REPENTANCE AND BAPTISM

FOY E. WALLACE JR.

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

In deference to readers who may not be able to quote the passage, it reads: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

A View of the Text

The passage presents an inseparable connection between repentance, baptism and remission. The preposition "for," being eis, means necessary to; in order to. It makes remission of sins depend on baptism in the same sense in which it depends on repentance. An application of the simple rules of grammar will make this fact clear. For instance, transposing the sentence it reads: "Every one of you repent and be baptized, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

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

The Answer Analyzed

The copulative conjunction "and" couples two verbs. Repent is one verb; be baptized is the other verb. They are joined together, by the Holy Spirit-and what the Holy Spirit joins together who will dare to separate? The phrase "the remission of sins" modifies both verbs, sustaining equal relation to both. Repent and be baptized for-what? For precisely the same thing. Eliminate one verb, make it a sentence with a simple predicate instead of a compound one, and read it: "Repent every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Or, eliminating the verb repent, and retaining the verb be baptized, read it again: "Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." There is no good sense in the passage if remission of sins is not the purpose of both repentance and baptism. In fact, in Acts 2:38, repentance by itself is not for anything; and baptism by itself is not for anything; but repentance and baptism are, together, for the remission of sins.

The Greek Preposition Eis

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

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

(Continued on Page 16)
“ABOUT CHURCH NAMES”

CLED E. WALLACE

We are glad for our readers to see the “More” that Brother Kurfees has to say “About Church Names.” There is a good deal of merit in much that he has to say, but it still seems to me that in spots he is shying at a bogey-man, so much so that, because he thinks brethren use “church of Christ” too much, he is almost if not altogether afraid to say it at all. It is my contention which I have reiterated over and over in the press for years that the people of the Lord should be called anything and everything they are called in the New Testament. The church of Christ in Tennessee or in Oklahoma includes the people of God in those states. It does not exclude any who are the Lord’s people, or include any who are not. If Brother Kurfees or any or “many” others think otherwise, they are simply mistaken. I have no defense to make of any who know little enough about the church to refer to it as “Another Denomination.” Neither am I conscious of any disposition to stereotype, or patent, so to speak, one specific designation for our Lord’s body or encourage anybody else to do so.

We have “church” and “assembly” in our English New Testament. In the language originally employed it was “ecclesia” with its various forms. The context and various designating terms identified by the character of the assembly. There was no religious significance in the term itself. The character of “the assembly” or “the church” in Romans 16:1 is certainly and necessarily implied even without a qualifying designation and the qualifying designation was therefore unnecessary. The brethren to whom the letter was written had no excuse for not knowing what it was. In the same chapter he refers to “churches of Christ.” (Verse 16.) There was one in Cenchreae. It was “the church” of Christ there. If not, why not? “All the churches of Christ” sent greetings to the church of Christ in Rome. Nobody that I know of denies that it was the body of Christ, the church of God, the Kingdom of Christ and God, the household of the faith and several other things it is called in the New Testament. The same applies to the church that was there in Antioch. I really do not see much point to what Brother Kurfees respectfully contemplates for just here.

I am aware of the fact that many people use scriptural names in connection with unscriptural things and affairs, and that it is confusing. I am not responsible for that and see in that fact no reason why I should not apply a scriptural name even regularly to the real thing. The term “Christian” has been very widely abused, but I have not heard that even Brother Kurfees protests the wide use of it by the brethren, because the followers of Christ are also called “disciples,” “brethren” and “saints,” and some others call themselves Christians when they are not. The church is still Christ’s and it is all right to say it is, regardless of what somebody else may say about the sectarian outfit he is lined up with. This ought to be too clear to be questioned.

Brother Kurfees is delighted over a big change in the way of church reports, from preachers over the country, read in the last few months. He finds the term “church of Christ” used in only one report out of seventy-one. That suits me all right and I would not cast any shadow over the joy he feels, but I do not see much point in it. If the reporters are talking about “the church,” they are talking about Christ’s church or ought to be. Whose church is it? Jesus said: “Upon this rock I will build my church.” He did and it is the church of Christ.

The observation that you can’t ever tell what is preached or practiced in a meeting house, by what the sign out in front may say has nothing to do with our brother’s objection to the term “church of Christ” as far as am able to see. You could always “tell” if people would always practice calling Bible things by Bible names, and practice quitting: calling unscriptural things by scriptural terms. It seems to me that Brother Kurfees ought to be working on them instead of us. They are the ones I like to work on for causing such confusion that I would have trouble finding “the church” should I come to his city.

We are given a specific example of just how we ought to say it. “We say, here in our city, Goldfloss Street Church, which meets for worship at ‘719 Goldfloss St.’, Well, is it a church of Christ ‘which meets for worship’ at that address? I think so for Brother Kurfees says that ‘Christ had no such idea about His church’ and ‘He did not give His church etc.’ (Italics mine) He should be careful or he will be using the term church of Christ next without quotation marks. We are to conclude that it is right to use the term “Goldfloss street church” with great regularity, but wrong to say “Goldfloss street church of Christ” at the same place with the same regularity. I don’t quite get it. “He did not give his church one distinct.
MORE ABOUT CHURCH NAMES

JOHN W. KURFEES

It is not my purpose to carry this discussion to an “erroneous extreme,” as Bro. Wallace seems to fear. But it should be carried far enough to get people to see the “erroneous extreme” many have gone to, and are going to, in order to stereotype, or patent, so to speak, one specific designation for our Lord’s body; when no such is even hinted at in the New Testament.

They have carried it to such an “extreme” that their patented term “Church of Christ,” is being referred to by prominent preachers and writers, as “the regular designation.”

Yes, it sure has become “regular,” but who is responsible for such regularity? I am sure no one can blame Peter or Paul for it.

They were pretty regular fellows, but not in that respect. In fact, Paul didn’t mind calling his Lord’s body the “Church of God,” or any of the other names found in the New Testament. But how many places can Brother Wallace cite us, where the brethren have, out in front of their meeting houses, a sign reading, “Church of God?”

I asked a party some time ago why they never used the designation ‘Church of God,” but persisted in using, all the time, and every where “Church of Christ?”

“Oh,” they said, “another denomination is using that term.” There you have it. ‘Another Denomination” is right.

Bro. Wallace agrees that the term “Church of Christ” is used in a sectarian manner, when it is “employed to cover too little or too much.

Certainly it is, and yet many, when referring to the church in a certain section will say, the “Church of Christ in Tenn.,” or the “Church of Christ, in Okla.,” and to whom do they refer? They of course are referring to no one except those who do not use instrumental music in their worship.

Of course those who are using mechanical instruments of music in their worship are in error, and should not do it, but many of them have obeyed the gospel and were of course added by the Lord to his body; and it is sectarian to be sure, to speak of the body of Christ in that particular section in a manner not to include them.

But Bro. Wallace says I seem to be “particularly concerned about what brethren write on their bulletin boards;” and then he informs me that the “meeting house is not the church at all.”

He had better read my article again if he thinks I ever intimated that the meeting house was a church.

I know what the New Testament says the church is, and I think I understand what the meeting house is.

Then Bro. Wallace says, “The term, ‘the church,’ has no religious significance whatever aside from the qualifying exclusive name” which is just another way of saying that the church of Christ is not given “one distinc, exclusive name.”

Brother Kurfees has a hard time trying to keep from saying it! He objects to the regular use of “one” designation and regularly employs a term without any designation, although there are several designations in the New Testament! Anyway, if I ever come to Winston-Salem I will try to find the “Goldfloss Street Church, which meets for worship at 719 Goldfloss St.” and when I find it I expect it to be the body of Christ. And if Brother Kurfees ever gets as far as Austin, Texas he is invited to the church of Christ which meets for worship at 19th and University. We assure him that he will not “find a pipe organ, piano and robed choir.”

designations, either expressed or implied, in the New Testament.”

Where is any qualifying designation in Rom. 16:1, where it says, “I commend unto you Phoebe our sister, who is a servant of the church that is at Cenchreae?”

Then in Acts 13:1, it says, “Now there were at Antioch, in the church that was there.”

I respectfully contend that there is not the slightest hint about religion, in either of the above statements, taken by themselves. It is neither “expressed” nor implied,” that the writer was even talking about a religious institution.

Of course I know religion is, or was, in it, but how do I know it? Certainly by nothing said in either passage. I can know it only by what I read before and after them; and so it is today. Bro. Wallace knows, as well as I, that notwithstanding the term “church” means technically, a called out body, it is seldom used in any other than a religious sense, either in the New Testament, or in common parlance today.

So when we say, here in our city, “Goldfloss Street Church, which meets for worship at 719 Goldfloss St.,” we are not uneasy but that all who read such notice, either in newspaper, or on sign board, will understand that we are not talking about a “mob,” but a religious gathering, even though we use no qualifying designation, before the word “church”.

I have often said that you can’t ever tell what is preached or practiced in a meeting house, by what the sign out in front may say; and as proof of this many brethren from other places who are wedded to the stereotyped designation, “Church of Christ,” come into our city, and of course are looking for a place to attend worship. Well, they drive around and find four nice meeting houses with sign out in front of each reading, “Church of Christ,” so they park” out in front of one of them and go in.

There they find a pipe organ, piano and robed choir.

Bro. Wallace insists that the sign be placed “over the meeting house door;” so I suppose if he passes through our city, he will be caught in the trap above referred to.

I would feel sorry for him, but he should not grumble, for he would be only getting a dose of his own medicine.

I don’t know who is responsible for the change, but anyway, there has been a big change in the way church reports, from preachers over the country, read in the last few months.

