellowship.” But we read again from Boll’s book: “In Matthew’s gospel we have thus far found the announcement of the Kingdom to Israel—the Kingdom foretold in the prophets and expected by the people. Now we arrive at an important crisis, which indeed had been brewing from Chapter 4 on, but comes to an issue in Chapter 12.” Therefore according to R. H. Boll, all the teaching of John the Baptist, Jesus Christ, the seventy, and the apostles under the limited commission up to the 12th chapter of Matthew had references only to the restoration of David’s earthly Kingdom. Brother Armstrong knows this is Boll’s teaching, and he knows that all gospel preachers do not preach the truth on this subject, according to Boll’s position. From Chapter 12 on, Boll says: “These parables are really an announcement of the new and unexpected aspect the Kingdom would assume during an anticipated age of the King’s rejection and absence from the world. We have here the Savior’s prediction of the cir-
cumstances as we find them unto this day. Therefore the church as we have it today, is only an *unexpected aspec* of the Kingdom.” That was announced by John and Jesus Christ. Brother Boll underscores the above statements to challenge the readers attention to their importance. Now Brethren you know Brother R. H. Boll is such a profound Bible student, so humble, *consecrated*, and pious, that he knows what he is talking about, and certainly he would not mislead you. But Harding College has sent out a “Bulletin on Premillennialism,” in which Brother Armstrong declares he does not believe these things. I am wondering what “that great host of brethren among us” who think so much of Brother Boll and his teaching are going to do about Brother Armstrong’s infidelity(?) on these matters? I do not believe he should be allowed to be “President Emeritus and Dean of Bible” of Harding College so long as he denies, or declares his unbelief in these scriptures (?) and at the same time proclaims his faith and confidence in R. H. Boll. And since there is perfect unity at Harding college on these issues, no action could be expected from that source, and here the matter must rest.

CONDITIONS OF THE GOSPEL

R. O. KENLEY

In legal parlance contracts between men have many and varied classifications, among which are executed (meaning one in which all conditions have been performed, as a deed to land in which the entire consideration has been paid), and executory (meaning one in which all or a part of the conditions are to be performed in the future, as a deed with none or only a part of the consideration paid, balance to be paid at some time or various times in the future).

Conditions embraced in contracts are classified as conditions precedent, and conditions subsequent. Both of these conditions are many times present in the same contract. Precedent conditions must first be performed before one can enjoy the fruits of the contract. For example, one buying land or personal property in most instances, must *pay* something down in cash before he can get possession of the property. The cash payment in such case as a condition precedent to the enjoyment of the property to any degree. Subsequent conditions must be performed as provided in the contract in order to secure continuous enjoyment and use of the property. For example, one may get possession of a home or personal property by making a small cash payment, with the further provision that other payments would be made in the future at stated times, future payments are conditions subsequent, and a failure to perform them would result in the loss of all prior payments as well as the use and enjoyment of the property.

The conditions of the Gospel, in many respects are similar to the conditions in contracts. God has always used language and terms in dealing with man that could be understood by men. Our first inquiry might be, *What is the gospel?* Paul’s definition cannot be improved upon.

Rom. 1:16, “For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.”

It is the agency or instrumentality through which the Holy Spirit and all other needed divine power operates for the regeneration and salvation of man.

It is both inclusive and exclusive. Paul says in 2 Tim. 3: 16-17 “All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in Righteousness:

That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.”

The gospel is what we read in the New Testament right-ly divided.

Grace is the love and mercy of God behind which prompted the giving of the gospel. Grace and the gospel are frequently used interchangeably, whereas the gospel is the fruit or product of grace.

Grace is divine, it is party of the first part in the gospel, it provides, through the gospel, the one and only remedy for sin and for man’s spiritual regeneration, however, this is subject to conditions precedent and subsequent on man’s part. Faith belongs exclusively to man. It is the means through which man appropriates the gospel given through the Grace of God. It is optional with man as to whether or not he accepts the terms of the gospel. Man is and has always been a free moral agent. Adam had this option and exercised it in the garden of Eden. Judas Isca-riot had and exercised the same option.

