

LESSONS FROM YESTERDAY



A collection of articles and sermons
from the pen of
WILLIAM GRANT ROBERTS



Published by
MISSOURI MISSION MESSENGER
7505 Trenton Ave.
University City 14, Missouri

(1946)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

THE PUBLISHER EXTENDS SINCERE THANKS TO THE
FOLLOWING PERSONS FOR AID GIVEN IN PREPARATION
OF THE MANUSCRIPT OF THIS VOLUME

HERSHEL OTTWELL

FLORENE STRACKE

GRACE BOWERS

BERNELL WEEMS

RICHARD KERR

IONE SMITH

DOROTHY DAUKSCH

THE JACKET WAS DESIGNED BY
CARL WHITE, FLAT RIVER, MO.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

INTRODUCTION

Folks, I want you to meet W. G. Roberts! The "W" stands for William, and the "G" for Grant—William Grant Roberts. He was born at Humboldt, Illinois, on December 13, 1868, and as this book goes to press, he is 77 years old. Since he began preaching at the age of twenty-six, you can see for yourself that more than fifty years have been spent by him in declaring the message of saving grace.

When he was 27 years old, he married Margaret Toyne Walling, and they lived together happily for 22 years, then death removed her from this world. Three children blessed this union; Paul, Raymond and Ruth.

About two years after the death of his first wife, Brother Roberts was married to Elma J. Allen, and three years later they took into their home a little girl, Jeannette, later adopting her as their own. The present home of Brother Roberts is at Hammond, Illinois.

When he first began to preach the gospel, the "age of debates" was in its prime. Those were the days when men buckled on their armor and sauntered into the arena of forensic combat to "put to flight the armies of the aliens." It was the time when such "isms" as Mormonism, Russellism, etc., were sweeping like wandering meteors across the religious sky. The Churches of Christ selected as a champion to meet these daring marauders, the subject of this sketch. In all, he participated in 196 debates. Thirty of these discussions were held with Mormons and 48 with the Baptists. A number of years ago, the Mormons and Russellites (now Jehovah's Witnesses) refused to meet him any more in public discussion.

The keen flashes of wit, the ready answers and swift repartee of Brother Roberts, are all well-known throughout the brotherhood which he represented. Some of his state-

ments have become virtually proverbial, having been repeated so frequently in recounting those battles of yesterday.

About 1902, Brother Roberts began writing articles for some of the religious journals then in existence. Fortunately, these were preserved, and the clippings pasted in scrapbooks. After reading a great many of the articles it occurred to me, that they were too good to let slip into oblivion. I negotiated with their author for their publication, and he kindly turned over the manuscript for me to work on, that some of these "Lessons From Yesterday," might be preserved in permanent form. But they will not reveal the familiar W. G. Roberts to you, as well as some of the material which is in slightly lighter vein. For that reason, I have selected the following reports to incorporate in this introduction, believing that they will help you to know the one who presented the deeper lessons found in the book.

It is always interesting for me to know about the experience of a preacher in the presentation of his first message in public. I was fortunate enough to locate this account written by Brother Roberts on February 13, 1917. Read it! You'll enjoy it!

MY FIRST SERMON

Well, as I have been asked for it, I suppose I'll have to tell it, so here goes. We all hate to tell about our ignorance, but when people ask us to make it public, we hesitate to refuse their request, so I guess I'll have to expose mine. Here goes!

My first sermon was on "Rightly Dividing The Word of Truth." I began my religious work with the U. B.'s. That is, I "jined" the United Brethren Church ("Benighted Brethren" would be more proper) and was elected "class leader" and served three years. This caused me to read the Bible more than I otherwise would have done. They wanted me to preach and asked me to read Mr. Otterbein's books and thus prepare for the ministry. Otterbein being the founder of their church, his works, of course, were authority with them. But I thought that if I was going to preach the gospel, I would need to read the Bible. I did this and thus read myself clear out of the "U. B. Church." Old Bro. David Reagon (God bless his soul) assisted

me much. It was under his preaching that I united with the Church of Jesus Christ.

I saw the sad mistake made by the U. B.'s was in not knowing how to rightly divide the word of truth, so that soon became my hobby. (You can take a truth and make a hobby out of it). But I saw that I was not well enough informed to preach the gospel in the Church of Christ, for it took something more than "grave-yard stories" and death bed scenes and funny anecdotes to satisfy the disciples of Christ. I had been used to hearing just such preaching for more than three years, but my study of the Bible convinced me that such was not the gospel. So I did not preach my first sermon until I was twenty-six years of age.

I only preached a few times for quite a period. I delivered my first discourse in a country meeting-house in the northern part of Moultrie County, Illinois. That congregation is now "digressive" and they went that way soon after I preached that wonderful (?) sermon. I don't know whether I caused them to go that way or not, but it wasn't long afterward until they did. An uncle of mine, Tom Brown, who had been preaching there many years made the appointment for me and went with me to fill it. I suppose he thought he would have to finish the sermon for me. Well—he did! I will never forget that first sermon but have never been anxious to tell others about it.

In preparation, I carried my New Testament with me most of the time, so that I could have it handy to read whenever a spare moment was presented. I had rented the Mullican farm, northwest of Kemp, Ill., and was working hard, as I had gone in debt quite a bit for horses, implements and other items, and was anxious to make a little money to meet my obligations, which I did. While resting the horses I would read my New Testament. Mother says I would preach while plowing. She tells on me that I would preach until she could hear me at the house! I would often sit up until past midnight studying my Bible. Thus I prepared for my first preaching attempt. Mother and wife (I married about this time) would often hide my Bible before I came in from work to keep me from sitting up so late and studying.

I was real anxious to be able to "rightly divide the word of truth" before I began preaching to others. I had learned that lack of ability to do this made and kept a great many people so-called "United Brethren." No honest person could be a sectarian if he knew how to divide God's Word and applied his knowledge as he should. Just as fast as honest persons learn to "rightly divide the Word," just that fast will they leave sectarianism. That is one great lesson all religious persons need to learn.

I had but very few books to assist me in the study of the Bible, which made it more difficult, but perhaps that was best for me. I am not much stuck on commentaries. I seldom ever look into one. If the commentary agrees with my idea, it is all right, but if it differs with my idea it is all wrong. I guess that is true with most preachers. And if so, then the commentary does them little good. Most all of such books are written by sectarians, so young brethren are apt to have their minds poisoned thereby. They are apt to take the commentary for an *authority*. Some of our brethren take them to meeting on Lord's Day to use in teaching their classes. They should not do this. The young in the class will arrive at the opinion that whatever the commentary says is true. This is not always the case. The teachers always depend too much upon the commentaries under such circumstances. Read them at home, like you would any other book, but don't take them to church. I think it may have been a good thing that I had no commentary to use in preparing my first sermon.

I had the idea that a preacher should speak for at least an hour. I have since learned that it is much better to have the audience praying for you to continue, than praying for you to quit. Many young preachers hurt their influence by trying to talk too long. But I concluded that the people would think I actually knew something if I could preach for an hour or more, hence I prepared my sermon so that it would be impossible, as I thought, to get through in less than an hour. When I preached it to myself out behind the barn, it took me just about an hour and a half. And I spent a good many sessions out behind the barn delivering it. I thought it was just about the best sermon I had ever heard. I had it "down pat" and felt that I could not possibly forget a word of it when the fateful Sunday came.

I was especially anxious to make a favorable impression on my uncle who had been a preacher for many years. I knew he was going with me, so I got ready to put it out "in fine shape." My uncle had been preaching more than fifty years, and I was confident he would be able to recognize a good sermon when he heard it. I was also highly desirous that he be pleased with my manner of delivery as well as with the expression of my thoughts. I had heard a preacher before this, who, it was said, practiced his gestures before a mirror. I thought that his gestures were about the acme of perfection, so I decided I would try and imitate him.

When I arose to deliver that memorable discourse, I began to gesture just as I recalled the other preacher doing. But something was a little awry. The method was not natural for me. It seemed a little awkward for me as I stood behind the gestures, but I thought that probably everything would look fine out in front. I soon learned that I was quite nervous, but decided that I could cover that up

with "good" gestures coupled with "splendid" thoughts and arguments. I waded right into it and worked hard. I couldn't help it. But I didn't know how hard I was working, or how silly I looked, until I noticed that I had sweat down my collar and my shirt front was nearly as wet as water.

When I had said every word I could possibly think of, and supposed that I had preached over an hour, I took out my watch and to my amazement found that I had been in the pulpit only twenty minutes in all. At least forty minutes of my fine sermon had vanished into thin air. I knew that behind the barn that sermon required more than an hour, but here I had gotten rid of it in twenty minutes. Then it occurred to me that my watch had stopped. But, when I put it to my ear, it was still ticking. Where was the rest of that sermon? In my panic I could not locate it. It was actually lost. And now something was getting wrong with me physically. I couldn't stand. I had to sit down. I didn't even extend an invitation. All I knew was that I had to sit down while I was able to reach the seat.

Brother Brown arose and talked for about twenty-five minutes, I suppose, but I never heard anything that he said, except these words, "Perhaps the young man will improve. I hope he will, and thus he may be useful to the church in future years." I had hoped for a compliment until I concluded that hour's talk in twenty minutes, then my hopes went glimmering. As I sat there I concluded that I had done the best I could and if it was a failure, I might just as well quit then and get the agony over with. In some fashion my conceit had gone in the same way and to the same place, as the major part of my sermon.

Although my uncle did not compliment me in public, he did give me a great deal of encouragement privately. This made me feel that I should try again. I suppose the congregation must have enjoyed the sermon, and no doubt it gave them a great many things to think about for all time to come, because they did not invite me back. However, uncle and I went back, and I made another effort. I have already told you that I tried to employ the gestures of another man, and did my very best to act just as he did. At close of the meeting, one of the old elders came forward, shook my hand, and said, "Brother, your sermon would have done very well, if you hadn't ruined it with your actions!" That was all the "compliment" I received that day from any of the members, and they did not give me an invitation to return and forgot to give me the contribution. I guess they forgot!

Wife went with me several times after that. Once she said, "What are you going to preach on today? 'Rightly Dividing The Word of Truth' I suppose." Said I, "Don't you like that subject?" She said, "Oh yes, I like it real well, but I think I've heard it often enough now

that I could preach it myself." So I got me another one, and from that day to this, I have not preached on the first one as an announced subject.

The foregoing clipping will serve to show you some of the trials of starting to preach, but we give you herewith another article showing some of the problems encountered in continuing in that chosen field of endeavor. It was published January 17, 1933, and contains an interesting account of an evangelistic tour.

EXPERIENCE OF AN EVANGELIST

I closed a very good meeting at Nixa, Missouri, at the water on December 12; 2 were baptized. Brother Clark did the baptizing well. Brother Bennett is a "live wire" in that congregation. Bad weather hindered the meeting the final week. The church there is composed of a fine congregation living in peace. Springfield, Ozark and Walnut Hill congregations attended a great deal. I went from there to Springfield to get a bus for Hot Springs, Arkansas. Talked a night at Springfield to an appreciative audience.

I left at 8 a. m., and was to arrive at Hot Springs at 7:50 p. m., but due to ice, snow and cold, it was 10:30 o'clock. Had the weather been good it would have been a more enjoyable trip. We went over, under and around mountains, and passed other mountains. Before and after reaching Eureka Springs, we went through, crossed and saw many canyons. Part of the time we were going east, then west, then north, then south; then almost straight down, then straight up; hence, we went in about all directions, including cross-ways! We travelled over straight roads (a short distance), crooked roads, winding roads, curved roads, around horseshoe curves, around some called "S" curves! Wonderful scenery! Sometimes I would look out of the window and it would seem that if the bus got two or three feet farther to the left or right, we would roll and tumble through space for a mile before finding a landing place. O, the wonderful works of God. I thought of Job 38 and Psalm 19, while riding over those mountains. The Ozarks are beautiful and impressive.

I was to hold a mission meeting at Maddox, about 16 miles from Hot Springs, so they were to meet me at Hot Springs. However, I hardly expected them at that time of night, so I went to a hotel, expecting them to be after me Saturday morning, for I had written them almost a week previously, telling them when to meet me. At the hotel I slept a little between sheets in a cold room, with a comforter and blanket over me. It was a cold night, the ground being

covered with snow, so there was not enough cover for a cold-natured fellow! I got up, doubled the comforter and got my overcoat and spread over me; then I slept some.

I arose on Saturday and waited for someone until noon, rather contentedly, but I got somewhat nervous in the afternoon. Night came and no one arrived for me. I had sent the money home which the Nixa brethren gave me, for my "better two-thirds" was in need of it. I never like to carry more money than I actually need. The agent charged me about four dollars more than the fare had been quoted, but I still had ample to take care of me, provided they met me on Saturday. However, I knew that if I had to stay at that hotel many days I would be "broke." It was too cold or snowy to sleep in a park or box-car, hence I fasted so as to have money to pay for my bed each night. But six meals straight are all that I missed, so I made it all right until they came after me from Maddox, which is a "city" composed of a lone dwelling with a post office in the family home. Mail is taken there by a Star Route driver and he often misses going there for two or three days at a time, so patrons do not get mail very regularly at that office. Brother Land (who was to meet me) only gets his mail once or twice a week generally. For that reason, he did not receive my letter until I had been in Hot Springs quite awhile. I called "Information" only to be informed that Brother Land had no telephone.

I knew not of a Church of Christ in that city, but Lord's Day morning I started out to see if I could find one. A man seemed to know what I meant by "Church of Christ," and told me where it was. I reached the place a little after 10 a. m., only to be disappointed again. I was very cold—had been cold all night in that hotel. (I later learned that we have a congregation in the city.)

Say, if freezing and smoking meat will keep it from spoiling, I should be in fair shape for "keeping," because men and women made a "smoke-house" out of two or three buses I was on during more than a 300 mile ride. One "lady" sitting near me, asked, "Does this smoke bother you?" I said, "No, not as it goes from your nose, but it hits me right in the face as it comes down. Really, I think if the Lord had wanted you to use your nose for a smokepipe He would have turned the thing up the other way." She flipped, frowned and turned away from me, while the "lady" who was with her (also a smoker) indulged in a laugh.

I decided there was no Church of Christ in Hot Springs, so while standing in front of that large meeting-house costing, perhaps, something like \$100,000, I decided to chance it and go inside. So I threw my head back, tried to put on a good front, marched up to the door just as though I was used to fine buildings, plenty of perfume, paint and lipstick, opened the door and went in. A well-dressed, fine look-

ing man started at me, but since he displayed no gun I stood my ground and played brave and also started for him. He grabbed me by the hand and began to shake it like he meant business, and asked, "What is your name?" I held a stiff upper lip, still playing brave, and told him. He smiled, which helped drive the chill from my spine, and said, "Come down in the basement where the men's Bible Class meets. They will be glad to have you take part with them." I consented, but found the "Men's Class" consisted mostly of women, about two women to each man present, I estimate. I was given a seat between two women. One quickly flashed the sparkle of her diamond in my face, and moved some distance from me. Well, that took out some of the conceit I had tried to accumulate.

There were about 18 in the class, and all the lesson they had was a lecture concerning Lincoln, Wilson, and "balancing the budget." When the lecturer finished, a well-dressed, well-furred lady arose and asked how many could be present on Thursday night. One lady said, "If it's as bad as it was Friday night, I wouldn't come on a bet!" I wondered to myself, "What is this, a meeting-house or a gambling joint?"

We went upstairs, were seated, and soon a lady came out of a side door on the platform and began playing a waltz (I suppose that's what it was), then the singers came marching out of the side-room, led by their beloved "pastor" and all went to their places. The singers wore robes somewhat like those of Catholic priests, only theirs were white, whereas those of the "wifeless fathers" are black, I believe. When they raised their arms it looked like they had the wings of a bat or flying squirrel! I think all were women but two. I could not tell by their apparel, for all of their robes were alike, and I could not see under the robe to tell what they had on; hence, had to decide by their painted faces, rouged lips and their voices.

When the aged, gray-haired pastor concluded his prayer, I supposed all would be seated; but not so: there was a moment's pause, then the white-robed singers began to sing "AMEN" until they had repeated it eight or ten times, their quiver-er-er-ing voices lowering a little each time, until at the last we could hardly hear them at all, then all were seated.

There were only 45 (counting preachers, babies and all) in that large house to hear the wonderful (?) sermon on "The Second Birth Of Christ." In his sermon the minister referred to me, and then just before dismissing, he said, "We have a brother here on my right from Illinois." Then he told them my name and said, "I want all of you to meet him and let him know that you are pleased to have him with us." Soon as we were dismissed I took a straight dive for the door, which I was near, and got out without anyone speaking to me but one man and a little girl. (Incidentally, they had 8 men to wait

on the congregation at the communion service, although the house was virtually empty, with only the 45 mentioned, in attendance).

I preached almost a week in Brother A. A. Land's home. The weather was so bad we could not go to the schoolhouse for services. I went there chiefly through arrangements of a son and daughter of the Land's, who live in my hometown. I believe the "ice" is broken for a wonderful meeting in that section. We had to close due to bad weather. The people down there are not accustomed to such disagreeable weather. But they want me to return again next August.

After preaching for several nights in that good home, I started back to Illinois on the bus, as that was, they told me, the quickest and cheapest way. Wife was sick and I was anxious to get home as soon as possible. We went from Hot Springs to Little Rock without trouble, except that it rained all the way, which bothered the driver to some degree. Before we got out of Little Rock, the bus broke down, and we had to be transferred to another. We were delayed two hours. Then for about six hours we drove over very rough roads. It was a tiresome trip.

About 5 a. m. the bus got stuck in the mud, and our Indian driver in trying to get out, got the bus off in a ditch, and we were there to stay until we could get help. They phoned to Poplar Bluff for aid. We were 32 miles from that place near the banks of a fast rising creek. After we sat there for three hours, two buses came; one to take us out, and the other to try and get the "stuck-in-the-mud" bus out. During that three hours the waters "were risen, waters to swim in" (Ezekiel 47), and were across the road, and up to the floor in the rear of the bus. They could not get the extra bus over to us, so had to carry most all of us from the one to the other. Two or three waded out. Then they carried our baggage over to us, and soon we were on our way again.

At Poplar Bluff they transferred us to another bus which gave us lots of trouble, but finally got us to Saint Louis, although very late. I should have arrived at Mattoon at 1:33 p. m. on Saturday, but did not get in until 3 a. m., Sunday. Thus I was 13 hours and 30 minutes late at my destination. I think the next "bus" I ride will be pulled over a railroad by a steam engine. Hungry, thirsty (can't even get a drink of water on a bus), tired, sleepy (was up two nights, and you can't sleep on a bus anyhow), broke, and angry (but sinned not), and fully decided never to ride another bus unless absolutely compelled to do so, at 4 a. m., I went to bed to attempt a recovery from bus-ism.

"Evangelists always have an easy time," did you say? Well, try it a few years, and see! Some of us can say with the apostle Paul, that we have been in perils of water, in perils among false brethren,

in hunger, and thirst, in weariness, watchings and painfulness, as well as suffering from persecutions. But Paul was, to be sure, in many more of these, than any of us.

And now you've met W. G. Roberts! I want to extend my sincere thanks to Brother Roberts for his kindness, and his wholehearted cooperation in the compiling of this volume, which, we believe, will do much toward rekindling the memories of bygone days. To all of you who read this, and the lessons which follow, we merely say, "May God bless those lessons to the edification of all."

W. Carl Ketcherside.

C O N T E N T S

	PAGE
JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH	1
DO BABIES INHERIT SIN?	7
IS THE BIBLE A PLAYTHING?	13
“BAPTIZED FOR THE DEAD”	16
BEING BORN INTO GOD’S FAMILY	19
ORIGIN OF THE BLACK MAN AND OTHER RACES	23
“VENGEANCE IS MINE”	28
FEET-WASHING AND THE LORD’S SUPPER	31
TELL THE TRUTH	44
TRINE IMMERSION	47
WILL THE BODIES OF THE WICKED BE IMMORTAL?	58
CONSCIENCE	63
CHRISTIANS ARE GOD’S POEMS	75
FOR WHAT IS YOUR LIFE?	79
THE FIRST RESURRECTION	102
DOUBTS	104
BREATH OF LIFE	107
LOVE AND AFFECTION	115
MYSTERIES: LOVE AND FAITH	119

	PAGE
"LET BROTHERLY LOVE CONTINUE"	122
THE MINISTRY OF ANGELS	130
THE TWO COVENANTS	133
THE BOOK OF BOOKS	145
DEVELOP THE YOUNG	148
NANCY HANKS	152
THE BIBLE	158
THE IDENTITY OF THE CHURCH	161
TAKING MEMBERSHIP	173
WOMEN SPEAKING IN THE CHURCH	178
FIRST PRINCIPLES	183
CHRISTMAS	208
ROCKS, HILLS, CANYONS AND FALLS	212
WHAT AM I? OR AM I WHAT I AM?	217
INFIDELS AND THE BIBLE	223
EASTER	228
THE HOLY SPIRIT	231
THE BIBLE VS. JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES, ADVENTISTS AND UNIVERSALISTS (15 ARTICLES)	247

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH

"Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Romans 5: 1).

This subject is one of infinite importance. But are we justified by faith ONLY? I have a little book that says we are. However, this text does not so state, and there is not a text in the Bible, so stating. The word "only" has been added. To try to assist those wishing assistance, and to shed a ray of light on the dark path of those seeking justification through the blood of the Son of God, is my design in writing this article.

The word "dikaioo" (from which we have the word "justification" in the text quoted) means: "To declare anyone to be what he ought to be, and to treat him as such; to declare one to be blameless, or innocent, and to treat him as such; acquit, absolve," etc. Thus, those who are justified understand that the heavenly Father has acquitted or absolved them from all guilt, and now treats them as if they had never sinned against Him. Hence it is said, "being justified, we have peace with God." Under such a state, we have "fellowship with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ" (1 John 1: 3).

There is no reflection so intolerable as the thought that God disapproves our conduct. To know that wherever we are—at home or abroad, at our lying down and uprising, our out-going and in-coming—the disapprobation of heaven rests upon us, who can bear the thought?

The apostle teaches that we are justified by faith! If, then, this glorious work is accomplished by faith, there are three questions which naturally spring to our minds: (1) What is the faith that justifies? (2) How is that faith obtained? (3) How is that faith employed, or exercised, in order to be thereby justified?

If we are justified by faith, we want to know what faith is. It seems that the term is understood when applied to any proposition in the universe, except that of religion. This should not be. Why is it thus? All Christians believe the Bible contains a revelation from God. A revelation is "the act of disclosing to others what was before unknown to them," says Webster. Faith is one of the words employed in that divine communication; and now I ask: If this term is not to be understood in the Bible according to its common acceptation, how can we know what is affirmed? We cannot. We shall not, therefore, charge the Spirit of all grace with thus mocking the miseries and wants of the children of men.

Paul defines faith: "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen" (Hebrews 11: 1). He then says, "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God." This example, given by Paul, shows faith is the evidence, or conviction, of that we see not. We did not see God frame the universe by his word, but through faith we understand that he did just that. Abraham had never read a word about the resurrection, nor heard of it, so far as the record informs us; yet he believed his son would be raised from the dead (Hebrews 11: 19). Here was faith in God, faith to believe that God could and would raise that boy from the dead. This faith was based on the evidence Abraham had seen of God's wonderful power in bringing other things into existence. That is, faith is the firm conviction or belief of this truth concerning God bringing the worlds into existence. In verse six of the same chapter, we are informed that "without faith it is impossible to please Him; for he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." In this, the apostle uses the terms "faith" and "belief" as expressive of the same idea. This is, then, the faith necessary to please God. The faith necessary to justification, is a cordial, un-

doubting reception of the whole revelation of God to man, contained in the Bible.

Faith is "the substance of things hoped for," Paul says. "Sub" means "under, beneath, below"; while "stance" (from "sto") means "to stand"; hence, faith is that on which we stand. It is the groundwork. It is the foundation of all our confidence, hope, etc. Without faith in the resurrection of the Son of God we can have no hope and no promise of eternal life. All this being true, it is impossible for repentance to come before faith in the plan of salvation, as the Baptists teach.

Where there is no faith, there is no justification. This all know to be true who believe the Bible. God has embodied the essence and soul-stirring influence of this whole revelation in three great facts: "that Christ Jesus died for our sins, according to the Scriptures; that he was buried, and that he rose again, the third day according to the Scriptures (1 Corinthians 15: 3, 4). This believed, and the Sonship of Christ is believed. We believe Him to be the Son of God, and hence, believe His word, obey it, and we are then justified.

This faith comes by hearing the word of God, as Paul teaches in Romans 10: 17, and Peter in Acts 15: 7. We have the same thought exemplified in 1 Corinthians 3: 5 and Acts 18: 8. These scriptures show how faith is obtained, thus supplying the answer for one of the queries which we said would naturally arise to our minds. On the first Pentecost after the death of Christ, Peter told them they had taken with their hands and crucified the Lord, and thus preached unto them until they cried out unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" It is obvious to all that those persons obtained faith by *hearing* the "word of God."

Examples of believers being made by hearing the word preached are many, and we shall not attempt to cite all. We have given enough to satisfy all that faith comes by

hearing the word of God; and not by some means independent of God's Word, as some teach.

We come now to the third question: How must faith be employed in order to be justified thereby?

First, we might notice this common belief: Does faith justify? We must answer with an emphatic NO! The apostle says, "It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth?" (Romans 8: 33, 34). But now this thought rises in our minds: If, then, it is God who justifies, or pardons the sinner—and yet, it is said, we are justified by faith—is there anything meritorious in faith? Does the sinner merit pardon by believing? We would not be so foolish as to affirm that he does. This would be the equivalent of saying that there is so much value in faith that we can purchase a seat in glory with it. That is, just believe and die and go to Heaven, independent of the church and *obedience* (Hebrews 5: 9); which contradicts the Scripture.

If, then, it is God that justifieth, and we are justified by faith—and yet faith does not purchase pardon—we again ask, Does faith influence God to pardon the believer? Does faith "*move the hand that moves the world*"? From the way some preach, talk, and pray, we naturally conclude that they think faith has something about it to control and influence the minds of God and Christ. When persons go forward to the "mourner's bench" (whatever that is) to seek justification, how often do we hear the leader exhort his brethren in this fashion: "Now, brethren, go to the throne of grace by faith, and pray long and loud; and let us never give up until these anxious seekers are justified." Then several engage in public prayer and it is "long and loud" all right. Seems they are trying to see who can pray the loudest, as if they thought the loudest prayer would have the greatest influence on God. Sometimes they are urged to "lay hold of the Savior by faith," and are told to not let loose until He has blest and justified them.

I have not the remotest idea that our faith has an influence on the mind of God. The Scriptures plainly teach that God changes not, and that He is always ready to receive and pardon the repenting sinner who complies with the terms laid down in His word. All of the power and influence of the believer's faith passes on himself—on his own heart and will—and is the moral lever, so to speak, which turns his heart to the Lord and enables him to comply with His will and law of pardon. When this point is gained in the sinner's mind by faith, and he complies, God pardons his sins—not because his faith has overcome the Supreme Being—but because it has overcome the sinner's will, and brought him to the place where the Lord promised to pardon.

It is God that pardons, that justifies. We cannot pardon our own sins, or the sins of our neighbors. If we are ever justified, God must do it. And if God justifies a sinner at all, He does it on the principle of mercy. Remember, we cannot purchase pardon of the Lord, for "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof." We have nothing we can truthfully call our own, with which to purchase God's favor. Should the sinner offer his body as a ransom for his soul, the Lord might respond, "You belong to me, both soul and body." Yet, we may become the servants of the devil, and die and go to the devil. But we are God's by creation, whether we obey Him or not.

God has the right, as the Sovereign of the universe, to stipulate his terms of pardon. No one can object to this. Then we have absolutely nothing to do with that arrangement. We, though, must comply with these terms, whether they are just as we would have them or not, if we wish Him to pardon and justify us. But the man without faith has no disposition or will to comply with these terms, therefore he remains unjustified. But when he believes in Christ with all his heart, he beholds (by faith) the overwhelming facts of the gospel, which express the love of God to a

ruined world in such strong terms, that his heart is affected, and he cries, "Lord, what wilt thou have me do?" His faith subdues his will and purifies his heart (Acts 15: 9), and influences him to obey the gospel.

Some will object to what I have given because it destroys the doctrine of justification by *faith alone*, which they claim is taught in the text under consideration. If you will notice that text again, my friend, you will see that the little particle "alone" is not there. Had Paul said men are justified by *faith alone*, he would have contradicted James, who says, "Ye see how that by *works* a man is justified and *not* by faith alone" (James 2: 25). A man may believe (as many do) and not be justified, either. Christ is the Author of Eternal Salvation to all them who OBEY him (Hebrews 5: 5); hence it is through obedience we are justified.

DO BABIES INHERIT SIN?

With but two or three exceptions, all the churches in the whole country teach that sin is inherited. Of course, the members of the Lord's Church accept the Bible teaching on this question. The Bible says, "Sin is the transgression of the law" (1 John 3: 4), and we all know that is true. I could not sin against your city without transgressing the laws of your city. I could not sin against your state, without transgressing the laws of your state. We all know, then, that "sin is the transgression of law," and the apostle John was not mistaken. Why then, do you teach that we inherit sin? If we inherit sin from our parents, it is *not* the "transgression of law," and John was mistaken. If it is the transgression of law, as the Bible affirms, then it is *not* inherited from our parents. Characteristics may be inherited, but sin cannot. Anything in the blood may be transmitted from the parent to the child, but sin is not so transmitted.

But we are told that Paul said (Ephesians 2: 3), that we are all "by nature the children of wrath, even as others," and that the word "nature" shows that the "wrath" was inherited. But you must read the first three verses together, and when you do that, you will learn they were not "children of wrath" until they could "walk according to the course of this world" and hold "conversation" concerning the "lusts of the flesh," and could "fulfil the desire of the flesh." Then and not until then, were they "children of wrath." I suppose the first thing your infant did when it was born was to start a "conversation" with you concerning the "desires" of its youthful flesh, and you refused it, after a long "conversation" with it; and that made the ten-minute-old infant angry, so it closed the "conversation," got out of bed and "walked" ("according to the course of this

world") to the nearest resort where it could fulfil and satisfy the "lusts of the flesh!" That must be the case with those who affirm that Ephesians 2: 1-4 teaches sin is inherited. But we know that their position is false and their application of Ephesians 2: 3 is a gross perversion of the text!

The word "nature" in this text is from the Greek word "phusis," and has no reference to an inherent quality. It means "habit," "practice," "custom." They were all by their habits (walking according to the "course of this world" and holding "conversations" about the lusts of the flesh) "children of wrath." Mr. Thayer in his lexicon, says the word in this text means a "mode of feeling and acting which by long habit has become nature." Dr. Groves, in his lexicon, says the word means "habit or custom."

I feel certain that you do not think when Paul said, "nature itself teaches you that if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him" (1 Corinthians 11: 14), he meant by the word "nature" that which he inherited from his parents. If that were true we men would not have to visit the barber-shop so often to get our hair trimmed. We did not inherit short hair, hence have to get it cut frequently. It was the custom or habit for men to wear their hair short. Those pictures lie, which represent the apostles as having long hair.

According to the doctrine of inherited sin, when Jesus said we must "become as little children" (Matthew 18: 3) He meant that only those who are "children of wrath" (the devil) can go to heaven. Oh, Mr. Methodist and Baptist preacher, et al., get rid of that miserable, wicked, damnable doctrine, please, and accept the scripture which says, "Sin is the transgression of law."

We are told that when Ezekiel said (18: 2)—"The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge," that he meant the fathers had sinned and their children inherited the sin. But read the next two verses: "Ye shall have no occasion any more to use this proverb," for

“the soul that sinneth it shall die!” Then Jeremiah 31: 29, 30 says, “Every man that eateth the sour grape, *his* teeth shall be set on edge.” This shows that hereditary sin is not hinted at! But it does refer to the fathers sinning, and the children having to suffer as a result. Their fathers worshipped idols, died and left the children in slavery under the Egyptians.

We are told Exodus 20: 5 teaches “hereditary sin” because it says “visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me.” However, the last five words you seldom quote. If this refers to “hereditary sin,” then it can only refer to children who have parents that *hate God!* No one but the haters of God were to have their iniquity visited upon their children. So you will have to confess that you hate God, if you wish to use that text to prove that your children inherit sin. Read all the verse, and learn He is talking about those who worshipped “graven images” (idols).

We will now let Jeremiah tell us what is meant by “iniquity of the fathers.” Read the entire fifth chapter of Lamentations, and learn that they were in slavery under the Egyptians and Assyrians. Jeremiah says, “Our fathers have sinned, and are not; and we have borne their iniquity.” Their fathers sinned by worshipping idols, died and left their children in Egypt where they were made slaves; hence suffered (bore iniquity of their fathers) as a result of their fathers’ sinning. Here is where their (the children’s) teeth were set on edge and where they bore the iniquity of their fathers.

Sometimes this passage is quoted to show that babies inherit sin: “The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies” (Psalm 58: 3). But this text says they “go astray,” and you say they were “born astray.” Who has told the truth, you or God? I had a Baptist preacher read this verse and then tell me all children lied as soon as they were born;

said his babies would cry, and by that act tell him they had the colic. He said he would get up and light the lamp, and they would hush crying. He said they lied, for they didn't have the colic at all!

I replied, "Man, you can't understand the language of your own babies. They never said they had the colic, by their crying. They asked for a light; and when you gave them what they asked for they 'shut up.' But you say they lied and inherited their lying from their dad; so dad had to be a liar in order for his babies to inherit lying from him; and I suppose too, you must have plenty of lies still wrapped up in your hide, so that other children born into the family may inherit lying." Thus, we prove from this Baptist preacher, that he is a liar, and that his children inherit lying from him; and prove by the Bible (Revelation 21: 8) that all liars have their part in the lake of fire. Rather tough for the preacher and his babies, if the babies die while infants! By reading the next three verses of the passage under advisement, we learn the children referred to were youngsters compared to "young lions" with "great teeth," "charmners" and "serpents," etc., hence not infants.

We are told that babies get angry, and that is proof they are sinners—have inherited sin. If that be true, then God is a sinner, for He gets angry (Exodus 32: 10, 11)! Thus, I suppose that since Luke 3: 38 says that God was Adam's father, Adam must have inherited his sins from God, his father, if this doctrine of "hereditary sin" be true. For if the babies getting angry proves they are sinners, it will also prove God to be a sinner; hence Adam could inherit sin from Him! Worse and worse! Shame on those who teach and accept such a false doctrine!

Again it is said that Psalm 51: 5 is proof that David was born a sinner. "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me," may prove that his mother sinned, but it certainly does not hint that David was born with sin in him. He was born into a sinful world, but not

with sin in him. A man might be born in a potato patch and not be a potato, either.

Here is another proof text of those who believe we are "born in sin." It is Job 14: 4, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." We are told this is proof no child can be born clean, that is, without sin. This verse doesn't refer to birth at all. The first two verses of the chapter refer to the birth and death of persons; they take you from "the cradle to the grave." Then the third verse takes you to the judgment—"and bringest me into judgment with thee." Then the fourth verse asks, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" If you enter the judgment an unclean man, none can bring you out clean. "Let him that is filthy, be filthy still." No chance for reformation at the judgment. You great body of sinners who make your lives unclean here, and who die unclean will also be unclean at the judgment. No one can bring you out clean there! Your judgment will be according to your works, which are and will be unclean, hence there will be no room in heaven for you. Cleanse your soul today, for tomorrow may never come to you!

You will notice that Job 14: 2 says the child "cometh forth like a flower." If the baby is born with sin in it, why did not this text say it, "cometh forth like a thorn or thistle," thus employing something to represent sin? But it reads, "cometh forth like a flower," and so uses something to represent purity and sweetness. Jesus says we must "become as little children" or we can't go to heaven (Matthew 18: 3). But little children, you say, have sin in them (by inheritance); therefore, we will have to get sin in us (become sinners) or we cannot get to heaven. That is the conclusion to which we are forced if we accept that doctrine. But Jesus Christ says that if you die in your sins, where He is you cannot go (John 8: 21). But if we don't go to Jesus, we will have to go to the devil. So there you are! You teach universal damnation, when you teach the doctrine

of inherited sin, and that without apparently realizing it!

If infants inherit sin and die in infancy, they will go to hell, for sin cannot enter heaven. "Oh," you say, "infants dying in infancy become the elect of God and are saved by the blood of Jesus." And where did you learn that? There isn't a hint of such a thing in the Bible! Christ came to seek and to save that which was *lost*, the Bible says. But infants were not lost (Matthew 19: 14); therefore Jesus didn't come to save the infants. Christ Jesus came to call sinners, and not the righteous to repentance. But infants were not sinners (1 John 3: 4); therefore Jesus did not come to call infants to repentance. They had, and have, nothing to repent of. Jesus did not come to save them (they never were lost), for they were, and are, *safe!* They, being *safe*, do not have to be *saved!* Remember, please, that infants are *safe!* No man can teach that infants inherit sin, without teaching infant damnation.

"Holiness" people teach that infants inherit sin, and then some of them get up and say they are without sin (and they sin when they say that, as 1 John 1: 8 tells us) and cannot sin. If they tell the truth (of course, they do not), and Jesus told the truth (Matthew 18: 3), then those Holy (?) people will go to Hell if they die while they are so sinlessly good; for they say children are born with sin in them, and Jesus said they must "become as little children" or they can't enter heaven, hence they will have to get some sin in them, or they can't go to heaven. That doctrine is as far from the truth as the old devil is from heaven!

IS THE BIBLE A PLAYTHING?

Some people act as if they thought the Book was not our guide, hence they pray "for the Holy Spirit to come down and guide them" into all truth, and to "come and strike them down in converting" them to the Lord. If such ideas were true, the Bible would not be needed, except as a plaything, or as a decoration on the shelf.

What is the power of God, anyway? Is it some direct impact on the heart independent of the Word of God? Paul says "the gospel is the power of God unto salvation" (Romans 1: 16). That being true, all praying for the "Holy Spirit to come and convert persons" is simply vain, empty work, misnamed "prayers to God." The Word of God is the revelation of God, therefore the power of God!

When I write a letter to my wife, is it necessary for me to accompany it with my very presence, or even with the spirit which is in me, in order to make it effectual, or to enable her to understand and appreciate it? You answer in the negative and so do I! But why? Simply because I am in that letter; my mind is in it, my wisdom is in it (if I have any), my spirit is in it, my knowledge is in it, my friendship, my love, my individuality, my sympathy, my soul; all I am or can be is in that epistle.

Is not this also true about the letter God has written to us, which we call the Bible? If not, why not? I pour my sympathy, my thoughts and my love right into my letter, and my wife cannot doubt what I say, unless she doubts my friendship, love and sympathy. If I am not in my word, there is nothing to it. Will you affirm that I am not in my word, thus, not in the letter I write to my wife? Certainly not. The letter would amount to nothing to her, if I were not in it.

Is God in His word? Is He in the Bible, friends? If yes,

then it contains all power; and no outside demonstrations are necessary to drive it home to the hearts of men. If He is not in it, it is not His word, and no power can make it so. If I am not in the letter I write to my wife, no one can put me in it, and to her it is a mere scrap of useless paper. So with the Bible. If God is not in it, then it is a useless book to us.

But God is in it! The Bible is true! It is the Word of God, and thus God is in it, and it is His power to save men and women. If so, then there is no other power; and all of the praying you will do, will not change the Bible. God is in it, Christ is in it, the Holy Spirit is in it, or it does not contain a word of truth, and is worthless to us insofar as a plan of salvation is concerned.

Do you read the Bible? If so, why? For its poetry? For its history? For its law? Do you read it expecting God to send His spirit to enable you to understand it? If so, you read as the infidel reads it, for he does not believe that God is in it. And if He is not (as some seem to think), if the Holy Spirit is not in it until He imparts some additional power, it is devoid of inherent truth, and it is not the revelation of God. If the Bible is the word of God, then God is in it. If it is not the word of God, then it is a fraud, and the work of men.

Why are the thoughts, works and productions of men insufficient for our salvation? They cannot save us, for hardly any two of them agree, hence no definite plan can be provided by them. They are only the achievements of men—of human minds. The grandest poetry, deepest philosophy, or the most attractive system of religion that bears only the impress of human intelligence can never lift us higher or make us better than the mind from which it originated. The Bible is the most important book, because it presents to us the thoughts from the mind of God and lifts us up to Him, when it is believed and obeyed. This, no other book can do!

Then why will men trifle with it, play with it, and call it a "dead letter"? Infidels admit that it contains the best code of laws ever written. This is proof that it did not originate with man. Just as the sun bursts in glorious splendor through the rifted clouds and fills the world with its beautiful and attractive light, so God shines through the Bible, more glorious than the morning sun, "to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Corinthians 4: 6). Yes, God shines through His word just as the sun shines through the clouds above us and never allows the world to be left in total darkness.

You cannot separate Christ and His word. Do away with the inspiration of the gospel and you do away with the divinity of Christ. Do away with the divinity of Christ, and you do away with the inspiration of the gospel. They stand or fall together. You cannot accept one and reject the other, or reject one and honor the other.

If the presence of God did not warm the thoughts, the facts, the commands, the laws, the promises, into a living personal reality, you would not accept the Bible, love, obey and defend it as you do. You who reject it, reject also the author of it, reject the promises it contains, reject the rewards and live in a dark world without hope of a bright hereafter. You see absolutely nothing for yourself in the future. Paul told us to look at the unseen (2 Corinthians 4: 18); and when we do that we see the God of heaven in this volume called the Bible. It is His power (Romans 1: 16), hence He is there. That is the reason the Bible cannot be destroyed.

If God is revealed in the Bible, if His presence keeps it alive, does not God work in us (Ephesians 1: 18-23) who believe and obey it? If His thoughts turn our thoughts heavenward (Isaiah 55: 7-9; 2 Corinthians 10: 4, 5); if His truths open our understanding (Luke 24: 45; Acts 2: 37); if His commandments conquer our stubborn resistance (2 Peter 1: 4); is it not a fact that they who appeal from

the Bible and ask for knowledge and salvation to be given them "direct from heaven" insult the author of the One Book which He has given us as a guide from earth to heaven? Are they not guilty of the blackest treason against the very foundation of God's government?

Man is limited in power. Then, could he invent such a God as is made known in the Bible? Give me the God of the Bible and you give me hope, comfort, and everything needed to encourage me along the dark paths of this life.

"BAPTIZED FOR THE DEAD"

In 1 Corinthians 15: 29 we read, "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?"

Concerning this there are many views. Mormons think we should practice baptizing for the dead, as they teach it. Some brethren think Paul refers to the heathen practice of baptizing for the dead, which is the same as the practice of the Mormons.

The word "dead," in this scripture is from the Greek, "nekros," and means "dead; one that has breathed his last; lifeless." In this chapter Paul discusses the death and resurrection of Christ before he discusses the resurrection of others (Cp. verses 12-29). Christ "died" and his body became lifeless, that we might die unto sin and live unto God. We are to represent that death in our obedience to the gospel. Some were denying the resurrection of Christ (verse 12), and Paul is proving that He did rise, and that we must represent that resurrection as well as His death (Romans 6: 1-5; Colossians 2: 12) in baptism, or in being baptized into Christ (Galatians 3: 27); hence all who obey the gospel represent His death.

Now we have Paul asking, "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead?" What dead? Why, Christ, of

course! That was the *subject* under consideration. So the dead we are baptized for, is Christ.

The word “for” in the verse, is from the Greek “*huper*,” and means “over, above, beyond, across.” But in this sense it does not occur in the New Testament, so we must look for the usage as per the New Testament, and here it is: “for one’s safety, for one’s advantage or benefit (one who does a thing *for* another is conceived of as standing or bending *over* the one whom he would shield or defend), to be for one (i. e., to be on one’s side, to favor and further one’s cause), on account of, concerning, of, as respects, with regard to.”

Now, it is plain to be seen that the thought implied in being baptized for the dead, is that it is for our “advantage” and “benefit.” But the real lesson is, “on account of” Christ’s death, “for the sake of” Christ who died for us and redeemed us from all sin, if we will be redeemed. We are baptized “with regard to, as respects,” the One who died to save us from eternal ruin and torment. So, that we are baptized for the dead, or “concerning” the death of Christ, is true every time one obeys the gospel. So it is with “regard to” Christ that we are baptized, so as to receive the “benefits” of the gospel.

It might be well for us at this juncture to note the opinions of certain scholars as to the passage under scrutiny. First, I refer to Dr. Bloomfield, who says (in his Greek New Testament with Notes): “What will they be doing, i. e., what will they benefit themselves, who are baptized for the sake of, i. e., in hope of, the resurrection of the dead? They will be no better for it, either in this world or the next.” Thus, the “doctor” agrees with what I said: that we are all to be benefited; but it was Christ who brought about the resurrection from the dead, and He must be first with us in all things. Paul says He must have the pre-eminence in all things (Colossians 1: 18).

Dr. Bloomfield further states, “There may also be (as

ancient commentators think) an allusion to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion; which, while typifying a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness, also had reference to the Christian's communion with his Lord, both in death and resurrection from the dead (See Romans 6: 4)."

I now refer you to the Cottage Bible, which contains this note from the Polyglott Bible: "The passage is thus paraphrased—if the dead do not rise, of what avail is it to expose ourselves to so many dangers in the hope of a future reward?"

Next we quote from Macknight, who says, "For baptism being an emblematical representation of the death, burial and resurrection not only of Christ but of all mankind (Romans 6: 4), it was fitly made the rite of initiation into the Christian church; and the person who received it, thereby publicly professed his belief of the resurrection of Christ and of the dead, might with the greatest propriety be said to have been baptized *for the dead*, that is, for his belief of the resurrection of the dead."

Summarizing, we may safely say that the weight of scholarship as well as the context, lends itself to the interpretation that all of us who believe and are baptized, are thus "baptized for the dead," or "on account of" Christ's death and resurrection, and looking forward to our own resurrection. The death of our Savior provides a motive for our obedience in baptism.

Therefore, Mormons are badly mistaken in thinking this passage teaches that when a friend dies without being baptized you may be baptized for that friend after he dies, and then he may hear, believe and obey the gospel after his death—with the exception of being baptized—and that your being baptized for him will make up this deficiency. Such is baptism by proxy, and no such thing is taught in the gospel! Christ is the one referred to in this scripture, and not some earthly friend who died without baptism. Anyone

can, if he will, see that the death and resurrection of Christ is the subject in 1 Corinthians 15: 12-29, hence, He is the one we are baptized for.

To say this simply refers to a heathen practice is also a mistake, for the same reason given against the Mormon idea. Paul is neither talking to or about heathen. He is talking (writing) to the *church* at Corinth, hence writing to Christians, not to the heathen. Paul is speaking about Christ, not about heathen. It is true, however, that heathen did practice baptizing for the dead, as Mormons practice it, but that is absolutely *not* the baptism Paul refers to in 1 Corinthians 15: 29.

BEING BORN INTO GOD'S FAMILY

There is but One Body or family (Romans 12: 4, 5; 1 Corinthians 12: 12; Ephesians 3: 15) and that One Body has but One Head (Colossians 1: 18). He was not made head until after he went to heaven and was seated at the right hand of God (Ephesians 1: 20-23). The Church is married to Him (Romans 7: 4), hence, is his wife (bride) and should wear only His name (Matthew 16: 18; Acts 4: 11, 12; Ephesians 3: 15; Philippians 2: 9, 10). Other names are of human origin, therefore unscriptural.

There is only one way for children to be born into our families. The Lord has only one way for children to be born into His family (John 3: 5). How is that?

Here it is: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God" (1 John 5: 1). Someone reads that and concludes that all he needs to do in order to be born of God is to believe. But we will hear John further: ". . . everyone that loveth is born of God" (1 John 4: 7). Then you cannot be born of God, without love.

Someone will say that faith and love come at the same time. Impossible! You first have to be made to believe

there is a Christ before you can love Him. Can a man love the Lord if he doesn't believe in Him? If a man is saved the moment he believes, can love save him? Does he believe before he is saved or in order to be saved? Love is the result of faith!

Since we have to love in order to be "born of God," we wish to know what love is. John answers, "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." Not "commandment," but "commandments"—all of them. Then in order for a person to be "born of God" he must "believe" and "love." But to love in this instance is to keep all of His commandments as given to the alien.

Again: ". . . everyone that doeth righteousness is born of God" (1 John 4: 29). Then a person must "do righteousness" to be born of God. But what is "righteousness"? Let the Bible answer: "All thy commandments are righteousness" (Psalm 119: 172). You cannot be born of God without doing righteousness, and you cannot do righteousness, without doing all of His commandments. We cannot select one or two and reject or ignore the others. All of them (the Book says) must be obeyed, else we are not "born of God."

In Romans 5: 1 we are said to be justified by faith, and in Mark 16: 16 we are told that he that believeth not shall be damned; so we all agree that all must believe. No controversy here! Why? Because the Bible says we must believe, and that is a good reason for our agreement.

In Acts 17: 30 we read, "And the times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." After reading that God has commanded men to "repent" we all agree. No controversy here! Why not? Because God has commanded it, and that is a sufficient reason for us all to agree.

"Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord" (Acts 10: 47, 48). Can we all agree at this

point? If not, why not? We all agree that all must "believe" and "repent" and the reason we thus agree is because God commands all to believe and repent. But the same God who commanded faith and repentance, also commanded baptism (Acts 2: 38; Romans 6: 3-5; Galatians 3: 27; Colossians 2: 12; 1 Peter 3: 20, 21). Then why, pray tell, should we reject the command to be buried in baptism?

We have learned that no person can be "born of God" without doing all the commands, and baptism is one of them; therefore, no person is born of God who has not been baptized in water.

There are but two scriptures in the Bible that tell a person in so many words, when he is "in Christ." They are Romans 6: 3, and Galatians 3: 27. Both say, "Baptized into Christ." Why say that? Because baptism is the last step a person takes in getting "into Christ."

Suppose I want in the meeting house and am four steps away. I take the first one, which we will call "faith." I have taken one step in the right direction, but if I stop there and die there, I will die outside of the house! But I take the second step, which we will call "repentance" and thus I am now halfway there. But if I refuse to take the other two steps I will die on the outside of the house! I take the third step, which we will call "confession" (Romans 10: 9, 10). I am now only one step from the house, yet if I refuse to take the fourth step, I will die on the outside! All three of these steps had to be taken before I could take the fourth step. "I am so near the house (kingdom) and yet so far." If I want in the house, I'll have to take that fourth step, which we will call "baptism." When I take that step, I enter the house, and not before then.

You say, "The fourth step put him in the house," and so it did; but the first three steps were just as essential to my entering the house as the last one, although it was the last one which actually put me in the house.

Thus it is in the plan of salvation. Baptism is the last

step required to put persons in Christ, hence it is said we are "baptized into Christ." If we refuse baptism we refuse to go all the way, hence die on the outside of Christ. In refusing to obey the command to be "baptized into Christ," we die on the outside, and have no promise (Hebrews 5: 9). Jesus said, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God" (John 3: 5). That settles the question.

Some say sinners are born of the Holy Spirit, and that such constitutes the new birth. This cannot be! We are born of the feminine gender, and the Holy Spirit is masculine gender.

The Bible teaches that Christ was born of the grave. But He had first to be in the grave or He could not have been born of the grave. Then when He was taken out of, or separated from, the grave, there was a birth. You cannot be born of a thing without first being in it! Then when you are taken out of, and separated from it, you have a birth. So if sinners are born of the Holy Spirit, they have first to be in the Spirit, then, when they are taken out of, and separated from, the Spirit, they are then "born of the Spirit"!? But no one believes that (it may be their opinion) for that would place all sinners in the Holy Spirit, and separate all Christians from the Spirit! Who is ready for such a conclusion? I think no one, although that is the popular idea (opinion) of the great mass of the religious world today. I believe Christians (and not sinners) are in God, in Christ and in the Spirit (John 14: 17-20; Ephesians 4: 4-6); hence not separated from Them.

This article is sufficient to show that there is but one church over which Christ is the Head, and to inform you how to become a member of that Body.

ORIGIN OF THE BLACK MAN AND OTHER RACES

In Acts 17: 26, we read, 'And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation.'" It is clearly stated here that God "made of *one blood* all nations of men," and He determined the "bounds of their habitation"; so we know all classes and colors of men came from "one blood."

Some have supposed that Cain went into the land of Nod and married a beast (ape), and that their offspring were black, hence we have the negro. But Cain's offspring were destroyed in the deluge. Cain married his sister, not a beast. "Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden. And Cain knew his wife; and she conceived, and bare Enoch" (Genesis 4: 16, 17). So he took his wife with him to Nod, and "knew his wife" in the same sense "Adam knew Eve his wife" (Genesis 4: 1), and in no other sense.

In Genesis 6: 10 we learn that Noah had three sons. In Genesis 5: 3-32 we learn Noah descended from Seth, not from Cain. The earth, after the flood, was repopled by Noah, not Cain. So if the negro had come from Cain, there would be no negroes today.

Still another thinks that the black man came from Ham. We are told that God cursed Ham, and it is assumed that the curse was the making of him black. Read Genesis 9: 18-27 and learn that it was Canaan (not Ham) who was cursed. It was not Ham, but his son Canaan; and Noah (not God) did the cursing. Do you think *Noah* had power to make a white man black? The curse placed on Canaan was, "A servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren." The curse was making him a *servant*, not black.

Adam was the first man (Gen. 2: 7). Was he brown, red, yellow, black or white? Keep that question in your head till we learn the meaning of "Adam."

It, like other words, has more than one meaning. "Adam" means "earth-born," or "rosy-red," or "great strength." God gave him a name of different meanings. "Earth-born" is so fitting, as his body was made from the earth. "Rosy-red" denotes perfect health; and you will, I think, agree with me, that God did not make him a sick man. "Great strength" simply showed he was mentally able to take care of everything on earth, over which God made him ruler or gave him dominion. Now keep that in your head (for we will need it later) while we see if Adam was white, black, yellow, or what.

By reading Luke 3 we learn Jesus was a Jew, and we all know Jews are white. So we have positive proof that Jesus Christ was white. That chapter traces the ancestry of Christ back to Adam, thus showing Adam, too, was a white man. So here is proof that proves, hence we know Adam was white.

The white man has always been superior to all others. Greatest and wealthiest governments in the world are those controlled by white men. England, France, Germany, and the United States have been made by the white man. Lay India, Africa, China, et al., down beside these and see the difference. Here are evidences of their mental strength.

But we will leave that thought and notice this: white is not a color. It is made up of all the other colors, which gives to it combined strength of all the colors, thus making it stronger and more powerful than any one of the single colors, as in "unity there is strength." The white man, however, has not always used his strength (ability) for betterment of his country as he should. Now keep all this in your head—and don't forget, either, that "all nations of men" have been made from "one blood"—while we look after the red man (Indian) and see where he originated.

Adam was white, his wife was made of him (taken from his side), therefore had his blood. The one blood is found only in Adam. All nations, therefore, have been of Adam, the white man. But the question naturally arises, "How did the other colors spring from him?" To settle the question read Genesis 25: 20-26 and learn Esau was red. Two nations sprang from Rebekah; two manner of people; a white and a red boy born of the same woman. God is showing how he makes nations of one blood. In Genesis 25 and Acts 17, He gives the key to it all.

When God made the first people white He put into them the very warp and woof of their being, all the colors. He was preparing for the future when He would make of the white people all the various colors of people, by extracting as it were, any one color from the white. It required a miracle of course. But everything was brought into existence by a miracle, then continued by laws of nature.

In the miraculous birth of a white son and red son, of a white woman, we have the key to how God made of one blood all nations of men. So do not forget the key in Genesis 25, that unlocks to us the mystery.

"Edom" means "red." "Now these are the generations of Esau, who is Edom" (Genesis 36: 1). So we might say, "These are the generations of Esau, who is red." His descendants are called Edomites, showing they were and are also red. We have, therefore, found the origin of the red man. Here, remember, is the key to the origin of all other colors and nations.

Where did the yellow man come from? Remember that all are "made of one blood." (Acts 17: 26). Then remember the "key" given in Genesis 25: 20-26. The father and mother were white, and of this union were born two sons; one white (a Jew), the other red (a Gentile); hence, two nations, which was a wonderful miracle. At some other time in the world's history there was a yellow child born of a white woman. It was not necessary that God should

tell the world just *when* this yellow child was born, nor tell the mother's name, for He had already given us the "key" in Genesis 25. His way of making different nations is made known in the birth of red and white children. Yellow and red together with the other colors are used in making the white. All other colors are in the white; so when God wanted to make the red race He simply went where all those colors were, and pulled out the red cord, so to speak, from among the other colors, using it separate and distinct all by itself, and the Indian is the result. Also, when He wanted to start the yellow nation, He simply pulled out the yellow and separated it from the other colors found in the white; and the yellow nation is the result.

The great color (the white race) was made up of cords of all colors twisted together, so to speak, and when God was ready to start a nation of another color He simply drew out one of those cords, and it became a separate people. You take a rope made out of four cords thoroughly and firmly twisted together, and it will be four times stronger than either one of those cords used singly; and so is the white race (made up of all the racial cords and colors) much stronger mentally than any nation made of just one color-cord. Here is the "great strength" we find in the word "Adam."

But what about the origin of the black man? In Genesis 25: 20-26, God has shown how the red nation was made of white parents (of one blood) thus furnishing the "key" to how other nations were made of "one blood." Hence, there is but one conclusion to reach concerning the black man; that is, somewhere, sometime, there was a black child born of some white woman, just as the red child was born of white parents, and no more of a miracle.

But you ask how we know he was not born of red or yellow parents? Simply because red is a single color, and the black would not be taken from that single color; yellow is also a single color and the black would not be taken from

it. White is the combination of all colors; that is, therefore, the logical place to go to pull out the black, or other color desired. Therefore, each time God wanted to start another nation, of a different color, He went back to the one blood (parent-blood of all nations) and pulled out the one desired.