Not so long ago, practically every report would say the “Church of Christ” in such and such place. Now most of them say, “the church” at such and such place. A few weeks ago, I read in one issue of the Gospel Advocate 71 reports, and the term “Church of Christ,” was in only one. Of course, as stated before, the church has a dozen or more qualifying designations in the New Testament, and that inspired record is speaking them all, every day, and all the time. We of course cannot do that, but we can speak and write in such manner as not to paramount, or in any way show a preference for one of these designations above the others: and to the extent we do show a preference we are violating God’s order; a thing we have been preaching against for a long time.

Of course we know that each denominational church seems to think that one distinctive denominational title is essential to its existence and its place among its sister denominations; but Christ had no such idea about his church. He did not give his church one distinct, exclusive name; and who are we that we should presume to change his arrangement?
I am taking this correspondence course in history under Brother J. N. Armstrong who was one of my teachers in the Old Nashville Bible School forty years ago. At that time he was only a beginner, and had no higher title than Brother Armstrong. Now he is "J. N. Armstrong, M. A. LL. D. President Emeritus, David Lipscomb College." Brother Armstrong is not charging me for this course, and I am glad to share it with the readers of the Bible Banner. This ought to give the Bible Banner a little better rating, than Brother Armstrong gave it before his writings began to appear in it. I have Brother Armstrong's reply to my article published in the August issue of the Bible Banner; but I have not yet received his reply to my article in the September issue of the Banner. Of course Brother Armstrong is a very busy man, and we will have to wait for his lessons as he finds time to give them. We should not complain at the delay since the course is free. I now submit Brother Armstrong's present paper, with my reply.

Dear Brother Lewis:

I thank you for giving my letter to the readers of "The Bible Banner." I wrote it. I appreciate also, the spirit of your comments.

I hold that the unity of God's people is so important that it is sinful to break fellowship and make division in the body of Christ over differences that may arise among brethren who hold the common faith and who are faithful to the commandments of God and whose lives, are worthy—differences that do not hinder obedience to Christ and that do not change in any way the work and worship of the Church—differences in which nobody's conscience is bound by the other's teaching; but each one left free to think, believe, and act as he sees God's word leads him. I agree most heartily with the man whose words I now quote:

"The whole sum and substance of Christianity may thus be reduced to faith in Christ and obedience to his commandments. Beyond this men should not be restricted in opinions or circumscribed in investigations. When we believe in Christ and obey his commandments, we are Christians. Having done this, if we differ we should differ as Christians, as brethren in the Lord and not make our differences denominational barriers which interdict Christian love, destroy brotherly fellowship, prevent successful cooperation, promote strife and ugly contumelies." (D. Strygley in "Larimore and His Boys," Second Edition.)

I believe Brother F. D. Strygley's position is the undenominational position and here I stand, also. Furthermore, if I have paid a price for keeping a "good conscience" respecting my conviction, it is no more than thousands of other Christians have done. If this mice has been exacted of me by my brethren, I can but deeply regret their wrong doing. No man has a right to decide my scruples.

Remember, Brother Lewis, I made no comparison of positions. You are the man who compared my position to Brother Boll's. And, since I could not see how you could fail to know T. W. Brents's and A. Harding's position on these matters, and since my position is about the same as theirs, I concluded that you would have to judge that the same difference—that of tweedle dee and tweedle dum—existed between the position of Brents and Harding and that of Brother Armstrong. This comparison of positions. You, not I, also introduced that unfortunate Advocate-Boll affair. And, while I believe it is better to let "the dead past bury the dead," I am not averse at a proper time, if you desire it, to digging up for review that regrettable piece of history; but only on the condition that both sides be given impartially to your readers. Suffer it to say here that doctrine alone was by no means the issue of the Lipscomb-Boll controversy. But, the fact that their difference of judgment did not mar the relation between Harding and Lipscomb, or disturb their cooperation with each other is of interest. Their difference of judgment did not lead them to "line up" the preachers or to "line up" the brethren into two parties—the Harding party and the Lipscomb party. Nor did these parties anybody in the Churches, and tell them whom to select to preach for them.

Though Brother T. B. Larimore (as you remember) did not think "opinions (?) over missionary societies and instrumental music" in the work and worship of the Church should cause him to "mark faithful men," though Larimore continued to use "the digressive preachers to lead prayers and take part in his meetings," though Harding "had just as soon call on the devil himself" as to do what Larimore was doing, and though Larimore was willing to invite that "saintly man" to preach for them whenever they wanted to do so.

It would be a good thing, Brother Lewis, for "faithful men" now to follow this "example" of my "illustrious father-in-law," and there would surely be less disturbance, less strife and bitterness, and few parties in the Church of our Lord. Harding could have made a whole of a fuss in the Church, after Larimore's practice. But he did not. What do you think of Harding's example here?

The report you have received that Brother Lipscomb stopped Boll from preaching his sermon on the millennium at David Lipscomb College must also be an incorrect report.

In 1910, Boll gave a series of lectures at David Lipscomb College. G. C. Brewer says, Boll "preached the errors of the premillennialists that the largest congregation of young was heard by "Brother Lipscomb, Brother Elam, and many of the other preachers in Nashville" that in an afternoon lecture, after Boll had preached the whole of the premillennial theory, Boll made a statement that Brother Lipscomb thought was a criticism of Lipscomb's own position on teaching prophecies; that Brother Lipscomb challenged Boll's statement from the audience; that Brother Boll immediately said, "Brother Lipscomb, I did not mean you."" G. C. Brewer was an eye-witness to what occurred in Boll's 1910 lectures; and the above is the report as given by Brewer himself in his lecture at David Lipscomb College on January 19, 1910. Read his testimony in his monographed lecture, "Premillennialism," pages 1, 2, and 3.

This was the only "stopping" of Boll that Brother Lipscomb is reported ever to have done, so far as I have heard or read, and this was in reference to his own teaching and
not Boll's. There is no evidence that Boll was at any time stopped by Brother Lipscomb from teaching anything that he had been approved or accepted by the other brethren. R. H. Boll continued to lecture at David Lipscomb College for five years after the lectures of 1910. His last engagement was in 1916, one year before David Lipscomb's death.

But it is true, as you say, that Brother Lewis and Brother T. Q. Martin, have both strongly commended James A. Harding and T. W. Brents, and since you both seem doubtful of Harding's position on the millennium, I think it better to let you both, as the Brethren of Lipscomb College know, take this question from both of these men for themselves on the question. I quote from their own pens:

J. A. Harding on The Millennium
(taken from his editorial in "The Way," October 15, 1903)

...When God made this earth he gave it unto the hands of man while he was yet in his pristine purity. Man turned it over to Satan. God swept Satan's servants from the face of the earth, and gave it again to righteous men, who before a great while turned it over to Satan again: who now is, and for a long time has been, "the prince of this world." (See John 12:31-14:30:16:11) Christ came to this earth, and, as the seed of man, took command of the discouraged and dispersed sons of righteousness, that he might deliver the earth from Satan, and destroy his hosts.

The war raging now, the war of righteousness against wickedness, of Christ against Satan, of the kingdom of heaven, under the leadership of Jesus, against the kingdoms of this world, under the leadership of Satan. When Christ has fully purged all things for the collecting of his people out of the kingdoms of the earth, he will come again "with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trumpet of God. Then all the dead in Christ shall arise from their graves, immortals; then "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump," the living Christians shall be changed, shall become immortals, and then shall be caught up into the clouds by the angels to meet the Lord, to be with him forever more.

When the saints are caught up to meet him, Christ comes on with them on earth. Then all the kings of the earth gather their armies together, with the beast and the false prophet, to make war against Christ and his army. The beast and the false prophet are captured and cast into the lake of fire, the first to be consigned to that awful place, then by the sword which proceeds out of his mouth Christ slays all the rest, all the wicked that are on the earth, and all the powers of darkness that have been in them from the beginning. Satan is then caught, chained and cast into the abyss, which is shut and sealed. In this place he is confined for one thousand years.

During this thousand years, Christ, and his saints reign, but the rest of the dead live not again till the thousand years have expired. This, the resurrection of the righteous, is the first resurrection; over these who come up at this resurrection "the second death hath no power; but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years.

Paul says: "There remaineth therefore a Sabbath rest for the people of God" (Hebrews 4:9). The beginning of Christ's reign was announced on earth on the day of the Pentecost. It was his resurrection and it will end with the judgment day, at the close of which the wicked shall be cast into the lake of fire; when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have delivered the kingdom to Christ, and shall have given him power and authority, and all power. For he must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be abolished is death. ... And first "the Gegevon of the fire." Then shall the Son also himself be subjected to him that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all. (1 Cor. 15:28.)

From all this it is evident that the last thousand years of Christ's reign will be a period of perfect rest from sin. During this period Satan will be in the abyss, and all the wicked shall be cast into it closed over with fire. The beast and false prophet will be in, the hell of fire; all the rest of the wicked will be dead; and the saints will have received their spiritual bodies, having been delivered "out of the body of this death." These facts point clearly to this period of a thousand years rest to Satan with rest to all the people of God... this glorious thousand years with which time ends; during which all the saints of the ages will reign with Christ in perfect freedom from the guilt and all the evil effects of sin, in perfect freedom from the temptation to sin. That this millennial reign will be on the earth is clearly indicated by the facts that at the beginning of it Christ and his saints are on the earth and so they are at the end of it. Compare Rev. 19:11-21 with Rev. 20:1-10. Read also 1 Cor. 15:20-28; 1 Thess. 4:13-18; 2 Thess. 2:7-9; Matthew 24:29-31.