By the terms of the gospel the unregenerated man is to hear about the love of God for fallen and sinful man, of the great sacrifice God made in the giving of his only son to suffer and die upon the cross; and the willing sacrifice made by Jesus to the end that a remedy or prescription might be given for sin; also man must hear and learn the terms and conditions of this remedy or prescription. This prescription is known as the gospel, and embraces facts to be believed, commands to be obeyed, and promises to be enjoyed. Man must understand and believe the things he has heard, with such a degree of faith, that he will promptly obey all commandments thereof; as one of the commandments growing out of belief, man must repent of his sins, and completely change the course of his life and thereafter look to Jesus Christ as his example and to the word of truth as his guide; and man, as a part of his belief, must confess Christ as his savior and as the son of God, and, as the final act of obedience growing out of his belief, man must be baptized for the remission of sins. The above are conditions precedent to man’s enjoyment of any of the benefits and promises of the gospel. As a reward for performance of the aforesaid precedent conditions, God grants to man absolute pardon for all past sins and adds him to his Church. Man’s citizenship is thereby changed from the kingdom of satan to the kingdom of Christ.

Upon the change of citizenship, man has constantly with him, as subsequent conditions, the duty of *hearing*, believing, repenting and confessing; these will be needed daily. *Baptism* alone becomes a condition precedent, and will not again be repeated. In the stead of Baptism, the new citizen is given the command and privilege of prayer. Therefore, the Christian is daily confronted with the performance of conditions subsequent in order to enjoy the hope and promises of eternal life. Paul greatly feared that he would fail in the performance and observance of the conditions subsequent of the gospel.

1 Cr. 2: 27. “But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preach-ed to others, I myself should be a castaway.”

The most popular, numerically, religious denominations in the world say that Paul’s fear was groundless, as he could not have apostatized to the extent that he could have been “a castaway.”

The two greatest religious errors today are:

1. That man will receive pardon from God for past *sins* short of full compliance with the precedent conditions of the gospel.

2. That in event man has complied with the conditions precedent, he will be saved without continuous compliance with the conditions subsequent of the gospel.
My son, Dow B. Wallace, is in the United States Signal Corps at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey. He is anxious to get in touch with boys who are members of the church at Fort Dix, Fort Hancock and Fort Monmouth, New Jersey. Parents of such sons are requested to write

Pvt. Dow B. Wallace,
U. S. Signal Corps,
Replacement Center,
co. “C” 4th Training Battalion,
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey.

Or they may write Brother

A. W. Hastings,
25 Tonnelle Ave.,
Jersey City, New Jersey.

These men can help your boys get properly located for worship and Bible teaching. My son writes: “I have located about four boys so far and about four more who are not members, who will go with me.”

During the latter part of August I did the preaching in a meeting with the Ridgedale congregation in the historic city of Chattanooga, Tennessee. This is a large and quite a good congregation which is exercising a good and a wide influence in and around the city. It is located at the foot of Missionary Ridge where one of the battles of the civil war was fought. The church is carrying on a constant and a winning battle of an entirely different sort. Brother Charles A. Taylor does the work of an evangelist under the direction of the elders of the congregation. He is a loyal and capable worker. I was with Brother Taylor once before in a meeting when he was working with the Lynn Street congregation in Parkersburg, West Virginia. He is a very helpful and companionable co-worker. Brother P. W. Stonestreet is an elder of the congregation and a nephew of the late M. C. Kurfees of Louisville, Kentucky, whose influence for good is still widely felt. It was good to meet and know Brother Stonestreet.