The black man has a soul, in spite of the fact that some say he has not. Moses married a black woman (Numbers 12: 1). "Ethiopia" means "black," and his wife was of Ethiopia.

In Acts 8: 26-39 we learn that God sent Philip to the black man for the purpose of teaching and baptizing him; hence, God was interested in the salvation of that black man. If the black people have no souls, then the white people do not have souls either, for the black came from the white. God separated the black from the white and we should keep them separate. I am opposed to mixing them.

“VENGEANCE IS MINE”

In Romans 12: 19 we read, “Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, ‘Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord’.” So vengeance belongs to the Lord, and not to us, in spite of our actions sometimes. Webster says vengeance means, “infliction of pain on another for injury received.” Thus if I receive injury from you, I must not try to injure you in return, for that would be taking vengeance; and God says vengeance belongs to Him, and he will exercise it. So we had best leave that unto the Lord, although it may be hard to do so. However, we must recall that we are soldiers, and are in a constant fight. We *must* do some things that are hard, and that is one of them.

Vengeance, in Romans 12: 19, is from the Greek word, “Ekdikeesis,” and means a “revenging; vengeance, punishment,” so Thayer says in his Greek-English lexicon. So I must not punish you simply because you mistreat me. God says He will do that. But we have to wait so long (as time seems to us) before God punishes the other fellow, that we decide to do it ourselves. But is it right for me to take this matter into my own hands? Here is one place where it is hard for me to behave myself? How is it with you? If we, live as God desires that we live, there will be many things hard for us to do. That is part of the sacrifice (mentioned in Romans 12: 1) we are to make.

In Acts 25: 15 we have “judgment,” a translation of “dikee,” and it really means vengeance. So the thought is, “they were desiring to have vengeance against him.” They wished to take vengeance against Paul, and we too often follow their example instead of the example of Paul. However, this word “dikee” is defined: “(1) Custom, usage; (2) Right, justice; (3) A suit at law; (4) A judicial hear-

ing, judicial decision, a sentence of condemnation; (5) Execution of the sentence, punishment, to suffer punishment; (6) The goddess Justice, avenging justice.” It was not justice so much that those persons wanted, as it was a desire to punish him. They wished his condemnation and punishment. That we should leave for the Lord to accomplish, but we just cannot wait for Him to do the job, when we think we can do it better, more quickly, and to suit ourselves. The Lord postpones his punishment too long to suit most of us.

The word Paul used in Romans 12: 19, is “Ekdikeesis,” and it simply means, “a revenging, vengeance, punishment”; and the Lord says that belongs to Him. It occurs nine times in the New Testament. (Read Hebrews 10: 30; 2 Corinthians 7: 11; and Luke 21: 22 in connection with Romans 12: 19, and you will perhaps, better understand the question).

Then look at the Greek word “Orgee” for “anger, wrath, vengeance,” which means “the natural disposition, temper, character; movement or agitation of soul, impulse, desire, any violent emotions”—as in 1 Timothy 2: 8, “I will therefore, that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands without *wrath* and doubting.” So when we go to God in prayer that temper of ours should be so controlled that it would not cause us to have wrath in our hearts. Notice that “wrath,” “anger,” “vengeance,” “temper,” and “violent emotion” are all related to the same word. Where one is, the other is apt to be. Then, in Ephesians 4: 31, we read, “Let all bitterness and *wrath* and *anger* and clamour and evil speaking be put away from you, with all malice.” Here we find once more the word “orgee,” and we also find, “wrath,” “anger,” “malice,” etc., in company with each other. Paul says, “Put them away from you”; but we keep them, usually.

We find this same word in Colossians 3: 8 and James 1: 19, and I wish you again to read them in connection with the ones I quoted. Punishment inflicted by magistrates (Ro-

mans 13: 4), because disobedience is visited with punishment, is an idea those people had, and it is true in our case, only God is the magistrate who will inflict punishment by refusing to admit us to His City, when we meet Him in the Judgment. That is, if we refuse to obey Him, we will be rejected. The word "orgee" attributed to God in the New Testament is that in which God stands opposed to man's disobedience, obduracy, and sin, and manifests itself in punishing the same (John 3: 36; Romans 1: 18; 4: 15; 9: 22; Hebrews 3: 11; 4: 3; Revelation 14: 10; 16: 19; 19: 15).

But all this does not mean that we would always sin if we protected ourselves under some condition. Paul, Peter and hundreds of others were killed without offering resistance; but they were murdered according to the law they had at that time. That is their law (so they claimed) condemned the apostles, and, hence, no use offering resistance—no more than it is worthwhile for a criminal to offer resistance under our present laws. They were not criminals but were considered as such. We are told to be "obedient to the laws" that be (Romans 13), and the law guarantees us the right to protect ourselves if some one is trying to kill us. To offer no resistance when we could escape death by punishing the would-be killer, would be to commit murder, for we would then be responsible for our own death. We could have prevented it, if we would, hence we would be in position of allowing the other party to murder us when we could have prevented it. It is just as wrong for an intelligent person to murder himself, as it would be for him to murder someone else. In such cases, we not only have the privilege to protect ourselves, but it is our duty to do so. If we do not, I believe God will hold us guilty of murdering ourselves.

We are told (Romans 13: 4) that the officer "beareth not the sword in vain." God has authorized law-enforcement officers to use the sword. Then in Matthew 26: 52 Peter

was told, they who "take the sword shall perish with the sword." Other translations read, "by the sword." Thus Christ informs us we have a perfect right to use the sword in self-defense. That is, if someone uses the sword on us, it shall be used on him. Then in Revelation 13: 10 Jesus informs us, "he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword."

Now we have both sides of the question briefly stated, and we can see the necessity of "rightly dividing the Word of Truth." We might take the position stated in the first part of this article, and stop there, and thus teach that under no circumstances would we be justified in punishing another. That would be wrong!

FEET-WASHING AND THE LORD'S SUPPER

Few understand the subject of feet-washing as mentioned in the thirteenth chapter of John. Many cannot conceive of it as being a "church ordinance" since they know the church was not yet established when Jesus washed the disciples' feet; yet, it seems they are not able to tell why Jesus performed this action, and to answer the so-called argument that the "Lord's Supper" and "feet-washing" were carried over into the church on the same bridge, as the Primitive Baptists and others often state.

There was a grand lesson of *humility* taught by the Savior when He washed the disciples' feet (John 13: 13, 14). There was nothing strange or unusual about washing feet; that was a very common practice in that country. But the idea of Jesus, whom they called, "Lord and Master," and whom they expected to be their king, stooping and washing their feet, was wholly unexpected by them. However, the lesson of "humbling yourselves one to another," is taught here

as it is also in Galatians 6: 1-3; 1 Peter 5: 5-7, and other places. In the kingdom or church of Jesus Christ one is no greater than another (Cp. Matthew 20: 20-26; Luke 22: 24-46). This, then, is the great and important lesson taught by Christ in John, chapter thirteen. Remember that washing of feet was a custom in that country, since they wore no shoes as we moderns do. It was as common for them to wash their feet as it is for us to wash our hands. It was an act expressive of the kindest hospitality to furnish water for this purpose (Cp. Genesis 18: 3, 4; 19: 2; 24: 32; 43: 24; Judges 19: 21; Luke 7: 44-46).

“And He turned to the woman, and said unto Simon, Seest thou this woman? I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no water for my feet: but she hath washed my feet with tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head” (Luke 7: 44). This teaches, if it teaches anything at all, that it was the custom of the people in that country at that time to give the person entering a house the water requisite to wash his feet. “*I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no water for my feet.*” Simon broke the custom of the people by not giving him water for his feet. Thus we learn, after reading all the Scriptures referred to above in the Old Testament, that it was a *custom* and not a *religious ordinance*.

After Christ's resurrection and the establishing of His church (Acts 2), we never find the practice referred to. It is only mentioned once afterwards, and then not as an ordinance of the church, but as a “good work.” Let us read it: “Well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work” (1 Timothy 5: 10). Paul here classes “washing feet” with “bringing up children,” “lodging strangers,” and “relieving the afflicted.” If washing feet is a church ordinance, and hence, to be practiced in the assembly as a part of the

public worship, then *bringing up children, lodging strangers, and relieving the afflicted*, as well as all "good works" are church ordinances, and, hence, should be practiced *only* in the assembly as a part of the *public worship!* Who is ready to affirm this?

That which proves too much fails to prove anything. When you try to prove anything more than "good works" by 1 Timothy 5: 10, you will fail to prove anything at all upon this subject. Christ told his apostles to teach "them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you (Matthew 28: 20). But they never taught others to observe feet-washing; neither did they practice it themselves. It, therefore, could not have been a command given by Christ. If this was a command to be obeyed by the church, why is it that the apostles were *silent* upon the subject? We find them instructing the disciples upon the subject of the "Lord's Supper" and other items of the worship. Why did they remain silent regarding the subject of feet-washing?

The apostles had the keys of the kingdom of heaven and were to "bind on earth" (Matthew 16: 19; 18: 18). Did they *bind* feet-washing on the church? If so, where is it mentioned? If the apostles did not bind feet-washing on the church, was it bound in heaven? Is it not a fact that the apostles never said a word about feet-washing, as a church ordinance or as a part of the worship, after they received the keys and were told to bind on earth those things which would be ratified in heaven? If *yes*, then there is no authority or doctrine or command, either from Christ or the apostles, for the practice. If *no*, then we must be cited to the chapter and verse authorizing or commanding the practice after Christ gave the keys to the apostles. Of course all who read the Bible realize this cannot be done. If it cannot be done, then the practice of feet-washing is without faith, because there is no evidence or testimony to produce faith (Hebrews 11: 1), and without faith it is impossible to please God (Hebrews 11: 6).

Again: If it is practiced in the absence of testimony, it is practiced without faith (Hebrews 11: 1).

But whatsoever is not of faith is sin (Romans 14: 23).

Therefore, the practice of feet-washing, as an item of worship, is sin.

"Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth" (John 16: 13). Christ was the speaker and the apostles the persons spoken to. Christ, therefore, told the apostles, that the Spirit of Truth *would guide them into all truth*. Did Christ tell a lie? If no, then the Spirit of Truth actually did guide them into *all* truth.

But when was the Spirit to come and begin this work? Let the Bible answer: "For if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you" (John 16: 7). This Comforter was the "Spirit of Truth" (Cp. John 14: 16, 17), which was to "guide them into all truth," and He was not to come until Jesus went away and sent Him. After Jesus went to heaven He sent the Spirit of Truth, and *He* (the Spirit of Truth) then guided the apostles into "*all truth*." But He did not guide them into the way of feet-washing; therefore, feet-washing as a religious practice in the church, is no part of all truth.

It is a fact, known by all Bible students, that the apostles never mentioned feet-washing after Christ went to heaven and sent the Spirit to guide them into all truth, except the one time (1 Timothy 5: 10), and there they classed it with "bringing up children" and "all good works." It is simply a "good work" for my brother to wash my feet, if they need washing, and I am not able to wash them, just as "lodging strangers" is a "good work." But who is he that will say that "bringing up children" and "lodging strangers" are religious ordinances which should be practiced in the assembly at a set time, once per year, or more often?

We are told that Jesus Christ said: "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet," etc. (John 13: 14, 15); hence

washing feet is a command and should be obeyed. As usual, those who assert this, are wrong again. "Ought" is not a command. It is virtual blasphemy thus to teach. Christ, through the apostle Peter, never said, "Ye *ought* to repent and be baptized" (Acts 2: 38), but He said, "*Repent* and be baptized every one of you." Here is a command. But it is not "you ought to repent." It is "*repent.*"

Christ did not say, "Ye *ought* to go into all the world" (Matthew 28: 19, 20). He said, "*Go!*" Here is a command. You cannot make "Ye *ought* to wash one another's feet" a command. Christ said, "Ye also *ought* to wash one another's feet," and the apostle John said, "And ye *ought* to lay down our lives for the brethren." If "ought" in John 13: 14 is a command, then "ought" in 1 John 3: 16 is also and should be obeyed. Thus we should all commence taking "Rough-on-rats" immediately and so "lay down our lives for the brethren," in obedience to the "ought" in 1 John 3: 16. But let us all wash one another's feet, in obedience to the "ought" in John 13: 14, before taking a dose, and thus we will obey both of the "oughts." Can you not now see, that it is almost blasphemy to teach that John 13: 15 is a command?

We have already learned that there is no command in John 13 for feet-washing. We have also learned that the apostles never taught or practiced feet-washing after the death of Christ. I now wish to see if the Lord's Supper was instituted in connection with feet-washing, or on the same night that he washed the disciples' feet, as we are often told.

I am sure that all who read their Bibles understand that the Lord's Supper was instituted while he and the disciples were eating the passover feast (Cp. Matthew 26: 17-30; Mark 14: 12-26). I wish to be followed closely in this chapter. I don't believe as do some, that the Lord's Supper was instituted at the same time he washed the disciples' feet. The supper in connection with the washing of their

feet was before the feast of the passover at which he instituted the Lord's Supper (See John 13: 1). What supper, then, do you suppose this was?

If you will turn and read Matthew 26: 1-16 and Mark 14: 1-11, it will be seen that two days before the passover, a feast was made for the Lord, in the house of Simon, in the town of Bethany, and, as they were eating, a woman anointed the Lord with a very precious ointment (Matthew 26: 6, 7; Mark 14: 3). Remember, there were two suppers, two days apart. We can now see, that it was at the time of this supper, which was two days before the Lord's Supper was instituted, that Judas contracted with the Jews to betray the Son of God for thirty pieces of silver (Matthew 26: 14-16; Mark 14: 10, 11). I ask that you turn and read these scriptures with care. In order to save space I will not quote all of them. It was two days after *that* supper, the Lord ate the *passover* with the disciples and instituted his *own* supper (Matthew 26: 1-30; Mark 14: 1-26). It was *after* the eating of the *passover* supper that Judas carried out his contract made with the Jews to betray Christ, two days before that. I think, we who are honest, will agree here.

We are now ready to read John 12: 1-3, "Then Jesus, six days before the passover, came to Bethany . . . there they made him a supper. . . . Then took Mary a pound of ointment of spikenard, very costly, and anointed the feet of Jesus."

The apostle has not told us on what day of the six days before the passover the supper in Simon's house, in Bethany, was made, but one thing sure, it was the supper at which Jesus was anointed by Mary. The two evangelists, Matthew and Mark, have told us that it was two days before the passover and I don't know any better than to believe it.

When did Judas go out and make the contract with the Jews to betray the Son of God? It was at the time of this supper that Judas agreed to betray Him, which he did two

days after that, immediately after the Lord had instituted *His* supper.

I think it best now to read John 13: 1-5: "Now before the feast of the passover . . . supper being ended, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot . . . to betray him . . . He riseth from supper After that he poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet."

Can you now tell us what supper this was? We all know it could not have been the passover supper, where the Lord instituted His supper, for the apostle John says, it was *before the passover*. This, then, settles that point. But, dear reader, it was at this supper that Judas Iscariot decided that he would betray the Son of God into the hands of wicked men (see verse 2). We have already seen from Matthew 26: 14 and Mark 14: 10, that it was while they were eating the supper in Bethany, where Christ was anointed by Mary, that Judas conceived the idea of betraying Christ. It was this same supper we read of in John 12: 1-5. Let foot-washers pause and meditate and they will say that there is nothing to give as a good reason against the idea that this is the same supper mentioned in John 13: 2, which, John says, was before the passover supper. Yet it was at this time Jesus washed the disciples' feet. Everything in the records indicates such to be a fact. One thing sure, it was not the Lord's Supper. It was at the passover feast where the Lord instituted His supper, and we have learned from the apostle John, that this supper, where Jesus washed their feet, was "*before the feast of the passover.*" (John 13: 1). It seems to me that all of the foot-washing denominations ought to see and understand this.

Look here! The last thing done at this supper was, that the Lord washed the disciples' feet; while the last thing done after Jesus instituted His supper was "They sang a hymn and went out." (Cp. Matthew 26: 30; Mark 14: 26).

See any difference? This one fact is enough to settle this point with all honest men.

But I now wish to call your attention to the fact that John tells us who it was that should betray the Christ. Hear him: "He it is to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it" (John 13: 26). Matthew, however, says that Jesus said it was, "He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish" (Matthew 26: 23).

Here are two different statements, and how are we going to account for the difference in the two? Just in this one way: When they were in Bethany, eating there the supper mentioned by John, Jesus said it was he to whom he gave the sop; and after receiving the sop, he went out and contracted with them to betray the Lord into the hands of his enemies. Two days after this, while they were eating the passover, where He instituted the Lord's Supper, He said it was "he that dippeth his hand in the dish with me." We notice it was after this Judas arranged to carry out the contract he had made with the Jews two days before. Just keep in mind the fact that there was more than one supper—that there were two, two days apart, and Judas went out from them both; first, *to contract* to betray Jesus, and second, *to carry out the contract*. If we remember this it will be a great help to us in understanding the question as to whether the Lord's Supper and feet-washing were instituted at the same time.

It is a fact, however, that feet-washing never was instituted as a part of the worship of the church of the living God. We should remember, too, that Jesus gave two different signs at those two different suppers. The sign given as mentioned in John 13: 26 was not the sign given in connection with the eating of the passover and the Lord's Supper in Matthew 26: 23. One sign was given in connection with the washing of their feet; the other was given in connection with the instituting of the Lord's Supper. After connecting the scriptures as we should and have done

upon this subject, can we not all agree that the Lord's Supper was not instituted where He washed the feet of His disciples, but in Simon's house in Bethany?

Christ has now become our passover (1 Corinthians 5: 7) and we have a feast (The Lord's Supper) to keep in memory of Him. We eat of this once every week and not once per year. To eat the old Jewish passover as some do, is to deny the Lord Jesus Christ. That passover was kept in memory of the work done by the "destroying angel" which passed over Egypt. Thus to keep it today is the equivalent of saying that Christ, our passover, is not yet come. Christians neither wash their feet nor keep that old Jewish passover, as our "Dunkard" friends do.

III.

Having learned that feet-washing never was authorized by Christ, nor practiced by the apostles, and that it cannot be carried over on the same bridge with the "Lord's Supper," we are now ready to compare the memorial institutions and see if what Paul called the "Lord's Supper" (1 Corinthians 11: 20), is not an institution separate and apart and different from all other memorial institutions.

"Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning" (Romans 15: 4). It becomes us, therefore, to study into the true meaning and intent of these things that were written aforetime, in the Old Testament Scriptures, that we may have strong consolation and good hope, while engaged in the practice of the things enjoined in the New Testament. With this purpose in view, I will now try to give a brief analysis of some of God's commemorative and typical institutions.

In all of such institutions, we find seven requirements:

1. The elements employed.
2. The things to be done.
3. The persons who were to do these things.

4. The time when these things were to be done.
5. The place where they were to be done.
6. The object for doing them.
7. The duration, or perpetuity, of the institution.

A little study and careful investigation will show that all of these points obtain in every commemorative and typical institution established by the command of God under the old dispensation, as recorded in the Old Testament.

As our first illustration, we will call attention to the institution of the sabbath. First, the thing involved, is the seventh day of the week, which we call Saturday. Second, the thing to be done is to remember it, observe it, keep it holy (Exodus 20: 8). Third, the persons commanded to observe the sabbath, were the Israelites. Fourth, the time of observance was from evening to evening; that is, from the setting of the sun on the sixth day until the setting of the sun on the seventh day. Fifth, the place where they happened to be; in their tents while in the wilderness, in their habitations when they became a settled people—"let no man go out of his place"—was the command of God. Sixth, the object of the sabbath observance was to commemorate the bringing of the Israelites out of Egypt; and it was also typical of our everlasting rest in heaven. Seventh, it was to continue until the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

We will now examine the Passover, to determine if we may find the same points in connection therewith. First, the elements employed are the roasted lamb, bitter herbs and unleavened bread; second, the things to be done were: the killing of the lamb, the sprinkling of the blood upon the lintel and door-posts, the roasting of the flesh, and the eating thereof with bitter herbs and unleavened bread; third, the children of Israel were to attend to this service; fourth, the time of observance was the fourteenth day of the first month, i. e., the month of Abib; fifth, the place of the observance was at Jerusalem; sixth, the object or pur-

pose was to commemorate the passing over of the Hebrew houses by the destroying angel, which killed the firstborn of the Egyptians—serving as a pre-figure of Christ, who is our passover; seventh, it was to be observed until the death of Christ.

Now to the feast of Pentecost. In this feast, the same leading points are clearly observable. First, the elements to be employed were two wave loaves, seven lambs, one bullock, etc.; second, they were to be waved before the Lord, and then burned; third, the priests were to do this work; fourth, it was to be done fifty-three days after the slaying of the paschal lamb; fifth, it was to be done at the door of the tabernacle or temple; sixth, it was commemorative of the giving of the law from Mount Sinai—being typical of the publication of the New Covenant, the coming in of a new dispensation; seventh, it was to continue until the death of Christ.

In my debates with non-ordinance people (those who oppose the Lord's Supper), I have found them unable to distinguish between these institutions at all. In trying to prove that the "Lord's Supper" mentioned in 1 Corinthians 11: 20, is the Jewish passover, they, on every occasion, have been unable to distinguish between these memorial and typical institutions, and would speak of them as though there were no feasts but the passover.

After these preliminary observations, we now invite your attention to the institution under consideration, "the Lord's Supper." Connected with this are all of the leading points mentioned as being present in the aforementioned commemorative institutions. First, the elements employed are bread and wine; second, the thing to be done is to eat and drink these elements; third, the persons who are to do this are the disciples of Christ; fourth, the time when it is to be done is the first day of the week; fifth, the place where it is to be done is wherever the disciples meet for worship upon that day; sixth, the object of the institution is to show

the Lord's death and point to his coming again; seventh, it is to continue until the Lord's second coming.

You perceive that in this institution, the seven points connected with the commemorative institutions established under the old dispensation are all to be found. In every dispensation God has had commemorative institutions, and we find this institution commemorative of the death of Christ (Matthew 26: 26-28; 1 Corinthians 11: 20-34). In this memorial institution we are to eat bread and drink wine. *Bread and wine* are the *only* elements. This is not the case in the observation of any other institution. It is not true of the Pentecostal feast or the feast of the Passover. How foolish and silly then to argue that the "Lord's Supper," mentioned by Paul in 1 Corinthians 11: 20, is the passover of Exodus 12. Feet-washing never was instituted and the Jewish Passover was taken out of the way at the death of Christ. Today we have what is usually designated "the Lord's Supper" as a memorial in the church. It is entirely different from the other memorial and typical institutions, but it still contains the seven points common to all of the commemorative institutions. In spite of the Biblical teaching, most all who wash feet as a religious ordinance refuse to eat and drink of this bread and wine and denounce us for so doing.

Paul instructed the brethren at Corinth to eat of the bread and drink of the wine in remembrance of Jesus (1 Corinthians 11: 23-34). Paul said he had received this of the Lord (1 Corinthians 11: 23). Therefore, to follow Paul's instructions in 1 Corinthians 11: 23-34, is to obey God.

Again, (1) In 1 Corinthians 11: 23-34 are instructions given by the Lord through Paul to Christians to be obeyed. (2) But some of our opponents in the religious world will not obey the instructions given to Christians in 1 Corinthians 11: 23-34. (3) Therefore, these opponents are denouncing the practice of these Christians, making Paul a liar and refusing to obey the Lord.

(1) Paul says, "Keep the ordinances, as I deliver them to you" (1 Corinthians 11: 2).

(2) This institution called the "Lord's Supper" is one of the ordinances delivered.

(3) Therefore, in order to obey the instructions of Paul we will have to keep this ordinance.

(1) Paul says, "Keep the ordinances." (2) But our "friends" who oppose us on this question refuse to keep the ordinances. (3) Therefore these "friends" of ours are denying a plain command of God (1 Corinthians 11: 23), refusing to obey God's law, and are denounced as false teachers in 1 John 4: 1, 6; 3: 4, and other places.

(1) The Holy Spirit guided the apostles into all truth (John 16: 13). (2) But the Holy Spirit guided the apostle Paul into the way of instructing others to eat and drink of the bread and wine. (3) Therefore eating and drinking of the bread and wine is a part of "all truth."

(1) Eating and drinking of this memorial institution is a part of "all truth." (2) But our opponents on this subject refuse to eat and drink of this memorial institution. (3) Therefore our opponents refuse, and fight against, a part of "all truth."

Once more: (1) Our opponents on this subject say that eating and drinking of this institution is a sin, as witness the debates they have held with us. (2) But sin and sinners cannot go to heaven (John 8: 21; Revelation 20: 10). (3) Therefore the apostle Paul, Jesus Christ, and all who have practiced partaking of this institution will be cast into the lake of fire.

Thus you see, these opponents are actually denouncing the plain teaching given by the Holy Spirit, and if they are right, Jesus Christ himself will have to go to hell in the judgment morn. All know that the bread and wine Christ ate and drank, and had the disciples to eat and drink, was not the Jewish Passover. How silly it is to reason in such a manner as to condemn the Son of God.

TELL THE TRUTH

Truth is mankind's morning star. It illuminates while prevarication casts a dark, chilly fog. The first excellency of a gentleman is to be truthful. Though one have all other virtues, if his tongue be not truthful, he is not a gentleman. All good men abhor untruths. Truth is the staff upon which a character in youth may lean and become strong. At the cradle it christens him, at the table it feeds him, in the winter it clothes him, at the altar it weds him, in the death-room it shrouds him, and beyond the tomb it assists in rewarding him. Tell the truth! It will prevail, but falsehoods will disgrace.

The opposer of Christianity must of necessity be an untruthful person, for the truth will not damage it in the least. He fights and in his efforts only kicks at the stars. The Bible remains a flaming sword in his path! He who falsifies and incurs religion's enmity must be a brave fighter, for he may have a thousand hands of logic, yet cannot lay low the one hand of religion's prejudice. Uphold religious principles, defy the falsifier, hold high the white banner of Truth, and point the lake of fire (Rev. 21: 8) out to the perverter of eternal truths. Warn him of the danger ahead by flashing the light of Truth across his dark and crooked path of exaggeration and prevarication.

Rich men do their most grievous error by toiling to amass their wealth, and by passing it at death to heirs who have never been taught the necessity of obedience and truthfulness. The only will that cannot be broken is the distribution of spiritual wealth before the death of the possessor. The truthful Christian (the untruthful are not Christians) will have friends, happiness, peace, and delight; Christ for his brother, God for his Father, and heaven for his home. We cannot have friends who are not our equals, for how else can they understand us, rejoice with us, weep with us,

and run with us the race for Eternal Happiness? Real happiness is in heaven, and no liars will be there (Revelation 21: 8). It could not be heaven if they were there.

We should be a grateful people, since God has done so much for us; and we should show our gratefulness by living pure, godly Christian lives, which all means that we will never purposely misrepresent our brethren. Gratefulness is not hatefulness; and he who misrepresents his brother has certainly acted mean and hateful! Ingratitude is one of the meanest words we have in the English language, however it may be spelled or spoken. In time of storm, when they should provide coat and cover, one sees his fair-weather friends within warm rooms, flattering the next fool.

Truthfulness is a clean robe of politeness and brightness in the life of etiquette which is of the outer man, good manners of the inner; the one is learned from books, the other from good breeding; the one is by decree, the other by reason.

Truthfulness is a shield of protection when the storms of enmity, hatred and misrepresentation are raging. It is a food to strengthen the soul when hungering after popularity, fun and frolic, which weaken the inner man, because falsification is the father of misrepresentation, which is an open door to "society" and amusements.

If you cannot tell the truth about your brother, say nothing! Keep still! It may almost kill you to do so, but you had better die with a shut mouth and a clean heart than to die with an open mouth and a heart laden with lies. When trouble is brewing, keep still! When slander is arising to its feet, keep still! When gossip is on the wings of the air and soaring above, keep still! It is hard to do, I know. Silence is sometimes a word spoken louder than thunder from a clear sky which surprises, but like lightning, purifies the air. Truth will prevail and win, but sometimes silence is the greatest argument that can be made. When

your feelings are hurt, keep still until you recover from your excitement; then the danger cloud will certainly have passed. Things look different, you know, through an unagitated eye!

Bridle the tongue, said the Inspired; but most of us have never had a bridle on, nor a bit in our mouths. Most of us are not bridle-wise, and need to be bridle-broken. Our tongue is a very unruly member, and often refuses the Wise Man to obey. It often damages a brother, slanders the church, grieves the Holy Spirit, blasphemes sacredness, denies the Bible, curses its friends, bites the hand that feeds it, makes the sweet water bitter, chills the room, overshadows the home with black clouds, makes the life dark, wilts the rose, destroys the flower gardens and the souls of men, if not bridled so as to be controlled.

Dear Lord, help us to control our unruly, yet controllable tongues, for they can be tamed and made to behave themselves. It takes will power to accomplish the task. Have we that power?

When the tongue is obedient and truthful it is the most pleasant member of the family. It is a comfort to all who associate with it. It heals the broken heart, dries tears from the eye, drives the damp, chilly atmosphere from the home, hoists the window-shades and lets the sunshine in; opens the Bible, offers a prayer, sings praises to His name, brings Jesus into the homes and hearts of wayward persons, destroys evil surmising, immorality, hatred, backbiting, and hoists the banner of sweet perfume, tranquillity, happiness and godliness, and opens the very gates of heaven to us.

Which tongue is yours, my brother? Perhaps, though, I had better ask your neighbor.

We need to spend more of our time and money for education. This means Bible education found in the home and the church. We omit our duty to our offspring too often. Illiteracy never assisted in making tongues bridle-wise and truthful. If a man empties his purse into his head, no one

can take it away from him. An investment in knowledge always pays the best dividends, and knowledge helps to tame the tongue that otherwise might go mad, wild, and dangerously reckless, so that all of the informed, truthful, godly persons would fear it.

TRINE IMMERSION

I

Matt. 28: 19, 20 is the text our friends who practice three dips always read and try to prove is elliptical and, hence, should read thus: "Baptizing in the name of the Father, and (baptizing in the name) of the Son, and (baptizing in the name) of the Holy Spirit." But we cannot accept that method of supplying the ellipses. Their first step toward supplying the ellipses is to insist the words "in the name" should be supplied before the Son and the Holy Spirit. The copulative conjunction "and" means "add to," and it does "add to" the name of the Father, the name of the Son, and the name of the Holy Spirit. But our "Dunkard" friends wish to add something else. The whole issue between us is as to how large a load the little conjunction "and" is to carry or draw after it. Our friends say the conjunction reaches still farther back into the preceding phrase, and adds to the second and third members of the sentence the word "baptizing" also; "baptizing in the name of the Father, and (baptizing in the name) of the Son, and (baptizing in the name) of the Holy Spirit." We both agree that in supplying the ellipses (of course there is no word in the Greek for the preposition "of," but I am supposing there is, just for sake of showing they are in error) the words "the name" are to be carried forward; but "Dunkards" go farther, and insist on the word "baptizing" also being carried forward every time. In this way they are in

error. That is incorrect, unreasonable, ungrammatical and unscriptural.

We will now see if examination of other passages of Scripture of similar construction will bear them out in their construction. Luke 9: 26, "For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of Man be ashamed when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels." Here is another elliptical sentence, which they and I would both agree to complete by adding "glory" to the last two phrases, making the conclusion of the verse read, "when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's (glory), and (in the glory) of the holy angels." But their method of supplying the ellipses would give this: "When he shall come in his own glory, and shall come again in his Father's glory, and shall come a third time in the glory of his holy angels." How foolish! If there are three different immersions commanded in the commission there are three different comings, or advents, promised in the verse just quoted. This would be simply foolishness, and no one will accept such interpretation of this text, and I will not accept their silly interpretation of the commission as given by Matthew.

Matt. 23: 1, "Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to his disciples." Did Jesus on this occasion deliver two different discourses: one to the multitude and the other to his disciples? Or did He discourse first to the multitude and afterward repeat the same discourse to his disciples? Is it not more sensible to suppose He made but one speech, which was heard by both at once?

Now turn to Col. 2: 2; " * * to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ." Does this even imply there were three mysteries? We understand by this there is one mystery—the mystery of God (the Father) and of Christ. But the Dunkard's method of reasoning would give us three mysteries; (1) the mystery of God; (2) the mystery of the Father; and (3) yet another

mystery, that of Christ. Nay, more, they would give us three acknowledgments also, and would supply the ellipses so as to make this clause of the verse read, "to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and (to the acknowledgment of the mystery) of the Father, and (to the acknowledgment of the mystery) of Christ." But dear, O dear, who understands language in that manner? No one—except our trine immersionist friends, and they nowhere else except in the commission.

We might continue by reading Num. 4: 1 and Matt. 8: 11, etc., but there is no use using so much space, as we have convicted them of being in error. So we will now notice their grammatical construction of Matt. 28: 19, 20.

The position of the "Dunkards" is that, in an elliptical sentence (like they claim Matt. 28: 19, 20 is) the whole of the first proposition was the model after which that or those connected therewith must be constructed. I wish to spend a little time in spreading before the readers the compound and somewhat complicated sentence constituting the commission. Let us read it: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." This is a compound sentence. One of its clauses (the predicate) is compound. The subject is "ye"—that of which something is affirmed. The predicates are "go" and "teach"; they express what is affirmed of the subject. The object is "nations"; it is that on which the act expressed by the predicate "teach" terminates. The subject "ye" is modified by the participial phrase, "baptizing them." Of this, baptizing is the leader—introducing the phrase; "them" is the subject—following the leader as its object. "Baptizing" is modified by the prepositional phrase, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." In this phrase "in" is the leader; "name" is the subsequent, modified by "the" also modified by prepositional phrases "of the Father," and "of the Son," and "of the Holy Spirit." In each of these

prepositional phrases "of" is the leader, introducing the phrase. In the first, "Father" is the subsequent, modified by "the"; in the second, "Son" is the subsequent, modified by "the"; in the third, "Holy Spirit" is the subsequent, modified by "the." "Nations" is the object, modified by "all." "Therefore" is a conjunction introducing the sentence. "And" is a conjunction, connecting "go" and "teach" on the predicate. In the prepositional phrase, "and" connects "Father" and "Son," and "Son" and "Holy Spirit." I think you who have followed me while analyzing the language of the commission cannot but see that "and" in the first portion of the sentence connects "go" and "teach"; and in the second connects "Father" and "Son," and "Son" and "Holy Spirit," instead of having the effect to bring the modifying phrase "baptizing," etc., down after it again on each occasion. "Dunkards" claim the conjunction "and" does not connect "Father" and "Son" and "Holy Spirit." That, of course, sounds very strange. But what, then, would they say they connect? Why, "baptizing" and "baptizing"; that is, the "baptizing" that is there with the "baptizing" that is *not* there! This exposes their "argument on grammar," as they call it. I have been giving their side, in part, so the reader could get connection and be able to use the argument, as that is why the article was called for. I have also dealt simply with King James' translation.

Baptizo is the Greek word from which we have the word "baptize," and I must now notice it as they try to make us believe it means repeated action. We agree that the word means: to immerse. But they say it not only means: to immerse once, "but to immerse repeatedly." Then there can be no immersion without repeated immersion. How could this be? Try this upon the commission and see how it would sound: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, immersing them *repeatedly* in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." We are referred to the termination "zo," engrafted upon the root "bapto" and

told that in the New Testament "bapto" is never used to express the ordinance of baptism, while "baptizo" is invariably employed. This we are pleased to admit. But when it comes to looking for reason why these different terms are used we are fed upon theories and speculations as unsubstantial as the cold north wind! One man imagines the peculiar termination may have been added to indicate repeated action; another, that it may have some reference to rapidity with which the action was to be performed. But these various suppositions have so slight foundation in fact as to be very unsatisfactory to the learned world, so we cannot have any respect for their argument built on "zo." Clark Braden said "zo" simply referred to "rapidity by which the *one* act is to be performed." Braden mastered fourteen languages, so he claimed, hence should be good authority.

"In the name of the Father," etc. We must now look at the language of the commission as given in Matt. 28: 19, 20. I do not deem there is any special force, and particular addition to the meaning, contained in the words, "name of." It is an idiomatic expression, a form of speaking, common in several ancient languages. The phrase "eis to onoma"—"into the name of the Father"—means nothing more than simply "eis"—"into the Father." "Into" implies relationship; "in" does not. The last clause of the commission means simply "baptizing them into the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit"; no "of" there in the Greek. When persons are placed under water and raised up they are in the Father. But they *cannot* be in the father without being in the Son and in the Holy Spirit. It is simply impossible to baptize persons into the name of the Father without placing them in the Father. But if they are in the Father they are also in his Son and in the Holy Spirit. So the one dip does all God intended should be done.

II

We will notice what some lexicographers say about "baptizo." Examine all Greek lexicons you wish and you will find only four of them—Donnegan, and Liddell and Scott, Groves, etc., whom they quote—intimate the idea of repeated action in the word "baptizo"; others say nothing about it. Testimony of lexicons and learned men is heavily against those who practice trine immersion.

In "Campbell and Rice Debate" fifteen lexicons are quoted; eleven of these say nothing about any idea of repeated action in the word. Liddell & Scott do say "baptizo" means to dip repeatedly. Then when "baptizo" is used with reference to being baptized into the name of the Father, it requires dipping repeatedly into the name of the Father. Baptizing into the Son, if "baptizo" is used, means a dipping several times into the name of the Son; the same with the Holy Spirit. It would require dipping repeatedly into the name of the Holy Spirit. Suppose it means repeated dipping. Is there any more reason for saying three times than twice? Hence, we will dip them twice into the name of the Father, and twice into the name of the Son, and twice into the name of the Holy Spirit, and thus dip the person *six* times! To carry out the idea of those who practice trine immersion it would require dipping *three* times into the name of the Father, three times into the name of the Son, and three times into the name of the Holy Spirit, thus have nine dippings! That rendering given by Liddell & Scott and about two or three other lexicons, out of the several that have been examined, is only a form of meaning, because the word "baptizo" was the word used in washing, and in washing we dip repeatedly. It was with reference to things of that kind the word "dip" was used in giving the translation, unquestionably, not with reference to persons of the Godhead. Greek literature speaks of ships being baptized when they were sunk; they did not have to be sunk repeatedly. When they were submerged they were baptized.

Take it all the way through, you see whenever anything is submerged it is baptized. But inasmuch as the word is applied to washing, where we dip repeatedly (as the hands), the idea of "repeatedly" is fulfilled.

In Matt. 28: 19 it is "name" not "names." In the Greek New Testament the words are "eis to onoma." Those who practice three immersions understand "onoma" is in singular number in the Greek. So when they say "names" they add to the word of God the letter "s", and God says, "Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee and thou be found a liar"! (Prov. 30: 6). The Greek does not say "names", and no one can have it "names" without adding to the word of God, hence, preaching another gospel, which is forbidden by the Lord in Gal. 1: 8, 9. No man can baptize into the name of the Father by one specific act, then into the name of the Son by another specific act, then into the Holy Spirit by a repetition of the same specific act, without separating those names in the three acts and making it "names", thus separating what God joined in one name. This is forbidden in Matt. 19: 6, "What therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." Those who practice three dips are under the condemnation of God as found in Gal. 1: 8, 9.

The three births taught in the Bible. The Scriptures teach there are three kingdoms—the kingdom of nature, of grace, and of glory. These must each be entered by a birth; the kingdom of nature we enter by birth of the flesh; the kingdom of grace by birth of the Spirit; the Kingdom of Glory by birth from the grave (the resurrection). Birth of the Spirit is symbolized by ordinance of baptism, also a type of the resurrection; and in baptism those who practice three dips contend for three immersions—three births. They must also contend for three births of the flesh; that is they must contend three births of the flesh are necessary in order to enter the kingdom of nature; and three resurrections from the dead to enter the Kingdom of Glory. Such must be

the case, or the figure the Lord gave—when he said, “Ye must be born again,” of water and of the Spirit—was not fitting for the purpose to which He applied it.

Washing of regeneration. Paul in his letter to Titus (3: 5) calls baptism “the washing of regeneration”; not “washings”, but “washing.” There is only one washing. Our friends who practice three dips will have to say in this one washing there are *three* washings. If so, then there must be three regenerations; otherwise, there will be two washings without any regenerations connected with them. But we read nowhere of more than one regeneration. I insist on our “friends” telling us which (of the three washings they give their candidates for baptism) is “the washing of regeneration,” also what kind of washings the other two are and what purpose they serve? Under the Law there were “divers washings” (Heb. 9: 10), but, “Christ being come, a high priest of good things to come” has done away with all these things. Do the “three dippers” want to go back to “divers washings” of the Jewish dispensation, and subject themselves to the fearful denunciations launched by the apostle against apostatizing Jews? One “washing” is all God intended his children should have, but “Dunkards” give their children three; that is, they wash their head and shoulders three times and the lower part of the body just receives one washing. If you wash the head and shoulders three times why not wash the back, breast, lower limbs, etc., three times? Where is the scripture that says the head and shoulders should receive three washings and the other members of the body only receive one?

Cast into the mold. We will now call attention to Rom. 6: 17, which we will read according to MacKnight’s translation, “God be thanked, that though ye were the servants of sin, ye have obeyed from the heart (paredothete tupon didachas) that mould of Doctrine into which ye were delivered!” The original word “tupos”, says MacKnight, among other things, signifies a mould into which melted

metals are poured, to receive the form of the pattern after which the mold has been made. But, what is the doctrine? The death, burial and resurrection of Christ. What is the mold? Baptism. See verses 3, 4; let us read them: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death that, like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." I have quoted from the Common Version, but will give MacKnight's comments: "Ye have willingly obeyed the mold of doctrine into which ye were cast at your baptism." The word "mould" you notice is in the singular number; there is, therefore, but one mold, and this is immersion. Our "Dunkard" friends contend for three moulds, three immersions, but the apostle Paul objects.

The metal must be melted before it can be cast into the mold. Suppose, then, our friend "Dunkard" takes a candidate for baptism to the water, all melted down with contrition of heart (like the heated metal), and casts him into the mold—that is, immerses him, in the name of the Father. He then raises him up and takes him out of the mould; now, sir, must you not cool him off and melt him again, before you can cast him in again—cast him in a second time? And if you melt him a second time, of what use was his first casting? Certainly none at all; for when metal, after having once been cast into the mould, is again melted, it assumes the same form it had when first melted; and the third melting has the same effect. There is, however, this result: every time the metal is melted it is thereby rendered harder. The apostle's language in this passage is evidently borrowed from the art of casting metals in molds to make them like the pattern from which the moulds are made. Now, who ever heard of a molder, who wished to make an article like a pattern given, making three moulds; and, pouring his metal in one of these, when it had assumed the form he desired, taking it out, melting it over again, and re-casting it; and,

when it had again hardened into desired shape, melting a third time, and repeating the operation yet again? Yet the practice of our Dunkard friends is parallel with this, in their baptizing by trine immersion.

In 1 Peter 3: 20, 21 salvation of Noah and his family is referred to, and we are informed "the like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us." Now in this type of baptism we have one ark, one flood, one entering-in, one salvation, clearly set forth. In baptism, as performed in the manner for which we contend the analogy is complete; we have one Church, one immersion, one entering-in, one salvation. To conform to the idea of trine immersion there should have been three arks, three floods, three enterings-in, three out-ridings of the flood. With three immersions there is no analogy between type and anti-type.

In Rom. 6: 3, 4 and Col. 2: 12 baptism is compared to a burial; the believer is represented as being "buried with Christ in baptism." But whom do we bury? I answer: those who are dead. And who is raised from the water? The believer is represented as being made alive with Christ, "in the likeness of his resurrection." Now, baptism symbolizing death, burial and resurrection—what idea is conveyed by my opponent's practice of trine immersion? He immerses—buries—his candidate once. He raises him up—but does the subject come up a living man or is he still dead? Is raising a dead man such resurrection as the Scriptures teach? According to the apostle, the believer, after immersion, is not raised, being yet dead; but, being risen with Christ, is "raised from the dead"—that, "like as Christ was raised from the dead, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Now, if you immerse or bury him again, you must either kill him or bury him alive—either of which would be most cruel, and a violation of the laws of God and the land. But the apostle contradicts your foolish practice; for he says (Rom 6: 10), after showing we are buried in baptism in likeness of Christ's death and raised in likeness of His

resurrection, "For in that he died, he died unto sin once," and "in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." Design of baptism is to represent the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. "Dunkards" in baptizing (three times) pervert the ordinance from its purpose, render it inappropriate to its original design, by representing death, burial and resurrection of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

Baptism a planting. In Rom. 6: 5 baptism is compared to a planting. Do men plant seed in the ground once, then take it up; plant it a second time, again take it up; and still a third time plant it? If not, we are not to be "buried in baptism" three times—or else planting is no fitting representation of baptism. We are said to be *planted in likeness of Christ's death*. Did he die three times? If Christ died but once, trine immersion bears no resemblance to Christ's death!

Baptism of the Children of Israel (1 Cor. 10: 1, 2). They were all under the cloud. Did they all come out from under the cloud and pass through the sea; and, having passed through, were they again immersed in the cloud, and so on, alternately, until they had all been immersed three times in the cloud and in the sea? If so, it must have been a most extraordinary and tedious proceeding. But what are the facts of this baptism? Why, while under the cloud, they passed through the sea; and by the cloud and the sea were enveloped, immersed *once*, and so passed over: as we are once immersed into Jesus Christ in the true gospel baptism.

WILL THE BODIES OF THE WICKED BE IMMORTAL?

Some have supposed that the bodies of the wicked would not be immortal. Such persons have either to take the position the Russellites take—that the wicked will be raised from the dead, then die again as brutes and there be nothing to be punished; or, second, that the bodies of the wicked will not be raised at all which is the Christadelphian idea; or, third, that their bodies will be raised, then die the second time (just as a brute), and the “inner man” be punished.

One says the wicked is not promised immortality, without any qualifying terms whatever. I suppose he will admit the wicked will suffer eternally; and, if so, the “inner man” is and will be immortal. But I will appeal to the word of God.

The word “mortal” means “subject to death”; while the word “immortal” means “undying; everlasting; imperishable.” All now understand just what we mean by the use of these two words.

All to be judged. “Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the *world* in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead. And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked: and others said, We will hear thee again of this matter” (Acts 17: 31, 32. In connection with this scripture read Isa. 45: 22, 23; Rom. 14: 10-12; Philip. 2: 10, 11; 2 Cor. 5: 10, 11.) There will be no controversy at this point except with the Universalists and Christadelphians.

Wicked to be punished. “To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life: but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness: indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon *every* soul of man

that doeth evil,—of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile; but glory, honor and peace to every man that worketh good,—to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile: for there is no respect of persons with God” (Rom. 2: 7-11). “Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power,” etc. (2 Thess. 1: 6-10. Read 1 Sam. 2: 9, 10; Matt. 10: 28; 25: 31-46; Mark 9: 43, 44; 2 Peter 3: 7-10; Rev. 20: 12-15.) The word “destruction” in 2 Thess. 1: 9 is from the Greek word “olethros,” and means “fatal”. The idea is that they shall suffer a fate that is eternal. It is to be a fatal destruction. It is also found in 1 Cor. 5: 5, “for the destruction of the flesh.” The body of the wicked can and will suffer that eternal fate. (See 1 Thess. 5: 3; 2 Thess. 1: 9 and 1 Tim. 6: 9.)

The Wicked will be raised. “Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out her dead” (Isa. 26: 19). “Thy dead” refers to the world. “My dead” refers to those who belong to God. Both are to “arise.” “And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.” (Dan 12: 2.) The body of the wicked, remember, will be raised to “everlasting contempt.” The righteous, after the resurrection, cannot “despise” and “scorn” the wicked; that would destroy the very meaning of Heaven. There can be no “contemning” in Heaven. But the wicked are to be raised to “shame and everlasting contempt,” which simply refers to their “sorry,” “pitiful” condition. They will “scorn” themselves because of their condition, as a re-

sult of their "mean," "haughty" past lives. I wish you to remember that all this refers to that which will come out of the "dust of the earth" where it has been "sleeping."

Now we are ready to read John 5: 28, 29: "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." I will call attention to the fact that it is the body that is raised to everlasting "damnation."

But some one says that word "damnation" should be translated "judgment." All right, have it "judgment" if you wish. It is to be *everlasting*, hence proof the body is to be living. No getting around this. If there is to be a resurrection of the bodies of the wicked, those bodies will live. It is to be an "everlasting" damnation (or judgment), according to Daniel. We will prove this by the apostle John, too, soon. If we admit the wicked will be raised, we admit their dead bodies will live.

Now let some one show a scripture that will even hint that they will die a second physical death. Come on, give us the text. If we prove their bodies will be quickened or made alive in the resurrection, then we are compelled to leave them in life unless we can find the text that says they will die a second physical death. Come on, give us the text that says they will die such a death after the resurrection.

We will now read Acts 24: 15: "And have hope toward God, which they themselves allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the *just* and *unjust*." So the question is settled. There will be a resurrection of the "unjust" as well as the "just."

Now we will read Rev. 20: 12-15, "And I saw the dead, *small* and *great*, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the Book of Life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And

the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell (hades) delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged, every man according to their works. And death and hell (hades) were cast into the lake of fire. *This* is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the Book of Life was cast into the lake of fire." There—the bodies of the wicked are in "the lake of fire." Get them out if you can, and have them die a second physical death.

If you can find some one not in death, nor in the grave, nor in the sea, nor in hades, then you may find some one that will not be in the Resurrection—will not be made alive. Now let some one show that these bodies of the wicked will die a second physical death. I now have them living; you kill them—if you can. I admit they will die in the "second death", but John says that is in "the lake of fire", and affirms that those in the "lake of fire" will be "*tormented* day and night forever and ever." So we prove by John that it is "everlasting", just as I told you I would. That which was in the grave, in the sea, in *death* was made alive, was in the Judgment, and then "cast into the lake of fire. *This* (being cast into the lake of fire) is the second death." You can't "torment" the unconscious dead, hence those bodies are alive in Hell.

Now we will ask you to read Rev. 21: 8, and there John says the wicked "shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." I only read this to prove what the "second death" of the wicked is. Adventists and Russellites claim it is a physical death of the body. Not so; the body and spirit are again united, just as it is with the righteous; and the "second death" is in the "lake of fire"—in Hell—a separation from God!

Now we will read Matt. 10: 28, "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and *body* in hell." We have already learned that that which is in the

“lake of fire” (Hell) will be conscious—will be alive, hence immortal; and here Jesus Christ says the body, as well as the soul, may be in Hell. By reading Matt. 8: 12 and 13: 50 we learn there will be “weeping,” “wailing” and “gnashing of teeth” in the “furnace of fire”—in Hell. So we have positive proof that that which is in Hell will be alive, hence immortal: and Jesus says that “both soul and *body*” may be cast into Hell. The argument is clinched!

I hardly think the soul, the “inner man,” has “teeth” when separated from the body. Jesus says they who are in Hell have “teeth,” and will “gnash” them, “weep” and “wail.”

Now we will read Mark 9: 43, 44, “And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than, having two hands, to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.”

The figure cannot be greater than that it represents, I believe, then, this teaches eternal suffering in Hell. But it represents the body, as well as the soul, as being in Hell; hence agrees with Matt. 10: 28.

CONSCIENCE

I

There is no subject discussed by sects, perhaps, more than the subject of conscience, and as little understood. In fact, but few have the first idea of its meaning. But few know what they are talking about when they talk about conscience (feelings) being a safe guide. It has been made a test of fellowship by those who know not its meaning.

"Conscience" is a combination of two words: "Con" and "science." "Con" of course means "against," but not always. When we speak of arguments "pro and con" we mean "in favor of" and "against," "con" meaning against. But as a prefix before the word "science" it means "knowledge." Dr. Groves says in his Greek-English dictionary that "con" is "a preposition governing the dative case; with, along with, in company with, together with, with the aid of. In composition it is sometimes intensive." Webster gives as one of the meanings of "con": "to know, to understand." So the word "con as a prefix to "science" means "knowledge." "Science" also means knowledge," but means "knowledge systematically arranged."

Science. (1) Knowledge, penetrating and comprehensive information, skill, expertness, and the like. (2) The comprehension and understanding of truth or fact; investigation of truth for its own sake; pursuant of pure knowledge. (3) Truth ascertained; that which is known. (4) Hence, specifically, knowledge duly arranged, and referred to general truths and principles on which it is founded, and from which it is derived; a branch of learning considered as having a certain completeness; philosophical knowledge; profound knowledge; complete knowledge; true knowledge.—Webster.

Dr. Buck says in his *Theological Dictionary*: "*Conscience*

signifies knowledge in conjunction; that is, in conjunction with the fact to which it is a witness, as the eye is to the action done before it; or, as South observes, it is a double or joint knowledge, namely, one of a divine law or rule, and the other of a man's own action. It may be defined to be the judgement which a man passes on the morality of his actions as to their purity or turpitude; or the secret testimony of the soul, whereby it approves things that are good, and condemns those that are evil. * * * A right conscience is that which decides aright, or, according to the only rule of rectitude, the law of God. This is also called a well-informed conscience, which in all its decisions proceeds upon the most evident principles of truth. * * * An ignorant conscience is that which may declare right, but, as it were, by chance, and without any just ground to build on. An erroneous conscience is a conscience mistaken in its decision about the nature of actions. A doubting conscience is a conscience unresolved about the nature of actions; on account of the equal or nearly equal probabilities which appear for and against each side of the question.

Of an evil conscience there are several kinds. Conscience, in regard to actions in general is evil when it has lost more or less the sense it ought to have of the natural distinctions of moral good and evil: This is a polluted or defiled conscience. Conscience is evil in itself when it gives either none or a false testimony as to past actions: when reflecting upon wickedness it feels no pain, it is evil; and said to be seared or hardened (1 Tim. 4: 2). It is also evil when during the commission of sin it lies quiet. In regard to future actions, conscience is evil if it does not startle at the proposal of sin, or connives at the commission of it.

For the right management of conscience, we should, (1) Endeavor to obtain acquaintance with the law of God, and with our own tempers and lives, and frequently compare them together. (2) Furnish conscience with general principles of the most extensive nature and strongest influence;

such as the supreme love of God; love to our neighbor as ourselves; and that the care of our souls is of the greatest importance."

With these definitions of the word "conscience" all can understand that it is a creature of education. Dr. Buck, in his *Theological Dictionary*, makes that plain. He insists God's word should be the educator, too, which is right. But we also learn there can be no such thing as "Christian Science" when we study the meaning of these words and then look at the meaning of the word "Christian." You can not spell "Christian" without spelling "Christ"; "ian" added to "Christ" spells "Christian." What does "ian" mean? It means "related to," hence "Christ-like," one "like Christ," a "Christian." But can that which is related to Christ in this sense be "science"? It can not. (See the definition of "science" given above.) Think of God having an *accumulated* knowledge! Think of God, who is all-wise, becoming skilled in a certain branch or branches! Think of God, who is all-wise, having a "knowledge duly arranged," arranged by some one else His superior! He, God, learned that which had been "duly arranged" and founded by some one else! He, God, studied this "branch of learning" until He became *science* in said branch or branches! He, God, now has "philosophical knowledge; profound knowledge; complete knowledge; true knowledge," and, hence, we have *Christian Science* (?) in the world! We now see there can be no such thing as "Christian Science," but I wish to go just a little further with this thought.

Literature, art and knowledge are synonymous terms, and "science," "literature" and "art" are connected and given by Webster as synonymous. God and Christ never attended any schools and studied "art" etc., until they became *science* in said studies. Science usually denotes systematic and orderly arrangement of knowledge. In a more distinctive sense, science embraces those branches of knowledge of which the subject matter is either ultimate principles or

facts explained by principles or laws thus arranged in natural order. Both science and art investigate truth, but science inquires for the sake of knowledge, art for the sake of production; and hence science is more concerned with higher truths, art with the low; science never engages, like art, in productive application. The most perfect state of science, therefore, will be the most high and accurate inquiry. Science is not perfection; it is continually inquiring for higher and better knowledge. God is not a god of science. He is not seeking for more and better knowledge. God is not the pupil, but the teacher. God is all-wise, and there can, therefore, be no such thing as "Christian Science." Since "con" means "knowledge," and "science" is seeking for a more thorough knowledge, we can see that "Con-Science" means a pupil in school all the time, if we are desirous of *knowing* God. "*Conscience*" never graduates. It is always in school seeking more knowledge.

Now, I think we have a pretty good idea of the meaning of the word "conscience" and also understand there can be no such thing as "Christian Science," hence we are ready for another thought.

II

Since defining the word "conscience" in my other article, I will now turn to the Scriptures and prove, not only the definition but that conscience is not a safe guide unless educated in the word of God.

Conscience is knowledge. "Howbeit there is not in every man that *knowledge*: for some with *conscience* of the idol unto this hour eat it as a thing offered unto an idol; and their conscience being weak is defiled" (1 Corinthians 8: 7). "For then would they not have ceased to be offered? Because that the worshipers once purged should have no more *conscience of sin.*" (Hebrews 10: 2). In these two passages of scripture we are told by Paul that conscience and knowledge go together. Conscience is knowledge of either the

idol, the word of God, etc. Their conscience of the idol and ignorance of the teaching of the apostles led them to worship the idol and hence, their *weak* conscience was defiled. They needed to be educated in the school of Christ and the Apostles. In Titus 1: 15, Paul says: "Unto the pure all things are pure: but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even their *mind and conscience* is defiled."

Not only do we learn the *conscience* can be defiled, but we learn the "mind and conscience" are coupled by the conjunction "and," which shows the mind (knowledge) is the conscience, hence men speak of "feelings" as their conscience. Most people seem to want to be led by their conscience (feelings), forgetting (if they ever knew it) conscience led these persons to worship idols and, hence, their "mind and conscience" was defiled.