T. W. Brents on The Millennium, in "Gosael Sermons" by Brents, pages 325, 340, and 341, and 342.

There is surely something taught in the Bible on the subject, and it can do us no harm to study it...
...
...This quotation. 1 Thess. 4:13-17, is full, clear, and specific. We learn that there will be righteous persons living when the Lord comes, but they will not go before those who sleep in Jesus. The dead in Christ, shall rise first. This is generic, and includes all the dead in Him. We are now prepared to read our text. "And I saw, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and such as worshipped not the beast, neither his image, and received not the mark upon their foreheads and upon their hand; and they lived, and reigned with Christ a thousand years." This is the millennium. If the war is raging now, the war of righteousness against wickedness, of Christ against Satan, of the kingdom of heaven, under the leadership of Jesus, against the kingdoms of this world, under the leadership of Satan. When Christ has fully prepared all things for the collecting of his people out of the kingdoms of the earth, he will come again "with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trumpet of God. Then all the dead in Christ shall arise from their graves, immortals; then "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump," the living Christians shall be changed, shall become immortals, and then shall be caught up into the clouds by the angels to meet the Lord, to be with him forever more.

...But Satan is to be bound during this thousand years. The wicked will be all dead, the righteous clad in the habiliments of immortality, and under the protection of their Master, and there will be no combination of the righteous against the wicked. Hence he will be completely shorn of his power. This will be a glorious period. No wicked living— the saints all immortalized, hence, free from pain, sickness and death. No sorrowing, no sighing, no tears, no sad farewells... All will be joy, peace, and love... for a thousand years.

Brother Lewis, I am not, and never have been, interested in teaching and writing on the millennium, as Brents and Harding were and as many other godly men have been from the first century to the present day—had I been, I should have been at it through these years; but I am concerned about your making our differences in respect to these matters a ground for division and the breaking of fellowship. I believe it is just as wicked for you to bind the conscience of another man who teaches on the subject, and it can do us no harm to study it. Never mind about any change Brother Boles has made in Christ Jesus.

These facts point clearly to this period of a thousand years rest to Satan, rest to all the people of God... this glorious thousand years with which time ends; during which all the saints of the ages will reign with Christ in perfect freedom from the guilt and all the evil effects of sin, in perfect freedom from the temptation to sin. That this millennial reign will be on the earth is clearly indicated by the facts that at the beginning of it Christ and his saints are on the earth and so they are at the end of it. Compare Rev. 19:11-21 with Rev. 20:1-10. Read also 1 Cor. 15:20-28; 1 Thess. 4:13-18; 2 Thess. 2:7-9; Matthew 24:29-31.

...This quotation. 1 Thess. 4:13-17, is full, clear, and specific. We learn that there will be righteous persons living when the Lord comes, but they will not go before those who sleep in Jesus. The dead in Christ, shall rise first. This is generic, and includes all the dead in Him. We are now prepared to read our text. "And I saw, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and such as worshipped not the beast, neither his image, and received not the mark upon their foreheads and upon their hand; and they lived, and reigned with Christ a thousand years." This is the millennium. If the war is raging now, the war of righteousness against wickedness, of Christ against Satan, of the kingdom of heaven, under the leadership of Jesus, against the kingdoms of this world, under the leadership of Satan. When Christ has fully prepared all things for the collecting of his people out of the kingdoms of the earth, he will come again "with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trumpet of God. Then all the dead in Christ shall arise from their graves, immortals; then "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump," the living Christians shall be changed, shall become immortals, and then shall be caught up into the clouds by the angels to meet the Lord, to be with him forever more.

...But Satan is to be bound during this thousand years. The wicked will be all dead, the righteous clad in the habiliments of immortality, and under the protection of their Master, and there will be no combination of the righteous against the wicked. Hence he will be completely shorn of his power. This will be a glorious period. No wicked living— the saints all immortalized, hence, free from pain, sickness and death. No sorrowing, no sighing, no tears, no sad farewells... All will be joy, peace, and love... for a thousand years.

Brother Lewis, I am not, and never have been, interested in teaching and writing on the millennium, as Brents and Harding were and as many other godly men have been from the first century to the present day—had I been, I should have been at it through these years; but I am concerned about your making our differences in respect to these matters a ground for division and the breaking of fellowship. I believe it is just as wicked for you to bind the conscience of another man who teaches on the subject, and it can do us no harm to study it. Never mind about any change Brother Boles has made in Christ Jesus.

After H. Leo Boles had discussed with R. H. Boll "Premillenialism" as it is styled; after he had examined, not in a heated oral debate, but in the quiet of his study, every position Brother Boll advocates in this field (and may I add that I once had done a real job at it, too) he concludes with:

"Brother Boll and I hold many things in common—enough to follow the eulogies of brethren for the Master. ...We differ as the reader knows; our differences and a discussion of them do not keep me from esteeming him very highly as a brother in Christ Jesus."

Never mind about any change Brother Boles has made since then. He gave what was his free, deliberate, and volunteer judgment. This is his right as a free citizen of the kingdom of heaven. During the time he held that judgment, long or short, it would have been wrong for those who held a different judgment to per- suade him to change his convictions, and to regard him as an unfaithful teacher. He was far better prepared after his thorough examination of the matter to make up his judgment than brethren who had not made so thorough an examination.
The fact, Brother Lewis, that a man of Brother Boles' training and scholarship, experience and wisdom, came to this conclusion after a careful and painstaking study of the issues proves that other good, intelligent, and faithful men may, after a thorough examination of the matters involved, reach the same judgment; it is not, may have done that very thing. They are rightous course, therefore, toward such brethren is to esteem them highly as brethren in Christ Jesus.

Brother Boles has since seen reasons for a change of judgment, he has a perfect right to make the change. But, those of us who hold now the same judgment as Brother Boles held in 1927, and who have not seen valid reasons for a change, deserve brotherly treatment. It is contrary to the spirit of the whole gospel for you to try to force your judgment on us and to decide our scruples. And, I verily believe, when you write us up in the papers, and warn brethren against us, and urge them to join you, we become responsible for any and all discord, disturbanece, and division that may come from your course.

I am now repeating my question: "If these men were living now-Harding and Brents-would you invite them to preach in your congregation, and would you make them free to preach on the millennium?" Since this involves the very issue between you and me, namely, the "marking" of the cross, I think that it is worth knowing for the millennium, I am anxious for you to tell the readers of the Banner what you would do now with those "veterans of the cross".

It seems to me, Brother Lewis, that many good men, like you, have not looked at this matter from all sides and seen the thing clear through.

Very sincerely,

J. N. Armstrong.

Evidently, Brother Armstrong, when you prepared the above article, you had not read my article in the September issue of The Banner. Has not your friend from Tennessee sent you the September Bible Banner yet? If you don't read my papers you cannot grade them. And you will be going over ground that I had already covered. I have told you that I compared your position, on the millennium, to R. H. Boll's position because you are so vehement in defending Boll's right to teach his theories, and so bitter in the philippics you hurl against those who challenge his right, that I thought logic would force you to avoid his vagaries, and share the consequences.

You ignored this explanation of mine, and wrote another rigmarole about my comparison, an "drenched the climax of absurdities by declaring that I compared Brents' and Harding's position to that of R. H. Boll's position, on the millennium. I introduced "that unfortunate advocate Boll affair," to show that the editors of the Gospel Advocate, who fellowshipped Brents and Harding, but cut Boll off and out of the Advocate, knew there was a difference in their teaching on the millennial theory. When Boll was given the front page of the Advocate, he certainly had the same confidence and respect of the other editors that Brents and Harding had had. But when his teaching became "vitiating and divisive" he was cut off the Advocate staff. He tried to quit teaching his newly discovered theories of the millennium, I was put back on the advocate staff, but later violated his agreement, and for four years denied having made an agreement. At the joint request of N. B. Hardeman and E. H. Ijams, "that regrettable piece of history" was dug up, and published in the January 1936 issue of the Gospel Guardian. Didn't your friends ever tell you about this? Somebody told you what H. Leo Boles said in the Guardian about Boll's theories; because you later referred to Boll's statement as having been made in an insignificant paper. I then tried to, get Brother Boles to say the same thing in the Gospel Advocate; but he never did do it, and you were right when you said only a few people ever heard his statement.* If, he had given the reason for his changed attitude toward Boll's teaching, through the Gospel Advocate, you doubtless would not have referred to it in your present letter.

In speaking, of what I said about Harding and Lari-
more, you say: "I think your memory jumps a few cogs in calling up details." Did you say this, Brother Armstrong, to discredit what I said that I heard Brother Harding say? I never claimed to have heard everything Brother Harding said about that matter. I simply told what I heard him say in his Bible class. You were not in the class. Of course you "had every chance to know those facts" because you were one of the teachers, and I am sure you "heard J. A. Harding tell the story more than once." If you will tell what you heard Brother Harding say, "more than once" on this subject, I will not try to discredit it, neither am I afraid it will contradict what I heard him say.

You next introduce G. C. Brewer to disprove what I said about Brother Lipscomb stopping R. H. Boll's lecture. You then speak of H. Leo Boles' attitude toward R. H. Boll's teaching in those days. If you have not the facts in these matters, I certainly want them. I am not out on a rampage of destruction, and distortion of facts, as you think I am. So my reply to Brewer's facts (?) and what you say about Boles' attitude, is the following from H. Leo Boles.

Dear Brother Lewis:

You kind letter of November 27 came in due time and I just now find time to give attention to it.

First, about the report that Bro. Brewer has given in an incident that occurred more than 30 years ago. His memory of the events and my memory there do not agree. As I recall Boll was lecturing on the Return of the Jews to Palestine Bro. Lipscomb heard his first lecture and called his attention to the prophecies that he had given, and made clear out the prophecy that the Jews would come out of Babylon. It was announced that he would continue his lecture the next afternoon. He did not lecture the next afternoon. I did not know why, neither did the other teachers and student body know. In our faculty meeting the next week the incident was discussed and it was revealed that Bro. Lipscomb had asked Boll not to teach further on that subject.

I was a teacher at that time; Brother Brewer was a student. I was present at the faculty meeting when the matter was discussed and reason given for his not continuing the lecture on that subject; Bro. Brewer was not present. I was a member of the faculty and had opportunity to ask questions and asked questions; Bro. Brewer was not present. I leave you to judge as to whose memory is the more accurate.