The meeting was well attended, but we had an unusual handicap in the way of crowds. No children under twelve years of age were allowed in such meetings due to the infantile paralysis situation. Some of the grownups who would otherwise have come, had to stay at horn-with-the-youngsters. I have at times been irritated by crying babies, but this was my first time to go through a whole meeting with no children in the audience. I did not know that it could make so much difference. I really missed the children and believe it or not, I really could have enjoyed hearing a baby squall before it was over. I never was as jumpy about crying babies as some preachers anyhow. My observation and experience lead me to the conclusion that mothers are usually more capable of attending to their babies than visiting preachers are. However, I must confess that I have seen a few mothers here and there, like a few other people, who displayed a considerable lack of good sense in attending to their duties. More than once in my life, I have yearned to spank the fire out of some young howling hyenas who were wrecking a perfectly good sermon, while his silly mother did not seem to detect any signs of depravity in him whatever. But I’ll run the risks and take the children. I don’t want any more meetings without them. Bring them along and we will get along somehow.

The Ridgedale church is only one of many good congregations in the city. I did not count them, but was told that there are fourteen of them. I preached to more preachers than any place I have been with the exception of Nashville. There are more preachers in Nashville and who think they are than any place in the world, I guess. Chattanooga has its share and some of them, maybe all of them, are good ones. I cannot recall them all. Among others it was a pleasure to be associated with R. C. White, A. S. Landis, Charlie Campbell and John Gerrard. All were very kind to me.

This congregation promoted the second and last Neal-Wallace debate which permanently cooled Charlie Neal’s yearning to test his premillennial theories in public discussion. The influence of the debate was far-reaching and is still strongly felt throughout the city. It helped crystallize opposition to premillennialism throughout that section. Brethren thereabouts are mighty scarce who will admit that they are premillennialists, and appeasers, if there be any, are mighty cautious. It is generally known that Neal went where he should have been all the time “out from vs.” We still have brethren who are not premillennialists “but”—In this connection that “but” has astounding significance for such a small word of only three letters, especially when some preachers use it.

A few things happen here and there that impress me. I was riding along one night after meeting with a brother and his wife. She was formerly a Baptist and converted to the truth a few years ago by the preaching of the editor of the Bible Banner. They were deeply interested in the success of the meeting. They called my attention to some of their sectarian friends they were interested in. They had introduced me to some of them. I gathered from the conversation that this man and his wife had invited and brought at least a dozen mature people to the meetings who otherwise would not have attended at all. They were so anxious to learn the truth that this man and his wife had invited and brought at least a dozen mature people to the meetings who otherwise would not have attended at all. They were so anxious that I preach on those themes which would help them see the truth. It occurred to me, that if all the members of the church would become as interested in a meeting as this couple was, what a difference we would see in results. Some lack both interest and boldness. They do not care enough to invite their friends and if they do, they are afraid the preacher will tell them something to the point after they get there. Too many people are trying to go to heaven by themselves. You’d better take somebody along with you or you may not get in yourself.

I had a nice, comfortable room in a downtown hotel. I ate breakfast in the hotel grill. A young waitress often took my orders. I was impressed by her efficiency and quiet manners. One day I went in and noticed a change. The girl was absent and the others were red-eyed and silent. The manager of the hotel told me that “Mary” had gone the day before to a near-by town to visit her mother. She stepped off the bus and was hit by a truck and killed. It seemed that she was a favorite and all were deeply affected. It affected me in a peculiar way although I did not even know her name. I awoke in the night and thought of that girl moving silently and gracefully among the tables and now she lay a corpse. Human beings in uncounted thousands are being snatched away by accidents, disease and war. They are all going somewhere. They leave behind them other uncounted thousands with broken hearts. “Come now, ye that say, Today or to-morrow we will go into, this city, and spend a year there and trade and get gain: whereas ye know not what shall be on the morrow, What is your life? For ye are a vapor that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away. For that ye ought to say, If the Lord will, we shall both live, and do this or that.” (James. 4:13-15) Surely the preacher of the gospel who points the way to a bright and eternal Tomorrow is engaged in the most important work in the world!
A LETTER TO THE EDITOR

The notices of the Lappin meeting in the Courier Journal and Times indicate, to some extent, the unhappy situation in Louisville which has come because of the “Boll theories” and their off-spring, the Witty-Murch flasco.