Conscience convicts of sin—"Which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." (Romans 2: 15). Their "conscience" would "bear witness" and their "thoughts" would "accuse" or else "excuse." The "thoughts" and "conscience" work together and, hence, would convict of sin. It would also excuse from sin. It must be educated. "And they which heard it, being *convicted* by their own *conscience*, went out one by one," etc. (John 8:9. Read verses 1-9.) These persons were convicted of sin by their conscience, but were not thus convicted until Jesus preached that short discourse unto them. Jesus said: "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her." This was the sermon that caused their conscience to convict them. This was the *teaching* that informed them of His knowledge of *their* sins, hence they all went out and left him alone. Their conscience was educated.

The conscience of women, part of them, in India caused them to feed their little babes to fish of the sea. They "felt

good" when they saw only a bloody streak in the water as a result of their conscience causing them to try to satisfy an angry god. What made them "feel good" when they fed their darling babes to the large fish? Because they *believed* their god to be angry at them and that he required that sacrifice. But what made them believe that? Their teachers. Our feelings are always the result of our beliefs, and our beliefs the result of our teachings. Their teachings were wrong, hence their faith was wrong, therefore their conscience (feelings) was leading them to commit an awful sin.

When Joseph was sold down into Egypt, the other eleven boys took the coat of many colors and stained it with the blood of an animal, took it home and told their old father a wild beast had killed his boy and their brother. The father (Jacob) believed it, hence felt like his boy was dead. He wept for a long time, *feeling* like his boy was dead. His conscience caused him to weep and be sad. Why all this? Simply because he *believed* what his boys told him. And there was the coat, and blood on it, hence the evidence or teaching that caused him to believe, and his belief caused him to feel like his boy was dead.

A lie told and believed will make the same impression the truth told and believed will make. It all depends on *believing* what you see, read or hear. Jacob's conscience caused him to believe a lie, simply because it had been schooled by lying boys. If I preach a falsehood and you believe it and obey it, you will "feel good" and, perhaps, shout and say you were "saved" and "know" it, for you feel it within. Your conscience would tell you you had obeyed the right thing, when you would have obeyed a falsehood.

Parents would pass their children through fire to their god Baal (Jeremiah 19): "to burn their sons with fire for burnt offerings unto Baal," etc. They burnt their children as burnt offerings and *felt* they were doing right. But what would make them feel it was right to burn their dear little children? Simply because they *believed* their teachers

(preachers) and *felt* they must obey. Their teachings were false, which caused a false faith or belief, and their feelings (conscience) were the result of their false belief. Their conscience told them to burn their sons as burnt offerings unto Baal, but did their conscience lead them aright? Everybody knows better, yet thousands will cry, "Let your conscience lead you!" and "I know I am right for I feel it within me. My conscience tells me I am right!" Allow the Bible to be the educator and the faith or belief will then be right, and belief being right the conscience will be right. If I could make you believe the moment you counted ten your sins would be forgiven, you would count ten and then shout, "My sins are all forgiven! I know, for I *feel* it within me! My conscience tells me I am saved!" Your feelings would be the result of your belief. I made you *believe* if you would count ten your sins would be forgiven, hence you *feel* like God has saved you.

Saul (Paul) made havoc of the church of God, and murdered the first martyr for Christ (Stephen), and said he did it with "all good conscience before God" (Acts 23: 1). Paul's conscience led him to murder God's servant (Acts 7: 54-60) and *feel* he was doing God's service. Paul, remember, was a religious man, and thought he was doing the will of God while he was being led by his conscience; but he was, nevertheless, serving the devil and displeasing God.

We have many conscientious men and women in the world today *feeling* they are doing the will of God. I believe there are many conscientious men and women in the Roman Catholic and Mormon churches who feel they are doing the will of God, but their feelings are the result of their beliefs and their beliefs the results of false teachings of such men as the popes and Joseph Smith. No doubt many a good woman has consented for her husband to practice polygamy as taught by Joseph Smith and did it with all good conscience; but her conscience had been educated in the school of Smith instead of Christ—she heard and believed a falsehood.

III

This false idea of allowing the conscience to be the guide, independent of God's word, is one of the "strong (?) arguments (?)" against the teaching of Christ in John 3: 5. Their conscience tells them they are saved, baptism or no. Since the hardest fight is usually made against John 3: 5, I will pay some attention to that scripture. They usually tell us the word "and" (in John 3: 5) is from the Greek "kai" and should be translated "even" and should read "water *even* the Spirit." That "kai" is sometimes translated "even" I will admit, but very often where it is translated "even" it should have been translated "and," as in Matthew 21: 5, 7. But I know of no translation translating it "even" in John 3: 5.

A few translations of John 3: 5. "Jesus replied, Truly indeed I say to thee, if any one be not born of Water and Spirit, he can not enter the kingdom of God."—Emphatic Diaglott.

"Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except one be born of water and Spirit, he can not enter the kingdom of God."—American Standard Version.

"Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."—Revised Version.

"Answered Jesus, Verily, verily, I say to thee, unless anyone be born of water and of Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God."—New Testament Interlinear.

"Jesus answered, Verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."—Cottage Bible.

"Jesus answered, truly, truly, I say unto thee, unless one be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."—Translation of the Gospels by Norton.

"Jesus answered: Verily, verily, I say to you, unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."—Anderson's Translation.

"In most solemn truth I tell you, replied Jesus, that unless a man is born of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the Kingdom of God."—Modern Speech New Testament.

"Believe me, Jesus answered, unless a man owes his birth to water and Spirit, he can not enter the kingdom of God."—The 20th Century New Testament.

"Jesus answered: Verily, verily, I say to thee, except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."—American Bible Union Translation.

Here are ten translations against the idea of "and" ("kai") being "even" in John 3: 5. You notice I have not quoted, in the catalogue above, King James translation, which has it "and" and all others, instead of "even." So we see scholars can not and dare not translate it "even" in John 3: 5. You will notice the word "of" just before "Spirit" is in italics, which shows it is not in the Greek. The word "of" just before "Spirit" in John 3: 5 is not in the original at all, and translators put it in italics so everybody could know they supplied the word. If the word "of" is left out, as it should be and is in most translations quoted above, the idea is clearly before us, that the *being born of water and the Spirit constitutes one birth, one, and one only.*

"And" is a conjunction. Our friends who try to explain away the Savior's meaning in John 3: 5 will admit "and" is a conjunction, hence we can agree on one point. "And" is a conjunction connective, or conjoining word. It signifies a word or part of a sentence is to be added to what precedes. Thus, give me an apple *and* an orange; that is, give me an apple, *add*, or give in addition to that, an orange. This being true, "born of the water and the Spirit" could not be rendered "born of the water *even* Spirit," for that would imply, as our Baptist friends say, that the water was the Spirit and the Spirit the water.

The word "even" means "to be equal," and that is the sense in which our friends usually use it, but misapply the whole thing. The conjunction "and" signifies a word or part

of a sentence is to be *added* to what precedes. "Spirit" is that which is to be *added*, hence not the same substance. The Spirit is to be added to the water. That is, men are begotten by the Spirit. But a begetting of a child amounts to nothing, so far as life in a new state is concerned, without a bringing forth or birth, hence the begetting can not be counted in, or as a part of, the birth when there is no birth, and that is why water is mentioned first. Just as well say that when I say, "Give me an apple *and* an orange" I mean give me an apple *even* an orange! Thus our Baptist and other sectarian friends would say an "apple" is an "orange." Shame on them! But if an apple were an orange, and an orange an apple, what would be the use of me saying, "Give me an apple, even an orange"? That would be useless repetition. The same is true with John 3: 5: if water is spirit and spirit is water, it would be useless repetition of the word "Spirit" to say, "except you are born of the Spirit Spirit." You can now see why it is *never* rendered—"except you are born of the water *even* Spirit."

"*That born of water is water.*" They often tell us "like begets like," therefore those born of water are water. All right, I accept their own argument just for argument's sake, and turn it against them and in our favor. If their argument is true, that that which is born of water is water, then it is likewise true that that which is born of the Spirit would be Spirit. But a spirit has neither flesh nor bones (Luke 24: 39), therefore Baptists and others lose their flesh and bones when they are born of the water *even* Spirit, for "like begets like," hence when they are born of the Spirit they become spirit, and spirits have neither flesh nor bones! That which proves too much fails to prove anything.

But if they say it is the spirit of man *only* that is born of the Spirit, then they lose their argument, for a spirit could not become a spirit any more than water could become water or watery. A spirit could not become a spirit any more than water could become water, therefore their argu-

ments on this fail them and prove men can and do become "new creatures" by birth of "water and the Spirit," and without this birth Jesus says they *can not enter into the kingdom of God*. These are words of Jesus, remember.

They sometimes quote: "God is a fountain of living water." God, then, is the "water" men are born of, and know it "because their conscience tells them so." *They feel it!* We will use their own argument again. They say, "that which is born of water is water"; then they say men are born of God, which is the living water.

1. That which is born of God would be God.—Baptist.

2. All Baptists are born of God.—Baptist.

3. Therefore all Baptists are gods.—Roberts.

This is the only conclusion I could reach from their premises. But this Baptist doctrine makes God contradict himself, for He says, "I am God, and beside me there is none else."

The Greek word "kai" occurs thirty times in John 3rd chapter, and is translated "and" twenty-nine times. In the 23rd verse "kai" is translated "also." Out of thirty occurrences of the word in that one chapter it is not translated "even" a single time. It is translated "and" every time, except in the 23rd verse where it is translated "also." "Kai" occurs in the Commission given by the writers of the first four books of the New Testament, and is translated by the word "and" every time. We have the conjunction "kai" in Acts 2: 38 joining baptism and repentance, thus making baptism just as necessary as repentance. Baptism, according to Acts 2: 38, is to be *added* to repentance, that their sins may be forgiven. In John 3: 5 it is the same, that is, "be born of the water and the Spirit" means we should *believe* and be *baptized*. Belief is the begetting (birth), as may be seen by reading 1st John 5: 1; James 1: 18; 1st Peter 1: 23; 1st Corinthians 4: 15; Titus 3: 5; Mark 16: 16. So the conscience will only lead you aright when you have heard and obeyed these and other scriptures. The feelings will then

be exactly right, hence you will not be led to commit murder, worship idols, etc., as others who have been led by conscience independent of the teachings of God.

God's word produces faith (Romans 10: 17; John 17: 20; Acts 15: 7) in the heart which causes us to feel right and go forward in obedience to His word, be immersed and do all other things He requires. Any other teacher is false, hence the faith or belief will be wrong and the feelings deceive us. Our conscience can only lead aright when educated by God's word. We will obey John 3: 5 when educated by this one great teacher (the Bible) for we will understand we can not enter into the Kingdom of God without a birth of water and the Spirit. "Water" is a common noun, and "Spirit" is a proper noun. Proper and common nouns are never *even*, you know. Grammar will not allow "kai" translated "even" in John 3: 5. No man can grammatically or logically translate "kai" "even" when it stands between a common and a proper noun. A little Baptist girl in the 8th grade would know this much. But I believe now all who have followed this serial can understand what "conscience" is and how it may be a safe guide. When conscience is guided wholly by God's word it will then guide you aright.

CHRISTIANS ARE GOD'S POEMS

It has been said that our "life is an open book, known and read of all men"; and there is truth in the statement. In Eph. 2: 10 Paul says: "For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Notice the location—"In Christ Jesus." A good place to live, don't you think? Are *you* living there? If not, why not? Do you object to the place—the location—in Christ Jesus? If so, why?

You notice those "in Christ Jesus" are the "workmanship" of God. The word "workmanship" is from the Greek word "payeema" and means "a work," "a poem." So when Paul declared that we are God's workmanship—literally God's poems—he made use of a daring and astonishing figure. Man is not merely something God has made, he is the very word of God. And more: as poetry is speech at its uppermost, a Christian life is therefore, the most lyrical utterance of God. Our life should be the best sermon preached in the community where we live. It makes no difference how much truth and Gospel we may preach and teach if we don't *live it*, it will make but little impression on others.

A Christian life, then, is worth living if there were no punishments and happiness in the future. It makes better homes, schools, etc., for us in this life. Yes, our lives are the utterances of God; for we are God's poems, so Paul affirms.

The Deity as a poet! What a revelation it is, what a revelation of God himself! If a Christian be God's poem, as Paul affirms, the Godhead stands revealed in a Christian heart. Men are reading this poem of God; and, hence, we should never allow the print to be blurred nor the pages soiled.

A poem, not a history. We are all certainly glad of that.

For a history has only one tense—the past. It knows no future. It is a something that is done. It is a tale that is told. It is neither present nor future. There are too many of us who look only backward. We are not looking to the future, I fear, as we should. We talk about the history of Christ, and we should; but we don't want a Christ in history only. We need the Christ today and tomorrow. We don't want to think of Him in history only. We want also to think of the living Christ.

The past alone cannot feed us. The manna of the wilderness cannot satisfy the hungers of today. We are, of course, glad it fell, but it cannot feed the starving ones now living. We are glad for the pillar of fire by night and the pillar of cloud by day, that guided Israel. They needed such a guide, but that cannot lead us in the way God would have us travel today. We need a guide now. We need some one to go before us and lead us. Christ, in His word, will do that.

We are glad Moses led the children of Israel. That was many years in the past, and he is not the leader we need today. Let us follow Christ. He is our living guide.

A poem is not only truth, but truth touched by the imagination. When you read good poetry you can imagine the stature, ability, style, etc., of the author. When men read the poem of God in your life they can imagine the author as being the creator of man, and, hence, all-powerful and all-wise. They can also imagine the home where the author lives as being happy and very beautiful, then wish to go there.

A poem is beauty. "Beauty" is another meaning of the word. The beauty may not be in the thought. The beauty may be in the words that clothe the thought, or it may be in both. But beauty there must be! Too little, far too little we make of beauty. It is fundamental. It is a necessity of life. What is more beautiful than a good clean character and a pure Christian life? Tell me, if you know. That Christian life is a beautiful poem of God. Only those who have been

"created in Christ Jesus" are the poems of God, and these poems are most beautiful.

There is no beauty in sin! Sin looks to the future for nothing pleasant or beautiful; hopes for nothing, expects nothing but the darkness and blackness of one eternal night of misery and torment. Righteousness looks to the future for beautiful, peaceful, happy rest and companionship with the Author of the poem Paul mentions in Eph. 2: 10. Certainly beauty there must be! Do away with the beauty and you do away with the poem.

The historian does not reveal himself in his history, the philosopher does not reveal himself in his philosophy, the logician does not reveal himself in his logic; not even does the novelist reveal himself in his novel; but the poet in his poems reveals his innermost soul. God has revealed himself (his innermost soul, Matt. 12: 18) in the poem (Christian life) He has written (created), and we should see to it that the world has an opportunity to read it. If we fail to live up to the requirements of the Author of the poem, the sinner who tries to read will, perhaps, become disgusted because we have either added to or taken from the poem until the sense and meaning is destroyed, and no enlightenment is there for the poor soul.

We must remember God is doing his work through us; that is, we are His agents, and must do the work He has assigned us or it may not be done. Our tongue, hands and feet must do the work as He has intended.

Christ has no hands but our hands
To do His work today,
He has no feet but our feet
To lead men in His way.
He has no tongue but our tongue
To tell men how He died,
He has no help but our help,
To bring them to His side.

We are the only Bible
The careless world will read,
We are the sinner's gospel
We are the scoffer's creed.
We are the Lord's last message
Given in deed and word,
What if the type is crooked?
What if the print is blurred?

What if our hands are busy
With other work than His?
What if our feet are walking
Where Sin's allurements is?
What if our tongues are speaking
Of things His lips would spurn?
How can we hope to help Him
And welcome His return?

We should allow our hands, feet and tongues to assist sinners in reading God's poems, and we cannot do that by going to and assisting picture shows and other questionable places. "If our feet are walking where sin's allurements is" we are causing the "type to be crooked" and the "print to be blurred."

“FOR WHAT IS YOUR LIFE?”

In James 4: 14 we read: “For what is your life?” (I will give you the rest of the verse later.) This is a question each should consider with some seriousness. I will not try to do something I know I cannot do, hence will not try to define “life.” I will not ask you to do something I know you cannot do, therefore will not ask you to define “life” for me. In man we understand “life” is that state of being in which soul and body are united; in a general sense, that state of animals and plants, or of organized being in which its natural functions and motions are performed, or in which its organs are capable of performing its functions. A tree is not destitute of life in winter, when functions of its organs are suspended; nor man during a swoon or syncope; nor, strictly, birds, quadrupeds, or serpents, during their torpitude in winter. They are not strictly dead till functions of their organs are incapable of being renewed. In a tree there is life so long as the functions are active. But when it is cut down we call it “wood”; it is no longer a tree. In man there is “life” so long as soul and body are united, but after the separation it is no longer a man, it is a “corpse.” But I cannot define life and will not try. Webster has helped us a little, but not enough to pay us for quoting much from him.

“Death,” of course, means “separation,” hence “the body without the spirit is dead” (James 2: 26.) But spirits cannot die, hence here is a part of man that never dies. This (spirit) is a life that continues after the death of the body.

But when did the body receive the life, or spirit, that never dies? (Answer)—“And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of *life* (lives); and man became a living soul” (Gen. 2: 7). Here, then, is where that life that never dies was placed in the frame (body) made from the dust of the ground. God said, “Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt

thou return" (Gen. 3: 19). But is there nothing of us but dust? Yes, the life (spirit) within us is not dust (See Matt. 10: 28; 1 Thess. 5: 23; 2 Cor. 4: 16; Eph. 3: 16). What, then, becomes of the spirit? Let the Bible answer again: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it" (Eccl. 12: 7). So that settles that question. The body dies and returns to the earth, but the spirit does not die; it returns to God who gave it. Then there are at least two lives: the life of the body (very short), and the life of the soul, spirit or "inner man" (eternal). The Hebrew for "life" in Gen. 2: 7 is "lives" (plural). God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of *lives*." There and then life was given the body. That placed within the body gave life to the body. One life is very short, the other never-ending, eternal. Here is something God did for man he did not do for any lower animals. Not once is it said God breathed into their nostrils the breath of *lives*. Why? Simply because this "inner man" that never dies is that part of us made "in the image of God" and after the likeness of God, hence has "dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth" (Gen. 1: 26-28.) It is that within our bodies that can control the king of beasts (lion). The flesh can't do that. They are flesh as well as our bodies, and they have strength, yet they fear us. The strongest beast has been tamed by mankind. We are all animals in the sense that we are flesh and bones, but there is something within this flesh of ours not within the flesh of lower animals, hence we have *dominion* over *all* animals. It is the "inner man," made in the image of God, that has that power. Our flesh (body) is very, very weak when compared with the horse, cow, bear, elephant, lion, etc., yet we can tame them. It is the eternal within us. The flesh is too weak.

Then there is the life of the body and the life of the "inner man" to be considered. Which, brother, are you most interested in? Do you give more time and attention to the body

(which is only here a few days at most) than you do to the spirit and soul which will never die? Are you laboring harder for the salvation of the body than you are for the salvation of the soul? In Job 2: 4 we read: "And Satan answered the Lord, and said, Skin for skin, yea, all that man hath will he give for his *life*." The devil told the truth here, if never before or since. "All that a man hath will he give for his life," the life of the flesh (body) of course. We would sacrifice the last dollar we have, and leave our wife and children on the mercies of people, for *just one more year* of this earth-life. Our wife and children would willingly see it all go if it would keep us alive so we could all be in each other's fond embrace *just one more year*. Here is not only the love we have one for the other manifested, but also love and desire we have for life—the life of the body. I am glad it is this way.

But why not have as much love and desire for the life of the soul, of the "inner man"? Why not spend as much time and money for salvation of the soul from hell as you do to save the body from death? We have learned one is from the earth and the other from God; that one must and will return to earth and the other to God. The body will be brought forth in the resurrection and the "inner man" will be in the Judgment and may hear it said, "Depart, I know you not"! Our *life* is "more than meat, and the body than raiment" (Matt. 6: 25). But the "meat" and "raiment" are about all many think about. Men, generally, don't seem to realize the soul needs spiritual meat and raiment. Let us feed and clothe the "inner man" as well as the body. Jesus says, "Man shall not live by bread alone" (Matt. 4: 4). In Luke 12: 15 He says, "for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things he possesseth." So many seem to think their life does consist in the things they possess, hence work themselves almost to death trying to be possessors of houses, lands, large bank accounts, etc., and do nothing for their souls. Of course if they are successful in a

financial way they will get to themselves great names and have lots of friends—in this life; but if they do all this to the exclusion of the teaching of God's word concerning *obedience*, they may die like "the rich man" and lift up their eyes in hell, being in torments. (Luke 16: 19-31.) O my God, let me die like Lazarus, with the dogs licking my sores, and awake in Abraham's bosom (in comfort and rest), rather than die like "the rich man" and lift up my eyes in hell!

Brethren and friends, we cannot afford to live for this life only. We must make a few deposits in Heaven's bank. In Acts 20: 24 we read: "But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God." The persecution, opposition, poverty, etc., did not move Paul from the Truth nor keep him from doing his duty. He would say, "neither count I my life dear unto myself," when speaking of the life of the body. But that is the life dearest to most of mankind, hence they give no attention to the spiritual life. This life, brother, does not amount to much when compared with the life beyond the grave. If I am a Christian, and the enemy of Christianity kills me tomorrow, he will only rob me of a few days of this life; I will have more days of life eternal to enjoy. That sweet, blessed, peaceful life, where angels live and purified spirits dwell, can only be enjoyed by those who prepare for it while in this life. Brother, sister, *what is your life?* Is it all for things of this world? or is it "hid with Christ in God"?

When Paul was contemplating a missionary trip to Jerusalem his dear brethren that loved him, knowing the Jews were lying in wait for him that they might bind him and turn him over to the Romans to be killed, pleaded with him not to go. They were weeping and begging him not to go, but Paul replied, "What mean ye, to weep and to break mine

heart? For I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 21: 13.) O my soul, think of the heart-bleedings and weepings of some children of God, amid it all they can say, "I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die * * * for the name of the Lord Jesus." "Neither count I my life dear unto myself." Praise God for such faith!

It is not all of death to die nor all of life to live. There is life and death beyond the grave. Which will be yours, dear reader, if you die as you are living just now? *Just now* could you say, "Come, welcome death, I'll gladly go with thee"? The "death" beyond the grave is separation from God; a home in torment, in hell (Rev. 20: 14, 15). The "life" is an eternal home in Heaven. Don't you want that life? I do.

In Gal. 2: 20 we read: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Some very touching scenes in the life of Paul, yet there is a bright side to it all. "Behind the clouds the sun is still shining," hence Paul could say, "The life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God." We are going to put off the flesh tomorrow, and O what weeping, what pleading, what gnashing of teeth (Matt. 13: 42) there will be in the morning, if the life we have lived in the flesh has not been lived by the faith of the son of God! Brother, sister, friend,—that is the life we should want to live and *must* live if we have a home in Heaven where we can enjoy eternal life God has for his own.

It is nice to go visiting on Lord's day, and have good visits, eat good dinners, play games, etc., go to shows, laugh at the wit of the clown and the dancing ladies' (?) high kicking, go to the Sunday baseball game or ride the Sunday excursion; get in the automobile, drive several miles to some city and spend Sunday in the parks and behold the many

beautiful things and attractive sceneries so far as *this life* is concerned. *But what about the life beyond the Cold Stream of Death? Had you thought about that, dear reader?*

It is not all of life to live nor all of death to die. Your "pastor" may tell you it is "all right" to do many or all the things mentioned above, *but what will the Lord say about it?* is the question to ask yourself.

In Col. 3: 3 we read: "for ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." Here, then, is the life we should desire. A life "hid with Christ in God" will not do any of the things mentioned above. It will not curse, defraud, forsake the assembly, cast a stumbling-block in a brother's way, and I doubt it having any tobacco juice on its shirt bosom or one end of a cigarette or cigar in the mouth, fire on the other end and smoke boiling out of the nose. The life we now live in the flesh should be lived by the faith of the Son of God. May our lives ever be *hid with Christ in God.*

II

We should ever keep this question before us: Is the life I am now living pleasing the Lord or is it pleasing Satan?

Either God or Satan is being pleased with our every thought, word and act. We should try to imitate the life of Christ and be kind to all. Even our enemies should be kindly treated by us. We may be persecuted by the enemy, and sometimes by those who should be our friends and brethren, but we should use much patience and kindness even then.

We cannot, of course, endorse unworthy men in the Church. It is kindness to tell men of their mistakes, and they should consider us friends when we thus inform them of their mistakes. But they often become our enemies. We can plead with them to correct their mistakes, and do all we can to save them, but after we have exhausted our ability in that direction, and have failed to get them to correct their mistakes, then we should, not in an abusive but in a kind yet

firm, positive way, let the Brotherhood know they are not worthy.

"Bless them which persecute you; bless, and curse not." "Recompense to no man evil for evil." "Therefore if thine *enemy* hunger, feed him." (Rom. 12: 14, 17, 20.) Can we live a life like that? We can. "What is your life?" Is it "hid with Christ in God"? If so, there will not be a score of men jump onto some one brother in private, from the pulpit, and with the pen through the press, because he has rebuked some one or more, or has said or done something that did not suit you, without you first going to him personally or writing him a personal letter (if it is not convenient to go in person), and thus try to restore—if he needs restoring—"such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted." (Gal. 6: 1; Matt. 18: 15-18.) If your "life is hid with Christ in God," and some brother has offended you with his rebuke or in some other way, you have either seen and talked with him or corresponded with him concerning the matter *before you even hinted it to any one else* (as suggested in above scriptures). If you did not do that, you failed to keep your life completely "hid with Christ in God."

"What is your life?" Is it meek, quiet, humble? If not, why not? If a brother doesn't suit you (suppose he is in the wrong and mistreats you) will you *despise* and *hate* him? Will you try to poison the minds of other brethren against him? Is that the life you are living, brother? When Christ was "reviled he reviled not again" (1 Peter 2: 23), and Paul commands, "Be ye therefore followers (imitators) of God as dear children" (Eph. 5: 1). Then if we try to imitate His life, when we are reviled we will *revile not again*.

"What is your life," brother? Is it a life of *hatred* for some brother? Is your life a *reviling* one? If so, it is not imitating the life of Christ. Don't try to justify yourself by saying some one else (of course you would be *personal* and name the preacher referred to) is as bad to "revile" and

say ugly things against a brother he doesn't like as any man you ever saw. One wrong never makes another right; neither will some one else doing wrong justify you in your mistakes. We should all try to look into our own lives and hearts and ask the question, "Is it *I*?" "Have *I* done or said anything against my brother that would be in opposition to imitating the life of Christ?" Of course if you have anything against the *moral character* of a brother then that is a different question. But even then we should be careful and give him plenty of time to reform before warning the Brotherhood against him.

But I am not meaning to write concerning men who have bad characters, but of those who may have *personal differences*. How careful we should be in our opposition to a brother simply because he has rebuked us or opposed us in our teaching on some subject. If he has done wrong in rebuking or opposing us, that will not justify us in *hating him* and *slandering* him to others. It does not sound well to hear one brother call another brother "pope," "boss," etc., simply because he does not like him. When Christ was "reviled he reviled not again," and Paul says *imitate him*. May God help us have more love one for another. We are brethren. John says if you hate your brother you are a murderer. (1 John 3: 15.) *How many brethren have we who are guilty of murder?* Serious thought. John also says, "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar" (1 John 4: 20). These scriptures are plain and need no comment. How many liars have we in the Brotherhood, do you suppose? If there be any, the Lord knows it.

Now, friends, when we consider the brevity of life and the certainty of death, and know the impossibility of living together in Heaven if we cannot here, it should cause us all to have greater desire to live together in unity and love and cultivate a better spirit. I do not claim perfection. I am preaching to myself as well as to others. I need the prayers of my brethren.

Now let us consider James 4: 13-16: “Go to now, ye that say, Today or tomorrow we will go into such a city, and continue there a year, and buy and sell, and get gain: whereas ye know not what shall be on the morrow. For what is your life? It is even a vapour, that appeareth for a little time and then vanisheth away. For that ye ought to say, If the Lord will, we shall live, and do this or that. But now ye rejoyce in your boasting: all such boasting is evil.” Many persons are doing just what James makes mention of above. It is to go into such a city or country and buy and sell or till the soil or something—to “get gain.” How often do Christians leave good church privileges, good schools and good society for their children, and go where they have no church privileges, and their desire to “*get gain*” makes them believe they are too poor to pay the expenses of holding a protracted meeting and thus try to establish the cause of Christ! Sometimes they will write a preacher who has a *family* and is in *poverty*, tell *him* how badly the Gospel is needed in their community and *insist* on him coming and conducting a protracted meeting of not less than a month; but close their letter by telling the preacher (who is much poorer than they) how “poor” they are, and hence not able to pay him anything for his work, but will promise to *board him* while the meeting lasts! They will see he doesn’t go hungry! It is all right for the preacher (who does not even own a house and lot perhaps) to sacrifice \$50 to establish the Cause there. These folks’ desire to “get gain” actually makes them think they are too poor to pay him for his time. If the preacher refuses to go, then they say, “*He is just preaching for the money,*” and of course feel hurt at him for refusing to go where the Gospel is needed so badly. They also weaken the church where they live, by moving away from it.

Sometimes they locate where they have church privileges, but bad society for their children. Of course they feel bad when they see their children in bad company and learn their

own dear children are taking up with bad habits of their associates. When that dear boy or girl has fallen and broken and bled your heart you may then think of the mistake you made by going into such a city or country—to “get gain.” You have sacrificed a beautiful boy or girl, or both, in order—to “get gain.” “For what is your life?” It is a dissatisfied one, simply because you are not laying by in the bank as much as you would like to—for your family. Your desire to “get gain” keeps you dissatisfied all the time. O, of course, you have an *excuse*, and *your* excuse is, naturally, better than the other fellow’s. Brother, you are the very man the Apostle James is writing to. Of course we will not, I suppose, be able to get you to see it; but it is true just the same. You were making a living and doing very well where you were, but you were not satisfied. Your desire—for more world’s goods—caused you to move, and you now see your mistake too late! You did not move to better your *spiritual* conditions; it was to better your *financial* conditions. It was—to “get gain.” Please get your Bible, sit down and read the following: Luke 12: 16-20; 16: 19-31; Matt. 16: 26; 6: 19-21; 1 Tim. 6: 10.

After James warned *them* and *us* against giving vent to desire to “get gain,” which causes men to move into other communities for that purpose, he then asks, “For what is your life?” Then he answers: “It is even as a vapour, that appeareth for a *little time*, and then *vanisheth away*.”

Our life, then, is compared to the vapour that is here one moment and gone the next. O how few are our days here in this world! “Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble. He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down: he fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not” (Job 14: 1, 2). Yes, he “cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down” in a very few days, when compared with eternity. Often the little rosebud is not permitted to unfold itself until it is cut down; most people die while young. I believe thirty-seven years is the average life now. The Board of

Health has lately extended life from thirty-three and a third to thirty-seven years. (This is just a little tough on “Hard Shellism,” however.) The rose is hardly permitted to show its rosy cheek when it is cut down by the icy finger of death.

A man who had desire to “get gain” was ill. He asked the Dreaded Messenger to leave and let his life remain—until he had accumulated more world’s goods and made preparations to meet his God. The Messenger promised, but said he would return and claim his own soon. The man asked, “Will you please notify me before you return, that I may be prepared to go?” The Messenger promised.

In a few days the man was well again, went to hard work and forgot, it seems, that he had promised the Messenger he would make preparations to meet his God. So in a few years, after he had gotten well and forgotten, it seems, the Messenger would return some day to claim his life, and while he was immersed with the idea of “getting gain” (that his family might live in ease) he was suddenly stricken—*the Messenger had returned!* It was the Messenger of Death. To the stricken and now dying man he said, “I have come to claim my own. Your life is just now being brought to a close; you must go with me.”

The poor, dying man, with tearful eyes, said, “You, Mr. Messenger, promised to warn me of your coming so I could prepare to go. I am not ready now. I have been so busy—providing for my family—during the short time you have been away that I have not prepared. My soul has neither been fed or clothed. Give me a few more weeks, that I may get ready—that I may put on the ‘wedding garment.’ I have prepared food and clothing for the *body*, but none for the *soul*, hence am not ready to go with you.”

The Messenger replied, “Ah, my dear sir, I have kept my promise, and have warned you often of my coming. It has been twenty years since I was here, and I have been warning you often during the last five and ten years. I warned you by placing wrinkles on your once rosy cheeks. I warned you

by dulling your hearing, by dimming your eyes and turning your hair gray. Once your eyes were good, bright and sparkling, but now they are dim. I have warned you often and you would not heed the warning. If you are not ready it is your own fault. Come on and go with me; I can no longer wait."

The dying man cried out, "O my God, how short is life! It seems but yesterday when this Messenger was here before." To his dear wife and sweet children he said, "Goodby, Goodby! I am going into eternity unprepared. Dear wife and children, don't make the sad mistake I have made. Goodby!"

The same may be true of the man who has obeyed the Gospel and moves away from church privileges—to "get gain."

III

James informs us of the mistake often made in providing for the body and neglecting necessary preparations for the soul. We too often forget that tomorrow to us may never come. Turn and read James 4: 13-17 again, please. He implies some rejoice in boasting of their gain or wealth, then says, "*All such rejoicing is evil.*" It is not the *amount* of money a man has that makes him rich in the Bible sense,—it is the setting his heart on what he has and his desire for more. It is "the *love* of money" that makes a man rich in the Bible sense. I might worship \$10 more than you would \$10,000, hence would be "the rich man" condemned in the Bible.

"What is your life?" Is it under the power of desire to "get gain," even though you have to sacrifice church privileges in order to do so? Is it under the power of desire for pleasure, fun and frolic? Is it under the power of sin, or is it under the power of God?

Many strong men and women have fallen and knew not that they were falling until they were down. Look at Noah, Samson, Solomon, David and others who have made serious

mistakes, and take warning. Some of them got up again; some never did. Let us be careful and keep our lives "hid with Christ in God" (Col. 3: 3). Samson was a judge of Israel twenty years. He was the leader, supposed to be an example for them, but his life was a miserable wreck. Let us read Judges 16: 21: "But the Philistines took him, and put out (bored out) his eyes, and brought him down to Gaza, and bound him with fetters of brass; and he did grind in the prison-house." So Samson is *blind, bound and grinding* in the prison-house. Why? Simply because his love for a Philistine woman was greater than his love for God's word. God said for them not to marry the Philistine women (Exo. 34: 16; Deut. 7: 3). Samson's parents objected to him marrying a Philistine woman (Judges 14: 1-3), but he ignored their wish and God's command. This seems to have been his first serious step in the wrong direction, but it was the cause of him taking many more. (O this *grinding, blinding, binding* power of sin! Let us keep our lives from being brought under its power.)

On his way to Timnath to get his wife, Samson killed a lion (Judges 14: 5, 6). After a time he passed by "and he turned aside to see the carcase of the lion: and, behold, there was a swarm of bees and honey in the carcase of the lion." This suggested a plan to Samson how he might get some of the belongings of the Philistines, hence he proposed this to them: "I will now put forth a riddle unto you: if ye can certainly declare it me within the seven days of the feast, and I find it out, then I will give you thirty sheets (shirts) and thirty changes of garments." The riddle was: "Out of the eater came forth meat, and out of the strong came forth sweetness." They soon saw they could not declare the riddle, hence they went to his wife and said, "Entice thy husband, that he may declare unto us the riddle, lest we burn thee and thy father's house with fire." Of course she never ceased weeping and pleading with Samson until he told her, but it was the last day of the feast when he finally told her. She

hastened and told the Philistines, hence just before the sun went down they declared the riddle to Samson thus: "What is sweeter than honey, and what is stronger than a lion?" Samson replied: "If ye had not plowed with my heifer, ye had not found out my riddle." He now leaves his wife and goes back to his father, but is not satisfied. His life is misery to him from now on. He decides to go back and live with his wife, but when he arrived at his father-in-law's he learned said father-in-law had given his wife to another man, hence poor Samson is again worried. This so enraged him that he set fire to their (Philistines') corn (wheat) fields and burnt them. This made them angry and they burnt the wife of Samson and her father. Samson said, "Though ye have done this, yet will I be avenged of you, and after that I will cease." (Of course he thought he could go one step farther in sin and then quit sinning; but he could not, or did not, as one step called for another.) So Samson "smote them hip and thigh with a great slaughter" and thought he would cease; but conditions got worse and worse. This act caused 3,000 men of Judah to bind him with the intention of turning him over to the Philistines because they were ruling over Israel since the fall of their judge—Samson. But Samson broke the cords that bound him and slew 1,000 men. (O this *grinding, blinding, binding* power of sin! But Samson could blame no one but himself for his trouble. Allowing his life to go out from under the influence of God's word is what caused him to have to hide in the top of the rock Etam.)

Next Samson went down "to Gaza, and saw there an harlot, and went in unto her." This caused him more trouble, and he had to take "the doors of the gate of the city, and the two posts, and went away with them, bar and all," so as to keep them from killing him. His great strength was his means of escape.

He next fell in love with a woman by the name of Delilah. The Philistines persuaded her to "entice him, and see

wherein his great strength lieth.” She thought she did so, but when she would cry out, “The Philistines be upon thee, Samson”! he would break the cords that bound him. At last she said unto him, “How canst thou say, I love thee, when thine heart is not with me? Thou hast mocked me these three times, and hast not told me wherein thy great strength lieth.” Thus she “pressed him daily with her words, and urged him, so that his soul was vexed unto death,” hence he told her his strength was in his hair. Then “she made him sleep upon her knees” and they “shaved off the seven locks of his head,” “and his strength went from him.” Now “the Philistines took him, and put out (bored out) his eyes, and brought him down to Gaza, and bound him with fetters of brass; and he did grind in the prison-house.” (O this *grinding, blinding, binding* power of sin! It has ruined the life of this strong man! He was strong, and yet how weak now! He allowed women to make a fool of him, hence he is now *blind, and bound, grinding* in the prison-house. ’Tis awful!)

But we have many Samsons in this respect today. Many men, like Samson, have been among the leaders in the Church, and have, like Samson, allowed women to make fools of them, and they have, hence, ruined their own lives by giving away to their weakness. Preachers sometimes get into trouble of this character, but if they are honest men they will try and make the wrong right. Their sins usually find them out. Samson said he would cease, but he did not until his life was blasted and his end was death. If we learn what our weakness is, let us guard and fight against it. This woman *pretended* to love Samson, thus won his heart. She was the *hypocrite* and cause of his fall this time. But had he not violated the law of his parents and his God in the first place, he might not have come to this awful end, as he would not, perhaps, have met this Delilah.

O my soul! This awful *grinding, blinding, binding* power of sin! How many are daily and hourly grinding out grists for Satan under the pretense of Christianity?

Joseph was strong enough to resist the temptation of his master's wife (Gen. 39: 7-20), but she lied on him either to clear herself (fearing he might tell on her) or to get revenge, and Joseph (the innocent) had to suffer. This is often the case in our day. The life of the innocent is sometimes misery because some one has lied on them and there is no possible way of clearing themselves. The innocent can do nothing, just let people believe it true, since *everybody*, or nearly so, will believe the lie of the "woman." We are almost continually shouting, "*Watch* the men, ladies!" which is all right. God knows many of them need watching. But the same good Lord knows the women are not all his angels, hence he has told us of sly cunning tricks and schemes to get men to commit sin. Since the Bible has most always placed the blame on woman in such cases, I would advise that men and boys "*Watch* the women!" too. There are so many sins mentioned in the Bible of which I might speak, but will not take the time. We all need to watch more closely, thus keep our lives pure. The purest will be tempted and have to fight against sin. Joseph seemed to be among them, yet that lying, hypocritical master's wife made his life miserable. No wonder Jesus said, "*Watch* and pray, lest ye enter into temptation. The spirit truly is ready, but *the flesh is weak*" (Mark 14: 38).

If we can keep from getting the "big-head" so bad we can't understand our flesh is weak, can't understand we are apt to commit error, we may make it all right; but when we get to thinking we are too strong to fall,—right then we are most sure to take a tumble *downward*, perhaps to the lowest pit of shame. It is usually the ruination of preachers and others for them to get it into their little heads that everybody likes them, and that they are the "most influential" men in the Brotherhood. *Conceit is necessary*, but we must not allow it to deceive and make fools of us. Some men have several pounds of conceit to spare.

"What is your life," brother? Is it full of conceit and self-

esteem? *What about that ego?* It has, no doubt, led many souls down to eternal night. Poor old Samson thought he was strong enough to go a little farther in sin, then cease (Judges 15: 7); but it just got him into more trouble, and he at last killed himself so as to get out of his troubles (Judges 16: 26-30). O this awful *grinding, blinding, binding* power of sin! It makes the life a misery while *here*, and much worse *hereafter* if we live and die under its power. Samson had too much conceit. The ego in him was one size too large, hence his downfall.

Brethren, let us have more love one for the other and a more ready and willing spirit of forbearance and forgiveness. A "big" preacher and a "little" preacher were talking in the depot at a certain city some time ago. The "little" preacher mentioned a certain faction in a certain city where the "big" preacher had preached. The "big" preacher did not like to have it called "a faction," hence he went to a certain congregation soon after and told some of the members he came very near calling the "little" preacher a liar! The "big" preacher and "little" preacher had always been friends, and the "little" preacher thought they were yet till he heard that. But the "big" preacher was crossed, hence got cross (after he left the "little" preacher, however) and talked about his brother to his back, and said he came very near calling the "little" preacher a liar! How wicked this is!

I think it best for us to take time to read Matt. 5: 43, 44: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, *Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you.*" Brother, sister, if I am guilty of being your *enemy*, you must "love me." If I *curse you*, you must "*bless me.*" If I *hate you*, you must *do good to me.* If I *despitefully use and persecute you*, you must "*pray for me,*"—so Jesus says. We must love each other while here in the flesh, and be able to overlook and forgive mistakes of our

dear brethren in the Lord. (I am not now speaking of immoral characters; I am speaking of little personal differences that sometimes come up.) May God help us, as dear brethren, to be not bitter one against another; to cultivate the spirit of love one for another rather than the spirit of hatred. (I am preaching to myself as well as to you.) We must live together in peace and love *here* or we cannot *Over There*. I will always thank you for telling me of my errors if you do it in the spirit of love. God bless the faithful!

IV

Not always, but usually, we make our own troubles. Most of us could have more sweetness and sunshine in our homes and hearts if we would. We too often pull down the window-shades and close the doors against sunshine, then grumble because the room is so dark. Open the doors, hoist the window-shades and let the beautiful sunshine into your homes and hearts. We too often look on the dark side of most everything, forgetting, it seems, that "beyond the clouds the sun is still shining." I like that song very well which says "Count your *blessings* one by one." Most of us would rather count our sorrows and troubles. Many would rather suffer the sting of the bee than to enjoy the honey it makes. Don't be *always* telling your troubles and never tell of a single blessing. Have you nothing to rejoice over? By those who are always looking upon the dark side of everything and always telling their troubles, never mentioning a blessing, the pierce of the thorn is more appreciated than the fragrance of the rose. Let us not forget the Hand that feeds and clothes us. It is He who feeds us and we should speak of the blessings we receive from him as well as tell of the sorrows of this life. We can make our own lives and homes a hell or we can live reasonably happy if we will. "Never trouble trouble till trouble troubles you." But when some people run out of trouble they always *borrow*. Strew flowers along the pathway of the living while they

can enjoy them; don't wait until your friend dies to place a wreath of roses on the casket. Lay them at his feet while he is living and can enjoy them.

Repentance. If you trespass against a brother and he rebukes you, repent. And if he forgives you then both will feel better and life will be more pleasant. Repentance may be defined: "penitence," "compunction," "contrition," "remorse," "regret." These words are synonyms. "Compunction" is a warning of the conscience against the act which is not strong enough to prevent it. Such repentance keeps men in trouble usually if not always. It is not deep enough. "Contrition" is a continuous state of grief and self-condemnation. Contrition is always for the past. This stage of repentance means something. It will keep a man from repeating over and over the same error. Our mistakes usually make our lives misery to us. "What is your life?" Is it full of mistakes? If so, repent and you will open the door and welcome the sunshine. "Remorse" is gnawing anguish occasioned by reflection upon a past deed or course. Neither compunction nor remorse denotes genuine regret of wrong doing expressed by contrition. "Regret" does not carry with it either energy of remorse, sacredness of contrition or practical character of repentance. "Repent" means to "turn." When we see we are doing wrong we should *turn* from it. Some seem to think it only means be sorry. Paul says, "Godly sorrow worketh repentance" (2 Cor. 7: 9, 10).

It is a work or condition. Some tell us salvation is without *works*, unconditional. Of course people who believe the Bible don't believe that "stuff." All Bible believers understand salvation is not secured without works. In Jonah 3: 10 we read: "And God saw their *works*, that they *turned* from their evil ways." God says this "turning" from their evil ways was "*works*," and I don't know any better than to believe what he says. But what kind of *works* was this? Let the Savior answer: "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: be-

cause they *repented* at the preaching of Jonas" (Matt. 12: 41). So what is called "works" (Jonah 3: 10) is called "repentance" in Matt. 12: 41. So the man who says salvation is without works simply says men can be saved without repenting! What will be the life after death of a man guilty of perverting God's word in such way? What could be more sinful? Our lives are too short to risk perversion of God's word on any subject. God wills all should repent (2 Peter 3: 9), but his will (desire) is being broken every day. Christ said, "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke 13: 3). Your life will be one of weeping and gnashing of teeth if you die without repenting of your sins.

In Rev. 2: 5 we read: "Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do thy first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent." So we learn the *fallen* must repent. It matters not if it be a bishop, deacon or preacher, he will have to repent (turn) or perish! He must not think because he has a few or several friends standing with him when charges are preferred, God will overlook his sin or sins, as the case may be. But Christ says, "If he repent, forgive him" (Luke 17: 3). But he *must repent!* They must "bring forth therefore fruits meet (answerable to amendments of life) for repentance" (Matt. 3: 8). If a brother trespass against you "*rebuke him,*" Christ says; and if he repents forgive him. But some men will not stand rebuking. If you rebuke them they turn against you and become your enemies. If their lives were "hid with Christ in God" they would repent and thank you for rebuking them in obedience to the command of Jesus Christ. Something is wrong with the life of the man who gets angry and becomes your enemy when you rebuke him. O, that our lives would be more like the life of God's dear Son, who when he was "reviled he reviled not again." Some will turn against the man that rebukes them and call him "a liar," "a dictator," "a boss," "a pope," "a disturber of the peace,"

"a crank," "a bull-head," etc. I ask, in God's good name, Is this the spirit of Christ, who when he was reviled reviled not again? Is it imitating the life of Christ? (Eph. 5: 1). Be serious a moment, please. Have you any hatred in your heart for any brother? Don't think about "the other fellow." "Is it I?" Look into your own heart, let "the other fellow" rest a moment. Honest now, brother, do you hate any brother? Are you angry at any brother? Let us all get right down into our own hearts and examine them. Somebody is going to go to hell! If the brother that rebukes me is wrong, will that justify me in saying ugly things about him? Say, *will it?* Be honest now. But suppose he is not wrong, then what? I will have to repent and change my life or perish, that's all. If a brother rebukes us let us not be so conceited we can't see there may be some possible room for rebuking—even us. There may be some room or cause for rebuke. We are all human. It is so easy to see the little "mote" in our brother's eye but we cannot see the "beam" in our own. It is not only our privilege to rebuke an erring brother but it is our *duty* to do so. The word "duty" is from the Greek word "ophilo" defined: "to owe, be in debt, be indebted; to be fined, condemned, pay a fine, pay; to wish, desire; it is meet, fit, proper or incumbent, it ought; oh that, would that; to exact usury, lend money at interest." It is translated "duty" but twice in the Common Version: Luke 17: 10; Rom. 15: 27. The latter might be translated "owe," while in Luke it might be translated "desire," without injury to the texts.

It is a task to have to rebuke a brother, especially if we know he is of a disposition to get angry. But it should be our duty (desire) to do so. We *owe* it to him and to God. The real meaning of "duty" is *owe* or be in debt. We are duty-bound (indebted) to God to do so, and if we don't rebuke an erring brother when we *know* he is in error, we don't do our duty. Let us do unto others as we would have them do unto us, please. We owe it to ourselves, to our fam-

ilies, to our brethren and to God, to correct our mistakes when we learn of them. If our life is worth living at all it is worth living right, hence we should accept, cheerfully, a kind rebuke. If I fall, and refuse to repent when rebuked, the Church of Jesus Christ suffers. If there was no one to suffer but the guilty, it would not amount to so much; but the Church of our dear Lord has to suffer. If I teach or practice error, and am rebuked yet refuse to repent, the Church must suffer. So will I, after death if not before.

I have made many mistakes, have you? I am not perfect. Are you? I need watching and criticising. Do you? I have been rebuked, and repented. Have you? I have long ago decided to live closer and closer to Jesus every day. Have you? There is no standstill in the Christian life. We are either getting closer to Jesus or getting farther away from him.

Fables. I wish to say a few words concerning fables. The word "fable" is from the Greek "muthos," defined: "A word, speech, saying, discourse, conversation; fable, fiction; persuasion, advice, counsel." But the root means "to relate stories, amuse with stories; to fable, allegorize." "To fabricate, i. e., to contrive, a tale, falsely."—(Young's Lexicon.) John Wesley says in his notes, commenting on 1 Tim. 1: 4 (the word is found in 1 Tim. 1: 4; 4: 7; 2 Tim. 4: 4; Titus 1: 14; 2 Peter 1: 16): "*Neither give heed*—so as either to teach or regard them. *To fables*—Fabulous Jewish tradition," etc. Both Jews and Gentiles abounded with fabulous tales connected with their several superstitions. Paul certainly means we should not heed story-telling of any kind, especially when said stories are simply *fiction*. But he also means a tale, falsely. Are you guilty of peddling false tales on a brother or sister? If so, after learning the story was false did you correct it? Did you make any effort to correct it? If you are wanting to live a godly life you will not want to injure a brother by peddling falsehoods on him. If you made no effort to correct it you are under condemnation of

scriptures referred to above. The word also means “to relate stories, amuse with stories.” This condemns all preachers who *amuse* audiences by “relating stories.” A story (parable) may be told to illustrate a point, and, hence, not simply to amuse. A story may be told to illustrate a point or offset another one told by an enemy of the truth which has deceived some one, and not be told for amusement at all. Some preachers announce they will *preach* at a certain time, and when the time comes the preacher is there but *lectures* against some organization and quotes from certain charters, and books which are not sacred at all. Said preachers should announce they are going to *lecture* against said institution, and the audience will not be deceived. Let us be careful about using deception and fiction in the pulpit.

“For what is your life?” “It is as a vapour, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away.” We are here only a few days, hence should be very careful about the kind of life we live. Trees are dressed in beautiful green today, but tomorrow they are disrobed. The rose is red today, but tomorrow it will fade. Birds warble beautiful songs today, but tomorrow all will be still. O the shortness of life and the thoughtlessness of humanity! Brethren, let us labor harder to keep our lives hid with Christ in God. The life we *now* live—let it be by the faith of the Son of God. James says, “Sin when it is finished bringeth forth death.” We must labor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace. Remember, I have been preaching to myself in these four articles as well as to you. I need to think of many things mentioned in these articles so much.

THE FIRST RESURRECTION

It is claimed by some that the first resurrection refers to the coming forth of the bodies of the saints after Christ's resurrection, as referred to in Matthew 27: 52, 53. But they went into the holy city, and appeared unto many, lived and died again, undoubtedly, hence they could not constitute the "first resurrection."

Others think that Lazarus represented the first resurrection (John 11: 43, 44). But this could not be for he did not come forth to die no more. He was not raised in immortality for he lived and ate and drank (John 12: 1-3), and of course died again and will come forth in the resurrection with all the rest of the saints of God.

It is claimed by a great many that the righteous will be the first resurrection, that the "dead in Christ" shall rise first. It is our purpose in this article to show that this is a mistake, and Christ was the first resurrection.

It is affirmed by many of our brethren that the "dead in Christ" will come forth first, and that the wicked will be permitted to live here a thousand years, then the wicked dead will be brought forth. But if you prove this to me, I will prove that time will never end. For instance, the wicked will live here on earth for a thousand years, continue to marry and to rear children during that time, some of which will be Christians. It could not be otherwise. It would be according to nature for some of them "to love and serve God." Then when the thousand years are ended, God will again have to raise the righteous and leave the wicked another thousand years, and when that thousand years is up, the same thing will have to be done again—the righteous being raised and the wicked left, and so it would continue and time never end.

The righteous and wicked dead will all come forth at the same time. "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in

the which all that are in the grave shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation" (John 5: 28, 29). The good and bad will all come forth in the same hour according to the Scripture, and the following passages further affirm this teaching: Ecclesiastes 12: 13, 14; Matthew 25: 31-34; Acts 24: 15; Romans 2: 5-16; Romans 14: 10-13. If these scriptures be true, and true they are, our friends are wrong; the righteous will not precede the wicked a thousand years. These scriptures condemn that theory.

Now let us note some passages which teach that Christ was the first to rise from the dead. "That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show light unto the people and to the Gentiles" (Acts 26: 23). The following scriptures, which we will not quote, teach the same: 1 Corinthians 15: 20-24; Colossians 1: 18; Revelation 1: 15. After reading these, we are made to believe that Christ was the first resurrection, and just so long as these quotations are in my Bible, that long will I teach that Christ was the first to rise from the dead.

In order to escape the "second death" we must have part in the first resurrection, and we become "priests of God" (Revelation 20: 6). If the righteous be the first resurrection, we will not be made "priests of God" until after that resurrection. How does this agree with Isaiah 61: 6, 1 Peter 2: 9, and Revelation 1: 6, which teach that all who have obeyed the gospel are priests now? "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection" (Romans 6: 3-5).

When we are made to walk in "newness of life" we are also made "priests of God" and it is then we have part in the "first resurrection." Christ was the first resurrection, and we are baptized into Christ, that is, into his death; and thus we show forth his resurrection, take part in it, and rise as "priests of God." We have part in the first resurrection when we are baptized to show forth the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, and on such the "second death" can have no power, as long as they are priests of God (Mark 16: 16; 1 John 3: 8, 9; 5: 4). Of course, we may become rebellious children and be lost.

DOUBTS

It is a fact, that not only the world, but the church also is filled with doubtful people. The stressing of different translations of the Bible, and the constant talk about mistakes in the King James version, have caused hundreds of weaker ones to question the infallibility of the Old Book. We should be very careful in our teaching, lest we drive more from, than we bring into, the fold.

Many there are, who doubt things that can be easily understood. Some doubt the existence of God, simply because they cannot understand how he could be from everlasting to everlasting—without beginning of days. But if you assume there is no God, then tell me how man originated. Did he come, as Bob Ingersoll said, from the lonely soulless vertebra of the sea? If so, why does he not still come from that same source? If there be no divine power, what was it which stopped this evolutionary process? And if man came from the monkey, why doesn't he still come from the same source? Why doesn't a man turn into a monkey occasionally? It's a poor rule which will not work both ways, you know.

Doubter, can you tell me which was first—the oak or the

acorn, the hen or the egg? You are compelled to admit that regardless of which existed with priority, it required a divine power to place them here. Doubt there being a God, and then tell me where the birds of the air, the fish of the sea, the beasts of the field, this earth and all things therein, came from. You cannot doubt the existence of these things. You know they are here! But if you doubt that there is a God you cannot account for them. You cannot even explain how the same food (grass) will produce fur on a rabbit, feathers on a duck, hair on a horse and wool on a sheep.

There are some who doubt the validity of the Bible. They say that they do not believe a word it contains. Well, let us see. We will ask a few questions.

1. Do you believe it is right to cry?
2. Do you believe it is right to laugh?
3. Do you believe it is right to stand?
4. Do you believe it is right to sit?
5. Do you believe it is right to lie down?
6. Do you believe it is right to kneel?
7. Do you believe it is right to farm?
8. Do you believe it is right to eat?
9. Do you believe it is right to wash?
10. Do you believe it is right to work?
11. Do you believe it is right to marry?
12. Do you believe it is right to rear children and educate them?

The Bible teaches that all of the above are right, but since you do not believe a word of it, then of course you must deny that the things mentioned are right. Poor fellow, what will you do? You cannot stand up, cannot lie down, cannot drink water, cannot eat food, but worst of all, you are condemned to a life of bachelorhood, for you cannot go courting and you cannot get married.

Some doubt that Christ built the church because it was not built until after his death. A man by the name of Hul-

man built the Catholic church in the town where I live. It took about two hundred thousand dollars. He didn't furnish all of this sum, but he gave most of it and also gave the instructions as to how the building was to be erected and how it should be furnished. He built it through use of agency. And that's the way Christ built His church.

Some doubt the church being built on Christ. Some affirm it was built on Peter! The following scriptures will forever settle that controversy. (Matthew 16: 18; Isaiah 28: 16-18; Psalm 118: 22; Matthew 21: 42-44; Acts 4: 11; 1 Peter 2: 6-8; Romans 9: 33; 1 Corinthians 3: 10, 11; Ephesians 2: 19, 20.)

Some doubt that Paul established the Colossian church. We learn the following facts from history which ought to settle the question. The church was not directly established by Paul himself, but by Epaphras, who was a native of Colosse, and who had been a convert, disciple and delegate of Paul, about the time of the apostle's sojourn in Ephesus (A.D. 54 or 55-57). The Colossian church appears to have been the least considerable of all the churches to which Paul indited an epistle. It was located in Phrygia, the ruins of the city hardly being recognizable today. It was not as important as Laodicea and Hierapolis, cities in the same valley, some twelve or fifteen miles to the west and northwest, where churches also existed. There is no record that Paul ever visited it, but nevertheless, it was a Pauline church, because planted by esteemed fellow-laborers of the apostle.