When the Boles-Boll discussion was held in 1927 conditions were different from those that now exist. What was stated and quoted by Bro. Armstrong expressed my attitude at that time. Since that time the theories have been more definitely formulated, some points have been added, emphasis has been put on different phases, and the theory of Boll has been pressed and promulgated until the brotherhood has been distorted. The peace and harmony of many churches have been broken because of the advocates of these theories. Boll and others have changed their attitude toward the theory and become more dogmatic and aggressive. One would be unfaithful to the truth and right if he did not change his attitude, then the opposition of truth changes his attitude. God himself changes his attitude toward men; if they are repentent his attitude is that of forgiveness, but if they are stubborn, presistent, and rebel-

ious his attitude will change and become more dogmatic and aggressive. That is the attitude of many churches that have broken because of the advocate's theories. Boll and others have changed their attitude toward the theory and become more dogmatic and aggressive.

*About 10,000 copies of the issue of that "insignificant paper." the Gospel Guardian in which Bro. Boles statement appeared were published and mailed to preachers and elders everywhere-Editor.

Yours fraternally.

H. Leo Boles.
I shall wait with interest your reaction and comments on Brother Boles’ letter. I feel sure you will admit that H. Leo Boles “had every chance to know the facts,” and G. C. Brewer did not. Naturally, C. thought what he was telling would be the last word on the subject, and you evidently thought so too; but you were wrong in this. However, I have not lost faith in you as a teacher yet. But I do think you ought to be careful about interpreting, in your lessons, the manuscripts of other “doctors.”

We now come to Brother Harding’s article. What did you publish this for Brother Armstrong? Did you publish it to show that Brother Harding believed that the “old Roman Empire will reappear and flourish again? That Christ will then come, convert the Jews nationally, gather them back to Palestine, re-establish the earthly Kingdom of Israel, sit upon the earthly throne of David, and rule over an earthly kingdom, in Jerusalem, for one thousand years? I cannot get these things out of the article, and if you did not publish the article to prove these things, then the article is beside the issue. These things are the warp and woof of Boll’s vagaries. If you do not know this, ask Brother Brewer, he knows. You might also get Brother Brewer to tell us if R. H. Boll taught these things when he “preached the whole millennial theory” before Lipscomb and Elam, in 1910, at the Nashville Bible School? “He was an eye witness.” Dr. Brents, in his sermon on the millennium, to which you referred, said it took more credulity than he had to believe those things. If you want to defend Boll’s theories, you are certainly trying to use the wrong witnesses when you call in Brents and Harding.

I will, for the benefit of the readers, quote from R. H. Boll, and let them see if they can get his theories out of Harding’s article.

“Israel is back in their land just before the Lord’s glorious coming: the temple is rebuilt, its service resumed. The last great world power, Rome, in her final shape, flourishes. The man in supreme rule exalts himself above all that is called God. He sits in the temple (either in person or his image installed there), setting himself forth as the object of worship. This is the “abomination of desolation.” When that thing occurs, all believers in Jesus who are in and around Jerusalem are warned to flee instantly. For then shall be unparalleled tribulations. The glorious appearing follows immediately upon this tribulation (Matt. 24:29).”

Readers, is this the “forty second cousin” of anything you read in J. A. Harding’s article? Brother Armstrong says: “I believe it is just as wicked for you to bind your opposition to this doctrine on the church as it is for the man who teaches on this subject to force his doctrine on the brethren.” The only consolation I get out of this, is, Brother Armstrong inadvertently admits that Brother Boll is as “wicked” as I am, and G. C. Brewer will tell you that R. H. Boll is the most pious, consecrated, and humble man of God that he ever knew. Therefore by “comparison” I am put on higher ground than I had ever hoped to find myself.

Back to Harding and Larimore again. You say: “Harding could have made a whale of a fuss in the church over Larimore’s practice. But he did not. What do you thing of Harding’s example here?” I suppose I think well of it. At least I am following it. For instance, G. C. Brewer, who holds an honorary “Doctor’s” degree from Harding College, calls on denominational preachers to lead prayers in his meetings, and I have never tried “to make a whale of a fuss” about that. I will ask you a question. Whose example, in these matters, would you recommend to the young preachers in Harding College-Harding’s or Larimore’s?

Now to your final question. “If these men were living now-Harding and Brents—would you invite them to preach in your congregation, and would you make them free to preach on the millennium?” If you asked this question to embarrass me, you “missed the bus” again. If J. A. Harding were living today, and in his prime as I knew him, there is not a man living that I had rather have preach where I preach, and I would not worry about what he would preach. I am absolutely certain that I would hear nothing about the re-appearing of the ancient Roman Empire, the national conversion of the Jews, the re-establishment of the earthly Kingdom of Israel, with Christ sitting on the earthly throne of David, in Jerusalem, ruling over an earthly kingdom for a thousand years, and such like bunk-which is the very essence of Boll’s vagaries. Since you persist in trying to prove, in a curious, circuitous way, that Boll’s theories on the millennium are the same as Dr. Brents’ and Brother Harding’s were, would you have Boll “to preach for your congregation?”

Or would you invite him to Harding College to give his theories about the millennium to the students there? I am sure you, too, would be glad to have Brents and Harding, those “veterans of the cross,” preach for you, if they were living. But what about Boll? Have you joined the “marketers”? I am sure the readers of the Bible Banner will appreciate the kindness of the editor in giving them the benefit of these lessons you are trying to teach me. I hope you can see your way to continue this free course. I assure you that your lectures will be published just as you send them. And I feel sure that it will eventually appear to you that yours and F. D. Srygley’s position on undenominational Christianity is too elastic, it would cover every ism under the sun. I told you that Brother Larimore himself told me in later years that some of his brethren had gone farther from the truth than he ever dreamed they would go. Therefore I believe Brother Larimore’s matured conclusions on digression, and Boles on “Bollism,” should take precedence over their earlier “opinions.” Don’t you?
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I am in exactly the right humor to do some vigorous and honest chopping on some paragraphs I find on the editorial pages of some late issues of the Baptist and Reflector. We have neither the space nor the inclination to reproduce all that the versatile and prolific editor has to say. It is not necessary to do so, nor unfair not to do so. If anybody is interested in seeing all that he has to say, the fair things to do is to subscribe for his paper. In an editorial designed to magnify the importance of “the churches,” which according to the slant he has on things religious, are Baptist churches, he has this to say:

So also the churches are to be honored denominationally. The churches must be put in and kept in the saddle in any denominational work which proposes to glorify Christ. No program which does not do this can rightly claim to honor Christ.

The editor of the Baptist and Reflector momentarily, in telling about some of the things “Southern Baptists are committed to,” he gets too little of his “material” from “what our scripture means.” by preaching the Word.

Editor Taylor uses Paul’s famous charge to Timothy about “preaching the word.” I do not now recall reading anywhere from Paul or the Lord about the churches riding horseback “in any denominational work which proposes to glorify Christ.” Maybe the Baptist and Reflector can tell us, or that such a “program” is “presented in the Word.”

I have no desire to keep “in the saddle” or ride bare-back. They are not as bad as they used to be along this line, and arousing the natural emotions of people to an extreme pitch is not what our scripture means. by preaching the Word.

Baptist preachers throughout the South have been “Cutting monkey-shines” and “telling a lot of deathbed and graveyard stories” so long, it is not likely that they could quit it all of a sudden, even if the Baptist and Reflector told them to, and they wanted to. It has become such a confirmed habit that it can almost be said that “Southern Baptists are committed to the proposition.” Multitudes under the influence of such preaching have mistaken a “nervous spasm” for the direct operation of the Holy Spirit and been voted on for baptism, when they tried to describe how they felt. They are not as bad as they used to be along this line, but they are still bad enough. Any improvement is to be encouraged. Editor Taylor is hitting the right nail on the right end, when he suggests fewer graveyard yarns and more “clear-cut scripture teaching.” We have been telling Baptists this for lo, these many years, and some of them have not been inclined to pay much attention to us. I will not be considered too forward I hope if I suggest some “clear-cut scripture teaching” that could with some profit be sandwiched in between “a lot of deathbed and graveyard stories” that are often heard in Baptist pulpits. Here are a couple of direct quotations. “And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned.” (Mark 16:15, 16). “Now when they heard this, they were pricked

THE CHURCH-DENOMINATIONS-AND PREACHING

CLED E WALLACE

It means reasoning with men “out of the scriptures” after the manner of Paul. It means presenting Bible doctrines and clinching it with a “Thus saith the Lord.” Both preachers and teachers are to do this.

Now, if “both preachers and teachers are to do this,” then they ought to stop talking about what “Southern Baptists are committed to,” and quit trying to keep them whipped into line “in any denominational work” by quoting “Art. II of the Constitution of the Tennessee Baptist Convention,” and “Art. II of the Constitution of the Southern Baptist Convention.” It looks to me like it would be better to present some Bible doctrine and clinch it with a “Thus saith the Lord.” Or it would be about as well to reason with them out of the scripture after the manner of Paul. It is my impression that Paul and the Lord are about as well informed about how things ought to be run, “in the saddle” or out, as the Tennessee Baptist Convention or the Southern Baptist Convention, or both. It is more than a little suspicious if neither Paul nor the Lord said anything about it and you have to resort to the constitution of some Baptist convention to find what you are looking for. That is why I think we ought to stick to Paul and the Lord and do our “reasoning with men ‘out of the scriptures’.” When the editor is talking about what “Southern Baptists are committed to,” he gets too little of his “material” from “what God says in His Word” and too much of it from “what some many says in His word.” I do not now recall reading anything from Paul or the Lord about the churches riding horseback “in any denominational work which proposes to glorify Christ.” Maybe the Baptist and Reflector can tell us when such a “program” is “presented in the Word.”