Following, the early introduction, in Louisville, in 1940, of the Boll teaching, my good and faithful friend, Bro. M. C. Kurfees, often predicted that as a result of that teaching many churches would be wrecked and much sorrow and confusion would result. Because of this conviction, born of a keen understanding of men, he, along with others of us, not so well informed, sought earnestly and long to prevent such occurrences as are now taking place in Louisville, but entreaties to Boll, that he cease pressing his theories and an effort to prevent the spread of this hurtful doctrine, were met by a cool rejection by Boll and the assurance of Jorgenson, Janes, Chambers and a few others here, that no harm could possibly come from their teaching. But the church in Louisville, as it has elsewhere, now is reaping a fearful harvest, just as Bro. Kurfees predicted we would and exactly opposite to the assertions of that wicked group, responsible for the present division, turmoil, strife and sorrow throughout the land.

One of the saddest things in the picture is that all or most of this misfortune could have been avoided had not the church been honeycombed with these “softie” preachers who refused to join in the effort, made by M. C. Kurfees, F. W. Smith, F. B. Srygley, J. C. McQuiddy and others, to prevent the sad situation which now exists.

However, we have also a bright spot now in the picture in that you were willing to pay the price involved in taking up the fight when the “Old Guard” had passed. You, with the mighty Banner, have also encountered “softie” preachers but buttressed by the result of the fight made by the “Old Guard” and with a fighting spirit all men admire, even if they do criticize, you have now largely won the battle and I feel assured no retreat will ever be sounded either by you or those associated with you in the splendid work done by the Banner.

Do not be discouraged by the wicked, unjust attacks made upon you personally but know that all who know you well love and trust you sincerely and in our associations with others seek always to protect you from those wicked men who love the applause of men more than they value truth and righteousness.

Sincerely, C. A. Taylor, Louisville, Ky.
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THE LEXINGTON GOSPEL MEETING VERSUS THE "NATIONAL UNITY MEETING"

The publisher of "Christian Ledger," formerly "The New Christian Leader," is showing both his hand and his heart in some personal side-lines incidental to the issues before us.

Below, in parallel columns, is reprinted the Rowe report of the Lexington meeting and the reports of reputable brethren who were there. We want the readers to see the spirit of these men who are waging this campaign of calumny. Brother Rowe has linked himself with them and would bind the work of a loyal group of Christians for personal spite. It was Brother Rowe who helped promote the unity meeting with the Digressive Christian church and the Boll-Rutherford Premillennial church in Lexington. And it is Brother Rowe who opposes the Gospel meeting held in Lexington and who now seeks to destroy the only loyal church of Christ in that city.

From the true and accurate reports of the Lexington meeting the readers can sum up the blunders in the Rowe-Baumer report as follows.

1. The Rowe "reporter" was not present at any service of the meeting.
2. In stating that the building was never more than half full he did not explain that it was held in a public auditorium seating more than 2,000 people.
3. The church he brags on is not a loyal church — but a Boll-Rutherford church.
4. The meeting "out in the hill country about the same size" which he commended was held in a Christian Church and instrumental music was used.
5. The "report" on the attitude of the Winchester Church, as seen in the statements of Brethren Dunn and Detherage is wholly untrue.

Brother Rowe is running in the wrong crowd. He is aiding the wrong crowd. He is aiding the wrong cause. If this is to be his course he would serve the cause of truth better to close up his Ledger.-Editor.

F. L. ROWE'S REPORT

Foy E. Wallace
At Lexington, Ky.