Doubts have arisen concerning the genuineness of the epistle on account of its reference to gnostic heresies, and due to its variation in style from Paul's earlier epistles. But even the negative critics have been forced to concede recently, that the epistle contains a nucleus written by Paul. This concession will mean the death blow to skepticism regarding its authorship, for the epistle holds together as one unified composition. It is no patchwork letter. Writers from the middle of the second century refer to it as Paul's. The

epistle was written in Rome and sent to Colosse by the hands of Tychicus, who was probably a native of Ephesus; and Onesimus, a runaway Colossian slave (Philemon 10-20).

If we cannot believe the things which we see and read in the Word of God, we would not believe although one arose from the dead and spoke to us. If the omnipotent voice of Heaven, when all was quiet in the stillness of the night, should speak face to face with that doubtful one, and tell him that he was the God of the living and the Creator of all things, he would, like the Jews of old, muster up some excuse to deny that it was the voice of God. Oh, doubtful one, where do you stand? Without the gospel you are in total darkness, doomed for a world that is worse than this. He that doubteth is damned. Sad, sad the bitter wail, "Almost—but lost!"

BREATH OF LIFE

I

Adventists, Russellites and all no-soul, no-spirit, no-devil and no-hell people claim the body, made "of the dust of the ground" (Gen. 2: 7), is all the soul we have, and use Gen. 2: 7 as their "proof" text. The word "life" in this text is from the word *Chaiyim*, in the plural number. It should read, "breath of lives," for that is what *Ruach Chaiyim* means. So there was more than one life given Adam. But we will speak more of this later. We wish now to learn who is the father, or maker, of the soul; where that soul was placed when made; the real meaning of the word soul, etc.

1. Who made the soul? "So Zedekiah the king sware secretly unto Jeremiah, saying: As the Lord liveth, that made us this soul" (Jer. 38: 16). "For I will not contend forever, neither will I be always wroth: for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made" (Isa. 57: 16). (Num. 16: 22 and Heb. 12: 9 inform us that God is

also the father of the spirit, but I am only dealing with the soul now, will take up the spirit later.) God is, we have learned, the father of the soul, and God is immortal, He cannot die; therefore the soul is immortal and cannot die. Man is the father of the flesh (Heb. 12: 9), and man is mortal, will die. It is nowhere said that God is the father of the flesh, nor that man is the father of the soul.

2. Where did God place the soul? "And he stretched (measured) himself upon the child three times, and cried unto the Lord, and said: O Lord, my God, I pray thee, let this child's soul come into (Hebrew: into his inward parts) him again. And the Lord heard the voice of Elijah; and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived" (1 Kings 17: 21, 22). The soul could not come into the body "again" without having been there at least once before. When the soul was separated from the body it resulted in death to the body. The soul was not the body, but was placed in the body. "But his flesh upon him shall have pain, and his soul within him shall mourn" (Job 14: 22). "When my soul fainted within me" (Jonah 2: 7). So we now have positive proof that God, when he made the soul, placed it within the body. Paul (2 Cor. 5), and Peter (2 Peter 1: 13-15), tell us the same; but we will not notice them now as we do not need them at this point. So God has placed the soul he made within us, hence this soul is not the body. I wonder, if when He breathed into the nostrils the breath of lives, He then placed the soul within the body? When we compare the above-quoted scripture with Gen. 2: 7, that is what we are compelled to conclude He did. That soul, then, came from Heaven, and is a part of God who is also a soul (Matt. 12: 18), hence can never die. This soul (the "inner man") is in the image of God. The life of the body (which is very short) and the life of the soul (which is eternal) are the two lives given man in creation. God says, "In whom my soul is well pleased" (Matt. 12: 18); so God has a soul. This is positive proof that there is at least one soul that will

never die. This proves Russellism and Adventists to be in error, for they quote Ezek. 18: 4 and say, "All souls will die." If their interpretation of "the soul that sinneth it shall die" be correct, I wonder why Jesus Christ died? I also wonder why little innocent babies die? Sin is the cause and death the effect. Where there is no cause there can be no effect. But sin is the cause, so where there is no sin there can be no death. Sin being the cause and death the effect, if their explanation be true, infants could not die and Jesus did not die, for He was without sin. The mistake made by the materialists is in selecting one meaning of the word soul as its universal and immutable meaning.

II

What does the word "soul" mean? It is a translation of the Hebrew word "nephesh" and the Greek word "psuchee," and means "life." God did not say that the living soul is man, as the "soul-sleepers" would have it read; but He did say "man became a living soul." When we say "Jane became his wife," do we not mean that Jane existed before she became a wife? We certainly do. This expression intimates that Jane and wife are not convertible terms—or that the one is the meaning of the other,—why should we conclude that "man" and "living soul" are convertible terms, or that the one is the meaning of the other? Such, however, is what Russellites and others of like "faith" on this subject are assuming. With the Bible before us we must conclude, if the constitution of man is to be inferred from the words cited, that man existed before he was possessed of a living soul, or before God breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives.

The phrase "breath of life" occurs but four times in the Bible—Gen. 2: 7; 6: 17; 7: 15; 22. As I have said, we find, uniformly, the same phrase, "Ruach Chaiyim," in the plural form, viz.: "breath of lives." This is against those who claim the body and soul in the Bible always mean the same. "I will destroy all flesh wherein is the breath of life ("Ruach

Chaiyim," breath of lives) from under heaven." Again: "And they went into the ark, two and two, of all flesh wherein was the breath of lives." "(Ruach Chaiyim') of all that was on the dry land, died." The destructionists read these scriptures and assert, "if breath of *lives* indicates intellectual and immortal spirits, they were imparted to dumb brutes and perished in the flood."

But we shall help them a little on the words, "man became a living soul." Here the word "nephesh" is translated "soul." It is found for the first time in Gen. 1: 20, also in verse 30. It is descriptive of the souls of fish, birds and reptiles. We read: "Let the waters bring forth abundantly, the moving creatures that have life"—(a soul, nephesh)". Again: "I have given every green herb for food to every beast of the earth, to every bird, and to every reptile that hath a soul." Many places might be cited where "nephesh" denotes the blood, the animal body. It often denotes any creature that lives by breathing. It has been observed by students of the Bible that this word does not certainly, in any other passage (than Gen. 2: 7), signify the spiritual part of man. So we may logically conclude that so soon as God breathed into the nostrils of Adam the breath of lives, he became a living creature. But all this makes nothing for the destructionists, for this reason: it is not a definition of body, soul or spirit. It presumes not to define man either as respects body or soul; but simply states the singular manner of his creation was different from all God's other works. God did something for man he did not do for the lower animal. God speaks on this occasion in a language wholly different from that employed in any other creation. When all this is stated and conceded nothing is gained by the whole class of destructionists, by all that plead for the soul's materiality and mortality.

Of one hundred and five times in which the word "psuchee" is found in the New Testament, it is forty-one times translated "life" and might have been much more

often. It is twice translated "mind," and once "heart," while at other times it is distinguished from them thus: "With all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind" (Matt. 22: 37). Again: "Love him with all thy heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul" (Mark 12: 33). In these passages there is a contrasted difference between the mind, the understanding, and the soul. So the mind, in these passages, is not the soul (as some think).

"Soul" and "souls" sometime stand for persons. For example: "Fear fell upon every soul." "There were added about three thousand souls." "Three-score and fifteen souls," etc. In such cases as these it does not mean the spirit, understanding or mind of man. In these and other instances it refers to individuals. It is such passages as these our "soul-sleeping friends" use and misapply.

III

Our last article was closed while contrasting the two bodies: the one we now possess and the one we will possess after the Resurrection. We can extend the contrast no farther as we are not authorized to go farther. Bodies, and neither souls nor spirits, are subjects of comparison. There is no more foundation in 1 Cor. 15-44, 45 than in Gal. 2: 7 or in chapter 2: 22, 30, for the destruction or for mortality of the spirit of man. Paul nowhere teaches the spirit dies; or that a soul, as a name for the rational spirit, will ever be destroyed or annihilated. Nothing dies that is not wholly of the earth. Angels, human spirits, Satan and demons cannot die. Their existence as conscious beings will never end. God, Christ and angels will exist eternally in Heaven, though God himself is said to have a soul (Isa. 42: 1; Matt. 12: 18).

There is a radical difference between the words "soul" and "spirit" in the original language, though I am not going to try to explain just what the one is, separate and apart from the other. The difference, however, is great enough to preclude the employment of the word "soul" in any case, as a

fair representation of the word "pneuma," spirit; or the employment of the word "spirit" as a correct version of the word "psuchee," soul. "Soul," it seems, is a more general, and "spirit" a more specific, term. "Nephesh" in the Hebrew, and "psuchee" in the Greek, and soul in the English, represent animal life, a person, blood, and sometimes the human spirit; while "Ruach" in Hebrew, and "pneuma" in the Greek, and "spirit" in the English, represent only the rational and moral nature of man. Hence, the Holy Spirit, the spirits of the saints, angelic spirits, are never represented by "psuchee," soul; while the term "spirit," in not one case, is ever said to be destroyed, to die, or to cease to exist. This fact alone is proof that there is a life that is immortal, because all admit we have within us something called "spirit," and it is a fact that spirits never die, never cease to be, and are never annihilated.

But, says one, "our breath is our spirit, and, of course, the breath, wind or air doesn't die." If that be true we can substitute the words "wind," "breath" and "air" for the word spirit and still have sense. We can substitute these words for the word "spirit" and make sense, if our Russelite and other "friends" be correct. Let us try it: ". . . but they that are after the wind the things of the wind" (Rom. 8: 5). "For to be carnally minded is death; but to be windy minded is life and peace" (Rom. 8: 6). "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the air (wind), if so be that the wind of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the wind of Christ he is none of his" (verse 9). "And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the wind is life because of righteousness" (verse 10). "But if the air of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his air (wind) that dwelleth in you" (verse 11). ". . . but if ye through the wind do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live" (verse 13). "For as many as are led by the wind of God, they are the sons of

God" (verse 14). "For ye have not received the wind (breath) of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the wind (breath) of adoption" (verse 15). "The air (wind) itself beareth witness with our air (wind or breath), that we are the children of God" (verse 16).

All of this in the 8th chapter of Romans, and not one time can we substitute "air," "wind" or "breath" for "spirit" and make sense.

"A man also or woman that hath a familiar spirit" (Lev. 20: 27). Their new translation would read, "familiar breath." "When Jesus had thus said he was troubled in spirit" (John 13: 21). If their position be true this verse means that Jesus Christ had asthma, and hence, could hardly breathe. How absurd! You cannot substitute the words "air," "wind" or "breath" for the word "spirit" and make sense!

IV

"Shall mortal man be more just than God?" (Job 4: 17) —is a favorite text with our Russellite "friends." But it seems they never read the 19th verse which says, "How much less in *them* that *dwell in houses of clay*, whose foundation is in the dust." Here is something called "them" that is said to "dwell in houses of clay," which shows there is something immortal dwelling in the "mortal man," or "house of clay." The "house of clay" is the "mortal man." The "mortal man" ("house of clay," or body of flesh) cannot "be more just than God."

In Job 10: 11 we read, "Thou hast clothed *me* with skin and flesh, and hast fenced *me* with bones and sinews." Here is something called "me" "fenced" with "bones" and "sinews." It is "clothed" with "skin and flesh." So this "me" is neither the "skin," "flesh," "bones" nor "sinews." This "me" is "clothed" and "fenced" with all these things. Remember, too, it was this "me" doing the talking and telling what it, he or she was "clothed" and "fenced" with.

In Job 33: 4 we are told who made this "me" and who gave this "me" life: "The *spirit of God* hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life." So this "me" was made by "the spirit of God," hence immortal. The "breath of the Almighty" gave this "me" life, so this "me" which is in the flesh (or body) has life.

We also learn the breath is not the life nor the "me" within the flesh. In Psa. 22: 26 we read: "Your heart shall live forever." So here is something within man that will never die—it will "live *forever*."

In Psa. 115: 17 is another text they often quote: "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." Of course the dead can't praise God, but there is something within us that never dies. The body, which is mortal, dies, of course, and hence, cannot "praise the Lord," but the very next verse says, "But we will bless the Lord from *this time forth* and *for evermore*. Praise the Lord"! So we learn there is something within us called "we" which will "bless the Lord" after the death of the body and will bless, or praise, Him "forevermore."

The dead know not anything; they sleep with their fathers, etc.; is all true. There is too, some analogy between a dead man and one asleep, but that analogy is only in that which is outward and visible. For when men are asleep in body the mind is often employed in the most active enterprises, pains and pleasures, so much as to arouse the body from that repose. So the body is not unconscious while in that sleep. The sophism on the part of "soul-sleepers" consists in their assuming that a resemblance in one or more respects is always proof of universal resemblance. If it be not always proof of universal resemblance, why infer it is so in this case? Do not those who deny that souls can sleep, themselves say of the dead that "they have fallen asleep," merely because of the resemblance between the body of the living man in sleep and that of a man dead? Strange logic it would be, should every figure we use be taken as proof

that we are always to be understood according to the letter.

But we have furnished evidence enough, hence will close these articles by saying Moses appeared on earth about 1,480 years after his death. He died on Mt. Pisgah, in the land of Moab, when about 120 years old, in the year of the world 2,553; and in about the year of our Lord 33 he appeared on Mt. Tabor (Matt. 17), which is proof that, though his body was dead, he (Moses)—the *real man*—was still living.

LOVE AND AFFECTION

Webster defines love, in part, thus: "n. A strong feeling of affection, especially to one of the opposite sex; courtship; devoted affection for or attachment to; parental care; a sweetheart; v. t. to regard with strong affection, feel devoted toward; delight in; to be in love; have strong affection."

With this before us we can understand what is meant by the Father so loving the world that he gave his Son (John 3: 16) to save the world, if the world would believe in and obey the Son. It was His "devoted affection for" those who were refusing to obey Him. He had created them, was feeding and clothing them; but they appreciated it not, and were on their way to everlasting ruin.

We know what it is to love our wives, children and parents. God has so arranged it that we may have a "strong feeling of affection" for "one of the opposite sex," hence we marry and people the earth.

But can we love our enemies as God did? Perhaps we cannot have the same love for them we have for those nearer and dearer to us, and should not have. (We explained this in another article.) But we can and should love them in the sense of wishing them well in all that is right; being willing to feed them when hungry and give them drink when thirsty. If we really love the brotherhood we love to assist

and encourage them. If we really love God we love the brotherhood, and if we love the brotherhood we love our enemies. But we love our brethren in the sense of preferring them; our enemies, in the sense of wishing them well in all that is right; our Lord, in the sense of wishing to please and obey Him. If we love a brother or sister in the Church with Christian love we will never harm, offend or cause that one to be grieved; that is, we will not purposely do such things.

How many claim to love the Lord and yet grieve him with their dirty, smutty words! Bitterness, wrath, anger, clamour, evil-speaking and corrupt communication (Eph. 4: 29-31) must be put away from us. Love will banish all such things from our minds. But many "Christians" are guilty of these things, and, hence, grieve their Lord. This, then, is proof their love for Him is not "a *strong* feeling of affection." It is very weak. Too bad!

Again: "If you love me you *will* keep my words" (John 14: 23). But some "Christians" often refuse to keep these words of His: "not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is" (Heb. 10: 25),—and go visiting on the Lord's Day, or stay at home and entertain company. Their love is weak instead of strong. Jesus says they don't love him.

In John 3: 16 we learn of the wonderful love of God in giving his Son. It declares (1) that God is love. But God is also said to be "a consuming fire" hence we cannot conclude (with Universalists) that God cannot punish because He is love. The disobedient will be punished with sorer punishment than death (Heb. 10: 29), so we need not think the disobedient will escape. (2) He loved the world instead of hating it. Some "Christians" even hate some of their own brethren, and often without a cause. (3) He so loved mankind that he gave his Son. We often refuse to give of our means to help save a soul from death. (4) He came to keep men from perishing. He did not come to appease the Father's wrath, but the Father sent him because He loved man

so well. The sun does not shine to benefit itself, but to benefit others. Christ did not come to benefit himself, but to benefit and help others. Are we imitating His life? Are we "walking in His steps"? What are *you* doing to help and benefit others? Love will cause you to help the one you love. Love will cause you to wish to be with the one you love. If you love your family you will wish to be with them. If you love the Lord's family you will be with them every Lord's Day when it is possible for you to do so. If you love the Lord you *will* obey him, and will have a strong desire to be where his body and blood are represented each Lord's Day.

The love and self-sacrifice of Christians have done more to extend the name of Christ and persuade men to obey Him than has argument. In the early ages heathen were wont to say, "See how these Christians love one another!" Our lives should be the best sermons preached in the community where we live. Love for God and the brethren will make clean lives.

We use the words "affectionate," "charity," "love," etc., as synonyms, yet there is a difference. We may be affectionate and not love; but if we love we will be affectionate. "Affectionate" is literally the quality of being, or the tendency to be, moved toward an object with tenderness and good-will. It regards in particular some enduring relationship; as we say, an affectionate father, husband, wife, son, daughter, friend. Affection is a natural, instinctive feeling. It has not the reasoning attachment of friendship nor the ardour of love, but is quite compatible with the first, and may grow into the second. It is kept alive by habitual converse, and is apt to be altogether lost under separation. It may be felt toward the lower animals and reciprocated by them.

Kindness belongs rather to natural temperament than specific association. It is possible to be kind to strangers; and we should be, and to persons generally. Too many of us lack this qualification for effective work in the home, in the

community and in the Church. We should be kinder even to animals, than many of us are. The epithet "kind" qualifies actions; "affectionate," only feelings and dispositions. Affection is measured by feeling, kindness by treatment. Kindness is often a duty or a virtue where affection would be quite out of place, as from a master to a servant. Kindness by you may cause me to be moved toward you with tenderness and good-will. You, by being kind to me, may cause me to become affectionate. This natural, instinctive feeling may be "created" within the person shown kindness. This being true, we can see how we may win many precious souls to Christ by being kind to them. We never gain anything by being cross and hateful with those who are aliens from the Lord and the goodness of His power. It never pays to be hateful and unkind.

"*Fond*" expresses the weak, self-indulgent side of affection. If this is carried to the extent of over-indulgence, the object has too much power or influence, and fondness becomes servitude (whether to inanimate things or animate); for fondness is employed (unlike the others) of immaterial objects, and especially of occupations, pursuits, pleasures. So characteristic is weakness of the tendency of fondness that in some connections the term "fond" is used as simply equivalent to "foolish," as—a fond (that is, unfounded) imagination—one in which inclination to believe takes the place of truth. Many persons have allowed kindness to impress them that fondness should follow. It should; but should not be carried to the extent of over-indulgence.

O, there is so much to watch and fight against while we are in the flesh! That, however, will not prevent the real Christian man and woman from doing their duty in regard to being kind to all mankind and making an effort to win souls to Christ. If our faith in Jesus is what it should be, we will stand and never fall!

MYSTERIES: LOVE AND FAITH

In 1 Tim. 3: 16 we read, "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." Paul says the "mystery of godliness" is without controversy. None will try to explain all the mysteries connected with godliness. Paul mentions six of them in this verse.

Where there is faith there may be love, and where there is love there will be good feelings, good-will and tranquility. We all live by faith, in the material, political and religious kingdoms. I did not see Abraham Lincoln assassinated, but I have the evidence that makes me believe he was assassinated. It is simply a matter of faith with us all. I did not see Jesus assassinated, but I have the evidence that makes me believe He was assassinated.

The early writings of Moses are the oldest history in the world. No other history comes within five hundred years of those writings of Moses. It is there we have the history of the origin of man, beast, birds and seeds.

Some mysteries hover round and about the Bible's advent into the world, and because of this some pretend to be infidels, or evolutionists as advocated by Mr. Darwin.

As far back as history takes us the young aquatic larva of an amphibian existed just as it does today. The frog was a frog, the fish a fish, the water lily a water lily, etc., the monkey a monkey, and men were men just as they are today. If man sprang from the lowly, soulless vertebrae of the sea, and came up through all these seafish, flowers, animals, etc., why is he not still evolving in that way? Who stopped the process? Here is proof of a higher power, and faith in that higher power will enable us to appreciate all the temporal blessings daily and hourly received.

They deny the Gospel being "the seed of the Kingdom,"

but admit they cannot destroy it. Some mystery surrounds the advent of the Gospel into this world, and because it cannot all be explained satisfactorily they claim not to believe it.

We ask them to tell us which existed first: the tomato or the tomato seed, and they can't tell us—to save their lives! A mystery they can't explain, hence they should deny there being any such thing as tomatoes!

We ask them to explain to us how it is that a horse, rabbit, goose and sheep may be placed in the same field and allowed nothing to eat but grass, and yet this grass will produce fur on the rabbit, hair on the horse, feathers on the goose and wool on the sheep! Until they can explain this mystery they must not lay their carcass on a feather-bed nor place a woolen suit on their backs. If they are going to be consistent, they will have to deny the existence of everything they cannot explain!

Every motion of our bodies, or every breath we draw, involves a mystery. Inert matter cannot move itself, and we know that our bodies are as inert as a block of wood or iron, since a dead man cannot move himself. Then what moves a living man's body? Life is an entity substance, though intangible and incorporeal.

No better illustration is needed than the movement of the inert bit of steel connected with a stick of wood with which we form letters into words, words into sentences, sentences into arguments, and upon which the reader's attention is riveted. The pen evidently cannot move itself, neither can the pen-holder. But, you say, the man holds the pen in his fingers, and they are the moving cause of the pen's action. But what moves the fingers? You answer, the hand; the hand is moved by the arm; the arm by the body, and so on. True; but all these are only inert matter, and neither of them can move itself any more than can the pen. And since only the actual contact of one substantial body can displace another body when at rest, there must be within the body a

substantial, intelligent entity superior to corporeal matter, which not only plans the words and sentences the man writes, but which, by actual contact, moves upon the nerves, muscles, ligaments, joints and bones of the arm, even to the tips of the fingers; and which, finally culminates in the orderly motions of the pen, leaving characters upon the paper which the reader translates into thought. In this alone is proof the real man is within our bodies, and that the real is the unseen.

There are most always, if not always, mysteries surrounding the invisible, too, yet we cannot deny their existence. But if we cannot deny their reality, how can we deny the real, unseen personage of God?

The real man is within our bodies (as we have now proven), hence we should say we feel through our fingers and see through our eyes. When our bodies are cold in death we will neither see nor feel with the natural eyes and fingers.

To think of these things, and a hundred more we might mention, should cause us to realize there is a higher power than man, and that He has done many things hard to be understood.

"LET BROTHERLY LOVE CONTINUE"

(HEBREWS 13: 1)

" LOVE YOUR ENEMIES"

I wish to write upon the subject of "Love" for the benefit of myself as well as others. Preachers should preach to themselves as well as others. "Love your enemies"; "Bless them that persecute you"; "If your enemy hunger feed him," etc., are statements found in the word of God which some say they cannot understand. The reason, of course, is because they have never studied the subject of Love. Such persons know nothing about the different degrees and different meanings of the word Love. They haven't *studied* it. There is quite a difference between studying and reading. We can't study the Bible without reading it, but we can, and many do, read it without studying it.

God told Paul to tell you and me to "Let brotherly love continue," but how many of us do this? How many of us know what the word "love" means? One has said we could not define the word "love" because it is as high as heaven and as deep as the ocean, which is true. But I am going to make an effort to give a dictionary definition of the word; I think we will then be better prepared to study the word in the light of the Scriptures. Now for a definition of the word "love":

Transitive: 1. To regard with strong feelings of affection, combined with gratitude; to feel devoted toward.

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and will all thy mind."—Matt. 22: 37.

2. To regard with feelings of tender affection, as one sex toward the other; to be in love with.

"Husbands, *love* your wives as Christ loved the church."
—Eph. 5: 25.

3. To regard with the affection of a friend.

4. To be pleased with; to like; to delight in.

In grammar, a *transitive verb* is one which is or may be followed by an object; a verb expressing an action which passes from the agent to an object, from the subject which *does* to the object on which it *is done*. Thus, "Cicero wrote letters to Atticus." In this sentence, the act of writing, performed by Cicero, the agent, terminated on letters, the object.

So under the definitions above mentioned we can love God in the sense that we have great "regard with strong feelings of affection, combined with gratitude." But we could not love a sinner and an enemy of the Bible, Church and God, in that sense, for the simple reason that this "affection" and "gratitude" could not pass from the agent to the object. We could not "feel devoted toward" that enemy of all righteousness, yet we are to *love* him. But in what sense?—that is the question. We could not "be in love *with*" him, but might have love *for* him.

"Love" as defined above, is a love that cannot be "passed from the agent to the object, from the subject which *does* to the object on which it *is done*." Rather, I should have said the love for the *enemy*, as mentioned above, cannot be passed from the agent to the object, etc. But the "love" as defined above can be passed in that way, hence we love God, Christ, the Church, etc., in this sense. We cannot love our enemies who are enemies of the cause of Christ in the sense of being "pleased with; to like; to delight in," etc.

But we will continue the definition of the word "love":

Intransitive: 1. To entertain feelings of affection toward others; to be affectionate and kind. "He that *loveth* not knoweth not God."—1 John 4: 8.

2. To be tenderly affected toward another of the opposite sex; to be in love.

3. To be tenderly attached to each other; to love each other.

4. To be pleased; to feel pleasure.

An intransitive verb is one which expresses an action or state that is limited to the agent, or, in other words, an action that does not *pass over to*, or operate upon an object; as *I walk; I run; I sleep*.

So we can "entertain feelings of affection toward others" even though they be our enemies. And we can "be affectionate and kind" with those who are both our enemies and enemies of Jesus Christ. But this love is not a "union love" or "binding love." I mean by this that it is in our own hearts, and nowhere else. It is not passed "from the agent to an object." We pity and feel sorry for our enemies, and pray for their repentance. We don't love God and the brethren in this way, unless it is a fallen brother. It is not "passed over to, or operated upon the object." It is *I love; I pity; I pray for you*, just as it is, "*I walk; I run; I sleep*." You understand the distinction without further explanation.

Ordinary language: 1. A strong feeling of affection, combined with gratitude and reverence. "For this is the *love* of God, that we keep his commandment."—1 John 5: 3.

2. Devoted attachment to a person of the opposite sex, Byron said:

Which still would meet with joy, with calmness part,
 "Yes—it was *love*—if thoughts of tenderness,
 Tried in temptation, strengthened by distress,
 Unmoved by absence, firm in every clime,
 And yet—oh, more than all!—untired by time;
 Which nor defeated hope, nor baffled while,
 Could render sullen, were she near to smile;
 Nor rage could fire, nor sickness fret to vent
 On her one murmur of his discontent;

Which still would meet with joy, with calmness part,
 Lest that his look of grief should reach her heart;
 Which nought removed, nor menaced to remove—
 If there be *love* in mortals—this was *love!*”

3. Strong attachment, liking, or inclination; fondness of or for anything.

* * * *

10. A state of favor, friendship, goodness, or close intimacy. “God brought Daniel into favor and tender *love* with the prince.”—Dan. 1: 9.

We can have “a strong feeling of affection” for our enemies, and *must have* if we wish to be Christians. But we must have more than that for God. Any one can love his enemies in the Scriptural sense, but not with the same degree of love he has for God. I love my wife and children, but must love God and Christ with a greater degree of love than I have for them. I love my enemies, but must love my brethren with a greater degree of love than that which I have for my enemies. Remember, too, that this “brotherly love” must “continue.” I need not define the word “continue,” for you all know what it means. If “brotherly love does not continue,” some one is to blame, and some one will be held responsible in the Judgment by God himself. Let us be careful.

“*Love* subsists between members of the same family; it springs out of their natural relationship, and is kept alive by their close intercourse and constant interchange of kindness: *friendship* excludes the idea of any tender and natural relationship; nor is it, like *love*, to be found in children, but is confined to maturer years; it is formed by time, by circumstances, by congruity of character, and sympathy of sentiment. *Love* always operates with ardor; *friendship* is remarkable for firmness and constance. Both *love* and *friendship* are gratified by seeking the good of the object;

but *love* is more selfish in its nature than *friendship*. As *love* is a passion, it has all the errors attendant upon passions; but *friendship*, which is an affection tempered by reason, is exempt from every such exceptionable quality. *Love* is blind to the faults of the object of its devotion; it adores; it idolizes, it is fond, it is foolish; *friendship* sees faults, and strives to correct them; it aims to render the object more worthy of esteem and regard." (Crabb: Eng. Synon.)

So we can now understand, if we did not before, why Christ often called his disciples "*friends*." It is *friendship* (love) we have for our brethren. Love—real love, deep love—sees no faults, hence we can love God in the strongest sense of the word. But we cannot love our brethren that way, as it would hide all their faults, hence corruption would rule supreme. God and Christ being *faultless* we can love them with all our heart, soul and strength. We can and must love our brethren ("Let brotherly love continue") dearly, but this *friendship* enables us to see their mistakes, and we befriend them by speaking to them concerning their mistakes. You are my friend if you tell me kindly of my mistakes. Your love (friendship) for me causes you to be anxious to have me live right, hence you gladly tell me of my mistakes. Your love (friendship) for me causes you to be interested in my salvation. Mr. Hume has well said:

"Whoever has passed an evening with serious, melancholy people, and has observed how suddenly the conversation was animated, and what sprightliness diffused itself over the countenance, discourse, and behavior of every one on the occasion of a good-humored, lively companion, such a one will easily allow that *cheerfulness* carries great weight with it, and naturally conciliates the good will of mankind."

If we are really friends we can be *cheerful* with each other. We will wish each other well, and will assist each other in everything that is right. The Apostle Paul has said that "*charity* (love) will hide a multitude of sins." Real love—deep love which is transitive—sees no sin. This is the

love with which we love God. But it is dangerous to have such love for each other. No wonder Christ said, "The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak." O, if we could always remember the weakness of the flesh, that we might be able to fight against it harder.

II

In the other article I only tried to give a definition of the word "love" with a few comments. This time I wish to deal with the subject more than the definition. I will not give my ideas of the Hebrew brethren who had obeyed the Gospel down there in Palestine, lest some one criticise. We have some brethren who believe God *especially* blesses the Jews; others who think God will *especially* bless them and restore *every one of them* in Palestine. Of course I don't believe this, and those who differ from me would say I have not studied the Scriptures sufficiently to be a safe teacher on those questions, though I have been *compelled* to study the question hard by day and by night, as I have had to meet it in every discussion with Mormons and Russellites. I don't know it all, however. I expect to be a disciple (learner) as long as I live. No one has ever heard me claim to be a "know-it-all." I am a learner, and expect to be as long as the good Lord lets me live and remain rational. But Paul said to them, "Let brotherly love *continue*," and it was written for *you* and for *me*. We can easily break up that love by cool treatment and unnecessary criticisms. We should be friendly (*friends*), and treat each other kindly, if we would let "brotherly love continue."

This short verse contains much; if we obey it there will be but little trouble among the brethren: "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have *love* one to another" (John 13: 35). Thus *love* is made a test of discipleship. It is not *the* test, but "a test." The world is looking on with a critical eye, and I am glad of it. True Christians will watch their words, acts, etc., toward each other closer. If

we actually love each other we will not mistreat each other. I love my children, hence will not purposely mistreat them. I won't wish to do anything that would cause them to have more suffering and sorrow. I wish to make life as happy for them as possible.

The world (sinners) knows that if we love each other we will not mistreat each other. This is one way by which they test our discipleship. If we wish *all* men to know that we are disciples of Christ, let us love each other dearly as *brethren* in the Lord, then we will not criticise, backbite and devour each other, and cause the world to laugh and say, "If *that* is Christianity I don't want any of it!"

In Rom. 12: 9 Paul says, "Let love be without dissimulation." But what does the word "dissimulation" mean? It means "dissembling; a hiding under a false appearance; hypocrisy," etc. Then Paul means that we should let our love be without "hypocrisy," or deception. To be a hypocrite is to be one of the very worst kind of persons. If you love me I want to know it; it is not right to keep it hid. If we love each other we cannot keep it hid. But if you don't love me I don't want you to pretend that you do when with me, and then when my back is turned, try to injure me. If you can give me the "right hand of fellowship" I will appreciate it, but I don't want you to give me the "right hand of falsehood." "Let *love* be without dissimulation," without hypocrisy. Don't "hide under a false appearance." Let us not use deception. Paul has here condemned it.

"These six things doth the Lord *hate*: yea, seven are an abomination unto him: a proud look, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood, an heart that deviseth wicked imaginations, feet that be swift in running to mischief, a false witness that speaketh lies, and he that soweth discord among brethren" (Prov. 6: 16-19). The Lord's loves should be our loves, and his hates should be ours. Paul said, "Be ye imitators of Him" (Eph. 5: 1), and if we do this we will hate what He hates and love what he loves. God hates

a "proud look"; then I, too, must hate it. I can't *love* pride. God hates a "lying tongue"; then I, too, must hate it. I cannot love lying. I must *hate* it! I must not use "hypocrisy," either. I must not pretend to love a lying tongue when I am with a liar, and then abuse him to his back. If I love God and the brethren I cannot love the "lying tongue." All of these seven things I must hate, if I love God.

"Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God" (1 John 4: 7). "Beloved, let us *love* one another." Why? because "*love* is of God." That is a good reason. Love does not come from the devil, unless it is love for sin, the enemy of all righteousness. But we are not now speaking of that. The "love" the "beloved" has is from God. "*Let us love one another,*" is beautiful language that should appeal to us and tender our hearts. Yes, "let brotherly love continue." But Baptists say the moment a man *believes* he is born of God. I believe we will have to *love* God before we can believe in Him. I haven't much faith in a man I have no love for. I have no love for the devil, hence have no faith in him. I want to know if a man can love God if he does not believe in Him? If a man is saved the moment he believes, how can *love* save him? Does he *love* before he is saved, or in order to be saved? So you see this will work both ways.

The definition of "love" given in the preceding article will help us out here. A man must have some faith in God before he can love Him; likewise, he must have some love for him before he can have much faith in Him. Baptists get mixed just a little here. Others do too; Baptists are not the only ones. Read the entire 4th chapter of 1 John. It is good.

"If ye love me, keep my commandments" (John 14: 15). Those that *love* the Lord will keep his commandments, for he says, in the 23d verse, "If a man *love* me, he will *keep* my words." That, then, settles the question, If we love Him we *will* keep his words—his commandments. It is useless for us to *pretend* to love Him and at the same time refuse

to go to meeting on Lord's days when we could go. Yes, and many, many other things He says *do*, you leave undone! You don't love Him or you would keep his words. "*Love*" will not sow discord, will not tell lies on brethren, will not shed innocent blood, will not remain from the worship when possible to be there, but will "endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4: 3).

THE MINISTRY OF ANGELS

"Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" (Hebrews 1: 14).

The Jews affirm that God not only spake in the law by the prophets, but that angels, or celestial messengers, were likewise employed in giving that institution—that they "received the law by the disposition of angels" (Acts 7: 53). To this the apostle makes no objection, but declares that Christ is much better than the angels (Hebrews 1: 4-6). If then, the law was glorious because it was given by the disposition of angels, how much more glorious must the gospel be, when these very angels are commanded to fall down and worship the divine personage by whom the gospel was given?

"Are they not all ministering spirits?" We are not to suppose, because Paul presents this matter in the form of a question, that he had any doubt as to the truth of the fact referred to—that angels ministered unto salvation's heirs. He often adopts the interrogative form when speaking of things about which there can exist no doubt. To the Corinthians, he said: "Am I not an apostle? am I not free? have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" (1 Corinthians 9: 1). Now, does this mean that Paul doubted his apostleship? Surely not! He adopts the interrogative form in reference to the most indisputable facts.

Now let us examine the scriptures which refer to the ministration of angels. The term angel means "one who is sent, a messenger." Thus, it implies office, without defining the nature of the office. Angels may be mortal or immortal. They may be celestial, terrestrial or infernal. They may be sent by the Almighty, by men, or by the devil. They may be sent from heaven, from earth, or from hell. But all these of which we speak, are celestial in their nature and office. While contrasting the angels referred to with him through whom God has revealed the gospel, Paul says, God "maketh his angels spirits and his ministers a flame of fire." They are spirits, and have been seen in flaming fire (Cp. Exodus 3: 2).

Let us notice the great velocity with which the angels can transport themselves from one part of this vast universe to another. The destroying angel which went through the whole length and breadth of the land of Egypt, visited every family and residence in one night. With what terrific speed he must have travelled. But the most striking example is found in Daniel 9: 20, 21. Daniel declares, "While I was speaking and praying, and confessing my sin, and the sin of my people Israel, and presenting my supplication before the Lord my God, for the mountain of my God; yea, while I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation."

Now, that there is a place somewhere in the vast dominions of the universe, where the Almighty dwells in His glory, all admit, who believe the truth. Into this most holy place it was that Christ "entered, there to appear in the presence of God for us." How far that holy, happy place may be from us, we know not. It may be, and no doubt is, far beyond the most distant fixed star. Let us then imagine, if we can, the distance of ninety-five million miles to the sun, and then realize that the most distant star is far beyond the sun, and then suppose this "most holy place" to be far

beyond that—how far must it be? It is beyond the power of all human conception.

While Daniel was praying that short prayer this angel came all of that distance from this heaven of heavens and stood by Daniel's side. God told him to "fly swiftly" and he certainly did so, in order to travel that tremendous distance in such a short space of time.

The number of angels is not given, but the Scriptures clearly indicate that it is great. When the angel brought the news of the Saviour's birth to the shepherds, suddenly there was with the angel "a multitude of the heavenly host, praising God" (Luke 2: 13). The term "multitude" always implies a very great company. Christ asked, "Thinkest thou that I cannot pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?" Daniel said, "Thousand thousands ministered unto him" (Daniel 7: 10). Paul said they had come to "an innumerable company of angels" (Hebrews 12: 22). This puts the number beyond the realm of human computation.

Reader, if you are not a Christian, why not? Would you not like to join this host of God's elect? Would you not like to become one of God's chosen through obedience to his plan? Oh, what a glorious thought it is that the blood of Jesus, God's only Son, has brought us into connection and relation with this glorious host. Brother, sister, let us work on, toil on, watch and pray, until God our Father shall call us home to join this innumerable company of angels.

THE TWO COVENANTS

The law of Moses is not the gospel of Christ, and we are living under the gospel of Christ, therefore, not under the law of Moses. Moses was a type of Christ, however, and his examples are worthy our consideration and were given for our learning (Rom. 15. 4; 1 Cor. 10: 6-11), but I fear few are learning in that school. The first law was in force till the death of Christ, then the second will took the place of the first. "For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth" (Heb. 9: 16, 17). Thus it is plain to be seen that after the death of Christ we were no longer under the first testament, yet people will go to the law to justify themselves in the use of the mourners' bench, sprinkling for baptism, instrumental music in their worship, etc.

1. The law of Moses was only the shadow of good things to come. "Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ" (Col. 2: 17). "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices, which they offered year by year, continually, make the comers thereunto perfect" (Heb. 10: 1). The law, therefore was not perfect, but pointed to a perfect law. "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established on better promises. For if that first covenant had been perfect then should no place have been sought for the second" (Heb. 8: 6, 7). The first covenant was a faulty or imperfect covenant; hence the necessity of a second, established upon better promises. It is impossible for us to keep both covenants.

2. Fulfillment. Christ intended to fulfil every word of the law, and he did it. "Think not that I am come to destroy the

law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matt. 5: 17, 18). "And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me" (Luke 24: 44). The prophecies that referred to Christ were therefore fulfilled.

3. The weakness of the law. There were some things the law could not do that the gospel of Christ can do. Let us read: "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8: 3). Let us now see what it is that the law cannot do for us.

(a) It could not justify. "And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts 13: 39).

(b) It could not produce righteousness. "I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness came by the law, then Christ is dead in vain" (Gal. 2: 21).

(c) It could not produce life. "Is the law then against the promise of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law" (Gal. 3: 21).

(d) It could not bring about perfection. "For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did" (Heb. 7: 19).

(e) It could not free the conscience from a knowledge of sin. "For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year" (Heb. 10: 1-4).

Thus we find at least five things that the law is weak in;

five things that the law could not do that the gospel does do for those that believe and obey its teaching. If we accept the last will and testament we will not practice circumcision; we will not use instrumental music in the worship of God; we will not keep the Sabbath (Saturday) as a day of rest; we will not practice sprinkling for baptism, etc., but we will immerse the body in order to get into Christ (Gal. 3: 27; Rom. 6: 3-5); we will practice vocal singing (Matt. 26: 28; Eph. 5: 19; Col. 3: 16; Heb. 13: 15); we will meet on the first day of the week (Acts 20: 7; 1 Cor. 16: 2; Heb. 10: 25-28).

4. It is impossible for all men to keep it. The law was given to and for Israel only. (See Ex. 19: 1-25; 20: 1-27; 31: 13-18.) We will read Mal. 4: 4: "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments." Malachi says this law was for whom? "All Israel." It never was given to the Gentile. I have had men to tell me that I could not find where it was called the law of Moses. I find Malachi calls it "the law of Moses," and Paul in Heb. 10: 28 calls it the law of Moses. We can easily see that it is not intended that all men should keep the law by looking at it from two standpoints, if no more.

(a) All the males of the Hebrews (not Gentiles) were commanded to appear before the Lord at a designated place three times a year (Ex. 23: 14-17; 12: 4-16).

(b) Those to whom the law was given were commanded, on penalty of death, not to kindle a fire throughout their (Jews) habitations on the Sabbath day (Ex. 35: 1-3). This we could not do and impossibilities are not required. The Hebrews in that country could obey that command.

5. The law abolished.

(a) The law is abolished. "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances," etc., (Eph. 2: 14-16). "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so

that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away" (2 Cor. 3: 7).

(b) That Christ is the end of the law. "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth" (Rom. 10: 4). Christ is the end of what? The law, Paul says. But the end of the law to whom? Paul says, to every one that believeth. Then, dear reader, if you are under the law you are an unbeliever.

(c) It is the ministration of death. (See Ex. 32: 27, 28 in connection with 2 Cor. 3: 7.) "And he said unto them, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Put every man his sword by his side, and go in and out from gate to gate throughout the camp, and slay every man his brother and every man his companion, and every man his neighbor. And the children of Levi did according to the word of Moses and there fell of the people that day about three thousand men."

(d) Christ took away the first that he might establish the second. "Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first that he may establish the second." (Heb. 10: 9. Read from 5th verse to close of 9th verse.) "In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away" (Heb. 8: 13). What covenant was it that was to vanish away?

II

The law was nailed to the cross. "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross" (Col. 2: 14). Some say baptism and the communion of the blood and body of Christ are two of the ordinances that were taken out of the way and nailed to the cross. But Paul says it was the "handwriting of ordinances" that was taken out of the way. The ordinance of baptism and the Lord's supper had not been written at the time Christ died,

but the law had been written (Ex. 31: 18; 32: 15; Deut. 4: 13; 5: 22; Eph. 2: 14-16), and it was the law that Paul refers to that was taken out of the way and nailed to the cross.

Those who had been under the law were delivered, or made free, from it. "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (Rom. 8: 2). "For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died" (Rom. 7: 9). "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God" (Rom. 7: 4). All Christians are dead to the law and alive to Christ, is the way Paul indicates it, but Paul's way doesn't suit some people very well.

Christians are not under the law but under the gospel, or grace. "For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace" (Rom. 6: 14).

They are no longer under the schoolmaster. "But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster" (Gal. 3: 25).

They are not required to serve the law. "Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law; to whom we gave no such commandment" (Acts 15: 24).

If Christians keep one point in the law they are to keep it all. "For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law" (Gal. 5: 3). "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all" (James 2: 10). If you use instrumental music and claim that it was used under the law by the authority of God, you must also offer your lambs, etc., as burnt offerings. You must also be circumcised and have your male children circumcised at the age of eight days, or

you will become a transgressor of the law, hence a sinner in the sight of God. If you just offend in one point you are guilty of all.

The Christian who sought justification under the law had fallen from grace. "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace" (Gal. 5: 4). Brother, sister, remember that if you cannot find authority for what you teach and practice in the New Covenant, but go to the Old Testament to justify yourself, that you not only fall from grace but Christ becomes of no effect unto you, and certainly you cannot be saved.

The righteousness of God is revealed in the gospel without the law. "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all them that believe: for there is no difference" (Rom. 3: 21, 22).

Now we are prepared to contrast the law with the gospel. The law was intended for one nation—Israel. (Ex. 20: 1-17; Malachi 4: 4; Ex. 31: 13-18.) The gospel of Christ is intended for all nations and all generations. (Matt. 28: 19, 20; Mark 16: 15, 16; Luke 24: 45-47.)

The first covenant was dedicated with the blood of animals (Ex. 24: 6-8). The New Covenant was dedicated with the blood of Christ (Heb. 9: 13-17; 1 Peter 1: 18, 19).

The first institution was administered by frail men—the Levites (Lev. 16: 1-34; Heb. 7: 11-23). The second is administered by Jesus Christ, who was made priest, not by carnal commandments but "after the power of an endless life" (Heb. 7: 16). Circumcision in the flesh was a sign of the first (Gen. 17: 1-4; Lev. 12: 1-13). Circumcision in the heart and spirit is the sign of the second (Rom. 2: 29; Phil. 3: 3; Col. 2: 11).

The law of Moses guaranteed to the obedient Jew temporal blessings (Deut. 28: 1-6). The gospel of Christ guarantees to the obedient spiritual blessings (2 Peter 1: 4).

The law guaranteed to the Jews the land of Canaan (Deut. 30: 5). The gospel of Christ guarantees a heavenly Canaan, or eternal life, to the Christian (1 John 5: 20; Rom. 6: 22, 23).

The law of Moses prohibited the Jew from taking the name of God in vain, but commanded him to "swear" by the name of God (Ex. 20: 7; Deut. 6: 13). The gospel forbids all swearing, and requires that our communications be "yea" and "nay" (Matt. 5: 37; James 5: 12).

The law of Moses required the Jews to remember the Sabbath day, and keep it holy (Ex. 20: 8-11). Under the gospel of Jesus Christ the people of God remember their passover (Christ) upon the first day of the week, and the sabbaths are called "a shadow" (Matt. 26: 26-30; Acts 2: 42; 20: 7; 1 Cor. 5: 7; 11: 23-29; 16: 1, 2; Col. 2: 16, 17).

The law of Moses prohibited murder (Ex. 20: 13). The gospel prohibits hatred (Matt. 5: 22; 1 John 3: 14, 15). The law of Moses forbade adultery (Ex. 20: 14). The gospel forbids even lust (Matt. 5: 28).

The law was changed. The law of Moses as a history, etc., remains to be read and studied, and in order to understand the New Covenant we must become acquainted with the Old Testament, but there has been a change. "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law" (Heb. 7: 12). "Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second" (Heb. 10: 9).

The day the Old Covenant was broken. "And I took my staff, even beauty, and cut it asunder, that I might break my covenant which I had made with all the people. And it was broken in that day; and so the poor of the flock that waited upon me knew that it was the word of the Lord. And I said unto them, If ye think good, give me my price; and if not, forbear. So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord" (Zech. 11: 10-13). "Then one of the twelve, called Judas

Iscariot, went unto the chief priests, and said unto them, What will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you? And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver" (Matt. 26: 16, 15). In connection with this read Matt. 27: 3-10, and you have the prophecy fulfilled. God said he would break the covenant, then said it was broken in that day, and in Matt. 27: 3-10, we learn the very day that it was broken. It was the day Christ our Lord was crucified. Yes, the law was taken out of the way and nailed to the cross. Who is prepared to deny this?

III

The first covenant was from Mt. Sinai; the second from Mt. Zion. "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free-woman. But he who was of the bond-woman was born after the flesh; but he of the free-woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. . . . Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bond-woman and her son: for the son of the bond-woman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free' (Gal. 4: 21-31).

We are not children of the bond-woman, or, in other words, we are not under the first covenant, which was from mount Sinai, and Agar is the representative of that law. Paul says, "Cast out the bond-woman and her son," for "we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free." Notice, the bond-woman and her son were both to be cast out, but our mother—Jerusalem—the Church—is to remain. Let us read Heb. 12: 22-24 in connection with the above: "But

ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels; to the general assembly and church of the first born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." Read to close of chapter! This Jerusalem Paul refers to in Gal. 4 is, therefore, the church of the new covenant, and all Christians are living under this covenant. Those who go to the first covenant to justify themselves, belong to the woman and child that were to be cast out, but those who go to the second covenant to justify themselves, and thus read chapter and verse for everything they teach and practice, belong to the woman—free-woman—that is to remain.

We learned in our eighth argument the very day this bond-woman was cast out. It was the day Christ died, and after his death the second covenant was given. (See Hebrews 9th chapter.) Under which covenant are you living, dear reader? Are you a member of a church that is not mentioned in the new or last covenant, and going to Abraham in the first or old covenant for its origin? If so, Christ has become of no effect unto you. How serious—it is awful! Christ becomes of no effect unto you. Those using instrumental music in divine worship are in the same boat, drifting and drifting, farther and farther away from Christ, by going to the old law to justify themselves in the use of the instrument. They have, therefore, fallen from grace, and Christ has become of no effect unto them (Gal. 5: 1-4). "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, the just shall live by faith. And the law is not of faith: but, the man that doeth them shall live in them" (Gal. 3: 11, 12). But in the face of all these scriptures men will go there for justification.

10. Gospel and law contrasted. From the foregoing arguments we are prepared to contrast the two covenants again and see just what we have learned concerning them.

FIRST COVENANT

1. Moses the mediator.
2. Imperfect.
3. Faulty.
4. To Jews only.
5. On tables of stone.
6. Law.
7. The bond-woman.
8. Dedicated by the blood of animals.
9. Limited time.
10. Done away.
11. Glorious.
12. Law of sin and death.
13. Letter kills.
14. Yoke of bondage.
15. Fathers could not bear it.
16. Sins remembered.
17. Without blood of Christ.
18. Promised land of Canaan.
19. Could not justify.
20. Could not produce righteousness.
21. Could not give life.
22. Could not bring about perfection.
23. Could not free the conscience from a knowledge of sin.

SECOND COVENANT

1. Christ the mediator.
2. Perfect.
3. Faultless.
4. To all nations.
5. On fleshly tables of the heart.

6. Spirit.
7. Free-woman.
8. Dedicated by blood of Christ.
9. Will stand forever.
10. Remains.
11. More glorious.
12. Law of spirit of life.
13. Spirit gives life.
14. Yoke of freedom.
15. Easily borne.
16. Sins remitted.
17. With blood of Christ.
18. Promise of heaven.
19. Justifies.
20. Produces righteousness.
21. Gives life.
22. Brings perfection.
23. Frees the conscience from a knowledge of sin. "And I will remember their sins no more."—God.

All of these points of difference have been proven in the preceding arguments, by the many scriptures referred to, and we hope the reader will profit by them. Salvation and justification are found in the last will, and not in the first, yet we must study the first in connection with the second, and thus have the types and antitypes side by side. Someone has compared them thus:

1. The tabernacle considered as a whole, prefigured or foreshadowed good things to come (Heb. 8: 1-5; 9: 1-10; 10: 1). The court was a type of the world (Ex. 27: 9-18; Rev. 11: 1, 2).

2. The altar of burnt sacrifices was a type of the cross of Christ (Ex. 40: 29; John 12: 32, 33).

3. The laver was a type of Christ (Ex. 30: 18-21; John 1: 7; 1 Peter 1: 22).

4. The first veil or door was a type of the dividing line

between the world and the church (Ex. 26: 36, 37; John 3: 5; Acts 2: 38; 1 Cor. 12: 13).

5. The holy place was a type of the church (Ex. 26: 33; Heb. 8: 2).

6. The shewbread was a type of Christ (Ex. 40: 4; Lev. 24: 5-9; Matt. 28: 20; John 6: 48-63).

7. The candlestick was a type of Christ and the light of the gospel in the church (Ex. 40: 7, 8; Lev. 24: 1, 2; John 1: 4-9; 3: 20, 21; 2 Cor. 4: 4-6).

8. The altar of incense was a type of our worship (Ex. 30: 1-10; Mal. 1: 11; Rev. 8: 3).

9. The second vail was a type of the dividing line between the church and heaven (Ex. 26: 33; Heb. 10: 19-21).

10. The holy of holies was a type of heaven (Ex. 26: 33; Heb. 9: 24).

11. The mercy-seat was a type of our mercy-seat which is in heaven (Ex. 25: 10-22; 1 Tim. 1: 5, 6; Heb. 4: 14-16).

12. The light that filled the tabernacle was a type of the Holy Spirit who fills the church (Ex. 40: 33-38; 1 Cor. 3: 16, 17).

Thus we can see the necessity of studying the new in connection with the old covenant. "In thee and thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed," is the promise to Abraham (Gen. 12: 1-3), and in this promise are the blessings to you and me. Here, then, are two promises:

1. Promise pertained to earthly Canaan.

2. Pertained to the heavenly Canaan (Gen. 22: 15-18; Heb. 7: 5, 6; Eph. 2: 12; Gal. 4: 21-31; Deut. 4: 13).

The ten commandments, then, were the first covenant, given through Moses, and it was abolished to establish the second, as we have learned. Out of the ten commandments (Ex. 20), nine of them are embodied in the new covenant (see Rom. 13: 9); six of them are mentioned here (James 5: 12; Col. 3: 5; Rev. 19: 5). "Sabbath" is omitted. The Sabbath is only mentioned once in the writings of the apostles (Col. 2: 16), and it is here referred to as a shadow of

that which was to come. You may read the following scriptures for the beginning of the new covenant: Jer. 31: 31-34; Zech. 11: 10-14; Heb. 7: 12; 8: 6, 7. If you can find where God began to forgive sins, you can then find the beginning of the second covenant. (See Acts 2: 37, 38; Rom. 6: 3-5; Gal. 2: 16; 3: 11; Acts 9: 6; 22: 16.)

THE BOOK OF BOOKS

The word from which we have the word "Bible" means "book." The Bible, then, is *the* book, hence the Book of books. You can't be a successful lawyer without it, a successful farmer without it, a successful doctor without it. No legitimate business can be a success without the Bible. If the man in business knows nothing about the Bible, he gets advice from those who do. I have been in the court room where we preachers had to assist the lawyers all the time.

It is the *only* book that has ever been written that cannot be improved upon. Disciplines, prayer books, confessions of faith and many human creeds have been and are being written, but all of them have been and are being corrected and improved upon. If they contain more than the Bible they contain too much; if they contain less than the Bible they do not contain enough; if they are just like the Bible we do not need them, for we have the Bible.

Infidels admit that the Bible contains the best code of laws that has ever been written. They tell us that is the reason the Bible lives and cannot be destroyed. But that is an admission that the Bible came from a higher power than man. All books written by men can be improved upon. None of them contains as perfect a code of laws as does the Bible. No infidel will go and live where the Bible, church and prayers are not. But where there is no Bible, prayers and churches are almost if not quite unknown. Why doesn't the Bible critic go and live where it is not?

No man can improve upon the code of laws contained in the Bible. They have been trying it for thousands of years, and infidels admit it cannot be done. This is proof of a higher power than man or the law of evolution either.

One has well said that it "contains the mind of God, the state of man, the way of salvation, doom of sinners and happiness of believers. Its doctrines are holy, its precepts are binding, its histories are true, and its doctrines are immutable. Read it to be wise, believe it to be safe, and practice it to be holy. It contains light to direct you, food to support you, and comfort to cheer you. It is the traveler's map, the pilgrim's staff, the Pilot's compass, the soldier's sword, and the Christian's charter. Here Heaven is opened, and the gates of Hell disclosed. Christ is its grand subject, our good its design, and the glory of God its end.

"It should fill the memory, rule the heart, and guide the feet. Read it slowly, frequently, prayerfully. It is a mine of wealth, a paradise of glory and a river of Judgment, and will be remembered forever. It rewards the greatest labor, and condemns all who trifle with its holy contents."

It feeds and clothes the soul, cheers the weary, heals the broken heart, removes the dark clouds from our homes, and dries the tearful eyes. It is the foundation of happiness, the rock of salvation, the tree of life, and the pure water of hope and consolation.

Without the Bible there could be no year of our Lord, 1922; no knowledge of the origin of man, and no history of the creation of the universe. Without it we would be at a loss to know what we are, where we are and whither we are going. Without it men might be called apes, and apes be called men. Without it we would be and live as brutes, know not from whence we came, who brought us here nor who or what will take us away.

It is the mountain upon which we can stand and view the Canaan of Happiness: the valley in which we can live and enjoy the fragrance of the roses, and the flower garden in

which we can live and enjoy the sweet perfume of tranquillity.

It is more to be desired than gold, and sweeter than honey. It is the sweetness in the life of the infidel, and the paradise of the skeptic.

The Bible condemns every sin, and immoral thing, and teaches the necessity of all good and right things which are found in the lives of men. Without it we might guess we came from the lowly, soulless vertebra of the sea; that we were tadpoles, minnows, a fish, a whale, a shark, a sea-horse, a tiger, a bear, an elephant, then a baboon, an ape, a monkey and then—a man!?

We might guess the earth and all things therein came by the law of evolution and then wonder when that law began, since all animals were as they are now as far back as history will take us. Then we would also be at a loss to know what power stopped the law of evolution and where said power came from.

Truly, the Bible is the Book of books, and without it we could not live and transact business.

DEVELOP THE YOUNG

Develop—"to lay open to view." Development—"an unfolding."—Webster.