Editor Taylor hits the right nail on the right end, when he suggests fewer graveyard yarns and more “clear-cut scripture teaching.” We have been telling Baptists this for lo, these many years, and some of them have not been inclined to pay much attention to us. I will not be considered too forward I hope if I suggest some “clear-cut scripture teaching” that could with some profit be sandwiched in between “a lot of deathbed and graveyard stories” that are often heard in Baptist pulpits. Here are a couple of direct quotations. “And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned.” (Mark 16:15, 16). “Now when they heard this, they were pricked.
WHO IS A CONSISTENT CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR?

JOHN T. LEWIS

To answer the above question intelligently we must study the difference between a temporal government, its purpose and mission, and the church or spiritual kingdom, its purpose and mission. Every temporal government has been founded by, and stands upon the sword. The spiritual kingdom was founded by, and stands upon love. A temporal government must defend its rights among the other nations of the world, these' rights should be preserved by peaceful means if possible; but by the sword if necessary. Our government also proposes to protect the rights and liberties of its law abiding citizens, from human leeches, rack-eteers, gangsters, rapers, premeditated murderers, etc., in its own borders. Therefore, our jails, penitentiaries, electric chairs, or gas chambers, all of which are absolutely necessary for the preservation of decent society.

With these observations before us, which are axiomatic facts, a person who does not believe in war under any conditions, has absolutely no right to a seat in our national congress, the only constitutional source of a declaration of war in defense of our country. Look at the pathetic, but absurd spectacle of Montana's incongruous congresswoman, Jeannette Rankin, voting against a declaration of war against the fanatical war lords of Japan, after their sneaking, contemptible, diabolical, unprovoked, copperhead stroke at the very life line of the United States' government, on that peaceful Lord's day, December 7, 1941. A stroke that will go down in history as the very essence, and climax of perfidy among nations at peace among themselves. Jeannette Rankin's vote could only mean the acquiescence in the destruction of our government, and the ultimate slavery of its people to an unscrupulous, and idolatrous nation. Therefore a pacifist, who is against war under any conditions, should never be woven (voted) into the warp or woof of a temporal government. I also believe that every one who votes, or otherwise takes part in political campaigns, should not only be ready and willing, but should be required by the government to back his ballot with the bullet. Christ himself said: "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews:" (John 18:36). Jesus knew that the kingdoms of this world would fight for their rights and existence. Yet He declared that his servants would not fight even to protect his life. "A consistent conscientious objector," therefore, must be a consistent, faithful Christian, who takes no part in politics, but respects, gives his moral support, and pays taxes to the government that gives him his religious freedom. His claims, then; for non-combatant service, should be made on his

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). If these "clear-cut scriptures" had been "set forth" in Baptist pulpits through the years as often as "deathbed and grave-yard stories" and other harrowing incidents" have been told to "arouse the natural emotions. of people to an extreme pitch;", "and work their hearers-into a nervous spasm almost, if not entirely," there would have been more Christians and fewer Baptists. But there is no need to cry over split milk. We are willing for the reform to start where it is most needed even at this, late date.

individual convictions, his belief in, and his respect for the teaching of Christ, and not on the flimsy claims that "the church of Christ does not believe in war." I believe it to be both misleading, and confusing to the government, for the preacher and elders of a congregation to get up a manifesto, sign it, and send it to Washington, declaring that "the Church of Christ is against carnal warfare." During world war Number 1, Brother J. W. Shepherd, and Dr. J. S. Ward, if I remember correctly, went to Washington to present the no war claims of "the Church of Christ" to the government. Congressman Houston, from Tennessee, who also claimed to be a member of the church, and whom Brother Shepherd had known from childhood, treated them, if not with contempt, with less respect and consideration, than General Crowder himself did. I cannot conceive of a worse medley of contradictions than for church members to vote to send a member of the church to the United States congress, where war must be declared, then after war has been declared, send a delegation to Washington to tell the government that "the church of Christ" does not believe in war. There can be no clear line of demarcation between the church, or spiritual kingdom of Christ, and the temporal, or political government, so long as we have "political persons" in our pulpits, and church members seeking and receiving political preferments and emoluments. War and capital punishment are necessary evils in civil government, which Paul declares, "is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil." (read Romans 13:3-7). Since the civil government or powers, have been ordained of God to punish evil doers, and since the New Testament teaches that a Christian cannot take vengeance on evil doers, therefore the Christian should not become entangled in political affairs. I believe in the absolute separation of the church and state. Therefore I do not believe our government should give the Pope of Rome, and his cardinals, any more recognition in governmental affairs than it gives the Methodist Bishops, and their presiding elders, and that should be absolutely nothing, but, freedom to run their church affairs.

BOLES BIBLE LESSONS

H. Leo Boles, Staff Editor of The Gospel Advocate, Editor of The Gospel Advocate Series of Bible School Literature, a preacher of the gospel of many years' experience, and a teacher of the Bible in David Lipscomb College for more than a quarter of a century, is now offering Bible Lessons by correspondence. These Courses cover both the Old and New Testament.

Opportunities are offered by these Courses to young preachers who do not have the means to attend a Bible College or others who wish to be led into a fuller knowledge of the Bible, to teachers of Bible Classes who desire to increase their knowledge of the Bible, and to elders of the church and all others who are interested in a study of the Bible. These Courses give a thorough and systematic study of the entire Bible; they will help to make one a more efficient servant of God.

You should grasp the opportunity to get the benefit of the experience and knowledge of such a Bible scholar. For further information write H. Leo Boles, 4100 Granny White Road, Nashville, Tennessee.
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IGNORING THE MAIN POINT

CLED E. WALLACE

The Baptist and Reflector is persistent in its efforts to establish as a fact that salvation is a gift of grace bestowed upon the sinner before and without obedience to the gospel. Since Baptists believe this, I have no quarrel with their persistence in teaching it. Nearly every issue of the Baptist and Reflector features it in one way or another. Since I do not believe it and think it a hurful theory calculated to make void the grace of God, I owe nobody any apology for pitching into its advocates as often as I think the cause of truth demands it. The Book says “he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him.” (Heb. 5:9) I believe it. Such obedience is the “obedience of faith” and in no wise contradicts what the scriptures say about salvation by grace. It is said that “a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith.” (Acts 6:7) This obedience was necessary to their salvation. Peter asks the question: “What shall the end be to them that obey not the gospel of God?” (I Pet. 4:17) Does the Baptist and Reflector seriously think that their end will be salvation? Paul says that when the Lord comes he will take vengeance on them “that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.” (2 Thess. 1:8) This does not look like salvation by faith before and without obedience to God. As “Rev. W. J. McDaniel” says on the front page of the Baptist and Reflector “God is consistent and the Bible is consistent. There is no contradiction to be found in the Word of God.” I believe that “By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast” and that the specified obedience that the Lord requires is consistent with this grace, faith and the gift that is involved. Here is an issue, the issue in fact.

Naturally, the fight is over whether or not baptism can have any thing to do with salvation. I believe it to be a divinely stated condition of the remission of sins. The Baptist and Reflector with its views of grace, considers such a position absurd and a reflection on the grace of God, if not something worse. One main point that we insist on is uniformly overlooked, or ignored, and it has often been called to the attention of the advocates of salvation by faith before and without baptism. We propose to keep on pressing that point as long as the need requires. I shall arrive at it shortly, but first a word from the Baptist and Reflector:

“Baptism is a ‘figure’ (symbol, illustration) of saving truth (Rom. 6:3-5; 1 Pet. 3:21). Therefore, it does not have any saving virtue. It is not a sacrament. Likewise, in the Lord’s Supper ‘ye do show the Lord’s death’ (1 Cor. 11:25). It, too, is only a picture. It is not a sacrament.”

We do not use the term “sacrament” in connection with either baptism or the Lord’s supper but accept exactly what the Bible teaches about each and both. Editor Taylor defines a “sacrament” as “an ordinance or observance interpreted as having a saving significance, as being conditional to or contributory to salvation. It is a Roman Catholic idea which has been accepted by many.” He side-steps the issue as far as we are concerned. We do not entertain the Catholic idea. Is the editor afraid to step up and meet the real issue? Baptism is a condition of remission of sins when ‘properly submitted to, because the Lord has by divine fiat made it so. There is no “saving virtue” in water, or in any act that a man may perform, be he saint or sinner. There is no such virtue even in the faith that a man exercises. Believing is something that a man does. The virtue is in the blood of Christ and salvation is by the grace of God. God who saves has the right to propose the conditions to be performed by man in order to be the recipient of the proffered salvation. “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved” said the Lord. “Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, unto the remission of your sins.”

It is often urged and that sometimes boisterously, that God can save a sinner without water and that a sinner does not have to take a dip into the tank to find Christ. Baptists have not always refrained from ridicule in discussing this. Is that what they mean? We are told that “By faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they were compassed about about seven days.” (Heb. 11:30) Did the children of Israel have “virtue” in themselves to believe the walls down, or to march them down? God tore down those walls when the people “by faith” did what they were told to do. Does the Baptist and Reflector think there was any sacramental value in marching, shouting and blowing trumpets? Would those walls have fallen had the people not obeyed God? Was it a matter of “grace through faith?” Did they make void the grace of God when they obeyed God? Why? Naaman, the leper, had the sentence of death written in his body. No human help could reach him. He sought divine aid and was told to himself seven times in the river Jordan. A straight look at him is an obedient man and he would be healed. Was there any sacramental “virtue” in the water that flowed in the channel of the river Jordan? Naaman rebelled against the idea and thought it foolish and absurd. He remained a leper until he obeyed God. Did he make void the grace of God when he dipped? Who healed Naaman anyway and why? It would be real refreshing to have the Editor of the Baptist and Reflector march up and make some sort of an attempt to meet the real issue. When he does, I promise to make it interesting for him. The cry of “baptismal regeneration” will not help him any as far as we are concerned. The fact that the baptism of a proper subject brings to him the promise of remission of sins, while the dipping of an improper one leaves him just as he was, properly dispels of that false charge. Baptism is for the remission of sins, only to a penitent believer, and that only because God says so. It “is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.”