Some of the brethren at Lexington made great preparations for the Wallace meeting which was held in the auditorium, August 3 to 17. It did not produce results hoped for, as the following from a special reporter indicates. He writes: "The great Lexington meeting is over and was a splendid failure. It cost over $500. Not a single addition and the building was never more than half full. Part of the time the audiences were small and after the first Sunday several of the outside churches quit attending. Winchester had to dig up $25 and are sore about it. All the expense of the meeting have not been paid. Brother Wallace preached one Sunday morning at Fairfax, Winchester, to a fair sized audience."

In contrast with the above failure by one of our big men, the reporter draws a picture of a small evangelist who for the local church. The premillennial church at Hanover and Cramer (the latter being the site of the 1940 unity meeting) with Homer Rutherford as minister, conducted a tent meeting in Lexington while the Wallace-Taylor meeting was in progress. I wonder why— if they do not believe in disfellowshiping? Central Kentucky churches are moving ahead against the evil forces. -In Gospel Advocate.

C. W. SCOTT'S REPORT

Lexington Meeting Closes

C. W. Scott, 414 Locust Street, Danville, Ky., August 23: "The meeting in which Foy E. Wallace, Jr., preached and Austin Taylor led the singing, at Lexington, Ky., closed last Sunday night, at the Woodland Auditorium, which Morton Utley, of Louisville, preaching the last sermon. Many brethren from Ohio, Indiana, Tennessee, Alabama, West Virginia, Canada, and numerous places in Kentucky attended. Plans were made during the effort for the purchase of a lot or suitable properties for a meeting place for the local church. The premillennial church at Hanover and Cramer (the latter being the site of the 1940 unity meeting), with Homer Rutherford as minister, conducted a tent meeting in Lexington while the Wallace-Taylor meeting was in progress. I wonder why— if they do not believe in disfellowshipping? Central Kentucky churches are moving ahead against the evil forces. -In Gospel Advocate.

E. C. DETHERAGE'S REPORT

Lexington Meeting

The meeting conducted here in the Woodland Auditorium closed Sunday, August 17th, with perhaps the largest crowd ever assembled in any previous effort ever put forth by the True Church in central Kentucky. The preaching done by brother Wallace was plain, straightforward, and in language understandable by all present, which of course characterizes his manner of presenting the Truth. Personally I like it that way, then no one has to guess at anything. There is no man that I can listen to with greater interest because of his ability to express himself and he has the courage to do it. The meeting was well attended by brethren all over the state and many adjoining states were represented. Preachers from distance, present were E. G. Creacy, Horse Cave, Ky. Cecil B. Douthitt, Louisville. Morton P. Utley, Louisville. E. E. Shoulders, Joe H. Morris, Huntington, W. Va. and others, as well as all central Kentucky preachers who had great part in making the meeting a success. The meeting was attended by many digressive preachers here in the city as well as members both digressive and premillennialist. We predict the meeting will have an effect in time. Let's have more fearless preaching.

—E. C. Detherage.
Jack G. Dunn’s Comments

“I suppose you read F. L. Rowe’s report of the Lexington meeting in the Ledger. The “special reporter” obviously was M. D. Baumer, who never even attended the meeting. Of course you know the remarks about the meeting were false; and I might add that the statement of the growth of Hanover-Cramer was also false. Ada Babers meeting “with 27 additions” was in a Christian church, and instruments were used in the latter part of meeting on the suggestion of the digressive preacher.

Bro. Scott is writing to Bro. Rowe, and Bro. Creacy is preparing an article? I read Rowe’s article at Winchester. Everyone laughed at the idea they were sure about anything. Couldn’t understand why Baumer wrote that.”—Jack G. Dunn.

God’s Cause Attacked

E. G. Creacy

When any man reflects upon the character and integrity of faithful brethren in the Lord God’s cause is attacked. If an apology is necessary for this article, charge it up to the man who has made it necessary that his attacks be met.