Who knows what the young member can do for the Lord if he has never been known to try, and how few members try to read in public, pray, exhort or preach without some encouragement? They are very few. Then we would say to the elders, Develop the young. Lay open to view the mind of the young man that others may see and know something of the deep thoughts and great reasoning power of the young men in your congregation. All young men, of course, haven't such great reasoning powers, but every talent should be unfolded (developed) and put to work and not hidden away by the older members. We have too many elders who do all the work themselves and seldom call on and insist upon the young man reading the Lord's day lesson, offering prayer, giving an exhortation or waiting on the table. Prepare that young man for the work that he may be able to take your place when you are dead and gone. If you were to die tomorrow, have you a man in the congregation prepared to take your place as elder? If not, who is to blame? Nine times out of ten, you are to blame. Can you not look into the future and see the need of qualified elders and deacons? If you can't you are not fit for an elder yourself. If you can, then develop the young and thus prepare them for this work.

It is true, we have more young men preaching than we ever had in the Nineteenth Century, but if elders would do their duty by developing the young we would have many more. There should be a development, an unfolding, of the great achievements of the young man in the Church of the living God; and as this work seems more difficult and embarrassing to the young than most any other work, the elders of the congregation should begin to unfold to their

brethren the great works, acts and possibilities of the young member that all may see the necessity of assisting him and helping to qualify him for the eldership or ministry. So many congregations have died when the elders died, because there was no one to take their place. Brethren, these things ought not so to be. Some elders, like some preachers, have so much conceit that they imagine every one would rather hear them speak than any one else on earth. Such elders seldom develop the young or old either. Read 1 John 2: 12-14 and see how the apostle John would encourage the young as well as the old.

We will now read 1 Tim. 5: 1: "Rebuke not an elder, but entreat him as a father; and the younger men as brethren." Paul instructs young Timothy to entreat young men as brethren. Yes, Timothy, you must pay some attention to the young men as well as the old. The apostle Peter says: "Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder" (1 Peter 5: 5). Here we learn that the young must submit to the elder. This being true, the elder is responsible, to some extent, for the young in the congregation who never do anything at all. (1) The young must submit to the elders (olders). (2) But the elders (olders) never say a word to the younger about work, but consume all the time themselves. (3) Therefore, the elders (olders) are to blame for the young being careless and refusing to develop the young.

In connection with Peter's statement let us quote from Paul: "Remember them which have the rule (are the guides) over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God" (Heb. 13: 7). Peter orders the young to submit to the old and Paul here says they have the rule over them, or as the margin has it, "are the guides." We would therefore understand, from this, that the young have guides and overseers which nature itself teaches us is right. This being true, the man who is ordained, or appointed, elder of the congregation, is just as responsible before Almighty God for the young members not being developed and not working as the

parent is for the child not knowing how to work at home. When it gets older and doesn't work you say: "Well, he was raised that way, his parents never raised or taught him to work." The elders' care of the church is compared, by the apostle Paul, to the ruling of our house (the raising of our children)—(1 Tim. 3: 4, 5) and the lesson should be studied carefully.

But hear Paul again: "Obey them that have the rule (guide) over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you" (Heb. 13: 17). Peter says the elders have the rule over the young and Paul here says the same thing and strengthens it by saying: "for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account." You can now see why I said the elders were responsible before God and would have to give an account to him for refusing to develop the young. The elders are supposed to watch after the souls of the young and if they do not do it they will be held responsible before Almighty God. Heb. 13: 17 is easily understood when compared with the above cited scriptures.

Oh, brother elder, will you not do more toward developing the young in your congregation, in the future, than you have in the past? I hope and pray that you will, for it will mean something to you in the judgment day. Timothy was a young man (1 Tim. 4: 12) and Paul put him out in the evangelistic field (2 Tim. 4: 5) while in his youth. But why could Paul do this? 2 Tim. 3: 14, 15 answers the question: "And that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." Some attention had been given young Timothy from a child. His mother and grandmother had developed this young man (2 Tim. 1: 5) and he was prepared to do a great work. I would to the Father of all, that grandmothers and mothers would take a lesson here and read and explain more scripture to the chil-

dren, then the elders will not have such hard work to develop the young. Paul could easily develop this young man because he had been taught the Holy Scriptures from a child, by his mother and grandmother. Some development, you see, had taken place at home. Let the mothers and grandmothers of today go and do likewise. If they do, the young can easily be developed in the Church and put to work for the Lord.

A few more words to the elders, bishops, or pastors, of the congregations and I will close. In 1 Tim. 3: 2 we are told that a bishop must be "apt to teach." If a bishop must be "apt to teach" he has to become a teacher before he is appointed bishop of the congregation. We can, therefore, see the necessity of the elders developing the young and putting them to work that they may become teachers and qualified bishops before they are even needed to fill that function. Develop the young, and whenever the office of elder or deacon is vacated you will have qualified material, already prepared and proven (1 Tim. 3: 10), to fill the vacant place. Very few of the young members will be "apt to teach" if the older ones consume all the time, every time you assemble. You must put the young to work and have them prepared to teach and thus take your place when you are gone. Paul teaches that the elders should look after the Church of God (1 Tim. 3: 5) and a part of the Church is composed of young men who, if looked after properly, may make good elders, deacons and preachers. Let the churches develop the young, as they should, and they will send out more, many more, preachers of the gospel.

NANCY HANKS

In Spencer County, forty miles northeast of Evansville, Indiana, is, I am told, Lincoln City. No town was there in the days of Abraham Lincoln. The "city" sprang into existence with the coming of the railroad, only a few years ago. The place is a town of barely a dozen houses, they say. There is a general store, a blacksmith-shop, the railroad station and a very good school. Nancy Hanks Park is a very pretty place in that country. Thomas Jefferson said, "The chosen people of God are those who till the soil," and that is the class of people you meet when you go to Lincoln City, Indiana.

Here on a little hill the mother of Lincoln sleeps. On the simple granite column are these words:

NANCY HANKS LINCOLN
MOTHER OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN
DIED OCTOBER 5, 1818
AGE 35 YEARS

The family had come from Kentucky, only a half day's journey as we count miles today by steam and trolley. But in 1817 it took the little cavalcade a month to come from La Rue, Ky., to Spencer Co., Ind., sixteen miles (as the birds fly) north of the Ohio River. Here land was to be had for the settling. Here the family rested by the side of the cold, sparkling stream. There were Thomas Lincoln, Nancy Hanks Lincoln (his wife), Sarah Lincoln (age ten) and little Abe Lincoln (age eight).

The family had four horses, old and lame. In the wagon were a few household goods, two sacks of cornmeal and a side of bacon. They built a shack from logs, closed on three sides, open to the south. The reason the south side was left open was because there was no chimney, and the fire they built was half in the house and half outside. Here the family lived that first bleak dreary winter. To Abe and Sarah

it was only fun. But to Nancy Hanks Lincoln, who was delicate, illy clothed, underfed, and who had known better things in her Kentucky home, it was hardship! She was a woman of aspiration and purpose; a woman with romance and dreams in her heart. Now all had turned to ashes of roses.

Abe wrote, long years afterward: "My mother worked steadily and without complaining. She cooked, made clothing, planted a little garden. She coughed at times, and often would have to lie down for a little while. We did not know she was ill. She was worn, yellow and sad. One day when she was lying down she motioned me to come near. And when I stood by the bed she reached out one hand as if to embrace me, and pointing to my sister Sarah said in a whisper, 'Be good to her, Abe!'"

The tired woman closed her eyes, and it was several hours before the children knew she was dead. The next day Thomas Lincoln made a coffin of split boards. The body of the dead woman was placed in the rude coffin, and then four men carried the coffin up to the top of a little hill near by and it was lowered into a grave. A mound of rocks was piled on top, according to the custom of the times, to protect the grave from wild animals.

For a year little Sarah cooked, scrubbed and looked after the household. Then one day Thomas Lincoln went away and left the two children alone to battle the storms of life by themselves. He was gone for a week, but when he came back he brought the children a stepmother—Sally Bush Johnson. This lady (who was now Mrs. Thomas Lincoln) had three children of her own, but she possessed enough love for two more. Her big heart went out to little Abe, and his young lonely heart responded. She brought provisions, dishes, cloth for clothing, needles to sew with, etc. She was a good cook. And, best of all, she had three books which Abe "devoured" and enjoyed.

Up to this time Abe had never worn shoes or cap. She made him moccasins, and also a coonskin cap with a dangling tail. Abe thought that fine! She taught Abe and Sarah to read, their own mother having taught them the alphabet. The young boy was an apt scholar.

Here Abe Lincoln lived until he was twenty-one years old, until he had reached his manhood and attained his height of six feet-four. He had read every book in the neighborhood. He had even tramped through the forest twenty miles to come back with a borrowed volume which he had read to his mother by the light of a pine-knot. He had clerked in the store down at "The Forks," at Gentryville. He had whipped the bully—and asked his pardon for doing so. He had spelled down the school and taken part in debates. He could split more rails than could any other man in the neighborhood. He had read the Bible, the Revised Statutes of Indiana, and could repeat Poor Richard's Almanac backward.

When Abe was twenty-one the family decided to move West. There were four ox-carts in all. One of these carts was driven by Abraham Lincoln. Before they started Abe cut the initials N. H. L. on a slab and placed it securely at the head of the grave of his dear mother. In 1876 James Studebaker of South Bend bought a marble headstone and placed it on the grave. Mr. Studebaker also built a picket-fence around the grave, and paid the owner of the property a yearly sum for seeing that the grave was protected and that visitors were allowed free access to the spot. In 1905 certain citizens of Indiana bought the hill-top (a beautiful grove of thirty acres) and this property is now the possession of the State, forever. A guardian lives there who keeps the property in good shape. And here alone on the hill-top sleeps the body of the woman who went down into the shadow and gave birth to the boy who later became President of the United States. Biting poverty was her portion; deprivation and loneliness were her lot. Disappointment and

sorrow were part of her life. But on her tomb are four words that express, from a human and political standpoint, the highest praise that tongue can utter or pen indite:

MOTHER OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

* * *

About nineteen hundred years ago a man came from a better "country" than the one from whence Thomas Lincoln came with his little family, and "located" near Jerusalem in Palestine. There was no "city" (Heb. 12: 22) there when He came, but a small one soon "sprang into existence" with the coming of the "narrow road" (Matt. 7: 14) only a few years ago. It has a "general store" of knowledge, a good school where sixty-six books are studied.

"The chosen people of God" are those who "till the soil" where this city is located. They work in His vineyard (Matt. 20: 1; 21: 33; Mark 12: 1; Luke 20: 9) and keep the "soil" prepared for the "seed of the kingdom."

He who came and established this road and city died at about the age of thirty-three and a half years, hence about eighteen months younger than Nancy Hanks when she died; but His years of suffering were more than hers, and the suffering much greater. He, too, was taken into another country (Egypt) for protection. His parents suffered much, and Mary (His mother) had to suffer the cold, bleak winds of that winter of death, bloodshed and darkness when she was forced to stand "afar off" and witness the shouting, the nailing of His hands and feet to a cross, the placing of His body in the tomb, etc.

He, too, was poor. He did not have the log cabin, the sack of meal and a side of bacon. Birds and foxes had more than He. But He "murmured not." To those who made the cross, drove the nails and pierced His side, it was only fun. But to His mother—who was, methinks, thinly clothed and underfed, and who had known better things in her former home—it was hardship and heartaches. She was, I think,

a woman of aspiration and purpose; a woman with high ideals and dreams of a better day in her heart. Now at the midnight hour of her life, all had turned to the blackness of darkness at that lonely hour of grief and sorrow. She and they did not understand that He would come back to them in three days and see them and they see Him; but He did, and they rejoiced! The tired woman had closed her eyes to all hopes of ever seeing Him again on earth, but she certainly saw Him.

Nancy Hanks said, "Be good to her, Abe!" Jesus said, "Behold your mother," and He went to sleep. John was good to her, for he took her into his own home and kept her.

A man carried the cross up the little hill (Calvary) and there He died and soon was laid in a coffin of stone; but that "coffin" would not (because it could not) hold Him. He arose—bless His holy name!

One day Jesus went away and left His children alone. They were sad and discouraged, hence went a-fishing. He was gone for several days, then He returned (in power) with His new (Eph. 2: 15) wife (Acts 2), and the children were glad and loved her. Up to this time the children (Rom. 8: 16; Gal. 3: 26) had never worn shoes (Eph. 6: 15), and had no cap (helmet, Eph. 6: 17) for their heads; but with the coming of this wife all these things were introduced and there for them to use. They also had a new, white suit (Rev. 19: 8) which they put on and enjoyed wearing. It meant much to them and means much to us!

Abraham Lincoln and his mother (Nancy Hanks) are both remembered and honored, and should be. But, my friends, nineteen hundred years ago there was a little woman in Bethlehem by the name of Mary who gave birth to a much greater, wiser and holier emancipator. (Abe was not even a Christian.) He is the one we should honor, respect and obey. He had no one who could select appropriate stones for His grave, so He selected and erected His own monument just before He closed His eyes in that long three-

days' sleep. That monument He left with His wife (the Church) to look after and keep in good repair.

Love and respect for Nancy Hanks Lincoln force many, even hundreds, to go visit her grave at Lincoln City where they can see her monument, place flowers on her grave and moisten it with tears. Her son's tomb is also visited for the same purpose. How many sacrifice as much to visit and keep in "repair" the Lord's monument? How many love Him and respect Him enough to cause them to go the sacred place on each Lord's Day and view His monument, drop a tear and offer a prayer? Do we respect and think more of the man who helped to save our country than we do of Him who gave His life to save our souls from death and hell? Lord, help us to love and pray more!

Upon Mary's tomb might have been written these words:

MOTHER OF JESUS CHRIST

Upon His monument is His name, and with the eye of faith we can see and read this:

JESUS CHRIST THE SON OF GOD

No tongue can speak greater words and no pen can write more holy and true.

Then we look again and see this:

HE GAVE HIS LIFE FOR ME

Blessed thought! Yet how few stop and think what that means. He says, "If you love me you will keep my words" (John 14: 23). How many love Him? How many keep His words found in Acts 20: 7 and Heb. 10: 25?

THE BIBLE

The Bible, or the Book, is the Book of books. It is our guide-book, and if we follow its directions we will never go astray. It is the oldest book in the world, and more instructive than all other books combined, and the only book that gives both sides of all questions.

It tells of a man's bad deeds as well as the good ones. For instance, take the life of Paul and Peter, of Moses and of Aaron. It gives the bad deeds that they have committed as well as the good ones. In this book we have language of God and Satan; of angels and of evil spirits; good and bad men and women. Hence when we read we must go back a few verses to see who is talking. Yes, we should learn to rightly divide the word of truth, and when we learn that, we will have learned obedience to God, and not before. When we learn to rightly divide this Book, we will then see the sinfulness in writing out human creeds. If one of these creeds contains more than the Bible it contains too much; if it contains less than the Bible it does not contain enough, and if it is just like the Bible we do not need it. Then if we take the Bible and study it we will soon see the uselessness of human creeds and the necessity of a divine one.

Human creeds have been written by men and belong to men. The Bible was written by the direction of God and belongs to God. Yes, the Bible is God's own book, as may be seen by referring to the following scriptures: Gen. 2: 1-25; Ex. 3: 4-22; Lev. 1: 1; Num. 1: 1; Ex. 32.

Nearly four thousand years have come and gone since Moses began to write Genesis. The Old Testament was about eleven hundred years in process of writing, while the New Testament was about fifty, with an interval of about four hundred and fifty years between the two, thus making the entire Bible sixteen hundred years in process of writing. It is the oldest book on earth and has done more to moralize

the world than any other book in existence. The Bible contains 3,556,480 letters, 773,746 words, 31,173 verses, 1,189 chapters and 66 books. The word "Lord" occurs 1,855 times. The word "reverend" occurs but once, Psalm 111: 9. The middle verse of the Bible is the 8th verse of the 118th Psalm. The 2nd verse of the 2nd chapter of Ezra contains all the letters of the alphabet, except the letter J. The 19th chapter of 2 Kings and the 37th chapter of Isaiah are alike. The longest verse is in the 8th chapter of Esther and 9th verse. John 11: 35 is the shortest verse. There are no words of more than six syllables. The Bible was written by about 48 persons. The Old Testament had about forty writers and the New eight—Matthew, Mark, Luke and John; Paul, Peter, James and Jude. The New contains 27 books, and 260 chapters; the Old contains 39 books, 929 chapters. Twenty-two of these books are historical, 21 epistolary, 18 prophetic, and 5 are poetical. If you want to read history, read the Bible. If you love to study prophecy, you have it in the Bible. If you love poetry, you have it in the Bible. If you want to know your duty as a Christian, read the epistles, or instructions to Christians. Then, what more could we want to read and study than we have given us in the Bible?

So we ask, Has man any right to change this book? Let the Book answer: "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of God unto another gospel: which is not another; but there are some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel to you than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed" (Gal. 1: 6-10). Then we have no right to change God's word. If this scripture be true, and true it is, the anathema of heaven rests upon that one who changes it or preaches any other gospel. "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." (James 2: 10. See also Rev. 22: 18-20.)

God gave us a perfect law (Psalm 19: 7), and we are not

allowed to change one word,—must take it as it is, and if we do offend in one point, live and die that way, we can expect God to do nothing more nor less than to anathematize us in the last great day. We turn to Gen. 3: 4-6, and we find our parents in the garden disobeying the law of God, and lusting after wisdom, and it resulted in their being driven from that sanctified spot, death brought upon the whole human family, (spiritual death) and the earth cursed with briars, thorns and thistles. Next we find Cain and Abel offering their sacrifices (Gen. 4: 3-15). Abel did just what God said to do, and his offering was accepted, while Cain offered of the fruit of the ground and his was rejected. He offended in one point, you see. Result: 1. Cain killed his brother. 2. There was a mark placed upon Cain. 3. He was cursed from the earth. 4. Cain was made to cry, "My punishment is greater than I can bear."

Several hundred years after this we find the sons of God disobeying the laws of God and doing partly as they pleased (Gen. 6). Result: 1. It repented God that he had made man, and it grieved him at his heart. 2. Man was destroyed in the flood, death being the result of disobedience. Not many years after the flood we find the people located in the land of Shinar, and there building a city and tower that would reach to heaven (Gen. 11: 3, 4). Result: 1. God was displeased. 2. Their language was confounded. 3. They were scattered upon the face of all the earth. 4. They received the name Babel (confusion). Five hundred and fifty years after this we find Lot's wife disobeying the command "not to look back" and the result was death (Gen. 19: 17-26). She turned to a pillar of salt. Eight hundred and fifty years after this we find David moving the ark. The Lord told them to carry it by the four corners, but instead of this they put it on the cart, the oxen shook it, Uzzah put his hand to the ark to stay it (2 Sam. 6: 6, 7). Result: 1. The anger of the Lord was kindled. 2. Uzzah was smitten, fell dead. God said not to touch any holy thing (Num. 4: 15).

THE IDENTITY OF THE CHURCH

Did Christ establish all the so-called churches now in existence? If so, why do they disagree, seeing they all have the same Bible? Do you suppose he established any of them? If so, pray tell us which one? And if more than one, how many? People say "it makes no difference which church we join." If this be true, it makes no difference how many we join. Men join many lodges—Odd Fellows, Modern Woodmen, etc., to get the benefit of all of them. If it makes no difference which church you join, why not join several or all of them so as to get the benefit of several or all of them?

Is it right for Mr. Jones to join the Baptist church? You say, Yes. Is it right for Mr. Smith to join the Methodist church? You say it is. They why would it not be right for Mr. Jones to join both of them? It would, provided we have the right to join different churches. But as Christ only built one church we can join no other and be a member of his body. The Methodists might join the Baptists, and the Baptists join the Methodists and the Presbyterians join both and the digressive Christian church join all three and in this way try to obey the scripture (1 Corinthians 1: 10) that says for us all to speak the same thing.

But as neither of these so-called churches is named in the Bible they could not be in the one body. If it made no difference which church we joined, then it would be all right to join the Catholics, Mormons or Universalists. You say it would make no difference if a man did not join any church. If one man can stay out of one church and be saved a thousand can and if a thousand can all men can. Then that church is a useless play house. The priests could not pass from the outer court to the most holy place without passing through the holy. The first department is a type of the world, the second department a type of the church, and the third a type of heaven, and we can no more pass from the

world into heaven without passing through the church than the priests could pass from the outer court into the most holy without passing through the holy.

Is it right for four men to teach and practice different things religiously, and at the same time wrong for one man to teach and practice all of them? Suppose it be right and pleasing to God for A to preach "once in grace, always in grace," B to preach "you can fall from grace," C to preach that "immersion only is baptism," and D to preach that "sprinkling or pouring will do as well." Would it not be right for A to preach all of these doctrines? If not, why not? If four men preach four different doctrines, the people say God is pleased; if one man should preach them all, they would say the preacher was insane. If four men preach these doctrines, people say they are preaching the Bible; if one man should preach them all, they would call him a perverter of God's word.

Can two men be right when they disagree? One man says there are 26 letters in the alphabet, another says there are 30 letters in the alphabet, another says there are 35, and the fourth man says there are 40 letters in the alphabet. Are all four of these men correct? One church is crying do one thing, and another says do something else. Are they all right? Not unless the four men were right concerning the letters in the alphabet. If God was pleased with all the doctrines taught in this world he would be as well pleased with falsehoods as with the truth, for, when one man positively denies the statement of another, both do not tell the truth. But God is not pleased with falsehoods. "The truth shall make you free," says Christ. "There is one body" (Ephesians 4: 4). "But now are they many members, yet but one body" (1 Corinthians 12: 20). What is this body? Let the Bible answer. "And gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body" (Ephesians 1: 22, 23).

"For his (Christ's) body's sake, which is the church" (Colossians 1: 24). The body is the church, and Paul says

there is but one body, hence but one church. Then it makes a difference which church we join, for Christ is head of but one.

But, says one, denominations are branches of the church? Well, let us see. God set the members (branches) in the body and tempered the body (not bodies) together "that there should be no schism (division) in the body" (1 Corinthians 12: 18, 24, 25). Is there schism or division among denominations? We all know that there is, even the names that they wear to distinguish one from the other are evidence of division. Then they can not be pleasing to God, for "God set the members every one of them in the body." Did God set the backsliding Christian church in? If so, he failed to tell us about it. Did he set the Mormon church in? He does not mention it? Did he set the Baptists in? No hint of it in the Bible. If God set in such churches it is strange that he never said a word about them. If he did mention them we would be pleased to have them tell us where. Perhaps the digressives or Baptists would be glad to cite us. Can a man be saved and go to heaven out of the various denominations? They say he can. Can he be saved and go to heaven without believing and obeying the gospel? No; for it is "God's power unto salvation"; and it (God's power) gives us all things that pertain to "life and godliness." Then denominations do not pertain to life or godliness, for men can not be saved without the gospel (God's power), but they can be saved without the denomination.

Some one is now ready to ask what we will do with John fifteenth chapter where Christ spoke of the vine and branches. Well let us examine that chapter and see if the branches represent denominations. Christ says, "I am the vine" (John 15: 1). Christ is the vine but who are the branches? Denominations, says one. Let Christ tell us. "I am the vine, ye are the branches" (verse 5). Ye who? Denominations? No: "*He* that abideth in me, and *I* in him." Do we speak of denominations as "*he*"? No. "If a man abide

not in me *he* is cast forth as a branch" (verse 6). Men, individuals, are the branches. Denominations are not hinted at in the chapter. If denominations be branch churches, where is the church from which they branched? The absurdity of this branch church idea is brought out by the Savior saying he was the true vine and ye men, branches.

Which is the church Christ established, and who compose it? Paul called it the 'church of God" (Acts 20: 28). Christ says "Upon this rock I will build my church." Whose church is it that you are going to build, Savior? My church. Then if it be his church it must wear his name. It is his wife (Revelation 19: 7; 21: 9), and Paul calls congregations "churches of Christ" (Romans 16: 16). Does Christ or Paul say anything about the "Christian church"? No, the Bible knows nothing about it; the Bible speaks of God's church, Christ's church, but none other.

The church is composed of Christians, but does not belong to them. They belong to it, and a man can no more be a Christian outside of the church than he can be a Mason outside of the Masonic lodge. This church has a creed (Bible) and that creed furnishes all instructions needed or allowed (2 Timothy 3: 16, 17; Revelation 22: 18, 19; Galatians 1: 6-12) without revising it every five years. Hence, we reject human creeds and names. This creed teaches us that we must believe, repent, confess and be baptized for the remission of sins to become Christians (Acts 2: 38; 8: 37; Romans 10: 9, 10; Acts 16: 15; 16: 31). After we become Christians this creed thoroughly furnishes us unto "all good works" (2 Timothy 3: 16, 17). Hence, we reject all human aids to the work and worship, such as the organ, the pastor, the societies and festivals, fairs, baby shows, old maid parties, kissing parties, quilting socials, hugging bee socials, sock socials, mule shoes, calico carnivals, hayseed parties, toe shoes, etc., etc.

In our next we will set up the church or find where it was set up.

II

“And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever” (Daniel 2: 44). Notice, in the days of these kings God is to set up a kingdom that is to stand forever. It is useless for me to consume space by giving the dream of the king and everything that was said and done (you can turn to Daniel and read that for yourself), but I am going to tell you how this was brought about. This image that the king saw represented four kingdoms (verse 40) and only four. Daniel says to King Nebuchadnezzar, “Thou art this head of gold.” Then Nebuchadnezzar’s kingdom is the first one in order. This king had gone out in his might against all other provinces and subdued them and had extended his dominion to the ends of the populated world. Babylon was the city in which was situated the royal palace hall, where the king was seated on his throne, and Daniel was brought into his presence to notify him that his kingdom was about to fall. Darius, who was the commander of the Median forces, with whom the Babylonians had been at war for some time had now consulted his nephew, Cyrus, who was the leader of the Persian forces and they agreed to put their armies together and overthrow the Babylonian kingdom.

This great city, Babylon, was to be overthrown, the head of gold must go. Babylon, the greatest of all cities, which was fifteen miles wide and fifteen miles long, with its strong walls towering to the height of three hundred and fifty feet, and 87 feet thick at the base, with its fifty streets, twenty-five running each way, each street two hundred and fifty feet wide. Within the walls of this great city sat this young and fearless king with provisions enough to last for twenty years. Here is how the destruction was brought about. Darius and Cyrus put their armies together and learning of the annual feast in which the Babylonians would be

wholly given up to mirth and revelry, they agreed upon this night to carry into execution their plans, which they did. So it was at the feast which Belshazzar gave to his lords that the Babylonian kingdom was overthrown. (See Daniel 5: 30, 31.)

Darius the Median took the kingdom and it now becomes the Medo-Persian kingdom. After the Medes and Persians had ruled the kingdom for a while, Alexander the Great, the leader of the Greeks, came against them and took the kingdom and ruled it himself. The first and second kingdom had been overthrown. After the Greeks came the Roman power, which Daniel says represented that part of the image composed of iron and clay. Thus we have the four kingdoms, Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Grecian, and Roman. Christ, the stone that was cut out of the mountain without hands, was brought up under and condemned to death by the Roman power. He was first tried in the Sanhedrin court but as they did not have the power to take life they could only find him guilty (by swearing lies; he was not guilty) and then take him to the Romans and try his case in their courts, and it was the Roman law that said, you may drive the nails through his hands and feet. So it was in the days of these kings that the Christ came and set up his kingdom. Daniel said it should take place in the "last days" (Daniel 2: 28), and Peter says this is the "last days" (Acts 2: 16, 17). The death of Christ was the "end of the world," (Jewish dispensation) and the beginning of the new world, (Christian dispensation); yes Christ died in the end of the world (Hebrews 9: 26), hence, the "last days."

"Upon this rock *I* will build my church" (Matthew 16: 18), not have built, but will build, some time in the future. "There be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power" (Mark 9: 1). Still future. Pray, "thy kingdom come" (Matthew 6: 10). Had not come as yet. "The harlots go into the kingdom of God before you" (Matthew 21:

31). "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God" (Mark 15: 43). "He that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he" (Luke 7: 28). All these scriptures go to prove that the kingdom had not yet been established, but after Acts 2 we hear them speak of it in the present and past tense. "Who hath called you into his kingdom and glory" (1 Thessalonians 2: 12). "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son" (Colossians 1: 13). "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which can not be moved." Thus the apostles spake of it as being already built. Before Christ's death they could not speak of it as being already built, but now since he (Christ) has bought it with his own heart's blood (Acts 20: 28) they can speak of it as being in existence. The church could not have been Christ's before he bought it and paid for it.

Three things are necessary to identify the church: 1. Retention of its organic name. 2. Preservation of its organic structure. 3. Adherence to its organic law. The organic name is given in the last will and testament of Christ: i. e. Church of Christ, Church of God. We are given five precedents for "Church of Christ" (Romans 16: 16; Galatians 1: 22; 1 Thessalonians 1: 1; 2: 14; 2 Thessalonians 1: 1). Also, "My (Christ's) church" (Matthew 16: 18); "Church of the first born" (Hebrews 12: 23). We are given fourteen precedents for church of God (Acts 20: 28; 1 Corinthians 1: 1, 2; 1 Corinthians 10: 32; 11: 16; 11: 22; 15: 9; 2 Corinthians 1: 1; Galatians 1: 13; 1 Thessalonians 1: 1; 2: 14; 2 Thessalonians 1: 1; 1: 4; 1 Timothy 3: 5; 3: 15). The organic structure is Christ, apostles, prophets, evangelists, bishops and deacons (1 Corinthians 12 and 13 chap.; Ephesians 4: 11-16; 1 Timothy 3rd; Titus 1 ch. See Matthew 28: 18; Ephesians 1: 22, 23; 4: 15; 5: 23; Colossians 1: 18). The organic law is fully set forth in the New Testament. Unto him be glory in the Baptist church? No, it doesn't read that way. Unto him be glory in the Christian En-

deavor society? No, it does not read that way. "Unto him be glory in the church" (Ephesians 3: 21). The above is the rule we will follow in the rest of our writings.

III

1. "And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, . . . and I will establish his kingdom" (2 Samuel 7: 12). Peter said (in Acts 2: 29) that David is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. God, through Samuel, promised to set up the kingdom between the death of David and his resurrection, and Peter, on the day of Pentecost, said he was yet sleeping with his fathers, or his tomb is with us to this day.

2. At this time his throne was to be established (2 Samuel 7: 16). Peter (in Acts 2: 30) says God has "raised up Christ to sit on his throne."

3. And he shall be a priest upon his throne (Zechariah 6: 13). Did he take his seat upon his throne before his death? No. "If he were on earth he could not be a priest" (Hebrews 8: 4). "Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God" (Hebrews 4: 14). He became priest after he went to heaven, and not before, so if you have a church that was built before Christ rose from the dead and went home to heaven it is without a priest.

4. We are sanctified by the blood of Christ (Hebrews 13: 12). Then the people were not sanctified or set apart to a religious work before his blood was spilt. He purchased the church with his own blood (Acts 20: 28). Then his (Christ's) church did not exist before his death.

5. The Spirit is another essential constituent in the church of Christ, for James says, the body without the Spirit is dead. "If I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I go I will send him" (John 16: 7).

This Comforter came on the first Pentecost after the death of Christ (Acts 2: 4). So if you have a church that was built before this it is without the Spirit, and the body without the Spirit is dead. Hence you have a dead body.

6. In order for this kingdom to be perfected it must have a law to control its subjects. The law that frees us from the law of sin and death (Romans 8: 2) was not made known before Pentecost or Acts 2. The law was to go forth from Mt. Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem (Isaiah 2: 3; Micah 4: 4; Luke 24: 45-47; Acts 2: 38).

7. This institution could not live without a head. Christ was made head after his ascension into heaven (Ephesians 1: 18-22). If you have a church that was built before Christ went home to heaven it is without a divine head, a headless body.

8. The apostles were first in the church (1 Corinthians 12: 28). The Baptists say Christ set them (apostles) in the church when he called them on the mountain and ordained them and sent them out to preach (Mark 3: 13, 14). But how could they be in the church then when Christ had not bought the church yet? He had no church at that time. Now let us read Ephesians 4: 10, 11, "He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things. And he (Christ) gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists, and some, pastors and teachers." When were the apostles set in the church? Paul says after Christ ascended up far above all heavens. Yes, after Christ rose from the dead and ascended up on high the apostles were set in the church, and they were the first in the church, they were set in the church on the day of Pentecost in the city of Jerusalem. Pastors (elders), evangelists, deacons (Acts 6: 3-7) and teachers were all set in the church in Jerusalem.

9. If you have a church that was built before the first Pentecost after Christ's death it is without: 1. A throne in heaven; 2. A priest; 3. Without the blood of Christ, i. e., a

bloodless church; 4. The people that constitute it were never set apart (sanctified) by the blood of the Redeemer; 5. Christ never entered into heaven with his blood for you (Hebrews 9: 24); 6. It is without the spirit, and the body without the spirit is dead. So you have a dead, lifeless church. The Spirit of our Father in heaven is not in it; 7. It has not the law of life in Christ Jesus that frees us from the law of sin and death. So you have never been made free. You have a lawless church; 8. Your church has no head. Christ was not made head of the church till after he rose from the dead and took his seat in heaven, so your church is a headless church; 9. Your church existed without apostles, prophets, evangelists, elders, deacons, or teachers. Now just look at your church for a moment. Isn't it a pretty looking thing? Aren't you ashamed of it? If God's word be true, and true it is, your church is a Christless institution.

IV

"In all places where I record my name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee" (Exodus 20: 24). Where did he record his name? "If my people which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land. Now mine eyes shall be open, and mine ears attend unto the prayers that are made in this place. For now have I chosen and sanctified this house, that my name may be there forever" (2 Chronicles 7: 14-16). Notice, it is only those who are called by his name who are to meet in this house and call upon his name. We learn here that he recorded his name in Solomon's house, the temple, and it is a type of the church, and here is where he was to meet his people and bless them. "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matthew 18: 20). God only meets with his people when they assemble

in his name, which name is recorded in his house. "But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God" (1 Timothy 3: 15). Paul here calls the church God's house, and in this house God's name dwells, and he has not promised a single blessing to those who are calling upon his name in other houses, societies or churches.

"Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end" (Ephesians 3: 21). Then we cannot give God glory through any other institution. The glory is all given through the church, for God's name dwells in no other than the one we read about in the Bible. Christ bought it with his own blood and it is his, and he is head of it only. But when we make the statement that there is only one church, hence, but one name, our attention is called to the "vine and the branches." This we explained in a former article but will refer to it again. The unchangeable law of nature is that all natural branches of the same vine produce the same kind of fruit. Did you ever see a grape vine bearing grapes on one branch, apples on another, peaches on another, melons on another, pumpkins on another, plums on another and a few beech nuts on all of them? Such a sight would be no more unreasonable than to suppose all the denominations to be authorized by Christ, the spiritual vine. So there is nothing here to justify us in wearing different names.

Is there anything in a name? Yes. "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him (Christ), and given him a name which is above every name" (Philippians 2: 9, 10). Is there anything in this name? Yes, it's above "every name." "He (Christ) hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they" (Hebrews 1: 4). "This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which has become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts 4: 11, 12). We

learn here that there is salvation in this name, and there is salvation in no other.

The term Christian is derived from the word Christ. The term Christ is translated from the Greek word *Christos*, which means "anointed one." Seeing, then, that the term Christian is derived from the term Christ, which means anointed, may not all who wear this name scripturally, be regarded as the anointed people of God? Under the old covenant all the priests were anointed with holy oil. Under the new covenant all the covenanted people of God are regarded as priests (1 Peter 2: 5, 9). Then are not these spiritual priests anointed? Their name, Christian, indicates that they are. To this holy anointing the apostle refers when he says, "You have an unction, (*chrisma*, that with which any one is anointed, an anointing) (1 John 2: 20, 27)."

There was a very great sacredness attached to anointing under the Old Testament dispensation. David would not take the life of his worst enemy (Saul) because he had been anointed (1 Samuel 26: 3-23). How sacred this anointing was regarded. "Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm" (1 Chronicles 16: 22). Then if Christians are God's anointed ones, as their name teaches, O how sacred are they in his sight!

It was always applied individually, and never to the church. The disciples (not the church) were called Christians first at Antioch (Acts 11: 26). Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian (Acts 26: 28), not a church, but a Christian. If any man suffer as a Christian (1 Peter 4: 16), not suffer as a church but as a Christian. The word Christian is only found three times in the Bible and applied individually every time. The church was always called the "Church of God" or "of Christ," as we showed in a previous article. We should remember that the word "Christian" means "Christ" or "Christlike." We cannot be Christ but we can be "like him," Christians. To have a "Christian

church" would be to have a church like Christ's, one similar to his, just an imitation. Christ says, "My church," (Matthew 16: 18) and John says, "For the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready" (Revelation 19: 7). "Come hither, I will shew thee the bride, the Lamb's wife" (Revelation 21: 9). If the church be his wife it must wear his name.

Dear reader, are you wearing this name, meeting in this house where God has recorded his name as one of his anointed children, receiving the blessings that he has promised the faithful? If not, why not?

TAKING MEMBERSHIP

The expression, "Taking membership" is not, of course, in the Bible, yet is a scriptural term. The expressions, "Eating of the loaf," "taking up the contribution," "Lord's day worship," "passing the loaf and cup," "protracted meetings," etc., are not in the New Testament, yet they are implied, hence, scriptural expressions. The following scriptures speak of Christians as being members of the one body, etc., hence, membership is implied (1 Cor. 6: 15; 12: 14-27; Eph. 4: 25; Acts 18: 27).

Webster defines the word "membership" thus: "The state of being a member." Paul says, "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ?" (1 Cor. 6: 15). Again: "For the body is not one member, but many. But now hath God set the members, every one of them in the body" (1 Cor. 12: 15, 18), hence, allowed us membership. "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular" (verse 27). "For we are members, one of another" (Eph. 4: 25).

With all these scriptures before us and with Webster's definition of the word "membership" no person, I am sure, could object to the expression "taking membership." According to Webster, if members we have taken membership.

"Well, but," you say, "we are members of the church and not the congregation." Well, if there were congregations there had to be members of said congregations.

WERE THERE CONGREGATIONS?

David, in speaking of the suffering of Christ and of the Church said: "I will declare thy name unto my brethren: in the midst of the congregation will I praise thee" (Ps. 22: 22). Thus God, through one of his prophets, spoke of the congregation.

Now we will turn to the New Testament: "Now when the congregation was broken up," etc. (Acts 13: 43). Some tell us that there is no authority for the local congregations, but they are mistaken.

ORDAIN ELDERS IN EVERY CHURCH

"For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee" (Titus 1: 5). "And when they had ordained them elders in every church," etc. (Acts 14: 23). "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons" (Phil. 1: 1). Here we learn that the church (congregation) at Philippi had bishops (elders) and deacons, hence, a congregation with bishops (in the plural) overseeing it and it only. The bishops of this congregation had nothing to do with the managing and overseeing of the congregations at Rome, Corinth, etc. Each congregation had its own overseers.

Let us now read Heb. 13: 17: "Obey them that have the rule (guide) over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you." "Obey them that have the rule over you," doesn't mean that one or two men have the rule (guide) over the entire brotherhood. It only refers to the

local congregation. The seven churches (congregations) in Asia were not overseen by the elders of the congregation at some other point. Each assembly was to have its own elders to look after its spiritual welfare.

I would like to know how the elders of a congregation are to know where their congregation is and who the members are that they must watch after, as they that must give account, if there is no such thing as taking membership with a local congregation since each congregation must have elders to look after the members, etc. I think it an impossibility for the elders to know just what members they must look after, where two or three congregations are close together, unless there be some business-like way of keeping a record of the names, and the persons whose names may be on the record must make it publicly known that they desire membership with said congregation. There is no way of getting around this since we have learned that the elders are to look after the local congregation of which they themselves are members. Do you object to me using the words "member," and "membership"? If so, pray tell me what word I'll use.

LOCAL CONGREGATION

It seems that the foregoing should be sufficient to convince any one that the Bible taught that there were local congregations and should be yet, but, fearing that some might say it was not clear to them, I will call attention to a few more scriptures. The Greek word for "church" means "assembly," hence, a body of people called out. Webster tells us that the word "local" refers to a "definite district." He also says, "limited or confined to a spot." So, when we find a body of people, in a certain locality, assembling to worship God, we say this is a local congregation, and the expression is scriptural.

"I robbed other churches, taking wages of them, to do you service" (2 Cor. 11: 8). Other congregations, called churches in this translation, gave of their means to assist

Paul while he did mission work in Corinth. We have the word "churches" here coming from the Greek word "ekklesia" and, in this case, referring to local assemblies or congregations. The word occurs one hundred and fifteen times in the New Testament and about seventy-one times it refers to the local congregation, as Paul's statement in 1 Cor. 4: 17: "As I teach everywhere in every church." Paul didn't mean by this that he was teaching or preaching for all denominations, but simply referred to the congregations. "And so were the churches (congregations) established in the faith, and increased in number daily." Here is a daily increase of the local congregations. To say that there is no authority for taking membership with a congregation is to do away with church organization, for where there are twenty congregations or more in one town, as in Nashville, Tenn., and the members of two or three congregations, perhaps, living in one block, it would be impossible for the elder to know whom he must watch. The elders would not know where to find their flock. Should they see a member on the streets drunk, which congregation would take up the matter and withdraw from him if he should refuse to quit drinking? Say, which one?

LETTERS OF COMMENDATION

I have too much of a subject to try to get it all in one article and I don't care to write two, hence, will just refer you to the scriptures and insist on you reading them in their order and then if you think it to be a sin for a Christian, preacher, or any one else, to take letters of commendation with him when going into a strange neighborhood to live for life, or only to remain a short time, why, we ask of you to tell us why God had these scriptures in the blessed old Book? (Acts 14: 26; 15: 40; 18: 27; Rom. 16: 1, 2; 1 Cor. 16: 3; 2 Cor. 3: 1-3; 8: 19; 10: 12; 12: 11; 3 John 5-12). You don't need my comments on these scriptures, as we find males and females, preachers and officers, all with letters.

LOCAL CONGREGATIONS LOOKED AFTER THEIR OWN
MEMBERS AND PREACHERS

I will just refer you to the scriptures again: Acts 11: 22; 14: 26-28; 15: 1-4, 22, 27, 40; Phil. 4: 15-18; 1 Thess. 1: 7, 8; 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2; 2 Cor. 8: 18-21; Rom. 15: 25-27; Phil. 2: 25; Acts 13: 1-3. Read all these scriptures and then tell me how these local congregations could cooperate with each other as they did in this missionary work without individuals having membership with the congregation through which they worked. We all know that it could not be done. You see, I am not now writing upon the subject of extending the hand of fellowship, but as to whether there were and should be local congregations. Should we be members (take membership, if you please) of the local congregation? If this question is settled, then you will soon find the how, just as you learned "the how" to know how much money had been paid in to the treasurer and how much had been paid out, and what for. Where did you learn to have a clerk to "keep book" for the church?

WOMEN SPEAKING IN THE CHURCH

There has been a great deal said on this subject. Controverted subjects should be studied carefully, and a man should know that he is right in his position before he writes upon such a matter. If the God of heaven has said for women "to keep silence in the church," then the man who teaches that they have a right to speak, sing, read or pray, does it in violation of God's Word, and such teaching may result in the loss of a soul. And if the Bible teaches that women should take part in the worship when the "whole church be come together in one place" (1 Corinthians 14: 23), and we teach that they must be silent, the result would be the same. Hence the necessity of *knowing* you are right before you do public teaching upon this important subject. We shall turn our attention to the Bible, and see what God has said upon the subject.

1 Timothy 2: 11, 12 forbids women travelling and teaching as Timothy was to do. The woman was not to "usurp authority over the man," but that does not prohibit her working when the "whole church has come together in one place." The man is the head of the woman. Christ is the head of the church. God is the head of Christ (1 Corinthians 11: 3). Although God is the head of His Son, that did not keep the son silent; he had a work to do but He must work under His head—God. He could not usurp authority over the head. Christ is head of the church but that is no evidence the church should keep silent. The church has a work to do and must do it, but it must work under the head—Christ. The church has no right to usurp authority over its head.

The man is the head of the woman, but this is no evidence that she should keep silent in the church; but it is proof

that she has no right to take the lead (travel as an evangelist, etc.) in the work of the church. If *she* can be the *husband* of one wife then she may take the lead (Titus 1: 6). The Lord never sent women out to preach the gospel. He sent John, the apostles and the seventy.

1 Corinthians 14: 22 also forbids women teaching the world. They are permitted to prophesy (exhort), and Paul tells us here that prophesying serveth not for them which believe not, but for them which believe. The woman is not permitted to teach the world as an evangelist, but she is permitted to prophesy or exhort in the church. (Prophesy means to exhort. See Webster's Dictionary.)

Some refer to 1 Corinthians 14: 34, 35 and say that the women must keep silent in the church. Why do they not refer us to verses 28 and 30 of the same chapter and say that it would be a disgrace to the cause of Christ for men to speak in the church? I do not believe in women going from city to city or state to state preaching the gospel, but it is possible for us to go to the extreme either way on the subject and it is certainly wrong for us to become extremists. And if trying to keep women absolutely silent in the church is not going to an extreme upon the subject, I am at a loss to know how a man would become an extremist.

The women were to keep silent in the church for the same reason that the men were to do so. Let us read: "But if there be no interpreter let him keep silent in the church; and let him speak to himself and to God. . . . If anything be revealed unto another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace" (verses 28, 30). Here is a positive command for men to keep silent in the church. "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak: they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church" (verses 34, 35). And here is a positive command for women to keep silent in the church.

Let us compare the two statements. The man is to keep silent, but when? When an inspired man speaks, if he does not understand, he is to hold his peace (verses 27, 38). Thus we understand when the man was to keep silent. But what about the woman—when is she to hold her peace? “And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home.” Then the woman is to keep silence at the same time as the man, when she does not understand and wants to learn. She must not jump up and begin talking about things of which she knows nothing. If the man wanted to learn anything, he was to speak to himself and God. If the woman wanted to learn anything, she was to “ask her husband at home.” It is just as easy to take that chapter and prove that it is wrong for men to speak in the church, as it is to prove that women must hold their peace.

Can any man take verses 34 and 35 and prove that a single woman is prohibited the right to speak? “Let them ask their husbands at home.” These women were the *wives* of the inspired men. That scripture is no more intended for the women of today than is the prayer which Jesus taught his disciples intended for a set ritual for today.

Let us read verse 15: “What is it then? I will pray with the spirit and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit and I will sing with the understanding also.” If the women are forbidden to speak in the church, they are forbidden to sing, for they cannot sing without speaking. Paul teaches the *church* to sing. Now if the women be a part of the church, they have a right to sing, and they have a right to pray. If this scripture denies the sister that right, it forbids the brother likewise.

If I believed as some do, that women were not to speak in the church, I would not permit them to sing in the meetings conducted under my supervision. They cannot sing without speaking, and neither can they sing and keep *silent* in the church. If I permitted them to sing, I would permit them to pray also, for if they are permitted to do one they are

permitted to do the other. Some men will get up and argue that the women must keep silent in the church, then call upon some good sister to "lead a song." Brethren, for your own soul's sake (if for nothing else), be consistent, and practice what you teach. Prove that women are to keep silent in the church, and then give me chapter and verse for them singing in the public worship, and I will "fess up" and go with you.

If the women be any part of the church, they have a right to prophesy (exhort). Read verses 23, 24, 31: "For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted." Prove that "For ye may *all* prophesy" leaves out the woman, and I will prove that "*all* may learn and *all* may be comforted" leaves out the woman, and thus her place will be at home, for she can neither speak, learn or be comforted. What business would she then have at church? It would be no comfort for her to eat and drink of the Lord's Supper—she cannot be comforted.

"Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy (exhort)" (Joel 2: 28; Acts 2: 17). Prove that it is wrong for the daughters to prophesy and I will prove that it is wrong for the sons to do so, for Joel said that both should prophesy and Peter quoted it as confirmation. Philip had four daughters which did prophesy (Acts 21: 8, 9). "I commend unto you Phebe, our sister, which is a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea; that ye receive her in the Lord, as becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you," etc. (Romans 16: 1, 2).

We have learned from Acts 2: 17, that women should prophesy (exhort), and from Acts 21: 8, 9, that they did prophesy (exhort), and from Romans 16: 1, 2 that they did serve the church. A deacon is one who serves. The term means "to serve, to attend at meals; to bring forward, arrange, deal, distribute; to do the duties required in or for"—Webster. Thus we conclude that Phebe was working in the church, doing the duties required of the church, etc.

Now to 1 Corinthians 11. In verse 2 Paul says, "Keep the ordinances." In verses 4 and 5 he says: "Every man praying or prophesying having his head covered dishonoreth his head. But every woman praying or prophesying with her head uncovered, dishonoreth her head." Remember that Paul is here writing to the church, and telling them to keep the ordinances. (See verses 2 and 16.) Praying and exhorting are two of the ordinances mentioned in this chapter, and women are told to keep both of them; yes, pray and exhort in the church. And if it does not mean for the women to keep these two church ordinances, it does not mean for the men to do so, for both are told to do precisely the same things.

The cutting off of the hair is not a church ordinance. Therefore, Paul says, "But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God." We are told to contend for the faith (Jude 3). Hence, Paul had no reference to praying or prophesying in this sixteenth verse, but wanted them to understand that the leaving on or cutting off of the hair was not an ordinance of the church, and they must not be contentious about the hair subject. Thus we conclude that women have a right to pray and exhort in the church. But they must remember that they are working under their head—man—and must not try to usurp authority over the head.

FIRST PRINCIPLES

I will write a few articles upon this subject, but wish first to write upon what Paul has said in the 6th chapter of Hebrews: "Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment" (Heb. 6: 1, 2). A great many think this refers to faith, repentance and baptism, which I think is a mistake, and, therefore, think it necessary to explain these verses the first thing we do.

A careful reader of the first five chapters of this epistle will discover the tendency among these Hebrew brethren. They wanted to return to the law of Moses with all its types, shadows, priests, bloody sacrifices, etc., under which they had been reared and taught to serve. Let us read a portion of the preceding chapter that is so closely connected with this one. It must be taken into consideration with it, in order to arrive at a correct understanding of what he intends to teach. We will commence at the twelfth verse of chapter five: "For when for the time (or at the time when) ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God, and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat; (verse 13) for every one that useth milk is unskillful in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe; but strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age."

Now, the same apostle, in his letter to the Galatians, in the 4th chapter represents the entire Jewish nation as children, until "the fulness of the time was come," when "God sent forth his Son, to redeem them that were under the law," and here, in his letter to the Hebrews, he speaks of those who are "unskillful in the word of righteousness" as

children. Children, or babes, then, who have need to be taught again the "first principles of the oracles of God," are those "that were under the law." These Hebrews exhibited a constant tendency to go back to the ceremonies of the Levitical priesthood, and seek justification by obedience to the law; and it was to counteract this disposition that the apostle exhorts the Hebrews: "Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation (this foundation had at one time in the past been laid for the apostle says, not laying again, etc.) of repentance from dead works," etc. These Hebrew brethren had obeyed the gospel, but their love for the law and its services and demonstrations of God's presence (Ex. 19: 9), was not wholly conquered, the divorce from the law was not practically complete with them, and, hence, they began to forsake the gospel for the law—began to "let slip the things which they had heard." The typical services of the law are what they have been disposed to go back to. This needs no argument. It is evident that what they are wanting to return to would be "laying again the foundation." We need to notice the force of the word "again." It indicates that the "foundation of the doctrine of repentance from dead works," etc., had been laid before, and the argument of the apostle reveals the fact that what these Hebrews want to practice, if practiced, would be "laying again the foundation" of the things mentioned by the apostle. It is a fact that can not be denied that they were wanting to get back to the law given by Moses from Sinai's flames, lightning, thunder and thick darkness. It is, then, an evident fact that when the children of Israel were under the law as a schoolmaster, doing the things required of them by that law or schoolmaster, as Paul calls it, they were "laying the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands," etc.

We must not allow the force of the word "foundation" to escape our notice. This scripture informs us that the foundation has been once laid. But the foundation of what?

1. The "foundation of repentance from dead works."
2. The "foundation of faith toward God."
3. The "foundation of the doctrine."

But of what doctrine?

1. Baptisms.
2. Laying on of hands.
3. Resurrection of the dead.
4. Eternal judgment.

Four important doctrines have their foundation in the practices that the Hebrew brethren wanted to return to.

Now we will make a few comments right here. What were these "dead works"?

1. Works of the law, from which they had once repented; if they should go back to them they would lay the foundation for a second repentance.

2. "And of faith toward God"; the seventh chapter of Acts contains a summary of the evidence upon which the Jews built their faith toward God; and to go back to the works of the law, would be to render necessary the revival of the Jewish religion in order to have faith toward God.

3. "Of the doctrine of baptisms." All know that under the law there were "divers washings and carnal ordinances imposed on them until the time of reformation" (Heb. 9: 10). The apostle used this argument to prevent the Jews from going back to Jerusalem. Here (Heb. 9: 10) divers immersions (*diaphorois baptismois*) are expressly classed with the "carnal ordinances" of the law. These baptisms were not the baptism of the gospel, however. It had nothing to do with the gospel more than being a type, and a type can not be just like the antitype. It could not be a type and antitype if they were just alike.

I am digressing from the subject. It is these baptisms of

the law the apostle says to leave. These services being but typical of future worship, proclaim by their nature that one day, when come the substance which they typify, they, the types, must be forsaken and turned from, as "dead works," to the substance typified. We find these baptisms under the law, that the apostle refers to, were for the purpose of cleansing the person who had defiled himself, etc.

4. "Of laying on of hands"; under the Mosaic Law, when a Jew brought an offering to the Lord, the imposition of hands was necessary. Lev. 1: 4: "And he shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt offering, and it shall be accepted for him to make an atonement for him"; and, you remember, many other scriptures. Paul exhorted the Hebrew brethren not to go back to these ceremonies, lest they "crucify the Son of God afresh and put him to an open shame."

II

I will begin where I left off with Heb. 6: 1, 2. We closed with the laying on of hands, showing that was a practice under the law. We will now call attention to what is said about the "resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment." We may dispose of these in the same manner.

The services in the worship under the law being typical, as taught by the apostle in chapters 8 and 9, they must have typified something under the New Testament. Jonah, being swallowed by a whale, the temporal punishments (death especially) of the children of Israel, etc., typified a resurrection and judgment, to say nothing about the judgment God passed upon them while at Kadesh-barnea, the tabernacle services, etc. They no longer need these types and shadows. They are to leave them. It is a fact that the doctrine for the remission of sins finds its foundation in these types—in the bathing of the priest in the brazen laver, who is a representative of the sinner, who, believing on the Christ, seeks remission of sins in the "bath of regeneration." The doctrine

of baptism in the Holy Spirit finds its foundation in the giving of the Holy Spirit to the "holy men of God who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit" (2 Peter 1: 21). I want to impress this one thought. It was not the doctrine of faith, repentance and baptism Paul urges the Hebrew brethren to leave, but that performing of the things which laid the foundation *again*. In these types are found the things which laid the foundation, or performing the things which laid the foundation were the "first principles of the doctrine of Christ" perhaps is a better way to express it. That which would "lay the foundation again" is what they are urged to leave. The apostle admonishes them to "leave the principles of the doctrine of Christ, not laying again the foundation," etc.

Leaving these first principles—the dead works of the law, the laying on of hands, the divers washings and carnal ordinances imposed on the Jews till the time of reformation—"let us go on unto perfection." For "the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did" (Heb. 7: 19). The force of this construction of language is that to practice these "principles" would "lay again the foundation" of something else. Paul didn't want these brethren to do that. The practice under the law of Moses laid the foundation once, which the Hebrew brethren had left and accepted and obeyed (the gospel), and the apostle urges them not to go back and lay this foundation again, but leave it and go on to perfection—continue in the gospel and not the type is the lesson to be learned. How brethren can take the position that the apostle meant leaving faith, repentance, confession and baptism is more than I can tell, though I once was of that opinion myself, but I can't tell now what my argument was then. I will now go back to the beginning and notice the fall.

THE FALL OF MAN

We will now read Gen. 3: 1-7: "Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but, the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman. Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat. And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons."

Let us now analyze the successive steps, and learn when she became guilty in the sight of God. Man has now fallen—he is away from his God. Can he get back without retracing his steps? is a question we want to answer. By analyzing the successive steps, I think we can easily answer the question. But I believe I will do my analyzing in my next article, as I am almost ready to close this one. I will now give a few brief statements from Smith's Bible Dictionary. Commenting on 1 Peter 3: 21, he says:

"The deliverance of Noah in the deluge is compared to the deliverance of Christians in baptism. The connection in this passage between baptism and 'the resurrection of Jesus Christ' may be compared with Col. 2: 12."

Let us read Col. 2: 12: "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." This needs no comments.

"Baptism was without question the initiatory rite in reference to Christian faith."—Smith's Bible Dictionary, page 99.

Thus Mr. Smith understood baptism to be the last step taken in order to be initiated into Christian faith, or, as we would say, into Christ.

"So John's baptism was for the remission of sins."—p. 98.

In the American Baptist Flag, Tuesday, July 28, 1904, James M. Bandy says in answer to a question asked him by A. J. Henson:

"The Bible Union Translation (a Baptist translation—R.) of Acts 2: 38, is, in my judgment, the very best that can be made, and reads: 'Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, unto the remission of sins'."

Thus James M. Bandy, of the Missionary Baptist Church, who claims to have had more than fifty debates, admits that "for," in Acts 2: 38, should be rendered "unto," and not "because of," as they usually teach.

I will now make a syllogism for them as they claim pardon before baptism. "He that saith I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him" (1 John 2: 4).

1. Baptism is a command. See Acts 10: 47, 48.

2. The B— believer says, before baptism, "I know him."

3. Therefore the B— believer, before baptism, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.

I would not call one of those people, who claim to know God before baptism, a liar, for a penny, but John says they are. That is, if they tell the truth when they say baptism is a command, and I think they do.

III

I will now take up the "fall of man" again. We will analyze the successive steps.

1. There was a preacher of falsehood and disobedience—falsehood and disobedience were preached and heard; but the woman had not fallen. She heard the preacher preach his falsehood, but she was not yet condemned—she had not yet fallen.