We are told that baptism “does not have any saving virtue” because it is a “figure,” and I Peter 3:21 is cited. This text states positively that baptism “doth now save you.” The play that is made on the term “figure” is a glaring perversion of the teaching of the text. The apostle affirms of Noah and his family that “eight souls were saved through water.” The fact that their salvation was “through water” does not argue that it was not by grace through faith. The grace of God in the whole proceeding is obvious. It is clearly stated that “By faith Noah, being warned of God concerning things not seen as yet, moved with godly fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house.” (Heb. 11:7) The apostle makes the salvation of these “eight souls through water” a type of baptism. The Baptist and Reflector gets things “hind part backwards” and gets his “figure” wrong in one place. A straight look at the text spoils the Baptist theory. “Eight souls were saved through water: which also after a true likeness doth now save you, even baptism.” God saved Noah and his family by grace through faith, but not without water. It was “through water.” This water is a type. What is the anti-type? “Which also after a true likeness doth now save you, even baptism.” God saves today by grace through faith. It is not without baptism but through baptism.
Editor Taylor missed the main point in all this. All efforts to prove that baptism does not save, do not explain Peter's statement but contradict it, and constitute a very vicious form of interpretation. Peter explains in the same connection that baptism is "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation of a good conscience toward God." It is not a carnal ordinance such as Jewish washings to cleanse from carnal impurities. The man who submits to baptism is in all good conscience reaching out toward God for the promised blessings. His is the obedience of faith. Of such Jesus says: "He that believeth toward God for the promised blessings. His is the obedience of faith. Of such Jesus says: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." All talk of "saving virtue" in the water or in the act is beside the point and designed to confuse. If God, who saves, proposes to do it "through water," it is most unbecoming in men, especially editors and preachers, to set up a howl of protest about it.

It is inferred for some unaccountable reason, that if baptism is a "symbol, illustration" it can "therefore not have any saving virtue." Romans 6:3-5 is cited and it proves to be an unfortunate citation for one who is almost frantically interested in eliminating baptism as a condition of remission of sins. Why should it be thought incongruous that "a picture" of the burial and resurrection of the Lord should be made a condition of remission of past sins to an alien sinner who had believed in the Lord and repented of those sins? Baptists are meriting a rather wide reputation for begging the question in this connection. "It is only a picture," exclaims Editor Taylor. "Let Paul express himself. "Are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death?" Paul says that water baptism brings us "into his death" that we are "baptized into Christ Jesus." Can a man be saved out of Christ or without coming into his death? A lot of loose talk about pictures and symbolism will not serve to obscure the facts in the case.

I AM A DEBTOR

CHARLES HUGO MccORD

"I am the debtor both to the Greeks, and to the Barbarians; both to the wise, and to the unwise." (Romans 1:14) Of what kind of debt was Paul speaking? He had not signed somebody's note at the bank, nor did he owe a large amount of money "current with the merchant." But, contended Paul, "Necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel!" (I Corinthians 9:16) "Before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious: but I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief." (I Timothy 1:13) Ever afterward he felt he owed a monstrous obligation to all mankind, civilized and uncivilized, educated and illiterate.

It is profitable to consider some of the persons to whom Paul as well as every one of us is indebted.

(1) To God. Paul nor we had anything to do with the making of our wonderful world, nor with our coming into this life. Somebody was good to us, somebody thought of us before we were, and that somebody was the I am. "Know ye that the Lord he is God: it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves; we are his people, and the sheep of his pasture." (Psalms 100:3) "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of Lights." (James 1:17)

(2) To Parents. Somebody took care of Paul when he could not feed and bathe himself. Somebody saw to it that he could leave home, Tarsus of Cilicia, and go to Jerusalem to school. To mother and father, owed by all of us, is a debt unpaid and unpayable.

(3) To Christ. "I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." (John 10:17-18) "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich." (II Corinthians 8:9)

(4) To First Century Christians. We are indebted to thousands of good people who gave their lives rather than deny Christianity. A Stephen dying so publicly, a Paul battling beasts at Ephesus, a John in exile, them we know. Of others, in Rome's arena, in provinces' prisons, we have read, but their names are "known but to God." We know not what the world would have been had these been convictionless timewasters, but as it is we are vastly their debtors.

(5) To preservers of Scriptures. When Diocletian and other Roman emperors made it against the law to have a Bible; when soldiers without warrants invaded homes searching for criminal evidence, a Bible; when Catholic domination exerted itself to keeping the Bible from the common man; when all those things happened, there were giant souls who loved the Word of God more than their lives, and hid copies of the Book. To them our debt is unpayable.

(6) To John Gutenberg. Before Gutenberg's printing press only the wealthiest could own a Bible. Carefully copied by hand, carved into papyrus or antelope skin, a book of the Bible was a painfully wrought work, the cost prohibitive to commoners. Now any dime store displays a testament for a coin. Are you glad you live when you do?

(7) To Bible translators. To put the Sacred Oracles in our mother tongue required more than scholarship. It required courage to stand against the exalted wealth and devouring power of the papacy. Luther, Wycliffe, others had to do their work in secrecy. Catholics, red in hate, unable to murder Wycliffe, in 1428 exhumed his bones, burned them and cast ashes on Avon River. Tyndale, for translating Bible, was strangled and burned, 1536. Even if you had a copy of the original Greek and Hebrew, could you read it? Do you owe a debt to the Bible translators?

(8) To Lord Baltimore, Others. To meet publicly in open daylight to worship as it is written is no little privilege. Catholics, by the Inquisition, forced all men to worship their way. Protestants, by the Thirty Years' War, through blood, plague, and famine, won some measure of religious freedom. Then, in their own turn, were just as intolerant of Catholics and others. Puritans and Pilgrims fled to American shores to escape religious domination, only to dominate all within their power: Roger Williams was forced into a wilderness in dead of winter. You and I owe an unpayable debt to Lord Baltimore of Maryland Colony, and to the revolutionary fathers, for our freedom of worship. Politics and religion, state and church, must be kept separate according to the Constitution of the United States of America. We are debtors even to have citizenship or a haven in the States. Gospel preachers would be jailed in Germany, Christians would have to meet in a cave or cellar to break the bread in Russia. Everything in our power, short of killing, we should do to keep the Stars and Stripes flying.

If 2,000 years back Paul was, debtor to Greeks and the Barbarians, to the wise and the unwise, what is true of us?
"I thank heaven for a man like Adolph Hitler." So spoke the founder of Buchmanism to a New York reporter in 1937. And these words have had no little part in proving the undoing of the movement started in the 1920s by Dr. Frank Buchman, baldish, plump, Pennsylvania-born Lutheran. The sect has been known under many names, among them being "Buchmanism," "First Century Christian Fellowship," "Oxford Groups," and "Moral Re-Armament."

There have been persistent rumors that Vidkun Quisling, the Norwegian traitor, as well as Rudolph Hess, who weren't. The issue of the debate was whether the Buchmanite "lay preachers" would be granted military exemption. They publicly condemned Hitler. "He loves Hitler as well as he loves us," said the Britisher, "and there is in all his preaching a strange tendency toward flabbiness and fascism." The sect has been known under many names, among them being Buchmanism, First Century Christian Fellowship, Oxford Groups, and Moral Re-Armament.

The sect has been known under many names, among them being Buchmanism, First Century Christian Fellowship, Oxford Groups, and Moral Re-Armament.

With practically the whole world regarding Hitler as the arch-enemy of all civilized values, and all decency and honor in both individual and national relationships, it is understandable that Dr. Buchman's impetuous admiration for Der Fuehrer should come back to haunt him. His movement, which spread like a house afire through the Protestant world about a decade ago, has gone into an eclipse which promises to be even more spectacular than its rise. In New York City on November 8th, Dr. Samuel M. Shoemaker, rector of Calvary Episcopal Church, and leading American exponent of Buchmanism, wrote a letter to his parishioners explaining his withdrawal from the movement, and denying the Buchmanites any further use of his parish house which had been their headquarters. His action was typical of that being taken by prominent Buchmanites all over the nation. And now the retreat from "Moral Re-Armament" threatens to become a debacle.

Swing of the Pendulum

Buchmanism, like nearly every false doctrine that has cursed the earth since the day of the apostles, represented a "swing of the pendulum" movement. One has but to look into church history to discover what a large proportion of heretical movements have had their genesis in "the same sort of situation that brought the "Groupers" into existence. It has been the practical neglect of some phase or section of Christian doctrine, followed by a long felt need for the thing being stressed, then the emergency of someone to emphasize that particular thing, with a consequent over-emphasis which amounts to heresy.

For example, there can be any doubt that the reformation started by Martin Luther, with its heretical over-emphasis on "faith" (salvation by faith only) was a swing of the pendulum away from the Catholic church's neglect of that doctrine? Because Catholicism had virtually eliminated personal faith, and had made salvation dependent almost entirely on doing the "works" of the church, Luther found a fertile soil for his emphatic preaching on the importance of faith.

Then there was Calvinism with its heretical over-emphasis on the sovereignty of God. In rebellion against the accepted idea that mankind could work out his own scheme of redemption, and that careful observance of the decrees of "the church" would bring salvation, Calvin declared the whole thing was in the hands of God. Not only could man not save himself, he couldn't even help to save himself. Before time began, God had settled everything by his divine decree. All was predestinated and foreordained according to his will.

Later on, Wesley came with his enthusiastic emotion-alized version of "whop-'em-up" religion. Which was a clear case of the "swing of the pendulum" away from the cold formalism of the Anglican church. His movement resulted in a heretical over-emphasis on the "feeling" side of religion.