Bro. F. L. Rowe was “tricked” out of his old Leader by Digressive Clinton Davidson (as per his own published statement) and started, another paper he now calls the “Christian Ledger.” Since he launched his “Ledger” he has repeatedly hurled ugly insinuations in the direction of Bro. Wallace and the Bible Banner. A very ugly “dig” is published in the September 2nd issue under the caption “Foy E. Wallace at Lexington, Ky.” In order that Bible Banner readers may be further informed concerning the evil work that is being done these days, read in full Rowe’s “report” of the Lexington meeting on the opposite page.

F. L. Rowe not only reflects upon Bro. Wallace, but upon all the faithful brethren in the Lexington area. I personally know these brethren, and know that they are loyal to the truth and worthy in every respect. Why should Bro. Rowe go out of his way to “dig” Foy E. Wallace as he has in the above false “report” of the worthy effort made to re-establish the ancient order of things in the “blue grass region” of Kentucky? The “special reporter,” whose name is withheld by Rowe, is quite well known in central Kentucky as a man who has wavered in action so much that he has no influence as a leader and teacher.

Knowing the brethren as I do who sponsored the Lexington meeting, and having attended the meeting in person, I knew that the “Ledger’s” report was false, and evidently intended to smear the name of Foy E. Wallace and give a crumb of comfort to the Premillennialists and their sympathizers. I wrote Bro. E. C. Detherage of Lexington, a man of sterling worth, for a statement concerning the meeting. Here is what Bro. Detherage writes:

It seems that the devil is busy as the report shows. In the first place why did-and Rowe need to report the meeting as a failure as they claim it? It was far from a failure. We had larger crowds than had ever attended any previous effort in this city made by the faithful church or the digressive-premillennial church “either. We had practically every Christian Church preacher in the city in attendance during the meeting and many of their members. Also a few of the premillennial group. The Winchester Church gave more than $25.00 and did not complain about it either. Also the expense has been all taken care of and a substantial sum in the treasury. Too Bro. Baumer only laboring with the Cramer Avenue Church less than two years and only had around seventy-five members when he left. I was there and I know. He had a few additions during his labors with this congregation. I know I am safe in saying not more than fifteen,

Bro. Rowe should be ashamed of himself and apologize to Brethren Wallace and Taylor, and to all the faithful brethren in central Kentucky for the ugly and false things he has published and circulated. Will he do it?

Bro. Rowe has never taken a forthright stand on the Boll question and many other vital issues before the church. He apparently doesn’t know what it is all about and like “Andy,” he is always in a jam! Some of us have tried to think he is sincere, and we respect his age, but there is no excuse for a man to continue his wild excursions and hurl ugly insinuations in the direction of faithful men whom he dislikes.

When F. L. Rowe sold out to the Davidson regime, and circularized the “brotherhood” in defense of Davidson, I wrote a short article under the caption “Brother Rowe Joins the Procession.” When he read it in the Bible Banner he became “legally minded” and even threatened to prefer “charges” against me before the elders of my home church. I renew my invitation to the Brother to proceed.

If the man is sincere in wishing to publish a clean paper, then he should retract his ugly “digs,” and cease printing them. Stand four-square for the truth and against error and the advocates of error, and a charitable “brotherhood” will uphold his hands.

In the language of the man Bro. Rowe dislikes so much, I sincerely say I am “sorry for Bro. Rowe, and devoutly wish that he could have saved himself the humiliation of the blunders he has made... It is not too late for him to make a clean breast of it all and square himself with the church.”

In a way, the Bible Banner does me an injustice. It matters not how busy I am, or what I am doing, when the Bible Banner arrives, I find it so interesting I simply stop and read it. I often say to myself, “I’ll just glance through it, see what is in this issue, and read it later.” But the glance is usually fatal! I soon find myself engrossed in the reading of it.

With regard to every gesture proffered by the Murch-Witty movement, I feel as Nehemiah did when Saballat and Tobiah invited him to meet them on the plains of Ono.

Charles L. Houser, Fulton, Ky.