2. Next she disbelieved God in believing the tempter, the preacher of falsehood, the devil; but she had not yet fallen. Suppose she had said to him: "Your appearance is good; what you say seems reasonable. Indeed I believe it; but God has said for me not to eat of it, and I will obey him." Would she have fallen? She would not.

3. She next desired the result of disobedience, and became dissatisfied with the reward of obedience; but she was not yet driven from the garden, she had not yet fallen, or become guilty. She might have said to the tempter: "Sir, I feel a strong desire to eat this pleasant fruit, and to become as God, knowing good and evil. I can not understand why I am restricted in this way, but God said, 'You shall not eat of it,' and I will obey him." Would she have fallen? All will say she would not.

4. She now arrays the last part of her nature, not already in rebellion against God, though she has taken three steps in that direction. She decides to disobey God and obey the preacher. The Bible says, "She ate and her eyes were opened, and she was ashamed." She is now ashamed or guilty, as she fell, and not till then. Hearing perverted her ideas—faith in the preacher, her judgment or belief—desire, her heart or motives—disobedience, her will, and arrayed her whole nature in opposition to the laws of God, and, she having transgressed the law of God, became guilty, and not till then. This will not be disputed by any one who believes the Bible, for it says, "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die."

How then does man return or retrace his steps? Or must he retrace them? Christ came to bring man back to God. He became our legislator, hence has legislated for man. He has "all power," hence the power to legislate. He lays down the law under which this is to be done in his last commission to his apostles: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world" (Matt. 28: 19, 20). "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16: 15, 16). "Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem" (Luke 24: 45-47).

From these Scriptures we learn that man's return to God is a progressive work, just as his fall was a digressive work. His return is accomplished by a succession of steps or acts, and without them there is no return. (1) The gospel must be preached, and obeyed by the one preached to. (2) Man must believe the gospel, or have faith. But he has not yet returned; he is not yet pardoned; he is not yet relieved from the guilt of sin, just as the woman (Eve) had not incurred the guilt of sin, when she believed the preacher—the devil. (3) We have learned from this great commission that man must repent—he must cease to love sin, and desire peace, purity, pardon, and acceptance with God. He is not yet pardoned, just as the woman was not yet guilty when she desired the results of disobedience. He hasn't retraced his steps yet, hence not yet back to God. (4) Since man has fallen and is in a state of rebellion against God, it is neces-

sary for him to confess Christ before men. (See Matt. 10: 32; Luke 12: 8; Rom. 10: 9; Acts 7: 37.) But he is not yet saved, he is not yet pardoned. Should he stop here his return would not be complete. His entire nature would not yet be tested, and brought in subjection to God's will. (5) He must next obey the positive command of God. He must submit his will to the will of God in his positive ordinance—baptism. This we have learned in the commission. The merit is not in the act alone, pardon is not in the water. There is no virtue in the water to take away sins. It is away back of that. It is in obedience to God's command, and this obedience can never exist without baptism. Baptism, therefore, occupies precisely the same relation in time and sequence, in man's return to God, that the disobedience of the positive command, "Thou shalt not eat of it," did in his departure. As man was not separated from God, till he disobeyed a positive law, so he is not restored or reconciled to God, till he has obeyed a positive law. We say—no baptism, no pardon, just as we say—no disobedience, no punishment. Christ has "become the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him" (Heb. 5: 9). No obedience, no eternal salvation. In the fall, hearing perverted his ideas, belief his judgment of mind, repentance his emotional nature of heart, obedience to a positive command, or baptism, connects his will or brings it in submission to God's will.

Perhaps we can make this plainer if we illustrate it by restating it. Hearing changes the ideas, faith the judgment or mind, repentance the heart, baptism the will, and pardon the state. Pardon is not in baptism, but just on the other side. We are accused of teaching that salvation is in the water. We don't teach it! When a couple of persons become attached to each other, there arises the desire for union in marriage. When this desire arises they proceed to comply with the demands of our law, and God's requirements, by a ceremony of marriage. Acquaintance produced love, love produced a desire to get married. Still they are not married.

They resolve to fulfill this desire. Still they are not married. They take their place before the minister, and when he has completed half the ceremony they are not married, according to our civil law. They are not married till the words, "I pronounce you husband and wife" are spoken. Not until then does the woman take the man's name, and become entitled to his estate. It is not in the ceremony, but just on the other side, that she becomes vested with a wife's rights.

So in baptism, we are not pardoned, but pardon is just on the other side. The ceremony must be ended before the couple are married. So in baptism, it must be completed before man is pardoned. Our state is then changed. We are then pardoned, and are children of God.

The Church is the "Lamb's wife." We say, no law (Bible), no preacher; no preacher no disobedience, no belief of falsehood, no desire for the results of disobedience; no desire, no disobedience; no disobedience, no guilt, no punishment. In like manner—no preaching, no faith; no faith, no repentance; no repentance, no obedience; no obedience, or baptism, no pardon. Who can reason on the first transgression—on the fall and return of man to God—without seeing the succession of steps or acts in getting away from God and returning again? If we will study this it will settle the question with honest people.

IV

Before taking up other scriptures in the New Testament on this subject, I want to call attention to the fact that the plan of salvation was never revealed in the prophetic dispensation. It was hid in the mind of God. I expect to take up most all the scriptures on this subject and devote one article to the subject of "conversion," but not now. I want to notice the mystery now, then we will pass on to others.

THE HIDDEN MYSTERY

"But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory: which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. But as it is written (Is. 64: 4), Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God" (1 Cor. 2: 7-10).

We learn here that there was a "mystery" hid away in the mind of God, which "none of the princes of this world knew," and which "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man." But we also learn that it was "prepared for them that love him." What was prepared and hid in the mind of God for the lovers of God? or, has it ever been revealed? Yes, we learn here that "God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." The "us" here is in the first person and plural number, and refers to the apostles who received revelations direct from God. God revealed it through the Spirit to them. We, therefore, understand that this "mystery" which "eye had not seen," "ear had not heard," and had never "entered into the heart" or mind "of man" was, at that time, made known unto the apostles. Don't overlook the statement, "But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard," etc. Paul is referring to Is. 64: 4, and, at that time, eye had not seen, etc., that which God had hid in his mind for us. This mystery was made known unto the apostles, but not unto the world until after the death of Christ. "And the disciples came, and said unto him, Why speakest thou unto them in parables? He answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given" (Matt. 13: 10, 11). Thus we understand that when Jesus would be speaking concerning the "myster-

ies" he would speak in parables, because it was not the proper time to make them known unto the world. (See Mark 4: 10-12; Matt. 11: 25, 26.) The apostles, however, knew something concerning them. The prophets and angels desired to look into these things and could not. "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ, which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the suffering of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven: which things the angels desired to look into" (1 Peter 1: 10, 12).

We learn from the foregoing scripture the following:

1. That which the prophets desired to know and could not (it was hid in the mind of God) was "salvation" and "grace."

2. It was to come unto us.

3. Christ was to suffer and this "glory" to follow; hence, to be made known after the suffering of Christ.

4. That it was revealed and made known by "them that have preached the gospel."

5. That it was even hid from the angels, though they desired to know what their "salvation," "grace" and "glory" was, yet they could not. This salvation was not received through Holy Spirit baptism, for it was not kept secret.

Peter informs us that this "hidden mystery" was the plan of salvation. *It is now made known to all men.* "Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ according to the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the ever-

lasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith" (Rom. 16: 25, 26). Thus we are told that this "hidden mystery" is "made known to all nations" (not necessarily every individual, but all nations, yet every individual may know it) "for the obedience of faith." (See 2 Tim. 1: 9, 10, in connection with Rom. 16: 25, 26, then read Col. 1: 25-28.) "Whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for you, to fulfill the word of God: even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints: to whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of his mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory: whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus."

By obeying this "mystery" preached by the apostles, we get *into* Jesus Christ, and may be presented *perfect* in him. If, therefore, we can learn how to get into Christ, we may then have an idea what this mystery was. What is the mystery that makes perfect? "That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish" (Eph. 5: 25-27). The "washing of water" here is baptism, as all Bible students of any note admit, and "cleanse" is remission of sins (as in Acts 2: 38; 3: 19). It is "by the word." What does this mean? Bro. B. Franklin, I think it was, answered the question thus: "The word is from the Spirit; the Spirit is from Christ; Christ is from God. The whole, then, is from God, who gave Christ, and from Christ, who loved the church and gave himself for it, and from the Spirit, who, through the apostles spake the word, and thus directed them to the water, or to immersion, that they might be sanctified or set apart to the service of God, and cleansed by the blood of Jesus, and thus introduced into the heavenly family." They were not

sanctified and cleansed first, and then washed in water, but sanctified and cleansed *with the washing of water* by the word.

“For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ” (Gal. 3: 27; Rom. 6: 3). These two scriptures tell us that we are “baptized *into* Christ.” They are the only scriptures in all the New Testament that tell, in so many words, just how to get into Christ. They tell us plainly just how. Paul informs us that obeying that mystery preached by the apostles put them into Christ. Here then is that “mystery” which God kept hid in his mind. This plan of salvation never was made known by the prophets. There were types of baptism, plenty of them, but no prophecy concerning faith, repentance, confession and baptism, for the remission of sins. This mystery could not have been Christ, for he was predicted in Is. 53d chapter, and many other places. It could not have been the building of the church, for it was predicted in Is. 9: 6, 7, and many other places. It was not speaking with tongues, for it was predicted in Is. 28: 11. It was not Holy Spirit baptism, for it was predicted in Joel 2: 28. It was not the bringing in of the Gentiles, for that was predicted. See Is. 45: 6; 57: 19; 60: 3-5, and many other places. But the how, that is, *the plan*, was not predicted. None of these things could be that “hidden mystery.” Who, with all of this before him, could deny that immersion in water is for the people this side of the cross?

V

THE NEW BIRTH

“Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God.” Nicodemus saith unto him, “How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother’s womb, and be born?” Jesus answered, “Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of

water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (Jno. 3: 6).

Without this birth it is impossible to enter the kingdom of heaven, Jesus says. Our passing from an unconverted to a converted state, or entrance into the kingdom of Christ, is called, or compared to a birth. Our state before conversion, when in sin, is compared to the helpless confinement and darkness of the infant before birth. Our entrance into Christ's kingdom is called a birth, because we are ushered into the light and liberty of God's children. The figure is continued by Peter when he speaks of new converts as new-born babes.

This entrance into the kingdom of Christ then, is the new birth, or regeneration. This birth is of two things, water and Spirit. When we understand what "birth of Spirit" is, and what "birth of water" is, we have the birth complete.

The Spirit breathes. How? In inspiration of his chosen instruments of revelation, as in the inspired, and you hear his voice or his word (2 Thess. 2: 14). In this way, or by hearing his words, and believing them, are you begotten by the Spirit. We are sustained in this by numerous quotations: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God: and every one that loveth him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of him" (1 John 5: 1). "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures" (Jas. 1: 18). See also 1 Peter 1: 23 and 1 Cor. 4: 15. Hence belief of the gospel, or faith, is called the birth of the Spirit, or being begotten of the Spirit. It takes the begetting and bringing forth both to complete the birth, hence the expression, "born of water and Spirit."

How are we born of water? "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Titus 3: 5). Here baptism is called "the

washing of regeneration," or our birth of water. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16: 16). Here faith, one part of the birth of the Spirit, is mentioned. Baptism is the other part, or our birth of water. In this figure we are said to be begotten by the Spirit in faith, or born of the water in baptism.

But why are we said to be born of the water and the Spirit? Why is baptism placed first? Because we are always born of the one who bore us, before we are born of the one who begot us. In Mark, however, being begotten of the Spirit is placed before baptism, as it should be. Hence the Savior, in announcing what should be the law of his kingdom, declares that we must be born of the water and Spirit, or have faith and be baptized, before we are ushered into the kingdom of heaven, or Christ's church. Or, he makes baptism a condition of our pardon.

In the commission as given by Matthew, Mark and Luke, we find what the Savior would have the apostles do.

1. We find where they were to go—to all nations; to every creature.
2. That they were to preach.
3. What they were to preach—that they were to preach the gospel.
4. That men and women were to hear the gospel.
5. That they were required to believe the gospel.
6. That they were required to repent.
7. That they were required to be immersed.
8. That all this looks to salvation or remission of sins as its object.

This commission can't be limited to the Jew, as some try to limit it, for it was for "every creature" and "all nations." Then every creature that enters the kingdom of Christ, will enter by this new birth—be born into it.

THE THREE THOUSAND BAPTIZED

They tell us that the three thousand, on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2), could not have been born into the kingdom, as we teach. They tell us that it would have been impossible to have immersed them in one day. But we should remind them of the fact that there were twelve apostles present on that occasion; all authorized to baptize. Now divide three thousand by twelve, and we have two hundred and fifty persons for each one to baptize. Peter's address commenced about nine o'clock (see Acts 2: 15). In order to give all the weight to the argument, that any one could ask, we will suppose that three hours were spent in preaching and arranging for baptism. This leaves six hours in which to baptize allowing twelve hours for the day. Well, two hundred and fifty divided by six, gives forty-one and a fraction, the number for each to baptize per hour. Where is the impossibility? Most anybody could baptize forty-two persons per hour. That is not fast work. But it must be remembered that there were seventy other preachers sent out, making eighty-two preachers somewhere. They were surely present on this occasion. Did not Jesus request them to be there? (Luke 24: 45-48). They were among the hundred and twenty. We, therefore, have eighty-two preachers present to do the baptizing. This, then, would only have given thirty-six and a fraction for each one to baptize during the six hours; a little over six to the hour. So this impossibility vanishes into thin air.

"On the 16th of April, A. D. 404, Chrysostom immersed three thousand people in Constantinople, dipping every person three times." — The Form of Baptism, by J. B. Briney, p. 160.

1. Being baptized is obedience to God.
2. God will take vengeance on the disobedient (2 Thess. 1:8).

3. Therefore baptism is necessary in order to obedience—essential.

1. All the promises of God are in Christ.

2. We are baptized into Christ (Gal. 3: 27).

3. Therefore baptism is necessary in order to enter Christ.

VI

We plead the various instances recorded in the New Testament as confirmatory of our views of what we distinctively denominate "believers' baptism" or immersion.

Those baptized by John confessed their sins. (See Matt. 3: 6.) The Lord Jesus Christ gave the command to teach and baptize. (See Matt. 28: 19, 20; Mark 16: 15, 16). At the day of Pentecost they who gladly received the word were baptized, and they afterwards continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship. (See Acts 2: 41, 42, 47.) At Samaria, those who believed were baptized, both men and women. (See Acts 8: 12.) The Eunuch openly avowed his faith (in reply to Philip's statement—"If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest"), and went down into the water and was baptized. (See Acts 8: 35-39.) Saul of Tarsus, after his sight was restored, and he had received the Holy Ghost, arose and was baptized. (See Acts 9: 17, 18; 22: 16.) Cornelius and his friends heard Peter, received the Holy Ghost, and were baptized. (See Acts 10: 44, 48.) Lydia heard Paul and Silas, the Lord opened her heart, and she was baptized, and her household. Paul afterwards went to her house and comforted the brethren. (See Acts 16: 14, 15, 40.) The jailer and all his house heard the word and were baptized, believing and rejoicing in God. (See Acts 16: 32, 34.) Crispus and all his house, and many Corinthians heard, believed, and were baptized. (See Acts 18: 8.) The disciples of Ephesus heard and were baptized. (See Acts 19: 5.) The household of Stephanas baptized by Paul, were the first-fruits of Achaia, and addicted them-

selves to the ministry of the saints. (See 1 Cor. 1: 6; 16: 15.)

In opposition to our opponents who deny the perpetuity of baptism, I maintain that the ordinance is as obligatory at the present time as it was at its first institution, assigning the following reasons for this persuasion:

1. That baptism was divinely instituted as an ordinance of the Christian religion, and administered by inspired apostles to both Jews and Gentiles, is plain from the preceding remarks.

2. There is no intimation that the law of baptism was designed to be restricted to any nation, or limited to any period of time. It is a general law, without any restriction, except that which refers to character, "he that believeth."

3. A divine law must continue obligatory until it is repealed by divine authority. There is no intimation in the Scriptures that the law of baptism has been repealed, and therefore there is no reason to suppose its obligation has ceased.

4. The permanent duration of the ordinance is plainly implied in the promise, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world" (Matt. 28: 19, 20). This important promise was given at the time the ordinance was instituted, and it plainly supposes the continuance of baptism "even to the end of the world."

5. Baptism is connected with the most important doctrines, duties and privileges of the gospel. The Savior connects it with the doctrine of the Trinity of Godhead; preaching and believing the gospel; fulfilling all righteousness; and the promise of salvation. (See Matt. 3: 15; 28: 19; Mark 16: 15, 16.) Paul connects it with the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, with the believers dying into sin, living unto God, and putting on Christ. (See Rom. 6: 3, 4; Gal. 3: 27.) He connects it also with "one body, one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one God and Father of all" (Eph. 4: 4-6). Peter connects it with the "remission

of sins." (See Acts 2: 38.) And also with salvation and good conscience. (See 1 Peter 3: 21.) Now, you set aside or do away with one, and you set aside and do away with all the rest, even God himself. To discontinue the ordinance of baptism would be to dissolve its connection with all these doctrines, duties, and privileges. And who, without authority from the Divine Author of the institution, can do this with impunity?

6. Baptism answers all the purposes at this day which it answered in the first age of Christianity, and these are needful now, as they were then. No reason can be assigned for the observance of the ordinance in the apostles' days, which will not apply in all its force to believers in every age of the church of Christ.

7. The above considerations afford incontestable proof of the perpetuity of Christian baptism, and show that its observance is as obligatory at present as it was in the days of the apostles, and that it will continue to be as obligatory until the consummation of all things.

8. It being thus evident from the Scriptures that baptism is designed by the Head of the Church to be co-existent with the gospel system, as a constituent part of it, and co-extensive with repentance toward God and faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ, it is manifestly a great error to imagine that the obligation to baptism has ceased. There is not the slightest foundation for such opinion; against it there is the strongest evidence. Those who dispute this statement we entreat seriously to consider whether they are not, through their mistaken opinions regarding the perpetuity of water baptism, doing great dishonor to the Savior by disobeying his command, and to the Holy Spirit, rejecting his written will, in setting aside what the Scriptures so plainly teach to be binding on all believers to the end of the world.

9. To suppose that the necessity of water baptism is superseded by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, is manifestly

erroneous on two accounts: (1) There is now, in the Scriptural sense of the words, no baptism of the Spirit. No miraculous gift, no converting operation, no sanctifying influence of the Spirit, is ever, by the inspired writers, called the baptism of the Holy Ghost, except what took place on the day of Pentecost, and at the first calling of the Gentiles in the house of Cornelius. On these two occasions the promise of baptism in the Holy Ghost was fulfilled, and in reference to no other events do the sacred writers speak of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. The bestowment of the Spirit on these two occasions is quite different from every former and every subsequent bestowment of the Spirit, so far as our knowledge extends. As the word of God mentions no other baptism in the Holy Spirit than what took place at Pentecost, and in the house of Cornelius, we have no warrant to expect the scriptural baptism of the Spirit in the present day. (2) But supposing every believer was as truly baptized in the Holy Spirit as Cornelius was, this would in no wise diminish his obligations to be baptized in water. Did not the apostle Peter command the Pentecostal converts to be baptized? And is it not expressly recorded that they were baptized? Did not the same inspired apostle command Cornelius and his friends to be baptized in water, and assign their being baptized in the Holy Spirit as a reason for their being baptized in water? "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?"

VII

In Matt. 13: 15, we learn that conversion comes before pardon. Jesus says: "And should be converted, and I should heal them." The "healing" comes after the conversion. The original Greek word *strepheo*, occurs eighteen times in the New Testament, and is translated "turn," in every instance, in the common version, except Matt. 18: 3: "Except ye be converted and become as a little child," thus making the

turning their own act, and not the Holy Spirit turning them. In every instance where the word *strepheo* occurs in the New Testament, except the last one, Rev. 11: 6, the person or that which was turned, turned itself, as for example, Acts 7: 42, "God turned"; Acts 13: 4, Paul says, "we turned to the Gentiles"; Luke 7: 9, Jesus "turned him about"; Luke 7: 44, "He turned to the woman." Thus we see the word "convert" means "to turn." It must be remembered that the person turned, turned himself.

The original word, *epistrepheo*, occurs thirty times, and is translated, in the common version, "turn," or its equivalent twenty-two times. It is eight times rendered "converted," or "convert." In a large majority of these cases, that which was turned, "turned itself," as Matt. 9: 22, "Jesus turned him about"; Matt. 10: 13, "Let your peace return to you"; Mark 5: 30, "Turned him about in the press," etc. There is nothing in the meaning of this word, showing which way the "turning," or conversion is, whether from bad or good. This must be learned from the connection, as for example, 2 Pet. 2: 22, "The dog turned to his vomit again"; Mark 13: 16, "Let him not turn back," etc. In one instance, where the turning is to the Lord, the turning is ascribed to the preacher; as, for example, Acts 26: 18, Paul was to "turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God."

Converted to God, means *turned* to God, and nothing else. But what are we to understand by being "healed," (Matt. 13: 15)? Mark, speaking upon this same subject, says: "That they should be converted, and their sins should be forgiven them" (Mark 4: 12). Then Matthew and Mark use the terms healed and forgiven, as convertible terms. To be healed, according to Matthew, is to be forgiven according to Mark. Conversion is one thing, remission is another. Conversion goes before pardon, and pardon depends upon conversion. Pardon takes place in the mind of God. The turning is done by the one pardoned, and takes place before

pardon. The simple term "convert" means to change, and God does not do the changing for us. The word is defined thus: (1) "To change, or turn into another substance or form. (2) To change from one state to another. (3) To change or turn from one religion, or from one party or sect, to another. (4) To turn from a bad life to a good one; to change the heart and moral character from enmity to God, and from vicious habits, to love of God, and to holy life," etc.—all of which is embraced in the simple word change. A house may be converted into ashes. A bundle of old rags may be converted into paper.

"Wash you, make you clean: put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil" (Is. 1: 16). This implies an entire change of life, or practice. We must make this change ourselves. God can't make it for us. We must do our own turning. God can't believe, repent, etc., for us. "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." This implies a change, and the wicked is the one who has the change to make. The apostle Peter teaches this same change. "Let him eschew evil, and do good; let him seek peace, and ensue it. For the eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and his ears are open unto their prayers: but the face of the Lord is against them that do evil" (1 Pet. 3: 11, 12). This is plain; we can understand that God is not going to knock the sinner down and thus convert or turn him. He must "eschew evil, and do good" himself. In Rom. 6: 16, we have the same idea expressed. We must yield ourselves servants, either to obey God or the devil.

Paul says: "For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death" (2 Cor. 7: 10). Repentance here means more than to be sorry for sin. "Godly sorrow worketh repentance." The word (metanoian) that is here translated

"repentance," Greenfield defines thus: "repentance, i. e., a change of mind and purpose; a change of one's mode of thinking, feeling and acting; reformation of life." Hence, a different man—a changed man—a converted man but not a pardoned man. We can see that there must be a conversion of state, or relation. The apostle says: "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing: and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty" (2 Cor. 6: 17, 18). Here is a conversion of relation. God says: "I will be a father unto you," which implies that he was not always such.

"Which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy" (1 Pet. 2: 9, 10). Here are persons who, at one time, were not a people, but who have been converted in their relation to God. The word "obtain" carries with it the idea of labor, of making an effort. These people, remember, "obtained mercy."

"Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord" (Acts 3: 19). Repentance, then, is not conversion of itself. "Repent ye therefore, and be converted." Repentance, the second step toward a complete change, and conversion, both came before the blotting out of sins.

In Acts 2: 38, we read: "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Conversion, according to Acts 3: 19, and baptism according to Acts 2: 38, mean the same thing—or more properly, by baptism, persons are converted. This (baptism) is the last step toward that change. They have now "obtained mercy" and the "remission of sins," hence are now "the people of God."

John Wesley, in his note on Rom. 6: 3, says: "In baptism, we through faith, are ingrafted into Christ." This certainly is a great change of state: to be taken out of a state of nature and be grafted into Christ. Wesley also says this was by the ancient order—immersion. He also says, "By baptism we enter into covenant with God; into that everlasting covenant which he hath commanded forever."—*Doctrine Tracts*, Conference edition of 1850, p. 247.

God says: that "they might be converted and I shall *heal* them." Christ says: "He that believeth and is baptized *shall be saved*," or shall be healed. Which side of baptism has Jesus placed salvation? "Hear and obey."

CHRISTMAS

Christmas is the day on which the nativity of the Savior is observed. The institution of this festival is attributed by the spurious Decretals to Telesphorus, who flourished in the reign of Antoninus Pius (138-161 A. D.), but the first certain traces of it are found about the time of the Emperor Commodus (180-192 A. D.). In the reign of Diocletian (284-305 A. D.), while that ruler was keeping court at Nicomedia, he learned that a multitude of Christians were assembled in the city to celebrate the birthday of Jesus, and having ordered the church-doors to be closed, he set fire to the building, and all the worshippers perished in the flames. This is the opposition with which it met at first. It was considered unscriptural and even the rulers refused to keep it at first. It seems that it did not become common or a legal holiday till about the fourth century.

Celebrating the birthday of Jesus is something the apostles never once thought of. It does not appear, however, that there was any uniformity in the period of observing the nativity among the early churches; some held the festival in the month of May or April, others in January. Every

month in the year has been said, by historians, to be the month in which our Savior was *born*. It is, nevertheless, almost certain that the 25th of December cannot be the nativity of the Savior, for it is then the height of the rainy season in Judea, and shepherds could hardly be watching their flocks by night in the plains. There is no one who knows when Christ was born, not even the month, then why set apart a day to celebrate the birth of Christ?

"Secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever" (Deuteronomy 29: 29). The day of our Savior's birth has never been revealed, hence, is one of the secret things that belong to God. Had God wanted us to celebrate the birth of Christ he would have revealed it—told us when it was and not kept it a secret. It is none of our business when Christ was born or God would have told us. If we would learn to tend to our own business and let others (God's and Christ's) alone we would fare much better in the judgment, I think. Moses was the type of Christ (Deuteronomy 18: 18-20; Acts 3: 20-23), and no man knows where his body was laid (Deuteronomy 34: 6). God kept it a secret, it was no one else's business or he would have revealed it, and no man knows when Christ, the anti-type, came into this world; it is a secret that belongs to God and it is wrong for us to celebrate a day in memory of his birth; even teaching our children that there is a Santa Claus (a falsehood), and having Christmas trees, etc., all in memory of the birth of Christ our Lord. The breweries and distilleries run night and day in order to celebrate the birth of Christ our Lord. Saloon keepers and Christians will all go to hell together if they don't dissolve partnership before death.

Christmas not only became the parent of many later festivals, such as those of the virgin, but especially from the 5th to the 8th century gathered round it, as it were, several other festivals, partly old and partly new, so that

what was termed as "the Christmas cycle" sprang up, which surpassed all other groups of Christian holidays in the manifold richness of its festal usages, and furthered, more than any other, the completion of the orderly and systematic distribution of church festivals over the whole year. So you can see where these ungodly feasts originated. It was in the 4th and 5th centuries and the Christmas feast was among the first. It is the mother of all the rest and the Roman Catholic church hatched it. Next was the Yule-feast held in commemoration of the return of the fiery sun-wheel. They (Germans) believed that, during the twelve nights reaching from the 25th of December to the 6th of January, they could trace the personal movements and interferences on earth of their great deities, Odin, Berchta, etc.

Many of the beliefs and usages of the old Germans, and also of the Romans, relating to this matter, passed over from heathenism to Christianity. But the church also sought to combat and banish—and it was to a large extent successful—the deep-rooted heathen feeling, by adding, for the purification of the heathen customs and feasts which it retained, its grandly devised liturgy, besides dramatic representations of the birth of Christ and the first events of his life. Hence sprang the so-called "Manger-songs," and a multitude of Christmas carols, as well as Christmas dramas, which at certain times and places, degenerated into farces or Fools' Feasts. Hence also originated, at a later period, the Christ trees, or Christmas trees, adorned with lights and gifts, the custom of reciprocal presents, and of special Christmas meats and dishes, etc. Thus, Christmas became a universal social festival for young and old, high and low, all done in memory of the birth of Christ our Lord. In the Roman Catholic church, three masses are performed at Christmas—one at mid-night, one at daybreak, and one in the morning.

Next a Christmas Box was invented. This was used on the day after Christmas, which was popularly called Boxing-day.

“Gladly, the boy, with Christmas box in hand,
Throughout the town his devious route pursues;
And, of his master’s customers, implores
The yearly mite: often his cash he shakes;
The which, perchance, of coppers few consists,
Whose dulcet jingle fills his little soul
With joy.”

At length the Christmas Box system became such an intolerable grievance that the public authorities issued remonstrances against it. At Christmas 1836, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs issued a circular requesting a discontinuance of the customary gifts. It went so far that there had to be a check put to it. And so it is, the world and the church go hand in hand in all this ungodly work. We do not know when our Savior came into this world but we do know when he went out and we have a feast to keep (1 Corinthians 5: 7) in memory of his death and suffering. Then let us keep that feast, and all things that have been revealed, let us study and keep—yes, be faithful until death and a crown of glory you shall wear. What history I have referred to, you will find in Chamber’s encyclopedia, Volume 7. Brethren, let us attend to our own business.

ROCKS, HILLS, CANYONS AND FALLS

I have looked at the towering rocks, sloping hillsides, valleys, deserts, canyons and beautiful streams in the West many times, and each time they seem more attractive to me. This time, while in Idaho, near the city of Twin Falls, I saw the Blue Lakes, the beautiful canyon where these lakes "live"; saw the Blue Lake Falls; saw the highest bridge in the world which was completed and "dedicated" while I was out there; saw Shoshone Falls and then asked myself, did the god of evolution create and pile up those rocks which the gate-keeper told us were six hundred feet high, make those wonderful, attractive falls, plant those Lakes between those rocks and slope those hills so when the sun is shining on them they picture a beautiful "rain-bow," as the people call it? Then I thought, pshaw! how could a soulless vertebra of the sea speak all these things into existence?

Again, the question came, Who placed the soulless vertebrae in the sea if there be no personal God? No monkey ever brought forth these wonderful things or spake them into existence.

As I looked at those things I tried to read all of them. At the head of Blue Lake Canyon a river comes right up out of the ground and runs visibly for perhaps a half mile, when it suddenly disappears again as it hides itself again in the earth; but perhaps a quarter of a mile from there it again becomes visible and soon connects with the water coming over the Blue Lake Falls; then both travel together until they flow into Snake River.

When I looked at those mountains of rocks I thought of Palestine and the many times Jesus resorted to those hills—sometimes to pray, sometimes to teach a selected class a special lesson; but the last time he went he took his cross

on which the Romans nailed him fast. I thought of that "dark night" at almost noon-day when He said, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" I wondered if that dark hour, when the sun could not be seen, could represent the darkness (another Dark Age) of Infidelity that Catholics and Mormons want to bring to us. At least I thought of the heathenism, their ideas, if accepted and enforced, would bring to us.

God save us from that dark hour and ever grant us the light of the Gospel!

I looked at that blue water, then thought of the hour Jesus spent in the Garden in prayer when he prayed, "Father, let this cup pass from me," etc. Then I thought of the gall they gave Him when he said, "I thirst." I wondered, too, if He was not just a little "blue" when He prayed that prayer three times in that Garden while his disciples (whom he took with him) would not stay awake while he agonized and prayed—as many "Christians" do on Lord's Days when a few real Christians meet to worship and pray. When in that Garden He was in the shadow of his death, and Christians remember that death on Lord's Days.

I looked at the water that came so suddenly out of the ground and made itself visible and its power known, and thought of the "fountain opened in the house of David for sin and uncleanness" (Zech. 13). That fountain was opened when they thrust that spear into His side and the water and blood suddenly appeared. "There is power in His blood," and without it we would be without spiritual life, just as we would be without physical life if it were not for the beautiful streams—many of them unseen just as the one mentioned above.

Shoshone Falls are the prettiest I ever saw, and I have seen many. As I looked at them I thought of the millions now going over the falls of Satanic persuasion while many of us are standing on the "walls of Zion" and the Rock of Ages above, warning them of the danger.

I looked at the more than four hundred steps in the stair-way leading to the canyon below the falls, and noticed the many landings, crooks and turns in that stair-way, part of which is between two great rocks only a few feet apart. The stair-way is very difficult to climb, but I thought—how could persons below ever reach the top and be saved from destruction in that canyon in the winter were it not for that stair-way? It is said only a few can climb it without being very sore afterward, yet hundreds climb it. I even thought of Jacob's ladder (Gen. 28) and of the seven steps (2 Peter 1) in the ladder for Christians, to take, after they have climbed the ones (rounds in the ladder) for aliens. They are just a little difficult to climb, and sometimes make us "sore" because we are not satisfied with the way the Lord built this ladder. However, it is our only way of escape from the chill and cold in the winter of sin and folly. God built the ladder for our escape, and we have neither the strength nor ability to change it and build another. So it is climb this one and live, or refuse to climb and die!

That high bridge, built by man, neither attracted my attention nor taught me a lesson like the great canyon beneath it which God built. However, it made me think how impossible it would be for us to cross that canyon and reach the other side were it not for the bridge. Then I thought of the Gospel in the hands of men. How many are on the other side of the "canyon" that separates between the world and the Church, and cannot be saved unless they cross the "canyon"! The Gospel is the "bridge" which God has placed in the hands of men to proclaim to those beyond the "canyon" (line of demarcation between the Church and the world) and admit them in perfect safety as they pass over on the other side where they are assured Eternal Life if they will only remain in the Gospel.

To leave that highest bridge in the world by stepping too far to either side would mean a fall of several hundred feet into the Snake River canyon, which would mean death.

Banisters, however, are prepared to keep persons from stepping too far to one side and thus losing their lives. To step aside from the Gospel means a fall into the very pits of Satan, which means eternal death and separation from God, Christ and Heaven. There are "banisters" though, prepared to keep persons from stepping to one side and falling. These "banisters" are true Christians encouraging you to remain on the "bridge," and discouraging stepping aside. The devil (once in the form of a snake) has most of those secure who step aside, and keeps them in the stream which leads to death and destruction, for that is the destination of the stream. American Falls Dam is a very beautiful place. That large dam across Snake River holds the water back about thirty miles and makes a lake about a half-mile wide from which they get water enough to water millions of acres of ground. This helps them keep vegetation alive, and vegetation helps keep the animal kingdom alive. Jesus said, "If you drink of the water I give you, ye shall never thirst" (John 4). Just as the American Dam was prepared to assist in keeping the animal kingdom alive so God gave his Son to suffer and die so as to keep the spiritual kingdom alive. However, many do not appreciate that which God did to perpetuate spiritual life as they do that which the Government did to help perpetuate human life, though human life is very short.

Soon these lakes, falls and streams will be frozen, then the ice is as pretty as the water—so I'm told. This, too, introduces another thought. It hardly seems possible that winter is here again, but it is. Time seemingly passes so fast! Yesterday I was helping my wife make garden; today I'm helping her dig potatoes. I hardly get over "spring fever" until my ears are frostbitten. I sometimes wonder if I am getting old, or is it something else stealing time from me? I don't feel old, I don't act old nor I don't look old; but must certainly be getting old, for soon as the rose bids me good-by the icicle reaches out his hand and says, "How

do you do, sir?" If I'm not old I certainly will be in fifty or sixty more years, for things are not as they once were. It used to seem like a hundred years from one Christmas (the only time I got any candy) to the next! But now I use my right hand to bid Christmas good-by and with my left at the same time welcome the same "gentleman." When I move into that House whose builder and maker is God it will not be so, for I'll never grow old over there.

I enjoy the flowers, birds, trees, hills, valleys, rocks and green grass in "the good old summer time." Then comes the autumn when the once green leaves are brown, black, yellow, pink, and form most beautiful scenery before my eyes—and I think I like that best. Then ice appears and leaves begin to fall, snow flies and we are "housed up" and shut in from all attractions we so much enjoyed. Then I think of life and death. As the leaves fade, die and fall, so we too must soon "fade away" and be shut in from the pretty scenes of this life. But when spring arrives the birds, leaves and flowers are "resurrected" and begin to send forth their music, sweet fragrance and beautiful colors to be enjoyed again. So with our bodies: though they are hid away in the graves for a time, yet the "springtime" will come when they will be resurrected, enjoy and be enjoyed in that City where we will never grow old, if only we will be obedient to our Master who is the Builder of the pretty rocks, Painter of the beautiful roses, Music Teacher to the sweet-singing birds, Creator of the trees, Picture Painter of the autumn leaves, and Sustainer of all things we today see, hear and enjoy while here in the summer, autumn and winter of our lives. That Spring will come—then the flowers will fade no more, birds will continue their singing, birthdays will be forgotten and Christmas unknown, for we will then have passed by "the milky way," said good-by to the morning star and anchored our souls in that beautiful rainbow of an Eternal Sabbath Morn.

WHAT AM I? OR AM I WHAT I AM?

One says I'm just dirt and wind (breath)—and that when the wind leaves my body there will be nothing left but dirt, and that it will sleep in the grave until the Resurrection, then this "sleepy dirt" will "wake up" and become lively and active again. If this dirt has been real good before it went to sleep it will never take another long nap like that, but will live forever in its heaven, which will be here on earth. If this dirt was real naughty before and when it went to the grave to sleep until the Resurrection, it will wake up but will not remain awake very long. It will go to sleep again, but will be in the hog-and-dog heaven, or whatever they please to call it. At least the dogs, hogs, rats and bats will be in the same place with the naughty fellow. They will be there eternally, too, I'm told, and that never-ending sleep will be the "punishment" inflicted for being naughty. So if this "dirt" and "wind" should miss the heaven where the good go it will be unconscious and know absolutely nothing about the "miss," hence will not and cannot worry about what it missed.

Of course these people think Jesus Christ made a serious mistake when He told us in Luke 16 that the "rich man" was conscious and knew what he missed. It seems there were no horses, cows, dogs, hogs, etc., with the rich man. The only "squeal" that was made was made by the rich man, and not by a bunch of swine.

Then there is that other fellow I saw the other day who told me I have no personal God, and that I only evolved into this world. He said I came from the same place and from the same parent the tadpole, the turtle, the frog, the mouse, the cat, the dog, the skunk, the wolf, the leopard, the lion, the elephant, etc., came from.

Then I hung my head and asked myself, "Do I look and act like all those fellows who he affirms had the same parent

I had?" Am I as small as the tadpole, as hard-shelled as the turtle, as noisy as the frog, as nosey and mean as the mouse, as quick as the cat, as growly as the dog, as stinking as the skunk, as wild as the lion, and as big as the elephant? If we originated with the same ancestor I certainly must have some of the characteristics and appearances of all of them. But if even in some respects I look and act like all of them I am certainly a monstrosity—horrible, hateful and dreadful enough to be placed in a wild animal show with the rest of my "brothers and sisters" in the flesh.

Now laugh, will you? Ah, you had the same dad that I had, and are just as much of a monstrosity as I am, and should be in the same cage with me if that fellow told me the truth.

Suppose I've been in the hunting and trapping business, and on the side of the old smoke-house I have the pelts and hides of all the animals I have caught. In some respects they all resemble. But could you imagine the mouse producing the cat, the cat producing the dog, the dog the wolf, the wolf the leopard, the leopard the lion, and the lion the elephant? Why not, since they are supposed to be developing in all respects? That theory forces the born to be larger than that from which it was born. They, too, are alike in many respects. Each has four legs, four feet, two ears, two eyes, one mouth, one nose, one tongue, one heart, one head, several teeth, two lungs, one stomach, several bones, flesh, skin and hair. Then why not all have the same parent?

But you say you never saw any cats born of mice, dogs born of cats, leopards born of dogs, nor elephants born of leopards, etc., and never met anyone who had seen such change of species. I can make this line from mouse to elephant on the old smoke-house, anyway—since they resemble in many respects—and come as near proving it as the fellow who told me I have no personal God (and that I came by way of evolution and have the ape and monkey as full brothers of mine) can come proving his position.

The evolutionist writes fiction, and not facts. His is not history, but imagination. That fellow can beat me with all my pelts and hides! He begins, not with real animals like I do, but only an imaginary cell or skulless vertebrae, millions of years old, he says. This cell was about the size of the God that is "without body and without parts" (nothing), you hear some people talk so much about. From that cell came all the sea animals, forest animals, fowls, plants, life, etc. Worms, flies, gnats, apes, monkeys, you and I all came from that one cell which was almost as large as nothing! That little ancestor is the daddy of us all, so that fellow, I met the other day, tells me.

This is the fiction gravely assumed by the evolutionary process of bringing into existence all things that exist. Just as well try to prove that mouse could and did give birth to a cow as to try to prove the fiction they assume is true concerning the origin of man. One is as logical as the other, and neither is a forty-second cousin to reason.

There are lines, we admit, of animal ancestry, but they are not a million and more years long. They are shorter lines, if you please. The fish makes a few lines; the birds a few lines; the animals a few lines; and man makes one separate, distinct line back to the Garden of Eden, and no history goes farther back. They break this line in fiction, but cannot break it in fact. Birds produce birds; snakes produce snakes; fish produce fish; and animals produce animals, each after their kind, just as far back as history goes. Who ever heard of a cow producing a horse, or mankind producing a cow? Men do not produce monkeys, nor monkeys men, any more than mules produce hogs or hogs mules. Who ever heard of a woman placing fifteen eggs under a setting hen and fifteen dogs or fifteen horses being hatched? Such "logic" makes me wonder if I'm a man? Am I what I am or am I an ape? What am I, anyway? If I accept so-called science I can't answer the question. I may be a toad or I may be a Western jackrabbit, or I may be in the

ancestral line of the water-lily. But if I accept the Bible then I know what I am. No guessing about it.

There are many things, however, we do not understand; but shall I deny there being a personal God and He bringing all creation into existence, as the Bible says He did, simply because there are some mysterious things? I do not understand the radio system, but I'd be a fool to deny its existence. Gravitation can neither be heard, felt, smelled, tasted or seen, yet that is no proof that gravity is not a substance as really truly as is iron or water. It is a mysterious something which pulls the weight toward the earth, but I can neither see, taste, feel, hear nor smell it; yet I know it exists. I also know it had an Originator higher and wiser than man.

One has reasoned thus: "He that formed the eye—shall He not see? And He that formed the ear—shall He not hear?" But how shall He "see" without eyes, or "hear" without ears of His own? Let the Bible answer; "The eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and His ears are open to their prayers." So the Lord is a person with "eyes" and "ears," and we were made in His image. He that formed the mind—shall He not think? He that formed the life—shall He not live? He that endowed us with consciousness and gave us our sensations—shall He be incapable of corresponding senses infinitely extended?

All this defeats the man of the street arguing that we have no personal God, and that everything was hatched out of that little cell millions of years ago. I'm wondering who daddied the cell.

Every breath we breathe, every motion of our body involves a mystery. Shall we deny they exist? Inert matter cannot move itself, and we know that our bodies are as inert as a piece of iron or a stick of wood, since a dead man (the body) cannot move himself. Then what moves a living man's body? Why doesn't the bench in the meeting house get up and walk out with you when the audience is

dismissed? The bench is matter and your body is matter, yet your body walks out; the bench remains. Why is this?

Mr. Spencer, in speaking of the "manifestations of God's power," says such a manifestation must take five distinct forms: Space, time, motion, matter, force. When we turn to Gen. 1: 1, 2 we find these very "manifestations," and almost in the exact order given by this scientist, Mr. Spencer.

"In the beginning.....time
 God created the heaven.....space
 and the earth.....matter
 and the Spirit of God.....force
 moved upon the face of the waters".....motion

I think Prof. Spencer knew not that this verse was given for his benefit as well as for mine.

Sir J. W. Dawson, geologist, gives a different, independent testimony:

Matter.....the earth (Gen. 1: 2)
 Darkness.....Darkness upon the face of the deep
 (Gen. 1: 2.)

Motion.....the Spirit of God moved (Gen. 1: 2)
 Light.....there was light (Gen. 1: 3)

Heat.....God made two great lights (Gen. 1: 16)
 —viz. sun—heat.

Spencer mentioned "time," "space" and "force," which Dawson did not mention. Dawson mentioned "darkness," "light" and "heat," which Spencer omitted. We find all in the very first chapter of Genesis. So we see the scientists have to admit the very thing taught in the Bible thousands of years before they (these two) were born. In this we not only have proof of a personal and all-powerful Creator, but have proof the scientist has not discovered anything new in regard to Creation.

In Gen. 1: 26, 27 and 2: 7 we are told that God "made," "created" and "formed" man. In Isa. 43: 7 all three of these words are found in the one verse. They all come from different Hebrew words, too. "Make" is from "asak," "created" is from "bata," and "formed" is from "yatsat."

Man was made. This refers to the soul, the individuality, the man himself, hence the rich man conferring with himself said unto his soul, "Soul . . . take thine ease" (Luke 12: 19). "Eight souls were saved" (1 Peter 3: 20). This is the life which man possesses in common with the animals. It is the animal life (soul) and not the spiritual. Gen. 1: 25 tells us, "God made the beasts"—every beast wherein there is a living soul" (Gen. 1: 30, margin). So then man, who had been, as to his body formed of the dust, now "became a living soul" (Gen. 2: 7).

"Formed of the dust." The original word ("yatsat") conveys the idea of a potter forming clay, shaping it into some vessels. It refers to man's body, to which was given an existence akin to the earth from which it came, and to which that body must return.

A man was created. This, coupled with the fact that God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life" or "lives" (the Hebrew word is plural), refers to His Spirit, enabling him to hold communion with his Creator. (See Rom. 8: 16.) It was Mary's spirit that rejoiced in God! (Luke 1: 46). It is this part of man which bears the image of God—Gen. 1: 27—"God created man in His image."

So I conclude that I am soul, body and spirit (1 Thess. 5: 23)—as Paul affirms; and that the fellow who told me I came from the same place and had the same daddy as the ape, snake, duck, horse, goose, cow, etc., is sadly mistaken. It is nowhere said that God "formed," "made" and "created" the lower animal. These three words are used in reference to mankind only.

But fallen man has lost that image, hence he is said to be without God (Eph. 2: 12); and, therefore, to restore that

image a new creation is necessary, so we read, "If any man be in Christ there is to him a new creation," literally (2 Cor. 5: 17). Just as in Eph. 4: 24 we read of "the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."

To the thoughtless mind these three words—"formed," "made," "created"—might easily appear to mean the same thing. They describe the three-fold origin of man.

INFIDELS AND THE BIBLE

Infidels of all classes criticise the Bible, and some of them denounce it and make light of it, yet they refuse to go to the jungles and live without it. They will only live in the land where the Bible lives. It is strange that they will fuss (and some of them even cuss) because we believe it and teach it to our children; and they make this so-called argument which they think will come nearer prejudicing their young minds against the Bible than anything else they can say: "If it is really the word of God, it would surely be recognized as such by the general body of men of great intellect and learning. The Bible circulates chiefly amongst the poor and common people."

Now while their statement is, generally speaking, true, the inference drawn from it is not true; for instead of militating against the divine authenticity of the Bible, this fact constitutes one of the strongest arguments, in its favor. The Bible is intended for all—young and old, rich and poor; for God desires "all (classes of) men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the Truth" (1 Tim. 2: 4). But the rich are so often engrossed with their riches, and the learned so prone to rely upon their intellectual attainments that in many cases they have neither ear nor heart for the voice of the Shepherd (John 10: 4, 5)—thus confirming to the letter the truth of 1 Cor. 1: 26—viz., that "not many

wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called." While on the other hand, our Lord's first public utterance gave voice to what is really the glory of the Bible—viz., that, unlike all human institutions, which invariably favor the rich (James 2: 3), this Gospel is preached to the poor (Luke 4: 18). Hence we read in Mark 12: 37, "The common people heard Him gladly."

We may and should thank God for that "m." The Bible does not say not any wise men are called, but not m-any. We are rejoiced to know that some of the great men of the earth have been humble enough to come forward and acknowledge the Bible as the word of God and contend for it in the face of its enemies and infidelity of all classes. They have been wise enough to recognize the inestimable value of its contents. I think it well here to name some of the great men who have acknowledged the Bible as being the word of God and believed it as such, whether they all obeyed it to the letter or not. They have been led to read and love the Bible and learn divine wisdom from its sacred pages.

From earliest times there have been kings like David and Solomon, rulers such as Ezra and Nehemiah, prime ministers like Daniel at the Babylonian court, who, in spite of the splendor of their surroundings, esteemed the word of God to be better unto them than thousands of gold and silver! (See Psa. 119: 72.) Later also, in New Testament times, Paul himself a highly cultured man, whose great desire was to let the word of Christ dwell in him richly—was able to speak of "they of Caesar's household" who were obedient to the Faith (see Philip. 4: 22); while scattered over the centuries we find the Bible has been read and loved by men of the very highest and mightiest intellect, the widest learning and most refined culture, representing almost every branch of science, literature, art and law. Prominent among them may be mentioned the following: Chrysostom (A. D. 347), the "golden-mouthed"; Augustine (A. D. 354), the greatest

of Latin Fathers; the venerable Bede (A. D. 673), "the greatest name in the ancient literature of England"; Alfred the Great (A. D. 871), England's "best and greatest king"; Michael Angelo (A. D. 1474), the most distinguished sculptor of the modern world; Martin Luther (A. D. 1483) the great reformer; Shakespeare (A. D. 1564), "the chief literary glory of England," whose writings abound with quotations from or reference to the Scriptures; Oliver Cromwell (A. D. 1599), the Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland; Milton (A. D. 1608), after Shakespeare the greatest English poet; John Bunyan (A. D. 1628), the immortal dreamer who said, "I was never out of my Bible"; Sir Isaac Newton (A. D. 1642), the greatest of natural philosophers; Leibniz (A. D. 1646), the great German philosopher and scientist; John Wesley (A. D. 1703), the founder of Methodism, who used to say, "I am a man of one Book"; Cuvier (A. D. 1769), the great anatomist and zoologist; John Ruskin (A. D. 1819), "the most eloquent and original of all writers upon art"; Michael Faraday (A. D. 1832), one of the most distinguished chemists and natural philosophers of the nineteenth century.

More recently we find the ranks of Bible readers swelled by such men as Earl Selborne, Lord Chancellor; Earl Carns, the great lawyer and statesman; Lord Shaftesbury, the great philanthropist; Sir John Herschel, Astronomer Royal; Sir Wm. Herschel, also a great astronomer; Sir Henry Rawlinson, the distinguished Eastern scholar; General Gordon, "the Christian soldier," as he was called; Gladstone, who spoke of the Bible as "the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture."

What shall I more say, for time would fail me to speak of Prince Albert, Queen Victoria, Earl Roberts, George Muller, Charles Hadden Spurgeon, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Presidents Roosevelt, Garfield, McKinley, Harding, and many others. Bryan (three times candidate for President) died in a great battle against the infidels and in de-

fense of the Bible. Whitelaw Reid, an American ambassador to Great Britain, once pointed out in a public speech that in the 130 years of the separate existence of the United States all the Presidents (with only one exception) had been religious men—in other words, men who believed the Bible is from God.

Sir Thomas Brown (A. D. 1635), who has been called “the richest and most dazzling of rhetoricians,” and whose writings exercised an extraordinary influence upon English literature, was a Bible student: his counsel was, “Fill thy spirit with spiritual . . . and thy life with the honor of God.”

Pascal (A. D. 1623), one of the best writers and profound thinkers of France—whose brilliant style has been likened to that of Plato, Cicero and Demosthenes—was also a Bible student, and wrote, “The advance of science does not involve the retreat of religion. . . . The Author of these wonders understood them. None other can do so.”

Even Professor Huxley (A. D. 1825), the well-known agnostic, has left a most remarkable testimony to the value of the Bible, and this testimony, coming from such a source, ought to appeal to all. In one of his speeches he said, “Take the Bible as a whole; make the severest deductions which fair criticism can dictate for shortcomings and positive errors, . . . and there still remains in this old literature a vast residuum of moral beauty and grandeur. And then consider . . . that it is written in the noblest and purest English, and abounds in exquisite beauties of mere literary form. . . . By the study of what other books could children be so much humanized and made to feel that each figure in that vast historical procession fills, like themselves, but a momentary space in the interval between two eternities?”—(Inspiration of the Bible, Forlong.)

Renan (A. D. 1823), who, owing to his combined learning and literary powers, was acknowledged to be the first man of letters in Europe in his day, though for years, an infidel,

became a devout Bible student, and has left on record these words: "O man of Galilee, Thou hast conquered! Henceforth no man shall distinguish between Thee and God."

Even Napoleon Bonaparte, who would scarcely be looked upon as a theologian, must have spent much time—especially in his later years—in reading the Bible; for it is recorded how on one occasion, in the presence of three General Officers, he said, "That Bible on the table is a book to you. It is far more than a book to me; it speaks to me; it is, as it were, a person." When confined to the rock of St. Helena, he turned to Count Montholon with the inquiry "Can you tell me who Jesus Christ was?" The question being declined, Napoleon said, "Well, then, I will tell you. Alexander, Caesar, Charlemagne and I have founded great empires . . . upon force. Jesus alone founded His upon love. . . . I tell you all these were men: none else is like Him. Jesus Christ was more than man. . . . He asked for the human heart; He demands it unconditionally; and forthwith His demand is granted. Wonderful? . . . All who sincerely believe in Him experience that remarkable supernatural love toward Him. . . . Time, the great destroyer, is powerless to extinguish this sacred flame. . . . This it is which proves to me quite convincingly the divinity of Jesus Christ!"

In the list of "a hundred best books," arranged by Sir John Lubbock, the Bible was placed first. It is also a matter of history how Sir Walter Scott, when dying, asked his friend Lockhart to read to him; and Lockhart, looking at the twenty thousand volumes covering the walls of the costly library in which the great man was lying, asked, "What book would you like?" "Need you ask?" said Walter Scott; "there is but one." So Lockhart read to him from that one Book—the Bible—the words of Eternal Life.

EASTER

Easter is now almost at hand and all denominations will be giving their entertainments and teaching their falsehoods. The word Easter is found once in the Bible (Acts 12: 4), and means "passover." It is a mistranslation. It should read: "Intending after the passover to bring him forth to the people." The encyclopedia gives it as follows: "Easter (Ger. Ostern, Fr. Paque, Scot. Pascha,—the passover), the festival of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, derives probably its Teutonic name from the festival of the goddess Ostara, in Anglo-Saxon, Easter, which the Saxons of old were wont to celebrate about the same season at which the Christian festival of Easter occurs. In the ancient church, the celebration of Easter lasted eight days. After the 11th Century, however, it was limited to three, and in later times, generally to two days. It was formerly the favorite time for performing the rite of baptism."

Easter was then the time for baptizing (sprinkling) infants, etc., as practiced by the Roman Catholic church, and now the denominations have conformed to Catholicism and observe Easter by coloring eggs and telling little children who don't know any better that they are rabbit eggs. They are just that much worse than the old Mother of Harlots and have stolen a great deal of their worship and practice from the old lady.

The courts were closed, and alms dispensed to the poor and needy in ancient days about the 11th and 12th Centuries. This custom led to much disorder, however. Slaves also received their freedom at that season; and as the austerities of Lent were over, the people gave themselves up to enjoyment; hence the day was called the "Sunday of Joy."

To the popular sports and dances were added farcical exhibitions, in which even the clergy joined in some places, reciting from the pulpits stories and legends, with a view

to stir the hearers to laughter. Against this indecency, the reformers of the 16th Century, loudly and successfully raised their voices. The clergy of today can tell stories and tales in the pulpit just as fast and as loud as they ever did in the 16th Century and why should not we raise our voices against the stories, noise and frolic in these latter days? On Easter day, the people saluted each other with the Easter kiss, and the exclamation Surrexit (He is risen); to which the reply was Vere Surrexit (He is risen indeed).

The proper time for the celebration of Easter has occasioned no little controversy.

In the second century, a dispute arose on this point between the eastern and western churches. The great mass of the people celebrated the 14th day of the first Jewish month or moon, considering it to be equivalent to the Jewish Passover. The western churches celebrated it on the Sunday after the fourteenth day, holding that it was the commemoration of the resurrection of Jesus. It seems that the denominations always choose the wrong side of almost every question. If either side of this question was right the side the Eastern people took would be the right side as they held it equal to the Jewish passover, but the denominations have taken sides with the Western people and color eggs in memory of the resurrection of our Lord and Savior. The Council of Nice (325 A. D.) decided in favor of the Western usage, branding the Eastern usage with the name of the "Quartadeciman" heresy, and I suppose this is the reason the denominations have kept the day in memory of the resurrection of Jesus. The great body of Roman priests said, "Observe Easter in memory of a risen Lord," and the sects (Christian church now in the lead) said, "All right, mother, we will obey your voice and join hands with you in this ungodly practice." The proper astronomical cycle for calculating the occurrence of the Eastern moon was not determined by this council (Nice). It appears, however, that the Metonic Cycle was already in use in the West for this pur-

pose; and it was on this cycle that the Gregorian Calendar introduced in 1582 was arranged.

An elaborate account of the whole matter was published by Professor DeMorgan in the "Companion to the British Almanac" in 1845. It was deference to ancient custom that led the ecclesiastical authorities to adhere to the method of determination by the moon. It must be remembered, however, that it is not the actual moon in the heavens, nor even the mean moon of astronomers that regulates the time of Easter, but an altogether imaginary moon, whose periods are so contrived that the new (calendar) moon always follows the real new moon (sometimes by two or even three days). The effect of this is, that the 14th of the calendar moon—which had from the times of Moses been considered "full moon" for ecclesiastical purposes—falls generally on the 15th or 16th of the real moon, and thus after the real moon, which is generally on the 14th or 15th day. With this explanation, then, of what is meant by "full moon" viz., that it is the 14th day of the calendar moon, the rule is, that Easter day is always the first Sunday after the paschal full moon, i. e., the full moon which happens upon or next after the 21st of March; and if the full moon happens upon a Sunday, Easter Day is the Sunday after. This Easter practice is stolen from Romanists and all Christians refuse to mix with them.