In our own country Mary Baker Eddy secured a tremendous following by putting great emphasis on a phase of Christian doctrine that was very generally overlooked and neglected—meditation and prayer. By staking her so-called "Christian Science" on these two points, and building her whole cult around them, she was able to snare a large number of people who had felt there was something lacking in their denominational teaching, without knowing exactly what it was that was absent. This writer has yet to meet a Christian Scientist who was not a member of some other denomination before he fell under the wiles of Mrs. Eddy.

Cardinal Points of Buchmanism

In much the same way, Dr. Buchman in the '20s and '30s pounced upon certain phases of Christian doctrine which were largely being neglected, and with these as a framework, built up an impressive following among religious people in nearly all the larger denominations. A study of the cardinal points of his teaching will show them to have been nothing more nor less than an over-emphasis on parts of the Christian religion which had been long ignored and abused:

1. The "quiet time." This is the name the Buchmanites gave to a period of meditation and earnest devotion which they pledged themselves to observe each day. Usually it is early in the morning. This time may be spent partly in prayer, and partly in an inner searching of the soul. Devout men have long since recognized that our modern high-pressure living has practically eliminated this sort of experience from the life of the average Christian. And successful Christian living simply isn't possible without it. Every soul must have some method of retreat and withdrawal from the noisy clatter and swift rush of daily living. Because our generation has virtually lost this technique of Christian living, the Buchmanites were able to capitalize on it. The result was an over-emphasis that made of the "quiet time" a sort of mystical, unearthly, experience in which the "Groupers" thought they would receive a direct message (guidance) from the Holy, Spirit. 2. "Sharing" was the word the Buchmanite used to describe his attitude toward others in the movement. In sharing he purged his soul by a confession of sins. Nothing was kept back. Everything from the most trivial pecadillos of behavior to the most revolting of crimes was...
laid bare. Again, thoughtful men have long recognized the actual, psychological, prophylactic value of a full and free confession. Modern Christianity has seemed much more willing to confess the faults of others than its own guilt. But Christ and the apostles taught, “Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another.” (Jas. 5:16) and “If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins,” (I Jno.1:9). Dr. Buchman, was quick to sense the weakness ‘in the modern attitude, and to emphasize this neglected portion of the gospel. But, as is usual with such “swing of the pendulum” movements, he over-emphasized the idea to the point of heresy.

3. Individual evangelism. Because modern denominationalism is frozen in its stiff formality of “called” and “ordained” clergymen, the Buchmanites saw a golden opportunity to return to the primitive conception of every member being an evangelist for the movement. In this attitude and conception Dr. Buchman gave a tremendous emphasis to a long neglected teaching of the scripture— that it is the solemn duty of every disciple to teach and influence all he meets to accept the new doctrine. But here, once more, the pious doctor went beyond the truth in his over-emphasis of this neglected principle. He has tried to make all his movement dependent on the work of the “lay preachers” giving no place at all to evangelists or teachers whose sole duty would be to spread the teaching.

How the Church can Profit

Although Buchmanism is clearly a heretical movement, it has non-the-less certain points well worth the Christian’s sober consideration. Can anyone deny that the church of Christ would profit immeasurably if all the members would give greater emphasis to the cardinal points of the “Groupers”-periods of meditation and prayer, honest confession of faults, and intense, flaming, individual evangelism? Not because Dr. B. taught them, but because Jesus Christ himself taught them.

The chief value of Dr. Buchman to us moderns has been to show us that the plan of Christ works. Even handicapped as it was by all the errors and wrong ideas of denominational teachings, it was undoubtedly the zealous individual evangelism of Buchman’s followers that made hundreds of thousands of converts to his movement within a short decade. And if the church of Christ in our day could develop the same intensity of enthusiasm on the part of every member that characterized the Buchmanites, who can say how rapid would be her growth throughout the world?

Dr. Buchman’s admiration for the goose-stepping Nazis and his lack of any solid doctrinal framework has doubtless doomed his movement to an early extinction. But the incredible speed with which his “Moral ReArmament” swept the world has been one of the outstanding religious phenomena of our day. It shocked and astonished our easy-going religionists into stupefied wonder. Two things were clearly demonstrated: first, our sophisticated twentieth century is certainly not hardened and immune to all religious influence; second, if people, are won to a new religious life it must be by a return to the flaming, passionate intensity or individual evangelism which characterized the church in the first century. The way of Christ and the apostles— the way of the early discipless is the way that get results. Let the church of Christ take notice!

Only to the extent that the church is kept militant (not in the persons of her preachers and leaders, but in the rank and file of her membership) can we hope for the church to become triumphant,

GOD’S CALL TO EXPANSION  
HOMER HAILEY

The Bible continues ever fresh and adaptable to man in all ages; containing its message to all classes of men, and to men under all kinds of conditions. Solomon said “there is no new thing under the sun;” and experience verifies the claim. If we delve deeply into the distant past, we find conditions and experiences coming and going about the same as today. Our study of the Bible should therefore reveal to us that which meets the need of the hour, then with the issue clearly before us, we should be able to meet it with all our might.

During a particular period of Israel’s history the people could not help being very disheartened. Sin had robbed them of power, and at the moment Sennacherib stood on the threshold of the land with his Assyrian army, threatening to wipe out the national life of Judah. The days of which I speak were the gloomy days of 701 B. C. In the midst of those trying times, Isaiah stood as the gigantic representative of Jehovah among the people, preaching, pleading, denouncing, threatening. Yet in the midst of his declarations of impending punishment and suffering, he encouraged them with promises and exhortations of the future.

In the fifty-third chapter of his book, the prophet pictures for Judah and Jerusalem the suffering Messiah, which he followed with a picture of glorified Zion in the days of that Messiah, following His suffering. “Sing, 0 barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child: for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, saith Jehovah. Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let thy curtains be stretched forth; spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes. For thou shalt spread abroad on the right hand and on the left; and thy seed shall possess the nations, and make the desolate cities to be inhabited.” (Isa. 54:1-3).

One need not speculate here, for Paul quotes the first verse in Galatians 4:27, applying the promise to the children of the new covenant, the covenant of promise. The fulfillment of the promise is realized in the church; and it is the church that should find inspiration in such a promise and command even now, as it faces its present day task and mission in the world. Amidst trying times the church was established, and when driven from Jerusalem by the enemies of truth did “spare not,” but “lengthened the cords” and “strengthened the stakes” till they had “spread abroad on the right hand and on the left,” “possessing the nations” and “making the desolate cities to be inhabited.” And now, today, when God’s people are again threatened, this time by the spiritual “Assyrians” led by the various “Sennacheribs” of the hosts of darkness, shall she withdraw from the conflict, to leave the field to others? Or shall she put the utmost faith in God, and “spare not,” but “lengthened the cords” and “strengthened the stakes” in anticipation of ultimate victory when the thousands of Sennacherib’s host shall lie prostrate in death, slain by “the breath of Jehovah, like a stream of brimstone?” The very spirit, thinking, and tendencies of the times are going to have their influence upon the church and its life today, which influence will be felt for years to come.

The present war is purely an economic war; but involved in it are moral and spiritual values. The primary concern today is for material things; but to the Christian the concern must be for the things eternal. The spirit of war tends to do two things: (1) draw men into a superficial alliance, in which for the moment differences that previously existed are laid aside. This is to be commended
and wished for, if there are no principles involved in the
compromise. (2) At the same time it breeds suspicion to-
toward all who differ with them in their spirit, and develop
hatreds for enemies, and unbalanced thinking in vital mat-
ters. Hatred, suspicion, compromise of principles, are all
counter to the Spirit of Christ, and the Christian calling.
In the midst of these conditions and dispositions there is
going to be the constant temptation to compromise con-
victions and positions by alliances with denominations in
various movements and efforts, and to slacken the fight
against sin “in the high places.”

Our question in the affairs of the day is, what is the
place of the church and the Christian life in the midst of
such conditions? The reply: The church must be a rock of
refuge in the midst of the storm. It must be the preserver
of faith and righteousness at all costs, as it loses not its
bearing, but constantly holds forth “the word of life” in
the “midst of crooked and perverse generation.” It must be
the “leaven” hidden in the three measures of meal, working
always to influence lives for good. Our task is the
same as always, the removing of hatreds, suspicions, and
and malice by changing the hearts of people through the
gospel; planting in the stead of these the principles of
Jesus Christ. This presents the challenge of the prophet
long ago, as he cried “Enlarge the place of thy tent... stretch forth the curtains of thy habitations; spare not:
lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakse.”

Spare Not

The definite goal of the church must be one of “all out
for Christ.” The world today is stopping at no cost to gain
victory; should the church with a vastly greater respon-
sibility than that of any secular power, be miserly in its
effort? Jesus said, “Ye are the salt of the earth;” salt is
consumed in accomplishing its purpose. Jesus further
said, “Ye are the light of the world;” the light burns itself
out giving light to others. It is consumed in its task, in
achieving its objective. Both of these illustrations of Jesus
intimate the accomplishment of Christianity at the cost of
self.

Paul said, “I will most gladly spend and be spent for
your souls;” this must be the “spare not” spirit of the
church today, if a remnant is to be salvaged from the spir-
Itual chaos of the times. This may demand suffering, but
Peter said, “Beloved, think it not strange concerning the
fiery trial among you, which cometh upon you to prove
you, as though a strange thing happened to you: but inas-
much as ye are partakers of Christ’s sufferings, rejoice.”
(1 Peter 4:12,13) Suffering has ever been the common lot
of Christians in all ages; we need expect no less today.

Lengthen thy Cords

The scope of the church’s service must be enlarged to
include all men. If such a catastrophe as is at present be-
falling humanity is to be averted in another generation,
the hearts of men must be changed by the gospel. The
whole world of unredeemed becomes our challenge. “The
World is the field,” said Jesus; while the Prophet vis-
ualized Him as a King ruling a “dominion... from sea to
sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth.” This
not in a “future dispensation” from the present, but now.