I watched with interest and open-mindedness the first maneuvers of the Witty-Murch Unity scheme. I heard Bro. Witty, speak in defense of the movement during the Freed-Hardeman lecture series in 1939. He stated in one speech that we had to go. Bro. Early Arceneaux pressed him as to where we must go. That question is as yet unanswered. My sentiment then assumed concrete form, and today I stand unequivocally opposed to the scheme. The fate of the church of the Lord isn’t to be bartered across the conference table, for no man can legislate for that body. Unity is possible only when all concerned accept the same standard of faith. A disposition to tolerate error is to be abhorred, but only through such can these unity meetings assume even nominal success. May the Bible Banner serve as a medium to destroy the evil effects of such compromising endeavors.

Norman L. Vaughn, Tuckerman, Arkansas.

Brother Wallace, I think you are “doing a great work.” Nehemiah 6:3. The work must not cease. I wish every member of the church would read every copy of the “Bible Banner.”

Jesse W. Stephens, Honolulu, T. H.
Dr. Charles R. Shirar, Baptist pastor, protests against the practice which seems to be more or less common among Baptists of “deferring baptism for several years.” Dr. Shirar had this and some more to say in the Baptist and Reflector.

“We are commanded to baptize disciples. We are not to be afraid of being mixed with some who believe in baptismal regeneration by insisting upon compliance with this command. All who believe ought to be baptized as soon as practical thereafter, and in the most orderly fashion as possible, in the right way, and for the proper purpose. There are being too many converts among the children who defer baptism until ‘later,’ and in a great many cases this means never. At least deferring baptism for several years will not add anything to their spiritual life. The false assumption is that if they can hold out for a year or two, then they can keep themselves saved forever thereafter, which violates every New Testament principle and personal experience.

We heartily agree that “all who believe ought to be baptized as soon as practical thereafter and in the most orderly fashion as possible, in the right way, for the proper purpose.” The right way for a believer to be baptized is to submit, to immersion as the New Testament clearly teaches. “The proper purpose” of baptism as stated in the New Testament makes an unnecessary deferral of obedience to the divine command a very serious matter, more serious in fact than Dr. Shirar, or any other orthodox Baptist will admit it is. “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” (Mark 16: 16) “And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins.” (Acts 2:38) “And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on his name.” (Acts 22:16) “Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death?” (Rom. 6:3). “The proper purpose” of baptism could hardly be more clearly stated than in this inspired language. The believer who defers his baptism, according to these texts, defers the important business of being saved, receiving the remission of his sins, and entering into Christ and into his death. Surely, then “all who believe ought to be baptized as soon as practical thereafter.” He is justified in going to great length to make it “practical.” In the case of the jailor Paul and Silas must have advised against any deferral whatever for “he took them the same hour of the night and washed their stripes; and was baptized he and all his immediately.” The most “practical” time for the believer to attend to such an important matter is “immediately.”

It is expected that when a Baptist preacher whether a hillbilly or a doctor, says very much about baptism, he will get “afraid of being mixed with some who believe in baptismal regeneration.” According to a Baptist, there is no way to accept baptism as a condition of pardon without believing in “baptismal regeneration.” It would be as logical for them to sneer at Naaman for taking the water cure for his leprosy because God commanded him to dip seven times in the Jordan that he might be healed. God promises a believer pardon when he is baptized and such obedience is an act of faith and a test of faith. Personally, I’m not much “afraid of” Baptist preachers “being mixed with some who believe” what the New Testament teaches on the design of baptism, for my observation leads me to believe that they are stubbornly set against it. However, that doesn’t change what the New Testament says about it. This Baptist doctor thinks it is a “false assumption” that those who defer their baptism “can hold out for a year or two,” then they can keep themselves saved forever thereafter. “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” (Mark 16:16) “And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins.” (Acts 2:38) “And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on his name.” (Acts 22:16) “Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death?” (Rom. 6:3). “The proper purpose” of baptism could hardly be more clearly stated than in this inspired language. The believer who defers his baptism, according to these texts, defers the important business of being saved, receiving the remission of his sons, and entering into Christ and into his
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