THE HOLY SPIRIT

Much has been said and written concerning the Holy Spirit, yet much more may, and will, be said. Some say that we as a people do not believe there is a Holy Spirit, but they are sadly mistaken, as I wish to show. We propose to show more work the Holy Spirit has done and is doing, than any person who claims to believe in "Holy Spirit baptism" has ever yet shown, within the scope of our knowledge.

"Whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ" (Ephesians 3: 4). The word "mystery" in this verse is from the Greek word "mysterion" and is rendered by the lexicographers thus: "a mystery, something hidden, a thing to be revealed." So we think Dr. Weymouth has correctly rendered it "the truth of Christ," in the Modern Speech New Testament. The "secret to be revealed" was the "truth of Christ." The idea is this: The Spirit had revealed "the truth of Christ" to the apostles; fulfilling the promise He made to them: "He shall bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." This revelation was so complete no one need be ignorant of the plan of salvation. The Spirit has made it known through the apostles and the gospel.

In John 16: 13-15 we learn the Spirit was to speak to the apostles, guide them into all truth, declare things to come, and glorify Jesus. It is necessary for us to understand something about the nature of the work of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit has been appointed a work which we should try to comprehend. Now we will note the relationship the Spirit bears to these four items in the work he was to do and is doing for mankind. Jesus says, "All things that the Father hath are mine; therefore said I that He taketh of mine and shall declare it unto you." The Holy Spirit was to speak, but not from himself. He was to speak only that which he heard. So completely did he fulfil this mission to

make known the things of God to man that Paul declared, "He searched out the deep things of God and revealed them unto us" (the apostles).

Did the Spirit glorify Christ? Yes. How? By taking the things that were Christ's and revealing them unto us. The Spirit guided the apostles into "all truth" and, hence, glorified Christ in carrying out this work. By faith we can say with Stephen, "I see the heavens opened and the Son of God standing at his right hand." Christians "walk by faith and not by sight" (2 Cor. 5: 7), and the evidence given in the Bible produces said faith (Romans 10: 17; Acts 15: 7; Hebrews 11: 1). The Holy Spirit assisted in giving this evidence unto us.

In 1 Corinthians 12: 3 we read, "No man can say Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Spirit." In John 14: 6 we have this: "No man can come unto the Father but by me." Then in John 6: 55 Christ said, "No can can come unto me, except it be given him of the Father." In these three passages we have the Father, Son and Holy Spirit spoken of as the persons by whom that great change in the relationship of man to God is brought about. All things necessary for man's salvation are brought from the Father through the Son, by the Holy Spirit, expounding unto us the great commission: "Baptizing them into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit" (Matthew 28: 20). "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16: 16).

We wish to show what the Holy Spirit has done, and is doing for mankind; but before proceeding with this, we wish to show, first, that the Spirit was a witness for Jesus. We will read John 15: 26, "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." This establishes the fact that the Spirit was to be a witness for Jesus. This text says He was to testify of Christ, hence, he is a witness for him. But how is the Holy Spirit a witness? See Acts, chapter one. When Judas

fell, the apostles understood (Psalm 69: 25; 109: 8) it was their business to select another witness to fill his place. The Spirit testified through these men (Neh. 9: 31). To reject the teaching of a prophet or an apostle was to reject the Holy Spirit (Acts 7: 52; Luke 7: 30). "Wherefore of these men that have companied with us all the time the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a *witness with us* of His resurrection" (Acts 1: 21, 22). The Spirit filled all of these conditions. The prophecy of David is fulfilled, and the twelve witnesses are testifying as the Holy Spirit instructs them.

The Holy Spirit was to convict of sin, righteousness and judgment. "And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment" (John 16: 7). This great work of the Spirit was to be accomplished in connection with the apostles. "I will send him unto you" (John 16: 7)—the apostles—is the promise. So the work of convincing of sin, of righteousness and of judgment, the Spirit would accomplish through the ministry of the apostles. To see how completely the Spirit worked in and through the apostles, you only need to be reminded that the first time the Spirit testified of the facts of the gospel, it did so through the apostles. "He" (the Spirit), said the Lord, "shall bear witness of me, and ye (the apostles) shall also bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." The Spirit bears witness with and through the apostles. To what do they witness? The Lord answers that question: "*He shall bear witness of me.*" The witness of the Spirit through the apostles was to produce the conviction of sin, making those who heard that testimony conscious that they were sinners. This result could not follow without the second being accomplished also; the conviction of righteousness. The conviction of sin brought into your mind by the witnessing of the Spirit to the work which

Christ wrought for your salvation, leads you on also into a knowledge of sins forgiven, into the righteousness of God, through faith in Christ.

But what about the judgment? It certainly speaks for itself. If evidence is submitted, and conviction follows, what else can come but judgment, unless justice be a failure? What is this work of the Spirit but another setting of the commission as given in Mark 16: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel unto every creature"—the witness of the Spirit to Jesus through the apostles. "He that believeth and is baptized (immersed) shall be saved." Convicted of sin, finding pardon for the same, thus obtaining the righteousness of God by faith. "He that believeth not shall be damned," or condemned. Judgment, condemnation, will come upon him. All of this is the work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of sinners.

The Holy Spirit was called a "Comforter." In what sense did he fulfil this role? There are many ways in which we can comfort one another. We are anxious to know in what way the Spirit comforted the apostles and how we receive comfort of the Spirit. Our next division will consider this angle of the question.

II

Biblical translators give us the translation, "helper" and "advocate," for the word "Parakleetos," from which we have "Comforter" in the King James version. It is thus rendered in several different translations of the Bible. Perhaps the thought is this: "one to help, like an advocate." That being true, we understand that the Spirit helps like an advocate. He must stay by your side to help and assist you. The Greek word "parakleetos" is defined in Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon thus: "One called or sent for to assist another; an advocate, one who pleads the cause of another, 1 John 2: 1, one present to render various beneficial services, and thus the Paraclete, whose influence and

operation were to compensate for the departure of Christ himself, John 14: 16, 26; 15: 26; 16: 7." So the idea we set forth is correct. He was one, by the apostles' side, to help. That is the business of an advocate.

Now we will read Ephesians 3: 16-19, "That he would grant you according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God." The point here is that we may be strengthened by God's strength. It is not our own strength but God's strength. The measure of this strength is not to be according to the measure of the poor measure which our limited view of our needs would indicate, but that it might be according to God's riches—that is the measure of the strength. But how is this done? By what channel shall this strength of God pass into our minds? By his Spirit, in the inner man, dwelling in us. Had it not been for this Spirit coming to the apostles and guiding them, we would not have the gospel (New Testament) today. The "breadth and length and height and depth" of revelation have been given to us in the gospel of Jesus Christ. Wonderful things were revealed by the Spirit to the apostles and given us in the gospel!

"The word of reconciliation" was "committed unto" the apostles, who were the "ambassadors for Christ"; and hence, the apostles would "pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God" (2 Corinthians 5: 19, 20). The apostles were left here "in Christ's stead" as his ambassadors, to give the "word of reconciliation" to us which had been revealed to them by the Holy Spirit. So if mankind is ever reconciled, or brought back to God, it will be by the words revealed to the apostles by the Spirit.

Now we must read 1 Corinthians 4: 9, "For I think that God hath set forth us, the apostles, last, as it were, appointed to death: for we are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men." The expression "us, the apostles, last" is rendered in the margin of the Bible, thus: "us, the last apostles." So those apostles were to be the last ones; there were to be no more apostles of Jesus Christ. The word "spectacle" is from the Greek word "theatron" and means: "a theater, a place where public games and spectacles are exhibited, Acts 19: 29, 31; meton. a show, gazing-stock, 1 Corinthians 4: 9." The idea is that we have to look to the apostles for all of the revelation and the plan of salvation. The word of reconciliation was placed in their hands by the Holy Spirit, hence to them we must look for the plan of salvation. The apostles are the "spectacles" upon which we must gaze, or look for the length and breadth and height and depth of revelation. They are the ones who "exhibit" the plan of salvation to us, having received it from Christ through the Holy Spirit. They have been set forth as the LAST apostles, and to them we must look for God's plan to save mankind.

Now we are ready to read Colossians 1: 25, "Wherefore I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for you, to fulfill the word of God." The word "fulfil" in this text is from the Greek word "pleroo," and is defined in the Greek Lexicon: "to be fulfilled, come to an end, be fully arrived." It, too, is in the passive voice; thus showing that there is nothing in the future to be revealed. So the apostles of Jesus Christ were "set forth as the last apostles" to "fulfil the word of God"; that is to bring the word of God to an end, so far as revealing the plan of salvation was concerned. There are to be no more revelations from God through the Holy Spirit; the apostles were set forth as the last ones to see that the Word of God "fully arrived" and was "brought to an end." Wonderful work has been performed by the Holy Spirit through

the apostles! Colossians 1: 25, gives us an argument no Mormon, or any other specialist on the Holy Spirit working independent of the gospel to save sinners, can meet.

In Christ's last lecture to his apostles, as recorded in John 13-16 chapters, he told them that he would leave them—the apostles; that he would send them—the apostles—the Comforter to take his place with them—the apostles; that the Comforter would reveal to their (the apostles') minds what he said to them—the apostles. That the Comforter would guide them—the apostles—into all truth; show them—the apostles—things to come; and would take the things of the Father and show to them—the apostles. These promises have not the slightest reference to the ordinary influence of the Holy Spirit on the Christian, for His work was all miraculous. These promises apply to the apostles, and no others. Our Savior's address was a closing charge to the apostles, and no others. It was a promise that they—the apostles—should be qualified for the work that he committed to their care—to the apostles, and no others.

Let us now dispose forever of the promise of the baptism of the Holy Spirit to this generation. It was a promise, not a command; was received, not obeyed; Christ was the administrator, not man; it was poured out from heaven, not performed by man on earth; it was promised as a miraculous power, not commanded as an ordinance. It was a miracle, was always attended by miracles, and always conferred miraculous power. It was not a memorial, a monument, a type, a symbol, a likeness, a form, an object-lesson, setting forth any fact or truth. It was perhaps the most extraordinary and miraculous event in the gospel dispensation; did not and could not become a permanent element in the church.

There is only one baptism in the church, and it is the "one baptism" taught in Ephesians 4: 5. It is a command, and men are to administer it to others (Matthew 28: 19, 20). Men are to obey it. It is in the name of the Father,

Son, and Holy Spirit; it is in water (Acts 10: 47, 48); it is a monument of Christ's burial and resurrection, a monument of the great facts of the gospel, a memorial, a type, a symbol, a likeness, a form, an object-lesson setting forth Christ's burial and resurrection, also the sinner's burial to his past sinful life, and his resurrection to a new life in Christ. It is for the remission of sins (Acts 2: 38). It is a permanent ordinance of the church.

We come now to the work of the Holy Spirit. We shall inquire (1) what work the Holy Spirit has done for man, (2) how much of the work has ceased, (3) what He does now, (4) how he does this work. The Holy Spirit has done the following work for man:

1. He inspired men. 2 Peter 1: 21. This has ceased as shown in this article.

2. Gave miraculous gifts. 1 Corinthians 12. This has ceased.

3. Baptized the apostles and household of Cornelius. Acts, chapters 2 and 10. This has ceased.

4. Reproved the world. Genesis 6: 3; John 16: 8.

5. Begets us. 1 John 5: 1; James 1: 18; 1 Peter 1: 22; John 3: 5.

6. We are born of the Spirit. John 3: 5.

7. Sheds love abroad in our hearts. Romans 5: 5.

8. Causes us to abound in hope. Romans 15: 3.

9. Quickens our bodies. Romans 8: 11.

10. Renews us to salvation. Titus 3: 5.

11. Justifies us. 1 Corinthians 6: 11.

12. Baptizes us into one body. 1 Corinthians 12: 13.

13. Seals us to the day of redemption. Ephesians 4: 30.

14. Sanctifies us. 2 Thessalonians 2: 13.

15. Gives us access to the Father, through the Son. Ephesians 3: 16.

16. Builds us together for a dwelling-place of God. Ephesians 2: 22.

17. Bears witness with our spirits that we are the children of God. Romans 8: 16.

18. Helps our infirmities. Romans 8: 26.

19. Makes intercession for us. Romans 8: 26.

20. Strengthens us mightily in the inner man. Ephesians 3: 16.

21. Reveals to us heavenly mysteries. 1 Corinthians 2: 10.

22. Taught the apostles. 1 Corinthians 2: 13.

We are told that the Spirit has done all this work for us, and still does it except for the miraculous work, which has ceased.

III.

We come now to notice what is called a "direct impact of the Holy Spirit."

This question concerns only *how* the Holy Spirit operates in conversion. It does not deal with whether it operates or not, for all of us believe that it does. Every conversion is begun, continued and consummated by the power of the Holy Spirit. We must remember that the issue between the Church of Christ and the denominations is not upon the fact of the operation, but upon the HOW of the operation. In our previous articles we have furnished evidence enough to eliminate the idea of receiving the Holy Spirit in any miraculous measure, but will now give further evidence, as this issue seems to be the "stumbling stone" upon this question. Such a promise was never given to those out of Christ. He said the world could not receive the Spirit (John 14: 17), and that should settle the question as to whether the world receives the Spirit. In John 7: 39, Acts 5: 32, and Galatians 4: 4-6, we learn that it was to be given to believers only. "And we are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that OBEY him." The Spirit is given after we believe. Let us read Acts 19: 2, "He said unto them: Have ye re-

ceived the Holy Ghost SINCE ye believed?" Again, "In whom also *after* that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise" (Ephesians 1: 13). It was given because we are sons, and not to make sons of us. Let us read Galatians 4: 6, "And because ye ARE SONS, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." Thus it is clearly shown by these passages that the Spirit did not reach the sinner's heart in converting (turning) him. No one receives the Spirit before "obeying him" according to these scriptures.

I now wish to show just how men out of Christ were convicted, turned, begotten, born and saved. Paul said in Romans 1: 16, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is THE power (Greek for "dynamite") of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth." In this text the apostle clearly denies the direct impact of the Holy Spirit in conversion, and establishes the doctrine of the Church of Jesus Christ. That is just the way we believe and preach it. In 1 Corinthians 4: 15, Paul says, "For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus have I begotten you through the gospel." So Paul, in talking to Christians who had been begotten, convicted and turned, declares it was all done by, in and through THE GOSPEL. The Gospel is the means through which the Holy Spirit works. So the Holy Spirit is not received by aliens independent of the gospel. They must first OBEY the gospel.

James has this to say (1: 18), "Of His own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of his creatures." Again, "Receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls" (James 1: 21). So these two verses show that the apostles James and Paul teach the same thing concerning the question, thus we have two inspired witnesses in favor of what we teach and believe. The apostle Peter says, "Seeing ye have purified your souls in OBEYING THE TRUTH

through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently" (1 Peter 1: 22). Peter affirms the position taken by the Church of Christ. He affirms that we are born of seed, and not by direct impact of the Holy Spirit, and says, too, that this seed is the word of God. Christ, in Luke 8: 11, says, "The seed is the word of God." We, therefore, know what the seed is and by this seed we are born, or begotten, as it is translated in the Revised Version. In Acts 15: 7, this same apostle Peter says that the Gentiles were made believers by hearing the word of God preached by his mouth, hence, there is no direct impact of the Spirit there. Peter DENIES the proposition of conversion being a miracle, or direct impact of the Spirit. Thus Paul, James and Peter have all testified in favor of what we teach on this subject.

We will notice that David has to say and see if he agrees with Paul, Peter and James. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul" (Psalm 19: 7). Thus David endorses our position and agrees with all the other witnesses in the case. David says the law of the Lord is PERFECT *converting* THE SOUL, hence denies the proposition of a direct impact of the Holy Spirit upon the heart of the alien sinner. David not only affirms that persons are converted by the law of the Lord, but he declares that law is perfect in doing the work. It is the law (gospel) and not a miracle or direct impact of the Holy Spirit on the sinner's heart, that converts (turns) him to God, so all of these inspired witnesses say.

We will next hear the Lord himself as he speaks in John 17: 18, "I have given them the words which thou hast given me." So speaks the Christ concerning his apostles. These were the "words of eternal life," so we are told in John 6: 68. In John 6: 63 we are told that these words are spirit and they are life. They will quicken (make alive), hence it is not a direct operation of the Spirit that makes alive, but the word of God. In John 12: 48 the Savior said these

words would judge them in the last day. In Revelation 20: 12 we learn that the words which will judge us in the last day are written in the books—that is, the Old and New Testaments. So this does not look like the Spirit operating upon the heart, independent of the word of God, does it?

We will now read John 17: 20, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word." Nothing could be plainer than that Christ expected for the world to be converted (turned) to him through the word preached by the apostles. Why people will deny such plain scriptures as these in order to hold to a theory not mentioned in God's Word is a mystery to me.

In Luke 16 we are told by Christ that a certain rich man asked that some untried means might be used to save his brethren back in yonder world. He requested that Lazarus be sent back to warn them against the place of torment where he then was. But Abraham reminded him that his brothers had Moses and the prophets, and if they refused to hear them, they would not believe if the miracle was granted. No direct work of the Spirit in that case, God forbade it, though the rich man prayed for it.

Abraham in Paradise, Christ on earth, with Paul, Peter, James and David, all endorse the position we take, and oppose the doctrine of the Holy Spirit operating upon the heart of the sinner independent of the word of God, the gospel.

I shall now show that Holy Spirit baptism ceased by divine authority. The Passover was given for a purpose, and when it had filled that purpose it then ceased by divine appointment. The sabbath was given the Jews for a purpose, and when that purpose was accomplished it then ceased by divine appointment. John the Baptist was sent from God to prepare a people for the Lord, and when that purpose was accomplished his work then ceased by divine appointment. His baptism is no longer obligatory. Miracles were given for a purpose, that purpose being to make be-

lievers (John 20: 30, 31). When that purpose was accomplished, miracles ceased by divine appointment. Holy Spirit baptism was given for a purpose, and that purpose was to endue the apostles with power to remember what Jesus had told them, to prophesy, to speak in new tongues, etc. All who received Holy Spirit baptism spoke in new tongues. Gentiles received it to convince the Jews that God had cleansed and called the Gentiles (Acts 15: 9; 11: 17, 18). When that purpose was accomplished Holy Spirit baptism ceased—by divine appointment. Holy Spirit baptism was among the miracles and ceased with them. After naming the nine spiritual gifts in 1 Corinthians 12: 8-11, Paul then in verse 31 said he would show unto them a more excellent way, and I believe the New Testament is the "perfect law of liberty" (James 1: 25).

IV.

Some think that the Holy Spirit is an invisible liquid of some kind, judging from the way they talk and pray. But the Holy Spirit is a person in heaven. We will note a few attributes of the Spirit, as follows:

(1) The Spirit has a form. The prophet says the Lord "formeth the spirit of man within him" (Zech. 12: 1). (2) Spirit can be willing. "Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak" (Matt. 26: 41). (3) Spirit can help. "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities" (Romans 8: 26). (4) Spirit searches. "For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God" (1 Cor. 2: 10). (5) Spirit speaketh. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith" (1 Timothy 4: 1). (6) Spirit can teach. "Beloved, believe not every spirit" (1 John 4: 1). (7) Spirit understands. "But there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding" (Job 32: 8).

(8) Spirit makes willing. "And they came, everyone whose heart stirred him up, and everyone whom his spirit made willing" (Exodus 35: 21). (9) Spirit has knowledge. "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? (1 Cor. 2: 11). (10) Spirit may be meek and quiet. "But let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit" (1 Peter 3: 4). (11) Spirit may be hasty. "But he that is hasty of spirit exalteth folly" (Proverbs 14: 29). (12) Spirit may be haughty. "Pride goeth before destruction and an haughty spirit before a fall" (Prov. 16: 18). (13) Spirit may be humble. "Better is it to be of an humble spirit with the lowly, than to divide the spoil with the proud" (Proverbs 16: 19). (14) Spirit sustaineth. "The spirit of man will sustain his infirmity" (Proverbs 18: 14).

(15) Spirit may be wounded. "But a wounded spirit, who can bear?" (Prov. 18: 14). (16) Spirit is in man. "I, Daniel, was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body" (Daniel 7: 15). (17) Spirit lives. "In all these things is the life of my spirit (Isa. 38: 16). (18) Spirit returns to God. "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it" (Eccl. 12: 7).

All I have mentioned can hardly be called "attributes" but all except about two or three may be called attributes of the Spirit. Sometimes, however, the writer refers to our spirits, and sometimes to the Holy Spirit. I did not separate them, because our spirits came from God and are immortal. The Scriptures we have quoted prove that the Holy Spirit is a living, thinking, reasoning something which can talk, search, help, be made willing, teach, understand, etc., which proves the Holy Spirit to be a person. John (1 John 5: 7) declares him to be one of the three IN HEAVEN helping to keep the record.

The scriptures cited, also prove that our spirit can think, be humble, hasty, haughty, quiet, meek, understanding, etc., which is positive proof that our spirit is not our breath, but a living something which will not die.

The Spirit is said to be a witness, and bears witness with our spirits that we are the sons of God. How does he bear this witness? The common explanation is that we feel in our hearts that God has forgiven us; we have the evidence within, and thus, have a clear conscience. "The Holy Spirit has come into my heart and told me I was God's child, and that my sins have been taken away," is a very common statement. But that would be the Spirit bearing witness **TO** and not **WITH** our spirits. That would be the Spirit telling, informing, or teaching our spirits concerning our relationship with God. The scripture (Romans 8: 16) says, "The Spirit itself beareth witness **WITH** our spirit, that we are the children of God." The Spirit says we must believe (Mark 16: 16), and our spirit says we do believe. The Spirit says we must repent (Luke 13: 3), and our spirit says we have repented. The Spirit says we should confess (Romans 10: 9, 10) and our spirit says we have confessed. The Spirit says we should be baptized (Acts 2: 38; Col. 2: 12), and our spirit says we have been baptized, hence, there is an agreement between the two spirits. The Holy Spirit bears witness *with* our spirits that we are the sons of God.

There is just one proposition to be proven and that is that we are the children of God. That one proposition is to be proven by two witnesses, and two only. One is our spirit, and the other is the Holy Spirit. If they agree as mentioned above, the proposition is proven, but if they disagree, one (or both) is in error. Will we accuse the Holy Spirit of being in error? Certainly not? Then, if there is a difference, it must be our spirit, which is in error. Our feelings are always the result of our teaching. Rather, our feelings are always the result of our belief, and our belief is always the result of our teaching. So if our teaching has been

wrong, our belief will be wrong; and if our belief is wrong, our feelings (conscience) will be wrong. Our conscience is not always a safe guide. Christ said, "They shall put you out of the synagogues; yea, the time cometh that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service." That time came in the lives of the apostles. Paul ordered Stephen killed and thought (felt) he was doing God service. In Acts 23: 1, Paul said, "Men and brethren, I have lived in all GOOD CONSCIENCE before God until this day." So Paul imprisoned both men and women and had Stephen killed, and FELT he was doing God service. His conscience led him to do all this evil work. But he had been taught that Christ was an impostor, etc., so he felt that he was doing right.

Our feelings are not always the result of the Holy Spirit in our hearts. Mormons practice polygamy, and "feel" they are doing God service. They have been reared in that faith from infancy, and feel they are right. They have been led by conscience as a result, they say, of the Spirit talking with them, and, hence, FEEL that they are right. The Roman Catholic goes to the confessional and has the priest see that his sins are pardoned, and he *feels* he has done right. He leaves the cathedral with a good conscience. He has been reared in that faith and feels it is correct. One mother will have her little babe sprinkled "for remission of sins" and believe she is right.

Is God the author of all this confusion? Let Paul answer. "God IS NOT the author of confusion (1 Cor. 14: 23). That being true, these people must be in error, for everyone of them claims to be led of the Spirit. But God does not contradict himself, neither does he tell men to do various and conflicting things in order to be saved. He is no respecter of persons. God has one plan for all. The Holy Spirit has revealed the plan of salvation to the apostles, and it is now written in the Bible. Read it, believe it, obey it, and you will be on the safe side.

THE BIBLE vs. JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES, ADVENTISTS AND UNIVERSALISTS

(A series of articles first printed in 1907)

I

It is not my intention to deal with every false idea advocated by the above-named sects. I wish to deal more with Soul-sleeping idea, no punishment for the wicked, etc. I will now notice their arguments concerning the Sabbath and future kingdom. They teach that Christ is not King. Of course, if they were to admit that Christ is king now, then they would have to admit that his kingdom is now in existence.

We shall turn to the Book and see what it says: "And Jesus stood before the governor: and the governor asked him, saying, Art thou the king of the Jews? And Jesus said unto him, Thou sayest." (Matt. 27: 11.) Jesus, just a few hours, perhaps, before his death, said he was king of the Jews. Remember this was the day he was nailed to the cross.

"Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; and the king of glory shall come in. Who is the king of glory? The Lord strong and mighty: the Lord mighty in battle. Lift up your heads, O ye gates; even lift them up, ye everlasting doors: and the king of glory shall come in. Who is this king of glory? The Lord of hosts, he is the king of glory." (Ps. 24: 7-10.)

We turn to Acts 1: 10 and find the fulfilment. "And as they looked steadfastly toward heaven, behold a cloud received him out of sight." And at this time, according to David, Christ was made king of glory. But the Soul-sleeping

Advents say, No, Christ is not king, and has no kingdom!

"I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before them. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away; and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." (Dan. 7: 13, 14.) The "Ancient of days" is God. This witness declares that he approaches the "Ancient of Days," the Father, and an escorting angel brings him, the Son, near before him, the Father. The Father now gives him "glory and dominion, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve and obey him."

Now at this time is fulfilled the royal decree, "Sit thou on my right hand till I make thy foes thy footstool." The royal diadem is now brought forth and the Son of God is crowned Lord of all. He is now made king and will sit at the right hand of the Father as king until all rule, authority, and power shall be given back into the hands of the Father. (1 Cor. 15: 24-26.) "These shall make war with the Lamb and the Lamb shall overcome them; for he is Lord of lords and King of kings." (Rev. 17: 14.)

The man who will say Christ is not king, does not believe these scriptures, or else he is not honest, for the Bible positively says that Christ is "King of kings." Then why not believe it and teach it just that way?

"And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords." (Rev. 19: 16.) This scripture should forever settle the question. The apostle John saw Jesus in heaven with the name written upon his person, "KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS."

Mr. Advent, do you believe this scripture? If not, why not?

Thus we can understand what the apostle Paul means when he says, "Which in his time he shall shew, who is the

blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords." Therefore the prophets and apostles teach that Christ is now King at the right hand of the Father. Thus when the Son ascended on high, there was a "name given him which is above every name." (Phil. 2: 9.) The hierarchs of heaven, angels, archangels, principalities and powers; all placed under this authority, his name, his title, "King of kings and Lord of lords." On his return to judge the world in righteousness, he will give up the kingdom, with its authority, to God, even the Father, that God may be "all in all." Thus we learn that he is now King, and will remain thus until all his enemies will have been subdued.

II

The Millennial Dawnites, Soul-Sleepers, and certain others, teach that Christ is not on His throne. They say he is now seated upon God's throne, and will remain there until the resurrection, when he will come to this earth and be seated upon the literal throne of David. David's throne was a political throne, and if Christ is to sit upon it after the resurrection it will be a political government, and not a spiritual one, as they themselves teach.

But let us turn to the Book of books and read: "Even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." (Zech. 6: 13.) We here notice the fact that He is to be a "priest upon HIS throne," not off of it, and on somebody else's throne, but *upon His throne*. This throne could not be here on earth, as these denominations teach. It being true that he who is the branch in Jeremiah (23: 5) and Zechariah, is none other than the Christ; and it being also true that he was to be a priest upon HIS THRONE, it follows that if he is now priest he is now on HIS THRONE. These being so, until he reached his throne, he could not be

priest. "If he were on earth, he could not be a priest." (Heb. 8: 4.) Thus on earth he could not be a priest, but he was to be a priest upon that which is called "his throne." This throne then, could not be on this earth, for if it were he could not be priest upon it, and he was to be a priest upon this throne; hence he must be a priest where his throne is. But he neither was, nor could be a priest on earth; therefore HIS THRONE is not on earth. If we prove that he is NOW a priest, then by this we shall prove that he is NOW on his throne. If on this throne, then, he is King on that throne, and being King on his throne, his kingdom is already set up. Therefore we ask, *Is he now priest?*

"Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession." (Heb. 4: 14.) Jesus was then not only priest, but, "high priest" when Paul wrote his Hebrew letter. Then at that time he was on his throne, and of necessity his kingdom had begun, for kingdom and throne are inseparable. But again, his priesthood is unchangeable; it continues forever. "But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood." (Heb. 7: 24.) For he testifieth, "Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizehek." (Heb. 7: 17.) "The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek." (Ps. 110: 4.) Read from first verse to fourth. Also read Acts 2: 29-36; 7: 9. To deny Christ being priest upon his throne is to contradict the OATH of God. David said, "The Lord hath *sworn and will not repent.*" Do you believe this? I do. If you believe it, then the question is settled. DO YOU BELIEVE IT? Here it is affirmed that the promise that David should never want a son to sit on his throne is fulfilled by and in the resurrection, ascension, and coronation of Christ, the Son and Lord of David in the heavens; also at that time the prophecy of God by David, "Sit thou on my right hand till I make thy foes thy foot-stool."

This prophetic promise is referred to six times in the New Testament, and in one of these references it is said that Christ is to remain where he now is on the eternal throne, at the Father's right hand until the final resurrection. Read 1 Cor. 15: 24-26. It is a fact that Christ's throne is in heaven and not here on earth as these sects teach. "For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, "The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec." (Heb. 7: 21.) "And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever." (2 Sam. 7: 16.) "The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David; he will not turn from it: of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne." (Ps. 132: 11.) Notice the prophet says of the "fruit of thy body" will I set upon thy throne.

Then Christ was not to sit upon the literal throne of David. Notice, "And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." (Luke 1: 31, 33.) "Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh." (Rom. 1: 3.)

We learned from Ps. 132, that Christ was to INHERIT David's throne; and here in Luke and Romans we learn that Christ was the fruit or seed of David and is upon the throne of his father David. That is, David's throne was a type. This being true Christ could not sit upon the literal throne of David. Just as well argue that David is the LITERAL father of Christ as to argue that Christ will sit upon the LITERAL throne of David, and therefore, is not priest now because not upon David's throne yet. Why not argue that David was actually the real father of Christ.

But listen to Peter: "Therefore, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." (Acts 2: 30.)

If Christ now has "all power in heaven and earth" (Matt. 28: 18), what power would he have when he became king and priest upon the literal throne of David here on earth that he has not now? If "all power" does not mean "all power," then I am at a loss to know what it does mean. Instead of him possessing more power when he comes to earth again, he will deliver up all power to the Father. (1 Cor. 15: 24-26.) We shall now proceed to locate the Lord's throne.

"The Lord is in his Holy Temple, the Lord's throne is in heaven." (Ps. 11: 4.) "Thus saith the Lord, the heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool." (Is. 66: 1.) To dodge such scriptures these sects, most of them, say, heaven will be here on earth; that there is no heaven above; that no one ever did nor ever will go to heaven; that all the heaven there is, is here on earth. The last scripture referred to shows heaven nor Christ's throne either can be here on earth, for HIS THRONE is in HEAVEN and the EARTH is his footstool. Then earth is one place and heaven another. The earth is not where His throne is found. *It is in heaven.* "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away, and there was found no place for them." (Rev. 20: 11.) John saw Christ in heaven upon his throne. "Even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne." (Zech. 6: 13.) These scriptures are sufficient to locate His throne. We shall now see if we can learn where heaven is.

HEAVEN IS ABOVE

"Is not God in the height of heaven? And behold the height of the stars, how high they are." (Job 22: 22.) "So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God." (Mark 16: 19.) "And he saith unto him, Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man." (John 1: 51.) Here we learn, (1) that God is in heaven; (2) that heaven is height; (3) that heaven is beyond the stars; (4) that the Lord went to heaven—did not remain on this earth; (5) that when he went to heaven he went UP into heaven; (6) that he was seated at the right hand of God who is in the HEIGHT of heaven; (7) that the angels will ASCEND as well as descend upon the Son of Man.

DWELLING PLACE OF GOD

"But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold, the heaven and heaven of heavens can not contain thee; how much less this house that I have builded?" (1 Kings 8: 27); (see verse 30.) "Return, we beseech thee, O God of hosts: look down from heaven and behold, and visit this vine." (Ps. 80: 14.) "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." (Matt. 6: 10.) "Heaven is my throne, and earth is my footstool." (Acts 7: 49.) The following scriptures show that Christ came DOWN from heaven to earth and then went UP from the earth to heaven again. "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven." (John 3: 13.) "For I came down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me." (John 6: 38.) "And he said unto him, ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world: I am not of this world." (John 8: 23.) "The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven." (1 Cor. 15: 47.)

"And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven." (Luke 24: 51.) "He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens." (Eph. 4: 10.) "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." (1 Tim. 3: 16.)

If the above scriptures are not proof enough that heaven is ABOVE and not here on earth you might read the following: Ps. 89: 6-37; Matt. 11: 25; 1 Pet. 1: 4; Rev. 21: 1; Job 22: 12-14; Luke 11: 2; Heb. 8: 1; Rev. 4; John 3: 31; Heb. 12: 25; Acts 1: 9; 3: 21; 1 Thess. 4: 16; Heb. 4: 14; 1 Pet. 3: 22; Mark 14: 62; John 14: 3; Acts 1: 11; 1 Thess. 1: 10; Is. 49: 10; Dan. 12: 3; Matt. 13: 43; Eph. 5: 27; Rev. 14: 13; 22: 3.

The mentioned sects are wrong on most every subject they take up, and, as usual, are wrong on this subject.

III

The above named sects teach that man is "wholly mortal." They say that all there is of man was made of dust and will return to dust again. Man will die just as a horse, cat, mouse or rat. This they say will be the "second death," however. The wicked will be raised in the resurrection then die as a mule would die—be unconscious after death because there is nothing to be conscious. They teach that there is no "inner man," that there is no evil, that there is no hell and that there is no punishment for the wicked, that the wicked will be annihilated (utterly destroyed) after the resurrection.

We shall now devote a few articles to the examination of this subject. The apostles teach that man is dual (two in one) and when the time will come that these two must be separated the outer man (body) dies, and the inner man

(spirit) goes to God who gave it. The word "wholly" is rendered (1) entirely; completely; perfectly. (2) totally; in all the parts or kinds. The word "totally," is rendered wholly; entirely; fully; completely. So you see the words, "wholly" and "totally" are used interchangeably, both mean the same. There is nothing annihilated or utterly destroyed, so that it does not exist. It may be dissolved or separated as in death, but it only returns to its elements of which it is composed and still exists. MAN, body, soul, and spirit, can not be mortal. "For I delight in the law of God after the inner man." (Rom. 7: 22.) "That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man." (Eph. 3: 16.) Yet in the face of such scriptures as these the denominations, mentioned at the head of these articles, teach that there is no "inner man" more than the blood and breath. They quote Gen. 3: 19, "For dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return." And then they say God made "man" and he (the man made of dust) became a living soul. So it was all man, and all made of dust, is their logic. If this referred to all there was of Adam, the whole man, then the breath that God breathed into his nostrils (Gen. 2: 7), and the "spirit" that God formed "within him" (Zech. 12: 1), was all dust!

Thus, according to these Soul-Sleepers, the breath that God breathed into Adam's nostrils was nothing but DUST! These people say no word which means "immortal" is ever applied to man. In 1 Pet. 3: 4 the word *aphthortos*, which means "incorruptible, immortal, imperishable, undying, enduring," is applied to woman and in the Common Version is translated "not corruptible." If you will turn to Rom. 1: 23 and read you will find that same word applied to God, and is there translated uncorruptible. It is the same word that is translated "incorruptible" in 1 Cor. 9: 25, and by the words "incorruptible" and "incorruption" in 1 Cor. 15: 52-54, where immortalizing of the body is mentioned. "My

people are destroyed for lack of knowledge." (Hosea 4: 6.) But these sects would have you believe the Jews no longer existed; but we read on and he says, "In me is their help." (Hosea 13: 9.) How could they have any help if they did not exist?

The word "destroy" does not mean to ANNIHILATE. Neither does "perish" nor "endless" mean what they say it does. The word "endless" is defined thus: (1) without end, having no end or conclusion, perpetual, applied to length and to duration, as an endless bliss, endless praise, endless clamor; (2) infinite, unlimited; (3) without profitable end; (4) external, everlasting, infinite, unlimited. *Perish*—to be bursted or ruined; as, the bottles shall perish. (Luke 5.) To be wasted or rendered useless. (Jer. 9.) To be injured or tormented. (1 Cor. 8.) To be lost eternally; to be sentenced to endless misery. (2 Peter 2.)—*Webster*.

So the word "perish" does not mean to go out of existence every time as they tell us. It is to be "lost eternally"; to be "sentenced to endless misery." So when the Bible says the wicked shall PERISH don't think that it means they shall be annihilated. It means "ENDLESS MISERY." These denominations make their play on these words, so we shall pretty thoroughly examine all these words.

CONSUME, PERISH, ETC.

"O Lord, are not thine eyes upon the truth? Thou hast stricken them, but they have not grieved; thou hast consumed them, but they have refused to receive correction, they have made their faces harder than rock; they have refused to return." (Jer. 5: 3.) Here it is said that the Lord had "CONSUMED" them, the Jews. Is it also said that they were "put out of existence"? No, but the opposite is said. Language is used to prohibit this. Instead of saying that they were blotted out of existence it is said, although the Lord had consumed them they yet had power both to choose and act. After the full force of the word "consume" was ex-

pended upon them, it was said that they made their faces harder than a rock. They, after being *consumed*, had power to act as they pleased, and doing thus they made their faces harder than a rock. This one case is sufficient to ruin their arguments drawn from the supposed specific meaning of this word. "Pour out thy fury upon the heathen that know thee not, and upon the families that call not on thy name; for they have eaten up Jacob, and devoured him, and consumed him, and have made his habitation desolate." (Jer. 10: 25.) Here are the terms, *consume* and *devour*, *made desolate* and *eaten up*; yet neither one, nor all of them combined, were sufficient to annihilate in the premises, for notwithstanding they were consumed, devoured, and eaten up, yet they lived. "My zeal hath consumed me, because mine enemies have forgotten thy words." (Ps. 119: 135.) Yet, after David was already *consumed*, he says, verse 41—"Yet do I not forget thy precepts." It is vain to say that these various terms are here used in a restricted sense, while in the other they are used differently; in both cases they are connected with the same beings—with man. "For we are consumed by thine anger and by thy wrath are we troubled." (Ps. 90: 7.) But again, "And thou mourn at the last when thy flesh and thy body are consumed; and say, How have I hated instruction, and my heart despised reproof." (Prov. 5: 11, 12.) Here we find both speaking and mourning after both flesh and body are said to be consumed. *Question*: If man is all flesh, all body, what will then be left to mourn and talk when the flesh and body are CONSUMED?

These denominations place a great deal of stress on the words "perish," "consume," "devour," "destroyed," "burned up," etc. They try to make it appear that there can be no conscious existence after a person is destroyed, consumed, etc., but the careful Bible student can easily see their mistake. They can not 'reason' away a devil and a hell by referring to these words. They can not "reason" away a SPIRIT and an INNER MAN in that way. "But we are all as

an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away; and there is none that calleth upon thy name, that stirreth up himself to take hold of thee: for thou hast hidden thy face from us, and hast consumed us, because of our iniquities. But now, O Lord, thou art our father; we are the clay, and thou our potter; and we all are the work of thy hand." (Is. 64: 6-8.)

In these and other passages, the entire context shows that although they were said to be CONSUMED, yet they were in existence. These things being thus, when the Materialist calls up these words to sustain him he would do well to take less for granted. It seems that what we have given in this article ought to satisfy the honest mind, but we have not examined all these words yet, hence we will continue. We have just got a good start now.

IV

"Shall not be," and "was not." It is claimed by the Materialists that these words of necessity express the idea of an entire and absolute cessation of conscious being or existence. If this be true the Materialists will have a little more annihilation than they have spoken for. See Gen. 5: 24. "And Enoch walked with God; and he WAS NOT, for God took him." "By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and WAS NOT FOUND, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God." (Heb. 11: 5.)

Does the witness now before us declare that because Enoch walked with God and pleased God, that therefore God put him so perfectly out of existence that he could not be found? It does if the Soul-Sleepers are correct in the use of the mentioned words. This would be too absurd to be credited. Then Soul-Sleeping, or Adventism, is not to be credited. The correct idea is this: The language simply

indicates a change of state or condition. Of Enoch it was said: He WAS NOT. Had his translation have been in the Soul-Sleeper's time, then in speaking of it it would be proper to say, *He shall not be*. If "shall not be" will put a person out of existence, "was not" with equal propriety speaks of that which has already been put out of existence. Who is ready for this conclusion?

"For the day of the Lord is near upon all the heathen: as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee: thy reward shall return upon thine own head. For as ye have drunk upon my holy mountain, so shall all the heathen drink continually, yea, they shall drink, and they shall swallow down, and they shall be as though they had not been." (Obadiah 15: 16.) That is, they shall exist as though they had not existed. Such must, of necessity, be the case, because it is already in proof from the word of God that men will never cease to exist. It is argued that the wicked will be annihilated because it is said that they shall be burned up. But it is evident that the conclusion is not in the premises, for it is said of the earth that it shall be "burned up." (2 Pet. 3: 9-13.) The phrase "burned up," indicates the wrath of God, who is said to be a consuming fire which will be manifested at the time when the change of the heavens and earth will take place.

Just so it will be with the wicked when they enter upon a state of existence entirely new to them. They will then be as though they had not been; that is, they will exist as though they had not existed. "And that the whole land thereof is brimstone, and salt, and burning, that it is not sown, nor beareth, nor any grass groweth therein, like the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboim, which the Lord overthrew in his anger, and in his wrath." (Deut. 29: 23.) "The spoilers are come upon all high places through the wilderness; for the sword of the Lord shall devour from the one end of the land even to the other end of the land: no flesh shall have peace." (Jer. 12: 12.) Jere-

miah also says the land PERISHETH. Here we have the words, "perish," "devour" and "burned up." Yet that which in Bible language is said to be "burned up" has existed for more than "two thousand years." "For wickedness burneth as the fire: it shall devour the briars and thorns of the forest, and they shall mount up like the lifting up of smoke." (Is. 9: 18.) Here is the full force of the phrase, "burnt up." It neither does nor can mean to put out of existence.

The noun "destruction" occurs twelve times in the New Testament, as follows: Matt. 7: 3; Rom. 8: 18; 9: 22; 1 Cor. 4: 5; 2 Cor. 10: 8; 13: 10; Phil. 3: 19; 1 Thess. 5: 3; 2 Thess. 1: 9; 1 Tim. 6: 9; 2 Peter 2: 1; 3: 16. Of these twelve occurrences of the noun "destruction," we have four words in the Greek: *Suntrimma*, *Kathairesis*, *Olethros*, and *Apolia*. These four terms are different in their signification, consequently we have four kinds of destruction in the New Testament. These four words being different not only in their structure, but their meaning also, it follows that different ideas were designed to be conveyed by them. We will now examine them one by one.

1. *Suntrimma*.—This word occurs but once. Rom. 8: 16: "Destruction and misery are in their ways." As a man is known by the company he keeps, so may a word. Notice the term "misery" is in company with the word "destruction." They are together. If the one overtakes a person the other is with him also. At the same time the term is rendered "misery." This gives the idea, not of a momentary pang, but of severe suffering, and this word modifies and gives force to the other. Thus it shows destruction in this case is not a blotting out.

2. *Kathairesis*.—This word occurs but twice (2 Cor. 10: 8), "For your edification, and not for your destruction." (2 Cor. 13: 10.) Here is the same language. Instead of destruction, read overthrow, and you will have the true idea. "For your edification and not for your overthrow."

3. *Olethros* is found four times. (1 Cor. 5: 5.) "For the destruction of the flesh that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." (1 Thess. 5: 3.) "When they shall say peace and safety, then sudden [*olethros*] destruction cometh upon them." (2 Thess. 1: 9.) "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction [*olethros*] from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power." (1 Tim. 6: 9.) "Which drown men in destruction [*olethros*] and perdition." Here note the fact—two of these four words in the same verse—*destruction* and (added to) *perdition*. The force of one is added to the other. Now if the first (*olethros*) destruction puts out of existence, then how can the other (*apolia*) rendered perdition, be added to it after a man is put out of, deprived of conscious existence? Can you then add to his punishment? Say, can you? Again, if *apolia* means to put out of existence, to cease to be, how could this be connected with the other? Either way the Soul-Sleeper will have an impossibility.

4. *Apolia* is found five times. (Matt. 7: 13.) "Broad is the road that leadeth to destruction." (Rom. 9: 22.) "Vessels of wrath fitted to destruction." (Phil. 3: 19.) "Whose end is destruction." (2 Peter 2: 1.) "Bringing upon themselves swift destruction." (2 Peter 3: 16.) "Wrest as they do the other scriptures to their own destruction." These are all of the occurrences of the noun "destruction" in the New Testament, and we shall have examined the original both the noun and verb form of these four words.

We now call your attention to the fact that although the noun form of *apolia* is found twenty times in the New Testament, it is but five times rendered by destruction; it is eight times rendered "perdition," as follows: John 17: 12: "Son of perdition"; Phil. 1: 28: "Taken out of perdition"; 2 Thess. 2: 3: "Son of perdition"; 1 Tim. 6: 9: "Drown men in destruction and perdition"; 2 Peter 3: 7: "Judgment and perdition of ungodly men"; Heb. 10: 39: "Drawn back unto perdition"; Rev. 17: 8: "Go into perdition." Eight times

the word is rendered "perdition." Twice *apolia* is rendered "waste." Matt. 26: 8; Mark 14: 4. "A waste of ointment." (2 Peter 2: 2.) *Apolia* is rendered by "pernicious ways," and verse 3, by "damnation," and in 2 Peter 2: 1, by "damnable." Once by *die*, Acts 25: 16. We have before you every case where the noun form of this word occurs. As this is the word most frequently used, we will also examine it in its verb form. This occurs ninety-two times in the New Testament. Now by collating and arranging these we can reach the true idea. We will do this in our next article.

V

We shall commence where we left off last week. It [*apollumi*] is rendered by "perish," "perished," thirty-two times. By "lose," "lost," thirty-one times. By "destroy," "destroyed," twenty-seven times. "Marred" once, "die" once. From all this we can certainly gather its meaning. We are now ready to attempt an inductive argument drawn from the use of the verb in question. "What man of you, having a hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety-and-nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost [*apollumi*], until he find it? And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulders, rejoicing. And when he cometh home, he calleth together his friends and neighbors, saying unto them, Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost." (Luke 15: 4-6.)

"Either what woman having ten pieces of silver, if she lose one piece, doth not light a candle, and sweep the house, and seek diligently till she find it? And when she hath found it, she calleth her friends and her neighbors together, saying, Rejoice with me; for I have found the piece which was lost" (*apollumi*). Verses 8, 9. In every case the same word that in Greek is, in these instances, represented by the word "lost," in all these and other cases is to the number of thirty-one times. The one that is rendered by "destroy" or "destruction" when the word occurs in the New Testament.

Now let it be remembered that before the Soul-sleepers can base a specific argument on the use of this word they must prove two things; first, That this word is specific; that it has but one meaning. Second, that that meaning is equivalent to a cessation of the being of that on which *apollumi* expends its force. Now, unless the prodigal son, the lost sheep, the piece of money, were said to be "out of existence," when they were said to be "lost," then this word does not, can not especially mean to put out of existence, because here are five out of more than twenty similar occurrences of this term where it can not by possibility mean to cease or go out of existence. They were in existence while lost as before, else they could not have been found. Then what about their so-called argument, based on these words, that there is no soul, no spirit, no devil and no hell? This one scripture, if there was no other, *ruins* them, or their argument rather. And be it remembered that the scriptures I am referring to are what they call THEIR SCRIPTURES. Well, "their scriptures" are easily turned against them. By "their scriptures" I condemn them, and overthrow their arguments. Jer. 9: 12: "Who is the wise man, that may understand this? And who is he to whom the mouth of the Lord hath spoken, that he may declare it, for what the land *perisheth* and is burned up like a wilderness, that none passeth through?" Is. 57: 1, 2: "The righteous *perisheth*, and no man layeth it to heart; and merciful men are taken away, none considering that the righteous is taken away from the evil to come. He shall enter into peace: they shall rest in their beds, each one walking in his uprightness." Here, after the righteous are said to have *perished*, they are said to enter into *peace*, to rest in their beds, to walk in their uprightness. Such language shows the perfect folly of these denominations on the word "sleep" when connected with man. If they fail here they are gone. "It was meet that we should make merry and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again; and was lost [*apol-*

lumi], and is found." (Luke 15: 32.) Was he out of existence while feeding swine in a foreign land? WAS THE PRODIGAL SON OUT OF EXISTENCE? He was "lost." Was he "unconscious" while both "dead" and "lost"? The Millennial Dawnites and Soul-sleeping Adventists are compelled to say, *Yes*, or give up their position.

"And when Jesus saw her, he called her to him, and said unto her, Woman, thou art loosed, [*apollumi*] from thine infirmity." (Luke 13: 12.) Was she out of existence? Did she go to nothing just as soon as loosed? I think not.

"But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." (Matt. 10: 6.) "For the Son of Man is come to save that which was lost." (Matt. 18: 11.) These cases are like the preceding ones. The same word that is rendered "lost" in the nine examples now given out in the thirty-one occurrences of this rendering will serve as a whole. In every case that which is said to be "lost" was as much in existence while lost as it was either before or after. There is no argument for them here, but there is for us who accept the Bible upon the subject, for the word "lost" implies "conscious existence" when viewed from a Bible standpoint.

"Destruction upon destruction is cried; for the whole land is spoiled: suddenly are my tents spoiled, and my curtains in a moment." (Jer. 4: 20.) What! annihilate a man twice over? How will you get at it? Jeremiah says, "Destruction upon destruction." How are you going to destroy a thing that is not in existence? "Let them be confounded that persecute me, but let not me be confounded: let them be dismayed, but let not me be dismayed: bring upon them the day of evil, and destroy them with double destruction." (Jer. 17: 18.)

I would like to ask our opponents how a man can be doubly annihilated? When once annihilated, will there be anything to double on? Say, will there? If the word of necessity means to cease to be, to put out of existence, when once put out, when once annihilated, will he not be gone?

If the word of necessity means to put out of existence, then when single destruction passes upon man he is clean gone forever. If he is, what is there to double on? See Prov. 21: 15, 16.

I believe we have devoted enough time to the words "deavour," "perish," "consume," etc., hence will now see whether a man has any conscious existence after death. These denominations say he has no conscious existence after death, or between death and the resurrection. We shall see what the Bible says about it, then we shall continue our search for the inner man. But before doing so I want to let Josephus tell us what the "*bosom of Abraham*" is.

1. "Now as to Hades, wherein the souls of the righteous and unrighteous are detained, it is necessary to speak of it. Hades is a place in the world not regularly furnished; a subterraneous region, wherein the light of this world does not shine; from which circumstance, that in this region the light does not shine, it can not be but there must be in it perpetual darkness. This region is allotted as a place of custody for souls, in which angels are appointed as guardians to them, who distribute to them temporary punishments, agreeable to every one's behavior and manners.

2. In this region there is a certain place set apart, as a lake of unquenchable fire, whereinto we suppose no one hath hitherto been cast, but it is prepared for a day afore-determined by God, in which one righteous sentence shall deservedly be passed upon all men; when the unjust, and those that have been disobedient to God, and have given honor to such idols as have been the vain operations of the hands of men, as to God himself, shall be adjudged to this everlasting punishment, as having been the cause of defilement; while the just shall obtain an incorruptible and never-fading kingdom. These are now indeed confined in Hades, but not in the same place wherein the unjust are confined.

3. For there is one descent in this region, at whose gate we believe there stands an arch-angel with a host; which

gate when those pass through that are conducted down by the angels appointed over souls, they do not go the same way, but the just are guided to the RIGHT HAND, and are led with hymns, sung by the angels appointed over that place, unto a region of light, in which the just have dwelt from the beginning of the world; not constrained by necessity, but ever enjoying the prospect of the good things they see, and rejoicing in the expectation of those new enjoyments which will be peculiar to every one of them, and esteeming those things beyond what we have here; with whom there is no place of toil; no burning heat, no piercing cold; nor are any briers there; but the countenance of the fathers and of the just, which they see always, smiles upon them, while they wait for the rest and eternal new life in heaven, which is to succeed this region. This place we call the "bosom of Abraham." Josephus History, page 603.

Thus Josephus has told us what the bosom of Abraham is, in the estimation of the Jews, hence, we are now prepared to take up the case of the rich man and Lazarus, but that we may be the better prepared for that case I will refer to a few other scriptures first.

VI

"And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." (Rev. 20: 4.) I expect to explain this "thousand years" in another chapter. "And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: and they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth."

Here the apostle John is writing of "the souls" of martyrs, crying unto God between death and the resurrection. Do you suppose they were conscious? Our opponents would say they were annihilated, but John informs us of their consciousness. "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." (Matt. 10: 28.) Remember what we have said upon the word "destroy." Soul and body will be cast into hell, and still be in a conscious state. (See Rev. 20: 10.)

These denominations sometimes tell us that "hell" here simply means the grave, but here they are mistaken again. "The Modern Speech New Testament," a translation of the "Resultant Greek Testament," says, "But rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna." Hell here doesn't mean the "grave," but "hell," a place of punishment. "And after six days Jesus taketh with him Peter and James and John and leadeth them up into a high mountain apart by themselves: and he was transfigured before them; and his raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow; so as no fuller on earth can white them. And there appeared unto them Elias, with Moses; and they were talking with Jesus." (Mark 9: 2-4.) Here are Elias and Moses TALKING with Jesus, hence in a conscious state between death and the resurrection. Moses had been dead about 1483 years, yet he appears on this occasion and TALKS with Jesus. This is too plain to be commented on, so I shall pass it by for the present and take up the much controverted passage known as the Lazarus chapter.

THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS

Please turn and read, if you haven't, and if you have, re-read Luke 16: 19-31. Here we find both the rich man and Lazarus conscious between death and the resurrection. If there was no other passage in the Bible upon the subject, this one would be sufficient to convince any honest mind that the souls of men are conscious after death.

But the denominations that we are reviewing say this is a parable and represents the conversion of the Jews and Gentiles. They say the rich man represents the Jews while Lazarus represents the Gentiles. Be it remembered that no inspired man ever called Luke 16th chapter a parable. And I shall now offer my objections to this being a parable. (1) Both are in death alike—verse 22—the beggar died. The rich man also died. Thus by the Savior both are left in death, while if Lazarus in Abraham's bosom is illustrative of the conversion of the Gentiles, then in the scene he should have been presented as having passed from death into life instead of being left in death. But the Savior represents them in death alike. The rich man died also; that is in like manner, for this is the only meaning of the word "also."

2. If death in the case of the beggar means conversion, it does also in the case of the rich man. Then what was he converted from and what to, and who was the converter and what the converting power?

3. There was a great gulf fixed between the parties so that passage to and fro is impossible. If this (gulf) is between Jew and Gentile, have you fixed or erected a bridge across the gulf so as to give ready passage both ways? This must be the case, for Jews are every little while going over to the Gentiles and Gentiles over to Judaism.

4. "There is no difference between Jew and Gentiles." (Acts 15: 8, 9.) *Question.*—Is there no difference between the two sides of the gulf? If God is the author of the gulf and has put the Jews on one side and the Gentiles on the other, has he not put a difference between the two?

5. If the rich man represents the whole of Israel, what is meant "by my father's house"? And who was his father? It was not Abraham. The Jews called Abraham their father, therefore the rich man was not representing the Jews.

6. If the rich man represented the whole house of Israel, who were his five brethren at home at his father's house? Were there five tribes yet in Palestine? If so, which of the twelve were they and what part of the land did they inhabit?

7. Neither Jews nor Gentiles, as such, could be indicated in the language, for the Jews were never known to call the Gentiles brethren.

8. You have five tribes on earth, one tribe in hell and the other six tribes you have lost all trace of.

9. "There 'was' a certain man in Caesarea called Cornelius." (Acts 10: 1.) If Luke 16 is a parable perhaps Acts 10th is a parable. We have found that our Savior, as recorded in Luke 16th chapter, demonstrated the continuity of human existence between death and the resurrection.

Soul-sleeping Advents, Millennial Dawnites, etc., seem to think that Lazarus could not have been conscious, and sometimes even ask how Abraham felt with a dead man in his bosom all covered with sores. Remember what the great Jewish historian, Josephus, has told us concerning "the bosom of Abraham." My reply to this question is: Hast thou never discovered the plain and marked difference between the "I" "myself" the "man proper" and the "body of the man"? If not, take a lesson from the apostles, Paul, Peter, etc. "Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me. Moreover I will endeavor that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance." (2 Pet. 1: 13-15.) First, mark the language in verse 13, "I am in this tabernacle." The pronoun "I" designates the person, the

"tabernacle," that in which he was waiting—his body. In verse 14 he says: "I must put off this my tabernacle," and this putting off of the tabernacle in verse 15 he calls decease—that is death. In verse 15, what is called in verse 14 "a putting off of this my tabernacle" is called by the apostle "my decease," words always used to indicate the person's death. Hence the "REAL MAN" is IN that which dies—the tabernacle, the body. This being true we understand that the REAL MAN—the "inner man"—never dies. While this shows that Soul-sleepingism was no part nor parcel of the apostolic theory, it also corroborates the definition of the word "die" and its derivatives, and is defined as a separation from that to which the person was formerly united—Lazarus having died, and by death became separated from his tabernacle, or body, might be deposited in the grave, there to return to dust while Lazarus himself could be carried into Abraham's bosom. Lazarus—his body—the outer man—was in the grave, but Lazarus proper—"the inner man"—was in Abraham's bosom. In harmony with the foregoing is the language of Paul, "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven, if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, while we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: (for we walk by faith, not by sight:) we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord. Wherefore we labor, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him." (2 Cor. 5: 1-9.)