The church possesses all the essentials for the accom-
plishment of the task, unless it be one: the realization of
the magnitude of its task and responsibility. It possesses
the gospel, “which is the power;” the promise of God’s
presence at all times, “For himself hath said, I will in
no wise fail thee, neither will I in any wise forsake thee;”
and the promise that our labor shall “not be in vain in the
Lord.” The thing needful then, is greater vision and hard-
er work. Standing on the threshold of a new year, with
far-reaching challenges before us, every congregation
should “lengthen thy cords” to the very limit.

Strengthen thy Stakes

But it must not build loosely, rather, it must build for
permanence. Stability is the thing that counts in a storm,
not size. While stretching out in various directions, the
stakes must be driven deep. There must be the develop-
ment of a right conception of God if permanence is to be
secured. God is not a tribal diety, interested in one race
because of color more than in another; He is universal, in-	erested in righteousness and faithfulness rather than
color and race. Neither is He interested in the mere ritual
of outward worship; He delights in sincerity and truth.

There must be home training, where principles of
righteousness and loyalty to the truth are instilled from
childhood. The sanctity of the home, and the integrity of
the church must be emphasized if the stakes are to be
strengthened.

Then, there is ever the dire need for thorough indoc-
trination in the fundamental principles of redemption. Ca-
tholism is going to make a tremendous effort to “come
back” out of the chaos of the day. Protestantism has
failed, its compromising and modernistic tendencies have
proved its undoing. In the midst of these facts, it is still
true that only the truth can make men free. The church
must “strengthen the stakes” as it prepares for the real
shock of frenzied feelings, hatreds, and suspicions of com-
ing days, and for the aftermath of present conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spiritual</th>
<th>Only One Year And A Half Old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A n d</td>
<td>AND TWENTY FIVE THOUSAND IN USE!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrip-</td>
<td>COMPLETE CHRISTIAN HYMNAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tural</td>
<td>(The Scriptural Hymnbook)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songs</td>
<td>IN TWO BINDINGS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limn: Per Copy, 35c; Per Hundred $30.00 Delivered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth: Per Copy, 50c; Per Hundred $48.00 Delivered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE MARION DAVIS COMPANY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 162 — — — Fayette, Al - .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MUSINGS FROM THE MOTOR CITY
A. B. KEENAN

"The restoration of the primitive church is neither possible nor desirable." This pearl of worldly wisdom, Satan-inspired, is from the hand of a learned divine associated with the extreme broad-gauge wing of the Christian Church. If it is not representative of the philosophy of that denomination as a whole, it is at least typical of what that communion breeds and too frequently tries to tolerate. It is, of course, the counsel of despair on the part of those who have sought for unity in the Church, but have sought for it, naturally without success, in the wrong place. They have tried to remove “bones of contention,” they have attempted fraternization they have tried to impress the impregnable with tomes of stodgy “research,” they have tried to keep “up with the Joneses” on the fashionable avenues, they have robed their “clergy” and bedecked their choirs, they have preluded and postluded, and all in vain. Their fielders have let the ball drop between them. They have sought the Lord in the wrong place. They could have with as much success looked for oysters in the Sahara. The Lord prayed for the unity of believers. The Apostles preached one doctrine, and the immersed became members of one church. Both Paul and John pronounced anathemas on any who should alter the sacred teaching delivered unto them. The whole tenor of the New Testament from Matt. 1:1 to Rev. 22:21 is the oneness of Christ’s teaching, church, and work among men. Restoration of the church-of Christ is not only possible, but in the face of the punishment incumbent upon our failure to do so most desirable indeed. An’ we don’t mean maybe.

... ...

"Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free." One of the beauties of New Testament Christianity is that, under God, we are responsible to no one, that is no synod, board, group, clique, claue, publishing house, editor, paper, or leaflet. We heard a good brother remark the other day that such-and-such a commentary was good, but put out by “sectarians.” Now we’re not here taking up your time reading this column with the recommendation of the least jot or tittle that’s sectarian. But what a pretty picture we’d have in the Church if the only thing we dared to read was something that bore the official imprimatur of authorities at A.... or N.... or (save the mark!) L.... All of the insane things among the brethren an index expurgatorius would, if you don’t mind the French, be the most indubitable. In the search for truth, we’re at liberty to take a leaf from any man’s book. In our study to show ourselves approved unto God, that we may be unashamed workmen, let us bring to bear on the subject of the meaning of the Bible anything that will help us—from any quarter, including the Roman Catholic—though, we grant you, that might be rare. Let us keep the good and cast the bad away. Let our first study be the Sacred Books’ themselves. In their light let us cautiously use whatever helps are thrown our way. We said cautiously. Another brother, in pique or desperation, recently averred, “No commentaries are of any value,” but did not realize that his own was thereby included. Let us listen, read, and learn all we can. By the way have you reviewed your Neal-Wallace debate recently? Therein the bastions of righteousness truly withstand the aerial blitz of error.

... ...

“No doubt some adults who have a mind-set induced by training in religious argumentation will give a legalistic interpretation of the ‘forerunner.’” (Statement discovered in a Christian Board of Publication quarterly.) We surmise that no one quite dreads the descent of a discussion into the “realm of mere argument” quite the way one who has nothing upon which to support his religious position does. Isn’t it the perspicacious editor of this periodical who frequently allows in his preaching that hornless cows are most averse to any kind of hooking? “Mind-set;” now that’s a good one, isn’t it? Anybody who disagrees with me, I should conclude the argument involved to be-, is suffering from an idea fixes. Or to vary it: “My position is right because my mind is open. Your position is wrong, and therefore you have a closed mind, to wit, a mind-set.” And then some more: “Training in religious argumentation.” If we were of a betting disposition, we would gladly wager our last thin dime that that fellow, whoever he may be, has been worsted at one time or another by one or more of the brethren. But again: “A legalistic interpretation.” That expression to this scribe’s knowledge is used as a two-directional club only by embattled Christian Church-men, and that when they have to beat down Judaism’s advances upon them through the avenues of Roman Catholicism and conventional Protestantism, proposing infant “baptism,” say, on the one hand, and unadulterated New Testament Christianity’s assaults from the other side because of their extra-marital relationships with interpretation will stick to loyal brethren like feathers to a flat car. We’ll beat them backward home on whatever Scriptural proposition they elect to defend. Yes, of course they’ll holler, but it’s not unamusing to see them run off like whipped mongrels, emitting whelps with every hound.

... ...

Preaching: when is it mere entertainment? In every city which can boast more than one faithful congregation of the Lord’s people, a certain type of brother makes himself sooner or later conspicuous, both by what he does and by what he doesn’t. This type is a lover of sound preaching, eloquently delivered; a lover of excitement and something (although the figure is unlovely) of a campfollower. What we mean is this: Whenever a visiting preacher comes to a neighboring congregation, or to neighboring congregations, this unstable brother immediately betakes himself to the place most likely to provide the best entertainment for the day, or days. If the work in his own local church depended upon him and his ilk, we’d give it until next Tuesday night to survive. No, this high-minded brother would never think of agreeing to take a Bible school class or in any other way, shape, or form, assuming responsibility for something specific. He must keep himself free from entangling alliances—for what? That he might skip with the light heartedness of a zephyr from place to place, wherever the work for him will be the lightest and the entertainment the best. Would this brother, having moved into a community, ever identify himself with a local church and come under the oversight of local elders? It’s a cold day in June when he does. When he does da in to visit you, he exudes patronage: why he knows the best preachers, he’s heard so-and-so-and-and-so-and-and-so-and-so preach. As a matter of fact, his grandpappy on his mother’s side was a pioneer preacher, and two of his brothers were preachers before entering the real estate business. Say, gentle reader, this nimble Jack couldn’t be too, now—or could it?
Apply the same argument to faith. Countless Is belief essential to salvation? Is baptism essential to the remission of sins. To oppose plain passages of scripture is but a waste of ingenuity.

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

2. Romans 10:10: “Believeth unto (eis) righteousness”—in order to righteousness.


4. 2 Cor. 7:10: “Repentance unto (eis), salvation”—in order to salvation.

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

Does Matthew 26:28 mean that his blood was shed because of or in order to the remission of sins? &et some Baptist preacher tell you.

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

Believe-Repent-Baptized

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

Two Answers Compared

The third chapter of Acts records the second sermon of Peter in Jerusalem. With the same object in view he said to these Jews: Repent and be converted (turn again) that your sins may be blotted out so there may come sea-sons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord” (Acts 3:19). This answer compares with Acts 2:38 as follows:


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

Some Objections Considered

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

It is argued that if baptism is essential to salvation it puts salvation in the hands of the administrator. But there is nothing that does not depend upon a contingency of some sort. True, one cannot be baptized without an administrator, or without water, or without a contingency of extrinsic help from another. But apply the same objection, to the knowledge of Christ that men must possess to be saved. What about remote countries where such knowledge depends on the missionary? Is belief essential to salvation? Then since Paul said, “how shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?” does not the same contingency carry the same weight in the matter of belief, or the knowledge of Christ? And what about the ord eis? Here it is: Repent eis order to righteousness. The words “eis” and “order to” are not rendered thus in any place in all of the New Testament.

The case has gone to the Judgment. Clemency belongs only to the Judge, and it is not within our power to grant it. The great commission itself required the third party. Read the book of Acts.

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

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

Finally, it is urged that to make baptism necessary to salvation contradicts numerous passages on faith. The objection rests on the assumption that these numerous passages on faith suspend salvation on faith only-the thing not one of them says. It will drive the objector back to the doctrine of salvation by grace only, that the sinner is helpless, his salvation depending on no act of his own, in which circumstances eliminate faith in Christ. The division of this nation as the dead man is for not rising from the dead. It would mean that naked Omnipotence saves or damns!

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