If there is no difference between the man; the person proper and his body, what is the meaning of the word, "our" as connected in the foregoing, "Our house of this tabernacle"? Is there no difference between the "our" and the "house of this tabernacle," or does the one represent the possessor and the other the thing possessed? Again, the same verse: "We have a building," is the possessor and the thing possessed one and the same? No. Then Soul-sleeper's doctrine is vetoed here also. See verse 6—"Therefore we are always confident, knowing that while we are at home in the body." *Question*: Can a person go away from or out of himself? He can if Soul-sleeping doctrine be true.

Turn with me now to 1 Cor. 15: 38: "And God giveth it a body." *Question*: Does the pronoun "it," personate the noun body in the text, or is grammar a bad thing for these denominations whose theory is that man is all body—all dust? Verse 35—"With what bodies do they come?" This is in connection with verse 38, where he says, "God giveth it a body." *Question*: Is the body and the "it," to which the body is given one and the same thing, or are they of necessity different things? Let these denominations answer this. They and the apostles, Paul and Peter, for it.

VII

We shall now read 2 Cor. 12: 2, 3, "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, [whether in the body, I can not tell; or whether out of the body, I can not tell; God knoweth]; such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, [whether in the body, or out of the body, I can not tell; God knoweth]; how that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter." Count back fourteen years and it will take you to Acts 14: 19, where they stoned the apostle Paul to death, as they supposed, and dragged him to the large stone walls and threw his body over the wall out of the city, as history informs us. The body lay there

on the ground bruised and bleeding, but where was Paul—the real man? "*He was caught up into paradise, and HEARD unspeakable words.*"

Paul said he knew a *man* but he didn't know whether this "man" was *in the body* or *out of the body*, which shows that the apostle understood that the body was not the man—the man proper; and that the body may be killed and the man—the "inner man"—live on in a conscious state, for the man Paul knew was, perhaps, separated from the body, yet he could HEAR, hence was living and conscious.

"For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." (2 Cor. 4: 16.) Here we learn that man is dual—two in one—and can not be all body. When I use the term "soul" I refer to this "inward man." I am aware of the fact that the term "soul" has been applied to the body. We shall explain these Hebrew and Greek terms in another chapter. "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" (Matt. 16: 26.) Here we learn that the soul (inner man) never dies. It will live on throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity. "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." (James 2: 26.) Here we learn that the spirit never dies. We also learn that the spirit is neither the breath nor body.

The doctrine of these materialists, whom we are reviewing, teaching that there is neither soul nor spirit, is no new doctrine, though never taught by Christ and the apostles. The Sadducees were materialists, and they were not Christians—were not Christ-like. Paul was a Christian and he denounced Sadducees and claimed to be a Pharisee. Here is where I made Prof. J. F. Wilcox feel the weakness of his position in his debate with me near Casey, Ill., and his brethren admitted defeat and asked to call the debate off till they could get another man. The fact that Paul denounced the Sadducees who were materialists and claimed

to be a Pharisee is sufficient of itself to condemn all materialism. The Pharisees held that man consists of spirit and body—of an immaterial spirit as a distinct entity, as well as a material body. (Acts 23: 6-8.) So you see these denominations under review are all Sadducees and not Christians, for Paul was a Christian and he condemned those Sadducees who were Soul-sleepers.

“And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. (1 Thess. 5: 23.) Here we learn that the soul, body and spirit are the separate and distinct somethings that can be preserved blameless. Paul says “PRESERVE” the soul and spirit. These materialists say NO, they can not be preserved. Paul here tells us that man is SOUL, BODY and SPIRIT. The materialists tell us that man is all “*dirt*” and “*wind*,” and can not be preserved. Paul, or the materialists, which will you believe?

“Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul.” (1 Pet. 2: 11.) Notice, Paul says, “Abstain from FLESHLY lusts, which war against the SOUL,” which shows that the “flesh” is not the “soul.” The flesh is one thing and the soul another.

“But this flesh upon him shall have pain, and his soul within him shall mourn.” (Job 14: 22.) Notice, “his flesh upon him.” What is the HIM that the flesh is upon? Let Job answer. “His soul within him shall mourn.” It is the “SOUL” that is “within HIM.” The soul is the “him” that the flesh is upon. The soul then is within the flesh, therefore the flesh is not the soul. Remember Job says “his soul WITHIN HIM.” This should settle the question it seems to me.

“And he cried unto the Lord and said, O Lord my God, hast thou also brought evil upon this widow with whom I sojourn, by slaying her son? And he stretched himself upon

the child three times, and cried unto the Lord, and said, O Lord my God, I pray thee, let this child's soul come into him again. And the Lord heard the voice of Elijah; and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived." (1 Kings 17: 20-22.) Here we learn again that the soul is WITHIN the body and that when the body dies the soul still lives. The soul could not come into the body AGAIN without having been there at least once before. Thus we understand that when the soul left the body then the body died, and when Elijah called the soul back INTO the body again the body lived—the dead body was quickened, or made alive. It is an evident fact that the SOUL here in this scripture is not the body. The body and soul were not together—they were separated.

"And it came to pass, as her soul was in departing, [for she died] that she called his name Benoni: but his father called him Benjamin." (Gen. 35: 18.) Here we again learn that when the body died the soul departed. The soul leaving the body results in death to the body. The soul referred to here can not therefore be the body. We also learn from these scriptures that the SOUL does not die, but the BODY does.

"For the word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit," etc. (Heb. 4: 12.) Here the apostle teaches that the soul, spirit and body can be separated by the word of God. If they can be separated the soul can not be the body in this case. We have now learned that the soul is not the flesh and that it is WITHIN the flesh—the body. We will now examine a few scriptures concerning the spirit.

"Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live?" (Heb. 12: 9.) God is immortal and He is the Father of our spirits, therefore our spirits are immortal. Man is mortal

and man is the father of our flesh, therefore our flesh is mortal. It is nowhere said in the Bible that God is the father of our flesh, but it is said that He is the Father of our spirits. It is nowhere said in the Bible that man is the father of our spirits, but it is said that man is the father of our flesh.

“The burden of the word of the Lord for Israel, saith the Lord, which stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him.” (Zech. 12: 1.) Notice, the prophet says the spirit is “formed” in man. The spirit then must have a form of some kind, and it is within the body, it, then, can neither be the breath nor the body. These denominations say the spirit is nothing more nor less than the air we breathe. Turn to the eighth of Romans and everywhere else where spirit is mentioned and read it “wind” or “breath” and see how ridiculous it sounds. “Into thy hands I commend my wind,” (Spirit)—*Jesus*. This is a sample of the deep windy things of materialists. When you get the WIND all pumped out of materialism there is nothing left but “DUST” and it is usually very dry—too dry to hold together. They say, you know, that the soul is dust and the spirit wind.

“And they fell upon their faces, and said, O God, the God of the spirits of all flesh,” etc. (Num. 16: 22.) Here again we learn that God is the Father of the spirit. He created the spirit, hence its Father. “Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created,” etc. (Ps. 104: 30.) These scriptures show that the spirit is created and that God its Father has created it. If the spirit has a Father and that father has CREATED it, and FORMED it in our body, as the above scriptures teach, can we possibly conclude that it is our breath—just WIND, or the air we breathe? *Pshaw!* how foolish!! The idea of the wind being created and formed in our body by its father is simply too ridiculous to notice, were it not for such men as Russell and hundreds of others teaching it.

“And he [Christ] put them all out, and took her by the hand, and called, saying, Maid, arise. And her spirit came again, and she arose straightway: and he commanded to give her meat.” (Luke 8: 54, 55.)

VIII

Jarius' daughter (Luke 8: 54, 55) was dead but when Christ called her spirit back into her again she revived. “But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead but of the living.” (Matt. 22: 31, 32.) Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were all dead, that is, their bodies were dead, but the inner man was still living, for God is not the God of the dead but of the living, and He is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Their bodies were dead but the man proper—the “inward man” was still living. This can not be denied.

“But there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding.” (Job 32: 8.) Notice, God giveth the spirit that is IN man “understanding.” Will you tell me that our breath has understanding? The idea of breath, air, wind having BRAINS! How absurd!! The spirit is not our breath; God formed this spirit in man, but did He form it out of the wind? or out of dust either? Are the spirit and body made of the same substance? Matthew tells us that God has a soul. Was it made of the dust of the earth? If so who made it? “There is no man that hath power over the spirit to retain the spirit; neither hath he power in the day of death.” (Eccl. 8: 8.) Man hasn't power to retain the spirit at death. The spirit leaves the body, then the spirit is not the body and does not go to the grave.

But, say the Materialists, we don't claim the spirit to be the body. It is the breath. Very well, we will read again. “And they came, every one whose heart stirred him up,

and every one whom his spirit made willing." (Ex. 35: 21.) Here the spirit is said to command, to make willing, to direct, guide and control. There are attributes ascribed to the spirit that could not be ascribed to anything but a living, acting, thinking, reasoning being. Then it could not be our breath. "If he set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath." (Job 34: 14.) Here a distinction is made between the SPIRIT and the BREATH, thus showing that they are not the same. "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him." (1 Cor. 2: 11.)

1. The spirit is IN man.
2. It understands.
3. It commands.
4. It is not perishable. It can not, therefore, be the breath.

"Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?" (Eccl. 3: 21.) Here we learn that the spirit of man goeth "up," but up where? "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." (Eccl. 12: 7.) Thus we learn that when the spirit "goeth upward," it goeth up to "God who gave it." The body goes to dust and the spirit (inner man) goes to God who gave it. Thus we have learned that there is a man within this body of ours that will live forever and ever; and we shall now proceed to examine the scriptures that teach the punishment of the wicked after death, as these people under review claim there is no punishment for the wicked after death, only they will die like a hog or a dog and go to nothing.

SHALL THE WICKED BE PUNISHED?

“And to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.” (2 Thess. 1: 7-9.) Paul says, “The wicked will be punished with everlasting destruction.” How long will that punishment last? FOREVER, Paul says, but the Materialists all say, *No*. Paul, you are mistaken, the wicked will not be punished (only to die an eternal death) they will be annihilated. But is not the same word that is translated “everlasting” also translated “eternal” in Matt. 25: 46? “And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal.” Everlasting and eternal then mean the same. If the “punishment” does not last always, how long will “eternal life” last? If the righteous are conscious of their happiness, the wicked will be conscious of their “everlasting punishment.”

Paul speaks of the Gentiles being dead. “Dead in trespasses and sins.” (Eph. 2: 1.) Paul does not mean that they no longer existed. He was speaking of real live persons, but dead in that they were away from God. And in Eph. 2: 5, Paul says, “Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ.” So you see a man can be dead in a Bible sense—separated—away from God—and still exist. The Materialist’s definition of the word “dead” is not a Bible definition of that word at all. The Bible does not say they will be destroyed utterly or annihilated; but their punishment, Christ says, will be eternal, or “everlasting punishment.” There can be no PUNISHMENT where there is no CONSCIOUSNESS. The wicked will, therefore, be in a conscious state throughout eternity, for their punishment is to be eternal.

“Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them

off, and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire." (Matt. 18: 8.) This fire is never to go out. It is "everlasting fire." Can you limit it? Three times over in the ninth chapter of Mark, Christ says, "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Christ says "they shall not die." The Materialists say they "shall die."

"And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." (Is. 66: 24.) But the Materialists tell us that the "worm" refers to the maggots that preyed upon the carcasses of dead beasts in the valley of Hinnam, south of Jerusalem. Well, we shall see what the Book says. "How much less man, that is a worm? and the son of man that is a worm?" (Job 25: 6.) "But I am a worm, and no man; a reproach of men, and despised of the people." (Ps. 22: 6.) Job and David both say that MAN is the WORM and Christ says the worm shall never die. He also says the fire shall never be quenched. Then this fire is to burn forever and the worm—man—shall live forever in this fire. It is, therefore, endless punishment for the wicked.

But Materialists try to dodge this by saying this place where the worm was to be, and never to die, is from the Greek word *Gehenna* and *Gehenna* refers to the valley of Hinnam, south of Jerusalem, where they cast their dead stock and rubbish and kept a fire burning continually. But the import of *Gehenna* can not be found in anything that is to transpire in this world. If it were, men could kill and cast into it. It is not and can not be found in the state of the dead, for both soul and body are not together there. Then it must be found ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE RESURRECTION. Having found that *Gehenna* is located in the eternal world, we inquire, is anything stated in the connection with that which will measure its duration? Mark

9: 44: "Where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." The Greek reads, "*Kai to Pun ou Sebennutai*," "and the fire shall never be quenched."

Sebennutai is from *Sebo*, to quench, to put out. *Asbestos* also is a member of this family of words meaning emphatically unquenchable, and, thus not to put out of existence. Not only so, but this is the only word that does mean unquenchable. The Greek has no other word that will of itself express the idea. This word does express it. Now a word that in its own nature expresses the idea of unquenchable. But the word *Sebennumi* when coupled with a negative, expresses, in the most positive manner, the idea of unceasing duration. Thus, "is not quenched." Mark the idea that the fire shall not go out or be quenched, but it is said it shall burn without ceasing, eternally, etc. Such is the case here, "Where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." Thus *Gehenna* is not in this world. "And the smoke of their torment ascended up forever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night," etc. (Rev. 14: 11.)

"And the devil that deceiveth them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever." (Rev. 20: 10.)

IX

Soul-sleepers say "forever and ever" means a limited period of time. The Greek words alluded to by them are *eis aionas aionon*, in the common version translated, "forever and ever." This is a quotation from one of those five chapters which they say mean a limited period of time. Then God himself will exist but a limited period of time, for this is a part of their whole five chapters. They say *aion* refers to the Jewish and Christian dispensation.

Let us see whether this be true or not. Look at Luke 20: 34, 35; and let us read it, interpreting *aion* according to the Soul-sleeper's rule: "And Jesus, answering said unto them, the children of the Jewish dispensation marry and are given

in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain the Christian dispensation neither marry or are given in marriage!" According to this, there have been no marriages since the Christian dispensation was ushered into being! An argument that proves too much fails to prove anything at all. In fact their representations regarding *aion* are entirely incorrect. Under *aion* in Robinson's Lexicon of the New Testament, we have this language: In conformity to the Jewish mode of speaking, *aion* means an age, period of the world, *seculum*; the Jews were accustomed to dispute concerning two ages of the world, one of which they called the present age or world, the other, the age or world to come. (Buxtorf Lex. Rob. Chald Tol. 1620.) The former, in their opinion, was to comprehend the time from the creation to the advent of the Messiah, and was marked by imperfection, ignorance, vice, misery and crime. The latter they referred to the joyful time when the Messiah should come in majesty to establish his dominion, etc. Here we have *aion* meaning "eternal," "everlasting."

The Soul-sleepers, Advents, Russellites, and Universalists, are compelled to assume their position, that *aion* can not mean but a limited period. If they are right on this word, then it is absurd to talk of anything eternal as connected with the gospel. This being, as they tell us, then there not only is no punishment for the wicked, but also no eternal life for the righteous, for the continuity of both is measured by the same word, and that word connected with the same being in the same state of existence consequently must have the same force or value. This fact their translator, Ben Wilson, saw. (It must be remembered that Ben Wilson hired the Emphatic Diaglott made, and it does not agree with other Diaglots). And hence being determined to save his theory of the annihilation of the wicked he has rendered the various places where in all other translations the phrase "eternal life" occurs, in his version you will find the phrase "age," "lasting life." That is, life lasting only one age.

Here is a fact worthy to be remembered. It is this: If the Soul-sleeper's translation is correct, and his definition of the word "life" is also correct, then the righteous will be annihilated long before the wicked. See Rev. 14: 11 for proof. Here it is said of the torment of the wicked that it shall last "for the ages of the ages." This quotation is from the Soul-sleeper's translation of the New Testament, by Ben Wilson. It can not possibly mean less than one set or series of ages growing out of another. The language, "ages of ages," must extend far beyond the singular form age lasting. This can not embrace the idea of a fraction of the one indicated by the plural form of the phrase. *This* is but one age, and *that* a series of ages, each growing out of its predecessors. Now as the existence of the righteous is, according to this author, to be but age-lasting, and the wicked are to exist "for the ages of the ages," it incontrovertibly follows that the righteous will go out of existence long before the wicked.

As we have said, the proper meaning of *aion aiona* is its etymological import. To this we must adhere, and that the meaning is that of unlimited duration. The etymology of it will admit of nothing less. It is composed of two words: the adverb *aei*, always or ever, and the present participle, *on*. Being thus compounded they give the idea of always or ever, being eternal, everlasting. Such being the origin of the word it has a definite and certain meaning in its structure that will forever stand, namely, "everlasting."

I now submit the following: *Aion*, in its simple form of construction, that is, in the singular number and construed with the preposition *eis*, always has its proper meaning. For proof of this see Donigan's and Robinson's Greek Lexicon. Ps. 29: 10—"The Lord sitteth King [*eis ton aiona*] forever." Ps. 9: 7—"But the Lord shall endure [*eis ton aiona*] forever." Mark 3: 29—"Hath [*auk eis ton aiona*] never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." The adjective form of the word, in its simple form, carries

the primary meaning always. For example see Ps. 112: 6—“Everlasting [*aionion*] remembrance.” Ps. 139: 24—“Lead me in the way everlasting,” (*aionion*). Other Greek words imply endless duration, like our words incorruptible and immortal, but this word *aionion* (eternity) and *aionios* (eternal) possess such a meaning in their structure and lead naturally and irresistibly to the idea of “endless duration.” David says, “For this God is our God forever and ever,” (*eis ton aiona kai eis ton aiona ton aionas*). This is our God how long? Forever, even forever and ever through the ever-revolving, never-ending period of the infinite future. Millennial Dawnites, Adventists, Universalists and all depend upon Ben Wilson’s translation of these words, hence the necessity of exposing the translation. They all play a great deal with these words; this is why I have dealt at some length with them.

“He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he that is filthy let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still.” (Rev. 22: 11.) It seems that this scripture should cause every person inclined to the doctrine of annihilation to repent and turn from that doctrine at once. John says concerning the “unjust” let him be unjust still, and concerning the “filthy” let him be filthy still. *Question*.—How could the “unjust” continue to BE UNJUST or the “filthy” continue to BE FILTHY if they are to be annihilated, or blotted out of existence? Can NOTHING continue in an unjust condition? If so, the materialists, “arguments” may continue, for it is about as near nothing as any argument I know of. The apostle John says, LET THEM BE. Here is where the materialists and the apostle differ, for they say, *Let them NOT be*. I wish they could agree. Don’t you? “For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie.” (Rev. 22: 15.) But these denominations say that without the holy city there will be NO CONSCIOUS EXISTENCE, FOR

EVEN THE DEVIL IS TO BE BLOTTED OUT. We always have to have their interpretation before we can understand the Books of books. They will read a passage of scripture and then give their interpretation and ask you to accept, not the scripture, but their **INTERPRETATION OF THE SCRIPTURE.** The apostle can make a statement and then these fellows will fix it for him.

“Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.” (Matt. 25: 41.) We learn from this and Matt. 13: 41-43, that the wicked will be banished into a place of punishment, at the same time the righteous will inherit or receive their reward. If the righteous live and are conscious after the judgment, wicked will also live and be conscious after the judgment, for both receive their reward at the same time. Malachi, fourth chapter, is one of their favorite texts where Malachi says, “The wicked shall be ashes under the feet of the righteous,” etc. Read the chapter. This can not refer to the end of the world, as they teach, for Elijah the prophet was to come before the coming of that great and dreadful day. Then it can not refer to the end of this material world. Again, “The Sun of Righteousness will arise with healing in his wings,” which refers to the time when Christ came for the redemption of mankind. We might take the chapter up verse by verse and show that it referred to the overthrow of Jerusalem in A. D. 70. Under the temple at Jerusalem, also under the two towers on each of its wings, were passages. When the rebel Jew found that resistance to the veteran Roman soldiers would avail nothing, as many as could, crept into their own oven-like passages to conceal themselves. The surface of the city was covered with the dead and dying. In this condition the city was fired, the flames spread, the temple and all were consumed. Those in the oven-like passage were burned as they would have been in an oven. Those strewn over the city in the houses and streets were burned to ashes. In time the

fire went out. The Roman army having accomplished its mission left the place. The disciples of Christ, who had before fled, then returned, walked over and among the ruins, stepping on the ashes of the wicked Jews, and thus the wicked were ashes under the soles of the feet of the righteous. Here and here alone is the fulfillment of this prophecy, if it is to be taken literally. No annihilation of the wicked taught here. The overthrow of this city was a type of the endless punishment of the wicked, if it be a type of anything.

X

We shall now pay some attention to Universalism. Universalists take the eighth chapter of Romans as a strong proof text favoring universal salvation. Rom. 8: 19-23 are their favorite verses. We shall briefly examine them. I am well aware of the fact that there are several ideas advanced concerning the "creature" mentioned here in Rom. 8: 19-23, and my position may be criticised, but I fear no successful criticism. "For the creature [creation, R. V.] was made subject to vanity"—(abuse, misery and corruption). Man, as well as the earth and all things therein, is the creation of God. Man was made subject to VANITY (corruption, decay), that is the BODY was made subject to vanity, hence will return to dust (corruption). See Gen. 3: 19. The gospel was preached to every CREATURE. (Mark 16: 15; Col. 1: 23.) Hence men and women are referred to as "creatures," therefore a part of creation. "Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption." (Verse 21.)

What part of man is it that will be "delivered from the bondage of corruption"? We have already learned that the REAL man dwells in this body of ours and that it will never die—will never be "delivered from the bondage of corruption." The "inward man" was not "made subject to vanity," but the body or outward man was. This "creature" that "was made subject to VANITY"—corruption—and returns to

dust—will be DELIVERED (raised from the dead) from that state of corruption. This can not possibly refer to anything but our body. "The whole creation groaneth." Yes, every creature groaneth, but why? The "creature" referred to here is the body, and, of course, suffereth pain. It is made subject to vanity, and "I die daily." And not only they." THEY who? *Answer*—That which was made subject to vanity or corruption. The "inward man" was not made subject to vanity. "They," then, refers to the bodies—the outward man. "But ourselves also . . . even we ourselves groan within ourselves." This shows that the inner man is groaning within the "creature" or body. "Waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." (Verse 23.) Then it was not the body referred to here that was "groaning," but something "*within ourselves*" (body) is doing this groaning. Yes, "His soul *within* him shall mourn." (Job 14: 21.) See 2 Cor. 5: 2, 4 also. The body is to be REDEEMED. The part of man that never dies and may groan within the body will "*wait the redemption of our body.*" See 1 Cor. 15: 38. The little pronoun "it" here refers to the "inner man." God will give "it"—the inner man—a body. The "creature" is the body in this chapter.

Now we will notice their "argument." The words, "creature," "sons of God," "children," etc., are used to prove that all mankind will be saved. They say the word "redemption" comes from the Greek word *apolo* and means "a setting free from," "cutting loose," etc. The fundamental idea, they say, is that of separation; severing the bands by which one is bound, and setting him free. The Greek text has "*apolutrosin ton somatos heeman*"; the word in the text is not *apulus*—it is *apolutrosis*, from *apolutroo*, meaning "to redeem." The word they refer to, *apulus*, does mean "to loose," etc., but the trouble is, that is not the word in the text. The word here used, *apolutrosis*, occurs in the New Testament twelve times; and is rendered "redemption" in every instance but one. It is the same word used in Colos-

sians 1: 14, "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Also Luke 21: 28, "Your redemption draweth nigh." So in the other several places where the same word is used. In one instance only is the word rendered "deliverance."

They say the Greek word *ktisis*, occurring in Rom. 8: 22, and translated "the whole creation," means "the whole human family." If it did, it would only refer to the bodies as the body is the "creature" referred to here, and the body will be redeemed from corruption as we have learned. But, it is a rule of interpretation that if a word be properly defined, the definition may be substituted in the context and not injure or alter the sense. Let us read this passage: "The creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." ALL MEN are the "children of God." Universalists say: "For we know that the whole creation"—*ktisis*, which Universalists declare to mean the entire human family—"groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now; and not only they"—the whole human family—"BUT OURSELVES ALSO, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body." Mark—not only *ktisis*, which they say, means "the whole human family," but "ourselves also" wait for the redemption of our bodies. That is, "The whole world and the rest of mankind! "Ourselves also" is the "inner man" and it is waiting for the redemption of the outer man—the body. But Universalists haven't learned this yet, and make it refer to the salvation of all. Let us keep one point constantly before us, namely, that when the creature was subject to vanity, God did it; God subjected the creature to vanity, not consulting the creature's will.

We must also distinguish between "evil" and "sin." I have always supposed that mumps, small-pox, etc., were great evils; but are they *sins*? Rom. 8: 20, says God did not

consult the will of the creature when he subjected him to vanity, or sin; therefore, sin is in the universe by God's will. This is the Universalist's logic. According to that, God is the author of sin; and if God is the author of sin, he is the greatest sinner—nay, the only sinner in the universe. They say the phrase "children of God" in Rom. 8: 21 means "angels"; and quote from Job 38: 7, where it is said the sons of God shouted for joy. But the Greek word used here happens to be *aggeloi*. In Matthew 25: 31, the same word *aggeloi* is found, and is there translated "angels." The term "children [or sons] of God" occurs four times in this immediate context; but only in this one case, the 25th verse, do they explain it to mean the angels of light; and I would like to know by what authority they interpret it to mean angels in this one place, but not in the rest. Their mistakes on the "redemption of the body" are as follows: First, they have got hold of a word that was not in the text; secondly, they apply a rule of Bullion's grammar (did this in their debate with me at Mt. Vernon, Ill.), that can not apply at all—the rule referring to the construction of the genitive after *verbs*, while the word translated "redemption" (like the English word "redemption") is a *noun*; and thirdly, to illustrate their theory of translation, that the genitive after *apolutrosis* should be translated by "from," they refer us to what they call a parallel case, in Heb. 11: 35, where there is no word in the genitive case, or any other case, after it in the same sentence—simply and only the accusation of *apolutrosis*! In Eph. 1: 14, you will find a case precisely parallel to the one before us in Rom. 8: 23. There the apostle speaks about an inheritance for which we are to wait "until (*apolutrosis tes peripoieeseas*) the redemption of the purchased possession." Here we have the genitive after *apolutrosis*—construction exactly similar to that with which Universalists have made such work in Rom. 8: 23. But how would they read it? Why, that we are waiting to be redeemed—"delivered"—"separated"—*from* the purchased possession!

Brother, do you want to be with the Universalists in this separation? They condemn themselves in the thing they allow. Take his mistake in the Greek away from the Universalist, and you forever close his mouth, if he is honest.

XI

Universalists, when not trying to make an argument on Greek phrases and words, work on sympathy. So it will be necessary for us to notice some of their "arguments" based on "prayer," "will," "matter," etc. Universalists say we can not pray for the salvation of all mankind because we do not believe all mankind will be saved. Their argument based upon the alleged fact that our reason leads to a result, endless damnation, which is against our hearts; that we can not pray for salvation in faith; that is God's will that all men be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. (1 Tim. 2: 4.) Also Matt. 6: 9, 10.

To this I answer: 1. *Salvation is conditional.* Heb. 5: 9: "He became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that OBEY him." See Acts 2: 40; Rev. 22: 14, 15, and many other Scriptures, which teach that salvation is conditional. I pray for the salvation of all, but only in accordance with the conditions of the gospel.

2. *The logic of their argument is false.* Whatever reasoning leads to a result contrary to our heart's desire is false; but my reasoning leads me to the result that if men have evil communications their good manners will be corrupted; that "he that believeth not shall be damned," or, that if my child has consumption it will die; or that, if your child, mother, commit murder, it shall be punished, perhaps hanged, or go to the penitentiary for life; all of which results are contrary to the desire of our hearts; therefore all such reasoning is false.

3. Universalists say, "*Whatever God wills, must be accomplished.*" They say, "God wills that all men shall enjoy

endless happiness; therefore all men will enjoy endless happiness." This is their "logic," but let us see how it works. God wills that no man shall lie, steal, swear, murder, get drunk, etc., etc; therefore none do lie, steal, swear, murder, get drunk, or commit adultery. *Shame!* This is their logic(?) and argument(?) on the WILL of God. This argument(?) is faulty, because it loses sight of the fact that God's will is only absolute as a rule of divine action—"He doeth according to his will in the armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth." But God has willed to make his will, as respects present and eternal salvation, depend on the free exercise of man's will. His will is that if men do not accept salvation on gospel terms they must suffer the penalty. In this sense, God's will, counsel, purpose, pleasure, desire, intentions, providence, shall stand—be vindicated forever. The commands of God are given, either, first, *without reference to the will of God*; or, second, *contrary to the will of God*; or third, *they are the expression of the will of God*. If they are given without reference to the will of God, then we have God acting without a will; if they are given contrary to the will of God, then we have God acting against his own will; if they are the expression of the will of God, then God's will is not always accomplished, for the commandments are not always obeyed. One of the three horns of this trilemma they must take.

In my debate with John Hughs, I forced him to take the third horn, then I proved that they taught immorality and infidelity. Now, I would ask them whether they are certain that the will of God, as expressed in 1 Tim. 2: 4 and other passages, where it is said that God "will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth," is the will of *determination* or only the will of *desire*? The Greek word *thelo*, used in this passage, does not mean "to determine," but simply "to wish," "to desire." God's DETERMINATIONS are always accomplished; but God's DESIRE is not. His desires are broken every day. The commandments of

the decalogue were the expressions of God's desire, but they were disobeyed by Jews every day. They again "reason," when ruined by the above scripture and reasoning, that our belief is contrary to the prayer of our heart. And this they produce as an argument to prove that all men will enjoy endless happiness. They say our logic is against the prayer of our heart, therefore our logic must be wrong; in other words, whatever conclusions our reason may reach, if such conclusions are unpleasant and disagreeable, such conclusions must be false.

Let us try this style of argument in reference to some other matters. I reason that if the grasshoppers or chinch-bugs visit any country in large numbers they will destroy crops. This is a very unpleasant and disagreeable reflection. It affects both our feelings and pockets. Therefore according to the Universalist's logic—if the chinch-bugs visit this country in large numbers they will NOT destroy our crops! An argument that proves too much fails to prove anything at all.

Another "strong" argument of Universalists is: "How would you like to know, mother, that your son, your darling and beautiful boy, whom you had been the means of bringing into this world, to sin, and die, and go down to an endless hell? Could you, mother, be happy in heaven and this darling son in hell beneath? They all know this argument and have it down pat. But what sort of logic is this? Because a mother does not want her boy to suffer endless punishment, therefore there can be no such thing as endless punishment. Apply the same logic to the gallows, and see whether it holds true. Mother, would not your heart be wrung with agony to know that your only child was destined to become a robber, or a murderer, and for his crimes have to suffer, strangle, groan and die upon the gallows? Of course your heart would be broken—yes, even melt and run as water, as Joshua would put it. Therefore, according to their mode of reasoning, there can be no gallows! Their

argument proves too much, hence fails to prove anything. They "reason" that the happiness of God, angels and men demand the happiness of all men.

I would ask the Universalist if God was not happy before man was created? If he was happy before man was created, he must have been, or became, unhappy when man fell; and if He can not be happy until all men are saved, He can not be happy now, because all men are not now saved.

They "reason" that the goodness and mercy of God are against or opposed to endless punishment. Read the entire 136th Psalm in connection with Matt. 5: 7; Rom. 9: 15-18; Rom. 11: 18, 23, 31, 32; 2 Thess. 1: 7-9, which show that the GOODNESS and MERCIES of God punished those that were continually punishing the people; that it is a righteous thing with God to punish the disobedient.

The Universalists argue that God can not HATE anything because he is LOVE. God is love and can not hate, they say. But what saith the Scriptures? "These six things doth the Lord hate; yea, seven are an abomination unto him," etc. (Prov. 6: 16-19.) "So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes, which thing I hate." (Rev. 2: 15.) Here are several things the Lord says he HATES. So the Bible is found to be against Universalism again. They argue that God is the Father of all, and that he will not damn his children. Read Matt. 8: 44; Acts 13: 10; 1 John 3: 8; 1 Pet. 2: 10; Rom. 6: 16; Gal. 4: 4-6; Heb. 12: 8, and you will learn that God is not the (spiritual) Father of all. The devil is said to be the father of the wicked and disobedient. God is said to be the Father of the obedient, and both classes will go to their father after death, as we have shown in previous articles. We can not have two fathers, in the same sense, at the same time.

Universalists say there was nothing said about eternal punishment for three thousand years after creation. This may be answered by asking another question. How long was it after creation before you find the words "eternal

life"? The words "eternal punishment" and "eternal life" came into existence at the same time. So if they were correct in their statement, their "argument" would amount to nothing for them but would strengthen our position.

XII

I have briefly given about all the main, so-called, arguments the Universalists use. I have, in previous articles, examined the words, "perish," "endless," etc., etc. I shall now offer a short series of arguments based upon scriptural antithesis which, for their correct understand, must be interpreted according to the law governing the antithesis. "Antithesis" is from *antitheemi*, "to set over against." It is synonymous with "contrast," from *contra* and *sto*, "to stand against." "Comparison," from "compare," and the Latin *comparo* or *com*, and *par*, "equal," signifying the putting together of things that are equal. "Contrast," in French, *contraster*. Latin, *contrasto*, or *contra*, and *sto*, "to stand," or *sisto*, "to place against," signifying the placing of one thing opposite to another. Likeness in quality and difference in degree, likeness in degree, but opposition in quality. I want to define this so as to be understood. The law of the antithesis is, that one member is to be taken in the same extent as the other, whether that antithesized be weight, number, duration, or anything else.

Now, the term "perish" is antithesized with the phrase "eternal life." Let us here read John 10: 26-28. "But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you, My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." In this passage, which the Universalists place beyond the resurrection, we have the Savior saying there are some that are NOT his sheep. These sheep, that belong to his fold, he will give eternal life, and they shall never perish—thus antithesizing "perish" with "eternal life." Now, as

the Universalists all apply this beyond the resurrection, after which period moral character is CHANGELESS, "eternal life" must be endless, and by the law of the antithesis, "perish" must be endless also. The Universalists can not deny that this word is ever used as reference to the endless condition of the future, for the Savior, greater authority, so used it in Matt. 18: 14. "Even so it is not the will of your father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish." "That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John 3: 15, 16.) Here, you see the words "eternal" or "everlasting"—for these are different translations of the same word in the original—are antithesized with "perish." Read also the 36th verse, same chapter. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." *Hath* everlasting life; this is as far as the Universalists care to read, but I will read the rest of the verse: "And he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." We have already seen what "perish" means, so we are forced to the conclusion that those who do not believe must suffer "endless punishment." "Saved" is antithesized with "perish."

"And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believe not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." (2 Thess. 2: 10-12.) Here "perish" is equivalent to "damned," and both the opposite of "save." The Universalists define "salvation" to be ultimate holiness. In the text before us, "perish" being in antithesis with "saved," if the SALVATION is endless, PERISH must express the same duration. "For we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ, in them that are saved, and in

them that perish: to the one we are the savor of death unto death; and to the other the savor of life unto life. And who is sufficient for these things?" (2 Cor. 2: 15, 16.) The same is true of this passage as of the other. Therefore, that which is opposed to life, that is, death must be endless.

"Eternal life" is also antithesized with "indignation and wrath." "But after thy hardness and impenitent heart, treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life; but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil; of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile; but glory, honor and peace, to every man that worketh good; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile; for there is no respect of persons with God." (Rom. 2: 5-11.)

In regard to this passage, I remark:

1. Eternal life is the reward of a class.
2. Indignation and wrath and retribution are for a class, and are antithesized with eternal life.
3. Glory, honor and peace are equivalent to eternal life.
4. Tribulations and anguish are equivalent to indignation and wrath, and are antithesized in the same way.
5. These rewards and punishments are to be awarded at the revelation of the righteous judgment of God which was then future.

Now, inasmuch as we have before shown that "eternal life" is "endless life," so the tribulations and anguish and indignation and wrath must likewise be endless.

I have, in this article, used the term, "Universalists," but the arguments are against all the Soul Sleepers as well. They all claim there is no such thing as "endless punish-

ment" but let some of them arise and answer these arguments. I have studied both sides of the question: have read everything I could get on both sides, and am using every point I could gather from others, in these articles. Let some one of their number answer these arguments in this one article if it is possible.

"Eternal life" and "death" are also antithesized. "What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death. But now being made free from sin and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end, everlasting life. For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." (Rom. 6: 21-23.) In regard to this I remark:

1. This passage looks to final results of human action.
2. The results of sin on the one hand, and of holiness on the other, are antithesized.
3. As extensive, therefore, in duration, as is life, so extensive in duration is the death. "Everlasting punishment" and "life eternal" antithesized.

"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." (Matt. 25: 46.) Read from verse 31 to 46. In regard to this passage, I remark:

1. The word *aggelos*, which the Universalists use to mean the sons of light, the heavenly messengers, occurs in the 31st verse.
2. The phrase "all nations" occurs in the 32nd verse, which, Universalists insist, comprehend the whole race of man.
3. Christ will come with the angels, and the race will stand before him, and he will judge them. But this can not refer to any judgment past, because no such events have ever happened.

4. At this judgment some (verse 41) are to go away into the fire prepared for the devil and his angels, or to everlasting punishment, some to life eternal.

5. "Everlasting punishment" and "life eternal" are in antithesis; if the life is endless, so must be the punishment, according to the law of interpretation governing the antithesis. But, as there is no judgment mentioned in the Scriptures, yet future, except that which is connected with the resurrection of the dead, therefore, the entering into life must be in the eternal state; consequently the everlasting punishment must be in the same state—hence endless, because in that state there is no change of moral character. The word *aiaios* is here used to express the duration of the life; but I do not propose now to build an argument upon *aiaios*, but upon this law of the antithesis, which requires one branch of a sentence to be taken in the same extent of meaning as the other.

XIII

I wish now to build an argument upon the sin against the Holy Spirit. "Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." (Matt. 12: 31, 32.) "Verily I say unto you, All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme: but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation; because they said, He hath an unclean spirit." (Mark 3: 28-30.) "If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it." (1 John 5: 16.)

Talk about ALL men being saved in heaven when our Savior positively tells us that there is a sin for which there

is no forgiveness, and tells us that some have, and others may, commit it, and then tells us, in John 8: 21, that if we "die in our sins: whither I go ye can not come."

Universalists endeavor to evade the force of this argument by saying that *aion*, here translated "world," refers to the Jewish and Christian dispensations. Very well, if this be so, that those who commit this sin can not be forgiven in either the Jewish or Christian dispensations, if forgiven at all, it must be beyond death. But it is for them to prove this, before they can rid themselves of the "never forgiveness" in Mark 3: 29. Then look at the passage in John's epistle. Here the apostle found there was one sin men might commit that he could not command prayer for. Whosoever shall fall under the awful condemnation of this sin—the sin unto death—can never be forgiven, neither in this world nor in the world to come. They tell us that there will be a chance to hear, believe and obey the gospel after death and refer us to 1 Pet. 3: 19, 20 and 4: 6.

WILL THERE BE A SECOND CHANCE?

We shall see what the Book says. If the Bible does not answer the question it can't be answered. John Wesley and others tell us that Christ did this (1 Pet. 3: 19, 20), preaching through Noah, and that is correct, as may be seen by reading the passage without any comments. The word "prison" in verse 19 does not mean "grave," as they try to make it appear. It is from the Greek word *phulakee*, which occurs forty-seven times in the New Testament. It is rendered "prison" thirty-four times, as in Matt. 5: 25, "And thou be cast into prison." Matt. 14: 3—"And put (him) in prison for Herodias' sake." Verse 10—"And beheaded John in the prison." I shall not give all thirty-four of the passages where this word is rendered "prison," as you can see it does not refer to the grave. "Grave" comes from a different word altogether. If we were looking for a rendering of the word "grave" we would look under the words *mneema*

and *mneemion*, the Greek words for grave. *Hadees* is related to this family of words also. While the word "prison" is from *phulakee* as found here in 1 Pet. 3: 19.

What, then, may we understand by 1 Pet. 3: 19, where it is said that "he went and preached unto the spirits in prison"? We shall read Is. 42: 6, 7, "I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house." The Gentiles are referred to as "prisoners" in "prison" by the prophet Isaiah. They are not in the grave either. "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." (Is. 61: 1.) Here again we have those who are in sin referred to as being in prison. Now turn to Luke 4: 18, 19 and you will find this language again. It is here used by the Christ himself. "And that they may cover (Gr. awake) themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken (Gr. taken alive) captive by him at his will." (2 Tim. 2: 26.) Being taken *captive* or imprisoned does not refer to persons in the grave or intermediate state between death and resurrection. But it does refer to living persons who are in sin—who are taken captive by the devil. This is the *prison* those referred to in 1 Pet. 3: 19 were in. They were the wicked persons preached to by Noah before their death.

Now we shall briefly examine 1 Pet. 4: 6. "For this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." Might not the apostle here be speaking of persons "dead in trespass and sin"? I think so. He is here referring to those persons in prison—persons *dead in sin*—separated from God. The verse explains itself.

"For this cause *was* the gospel preached also to them that *are* dead." "Was" is in the past tense; "are dead" is present tense; thus we understand that it *WAS* preached to them that *ARE* dead, hence preached to them before they died. Instead of these scriptures teaching that a man may hear the gospel, believe the gospel, and obey the gospel *after* death, they teach that the preaching and hearing and rejecting or obeying was done and must be done *before* they die. "For in death there is no remembrance of thee: in the grave who shall give thee thanks." (Ps. 6: 5.) "Wilt thou shew wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise and praise thee? Shall thy lovingkindness be declared in the grave? or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" (Ps. 88: 10-12.) "For the grave can not praise thee, death can not celebrate thee: they that go down into the pit can not hope for thy truth. The living, the living, he shall praise thee, as I do this day: the father to the children shall make known thy truth." (Is. 38: 18, 19.) "In the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be." (Eccl. 11: 3.) These scriptures all show the necessity of *obeying* while we are living.

But I wish now to call attention to Rev. 22: 11, which would settle the question if there was not another scripture in all the Bible upon the subject. "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still." What more could the Lord say, than to you He has said in this verse? It should make all who teach a "second chance" fear and tremble. I know of no doctrine more dangerous, than the doctrine taught by all these denominations under review that a man will have an opportunity to hear, believe and obey the gospel after death. This is also a part of Mormonism. I might refer to other scriptures, but what is the use? A man that won't believe what is given us here in Rev. 22:

11 would not believe though one arose from the dead. I believe I will ask you however to read the first thirteen verses of the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew. Notice the "shut door," etc., and see if you think Christ teaches a "second chance" there.

I shall continue this line of argument by taking up the subject of the resurrection. I now base an argument upon the fact that man will come forth after, or in the resurrection, in diverse moral conditions, and to diverse destinies. "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." (John 5: 28, 29.) Parallel to this is Dan. 12: 2, 3. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever." You will notice that the damnation, the shame and contempt, must be endless! I reason that whatever shall be the condition into which every man shall enter at the surrender of the mediatorial kingdom to God, or at the resurrection, or at the "song of victory" (1 Cor. 15: 55), that condition shall be changeless and endless as to moral character. Those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ shall enter into a condition of punishment or suffering. Hence, those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ will suffer endless punishment.

Before noticing a few scriptures on the second coming of Christ, I want us to read Heb. 5: 9. "And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." Then he has only "become the **AUTHOR OF ETERNAL SALVATION UNTO ALL THEM THAT OBEY HIM.**" No obedience, no eternal salvation, is the way this reads, and this obedience must be before death.

XIV

Now I will notice a few scriptures on the second coming of Christ. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the arch-angel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first." (1 Thess. 4: 16.) "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left." (Matt. 25: 31-33.) "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." (2 Cor. 5: 10.) "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." (Jude 6.) Does this look much like there was a chance for obedience after death?

"Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, Amen." (Rev. 1: 7.) "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him: for we shall see him as he is." (1 John 3: 2.) Read in connection with these 2 Thess. 1: 4-10; 1 Cor. 15: 51-55; Acts 1: 9-11; Jude 14: 15; Rev. 20: 10-15; 2 Pet. 3: 7-10. In order to save space I have not quoted all the scriptures I would like to have quoted, but I have referred to them and insist on you, dear friend and brother, reading them for yourself.

From the foregoing scriptures, we find that the following events will be concomitant with the coming of Christ:

1. The coming is to be personal.
2. He is to come in the clouds of heaven as he went away.

3. Every eye shall see him; even his murderers; hence it must be at the resurrection.

4. It will be with shouting, with a voice of the arch-angel and the trumpet of God.

5. Then the resurrection will take place.

6. The righteous are to be changed; their bodies to be glorified.

7. The wicked are to be punished with everlasting destruction.

8. The angels are to attend Christ.

9. The saints will accompany him.

10. The elect are to be gathered to him.

11. "All nations," are to stand before him for judgment.

12. The heavens and the earth are to perish by fire.

13. Rest is to be given to the saints.

14. Tribulations to be meted out to those wicked Greeks who troubled the Thessalonians. (1 Thess. 2: 14.)

15. The wicked are to be cast into everlasting punishment, the righteous are to enter into life eternal.

16. The wicked are to be cast into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels, and to be tormented day and night forever and ever.

God enforces no such language in the present state of existence; his language to the sinner now is: "Repent, obey and live." I would like to see the shape of the man's head who would say, after reading these scriptures and arguments, that the Bible teaches a chance for obedience after death. There is no such thing hinted at in all of God's word. The judgment will settle it all, and we shall then be judged for the deeds done in the body, hence before death.

BIBLE AND UNIVERSALISM COMPARED

1. Bible: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." (Rom. 8: 14.)

Universalism: As many as are led by the spirit of the *devil*, they are also the sons of God, and heaven will be their home.

2. Bible: "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me: and ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." (John 5: 39, 40.)

Universalism: Ye *shall have* eternal life whether ye search the Scriptures or not, and all shall have eternal life whether they come unto me or not!

3. Bible: "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God." (Rom. 8: 28.)

Universalism: And we know that all things work together for good to them that love *not* as well as to them that love God!

4. Bible: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. 5: 3.)

Universalism: Blessed are the proud and devilish in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven sure! They stand just as good show for heaven as "the poor in spirit."

5. Bible: "Blessed are they that mourn for they shall be comforted." (Matt. 5: 4.)

Universalism: Blessed are they that WILL NOT MOURN but whoop and halloo and laugh and scorn, and have a jolly time, for they SHALL be comforted, yea, eternal life at God's right hand shall be theirs—no mistake about it!

6. Bible: "There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God." (Heb. 4: 9.)

Universalism: There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of the *devil*, yea, the demons shall all enjoy that everlasting rest as well as the people of God.

7. Bible: "Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty

hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time." (1 Pet. 5: 6.)

Universalism: God will exalt you whether you humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God or not. All that humble themselves under the mighty hand of the DEVIL will be exalted in due time just the same.

8. Bible: "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure." (2 Pet. 1: 10.)

Universalism: Wherefore the rather, brethren, there is no need of you "giving diligence" for the calling and election of ALL MEN is unalterably fixed, and all men will finally be holy and happy.

9. Bible: "Repent ye therefore and be converted that your sins may be blotted out." (Acts 3: 19.)

Universalism: Just rest easy, your sins will be blotted out whether you repent or not. Don't let these "conditional fellows" and "water dogs" excite you.

10. Bible: "Wherefore my beloved brethren . . . WORK OUT your salvation with fear and trembling." (Phil. 2: 12.)

Universalism: Wherefore, my beloved brethren, ye shall all be saved with an everlasting salvation without work. As for the fear and trembling Paul talks about, there is no need of that for there is NOTHING TO FEAR, for salvation is yours, let you do what you will.

11. Bible: "Save yourselves from this untoward generation." (Acts 2: 40.)

Universalism: How foolish! There is no need of trying to save yourselves, for salvation is unconditional and ALL men will enjoy that salvation in the "sweet by and by."

12. Bible: "That ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer." (2 Thess. 1: 5.)

Universalism: God counts all men worthy of the kingdom of God whether they suffer or not!

13. Bible: "Rejoice and be exceedingly glad, for great is your reward in heaven." (Matt. 5: 12.)

Universalism: There is no need of rejoicing and being glad, for your reward is sure anyway; and then this reward is not in heaven, but here on earth!

14. Bible: "For what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world, and lose himself, or be cast away." (Luke 9: 25.)

Universalism: It will be impossible for a man to lose himself as none can be lost and it will be an advantage, a great advantage, to be cast away, for he would be cast into heaven!

15. Bible: "Which devour widows' houses, and for a pretense make long prayers: these shall receive greater damnation." (Mark 12: 40.)

Universalism: Which devour widows' houses, and for a pretense make long prayers: these shall receive immortality and everlasting life and rest at God's right hand in heaven. Therefore, devour widows' houses, etc., if you want to, as there is no greater damnation, you will not suffer endless punishment for it!

16. Bible: "And Jesus answering saith unto them, Have faith in God." (Mark 11: 22.)

Universalism: There is no need of having faith in God, as God will not damn any, but will save all, faith or no faith.

17. Bible: "Hear him." (Mark 9: 7.)

Universalism: It is not necessary to *hear him* in order to salvation as salvation is offered to all without hearing.

18. Bible: "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." (Mark 10: 15.)

Universalism: Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he SHALL enter therein, no mistake about it, he is as sure of the kingdom of God as he is of death. None shall be lost and all shall be saved!

XV

I want to devote this article to a few facts concerning hell, second death, etc. It seems to me that we have said enough and quoted Scripture enough to convince any person that there is a hereafter for the sinner as well as the saint. Most of what we say in this article will be taken from A. Campbell's speech on "Life and Death" and should settle the question with all. Having shown that eternal life is eternal existence, does it not follow that THE SECOND DEATH, in contrast with eternal life, can not possibly intimate second non-existence? Indeed, is not the very definition absurd? The first death, first non-existence; the second death, second non-existence. How do you Soul-sleepers like this? Did any human writer ever speak greater nonsense? And yet we have men amongst us so full of the conceit of superior wisdom as to make the inspired writers utter such nonsense. Eternal life and eternal punishment are placed in contrast by our Savior. In giving an account of the final judgment, he says all on his left hand shall depart "into everlasting punishment." He uses the word *kolasis* to indicate what sort of punishment he means.

The word occurs but twice in the New Testament. In a passage found in 1 John 4: 18, it is translated "*torment*." They shall go into everlasting torment. How weak or how vicious the head that thence infers that torments are to end in a second death!! "Man became a living soul." Here the word *nepesh* is found and correctly translated *soul*. But, unfortunately, it is found for the first time in Gen. 1: 20; and, again in the 30th verse of the same chapter, descriptive of the souls of fish, birds, and reptiles. We could give many instances in which *nepesh*, translated soul, denotes the blood—the animal body—alive or dead. In this respect it exactly resembles its Greek representative *psuchee*, and its Latin converse *anima*. It often denotes any creature that lives by breathing. This word does not certainly, in any other passage, (than Gen. 2 and 7, if

there) signify the spiritual part of man, usually called his soul. Thus we may logically conclude, that so soon as God breathed into the nostrils of Adam the breath of life, he became a *living creature*. But yet, in fact, all this makes nothing for those who will have Adam a mere biped animal with a superior organization; but as susceptible of death, in his entire constitution, as any other creature. For this reason—it is not a definition of the body, soul, or spirit, in their technical meaning. It presumes not to define man either as respects body or soul but simply states the singular manner of his creation as different from all God's other works. When all this and much more to the same effect is stated and conceded, nothing is gained by the whole class of destructionists.

“Man has a spirit.” True, the *soul* is, by many, supposed to be synonymous with the word *spirit*. This is, indeed, assumed by all the materialists and destructionists. They build upon a false assumption, they are not synonymous. Sometimes indeed, the word SOUL is substituted for the word SPIRIT and MIND. Hence the soul is immortal in one sense, and mortal in another. The word *nepesh* in Hebrew, *psuchee* in Greek and soul in English, as often signify life as anything else. Of the one hundred and five times in which the word *psuchee* is found in the New Testament, it is forty-one times translated life. It is twice translated mind, and once heart, while at other times it is distinguished from them, thus: “With all thy heart, and with all thy mind.” (Matt. 22: 27; Mark 12: 30.) See also Mark 12: 33. In these instances, and suchlike, there is virtually, a contrasted difference between the mind, the understanding and the soul. Soul, and souls, frequently stand for persons. For example: “Fear fell upon every soul”—“There were added three thousand souls”—“Every soul that shall not hear, will be destroyed,” etc. “For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?” And who knoweth the things of God, but the Spirit of God?

Here the spirit of man and the Spirit of God are introduced as INTELLIGENT spirits, each knowing and alone knowing the things of the person to whom he belongs. This is the reason why mortality, or death, or destruction, is never once alleged of a spirit—any spirit good or bad. Indeed it is said, "THEY CAN NOT DIE" when it is said that angels cannot die.

Of the whole number of three hundred and ninety-three occurrences of *pneuma*, in the apostolic writings, it is applied to the SPIRIT OF GOD some two hundred and eighty-eight times; to EVIL SPIRITS some thirty times; to the HUMAN SPIRIT forty times; and figuratively, to indicate TEMPER or DISPOSITION, some seventeen times. We will now pass to *Hades* and *Sheol*. *Sheol* in the Old Testament and *Hades* in the New Testament mean both the GRAVE and the separate state of the dead. The Hebrew word *Sheol* is translated thirty-one times "hell" and thirty-four times "pit" or "grave" in the Old Testament; and *Hades* in the New Testament corresponds exactly to the Hebrew word *Sheol*, but these denominations want to translate it "grave" in every place it is found. In the New Testament, *Hades* occurs but eleven times, and is ten times translated HELL, but once GRAVE, yet we have the term HELL in the English Testament TWENTY-TWO TIMES. Of these, however, twelve are the English representatives of the word *Gehenna*, found just twelve times in the Greek Testament. *Gehenna* and *Hades* do not represent the same idea. The former is the receptacle of the wicked only, the latter is the receptacle of the spirits or bodies (as the case may be) of all mankind, good or bad. Certain it is, then, that two words so dissimilar ought not to be represented by one and the same English word. It would have greatly startled an English Christian to have read the words of Jacob to his son, thus: "You shall bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to HELL." And yet, *Sheol*, the Hebrew representative of *hades*, is there found. They have judiciously enough in this case, translated it GRAVE,

as they have 1 Cor. 15: 58—O, GRAVE, (not O, HELL), where is thy victory?

The spirit or soul of Jesus did not descend into HELL, as the church of Rome and our English Testament read it: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, nor wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption." Again, it would seem no less confounding to say of the rich man, that in hell he lifted up his eyes in torment; if it meant no more than the grave, or that in the grave he saw Lazarus in Abraham's bosom. For example, should we represent the matrimonial state by the word *hymenia*, and say of all persons, when married, they enter into *hymenia*, and that in *hymenia* some enjoyed happiness and others misery, might not many persons, ignorant of the meaning of *hymenia*, be not little confounded to comprehend what sort of a PLACE *Hymenia* was, in which some persons might be happy and others miserable? PLACE and STATE, in things terrestrial, are more easily distinguishable than in things not terrestrial. They sometimes tell us that we haven't the manliness to come out and tell the people that *Gehenna* was the proper name of a valley near Jerusalem. But suppose it did mean that (as it did), in the beginning; does it follow that it always continued to mean ONLY that, that it NEVER came to mean anything else? Mr. Skinner, a Universalist preacher, and high in authority in his denomination, says: "In process of time, *Gehenna*, and *Tophet*, another name for the same thing, were used in the Old Testament, FIGURATIVELY, to set forth the temporal but severe judgments coming upon the Jews." (Campbell and Skinner's Debate, page 120.) We should think they would have more discretion than to run against their own authorities, but they have not.

Parkhurst says: "*Gehenna* was, in our Savior's time used by the Jews for 'hell,' the place of the departed. This appears from the word being thus applied by the Chaldee targums, and by the Jerusalem targum, and by that of Jonathan Ben Uzziel. Clark gives an example, in connection

with Psalm 110, where the Chaldee targum, speaking of the tale-bearer, says: 'He shall be hunted by the angel of death, and thrust into *gehenna*.' " Now, *gehenna* can not be in this world, or men could kill and cast into it; nor can it be in the intermediate state, between death and the resurrection, because the soul and body will be separated; so beyond the resurrection *gehenna* must be; for death, that holds the body will be destroyed, and *hades* that holds the spirit, will yield up its victims, and in the resurrected state, body and soul will be re-united; and then, and not till then, can the casting of both body and soul into hell be possible.

In concluding this article I want to call attention to their mistake in rendering of Heb. 12: 10, where they claim the word *kolasis* occurs and means "pruning." This I deny. There is no place in the Scriptures where the word is used in that sense. Whenever chastisement is spoken of in the New Testament, the word used is not *kolasis*, but *paideia*, which is from *paideuo*, from which we have *pais*, "a child." They refer to Heb. 12: 10, as a text in which *kolasis* is used in the sense of pruning or chastising. But the word used there is not *kolasis*, but *paideuo*. Nothing is here for them then either.