

"I will ask of you one question, and answer me."

# QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

BY  
DAVID LIPSCOMB,  
EDITOR OF THE  
GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

EDITED BY  
J. W. SHEPHERD,  
OFFICE EDITOR OF THE  
GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

SECOND EDITION.

Nashville, Tenn.  
MCQUIDDY PRINTING COMPANY.  
1910.



*David Lipscomb*

Copyright, 1910,  
**BY**  
J. W. SHEPHERD.

# PREFACE

---

David Lipscomb began his editorial work on the Gospel Advocate, January 1, 1866; and from that time to the present not many issues, if any, have been published that did not contain something from his pen. During all these years the cardinal thought that he has always held and faithfully maintained has been to follow the will of God as expressed in precept or approved example. Guided by this principle, he took his position in favor of following the approved examples of the Scriptures as to how to get into Christ, worship God, and spread the gospel, and urged it with a zeal worthy of a faithful servant of the Lord. Through the working of this principle he has maintained an unwavering fidelity to his convictions of right in the face of the greatest opposition.

The matter contained in this volume has been gleaned from his answers to questions that have largely grown out of the maintenance of these convictions. After months of diligent work, I gathered a complete file of the Advocates, arranged them in order, went over them issue by issue, clipped the questions and answers, and filed them under proper topical headings. Having done this, I found an arduous task before me; for in numerous instances the same question had been answered many times, and in order to make the proper selection it was necessary to read them all very carefully. Sometimes it became necessary to select one answer and add to it several items from others to make it as full as he had given it.

The names of none of the querists are given, because the same question had been asked by different persons so many times in almost the same words that it would be disappointing to many who had asked the question to find the name of some one else signed to it. In such cases justice could not be done without giving the names of all who had asked the question, which in some instances would require the giving of as many as fifty names.

In regard to arrangement, I have been very careful to put the matter in such a form as to make it easy for the reader to locate any information given. To this end, it was decided, after much thought, to put it in the form of an encyclopedia,

transposing the headings so as to put the leading word first; then, in order to make it more convenient, a topical heading is frequently inserted, under which there is no discussion, but a cross reference is given to the subject under which it is discussed. And again, at the end of many articles I have given references in black type to other articles of a kindred nature to enable those desiring to more thoroughly study the subject to find the required information. Finally, in order to complete the arrangement for convenience, a scriptural index is added, giving a complete list of all scriptures explained, enabling one to readily turn to the page on which the desired information is given.

The scripture quotations are from both the Common Version and the American Revised Version. No credit is given except in rare instances, leaving the reader to ascertain which is used.

This book will do good only in proportion to the number of readers and the disposition to receive correction, instruction, consolation, and encouragement from one of God's noblest servants; and I send it forth with an earnest prayer that it may tend to the promotion of pure and undefined religion, help extend the knowledge of God, and be instrumental in aiding the glorious work of converting and edifying all who seek a habitation in "the city which hath the foundations, whose builder and maker is God."

Should this book meet with a hearty reception, it is my intention to publish another, containing his valuable editorials; and also his commentary on the Gospel of John and on all of the Epistles.

Nashville, Tenn., April 6, 1910.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "J. M. Shepherd". The signature is written in black ink and features a prominent, sweeping underline that extends to the right.

# QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

---

## **ABRAHAM, GOD'S COVENANT WITH.**

Was God's covenant with Abraham taken out of the way with the law and ordinances?

The covenant was twofold in its character. First, God said to Abraham: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." This promise certainly has never been taken out of the way, but in his seed, Christ, all the nations of the earth are being blessed. Secondly, God covenanted with Abraham to give him the land of Canaan for an everlasting inheritance for his children. His children are not in possession of the land of Canaan. This covenant was dependent upon the children of Abraham obeying God. They refused to do this. God's covenant clearly implied if they would not do this, he would drive them out of the land of Canaan and make of them an enslaved and scattered people. When they disobeyed him, the terms of the covenant obligated him to drive them out, to enslave, to disperse and scatter them. They refused to obey him; he has performed his covenant by driving them from the promised land, by scattering them among the nations. The wicked are the sword of the Lord. He used the wicked nations in driving them out of the promised land.

The law and the ordinances constituted no part of the covenant. The wickedness of the children of Abraham prevented the immediate coming of Christ and fulfillment of the promise. On account of these transgressions and the consequent postponement of the promised blessing, the law and ordinances were added as a schoolmaster to train them and make ready a people for the Lord. The law and ordinances were no part of the original covenant with Abraham. (Gal. 3: 17-19.) They grew out of the violation of the covenant by the children of Israel, and had to be taken out of the way before the covenant based on the promise of the blessing to all nations could be fulfilled. I do not see that the removal of the law and ordinances in any way affected the force of the covenants, otherwise than to give to this one immediate effect.

The covenant guaranteeing the land of Canaan to the family for a perpetual inheritance has been broken—was broken by the transgressions that necessitated the giving of the law and the ordinances. Whether the break has been final and complete, I cannot tell. Many think yet there will be a return of the Jews to the land of Canaan, and every few years there is a talk of the hold the wealthy Jews are getting on the land by loans to the government controlling the land. If they ever return, it will be after they have turned to the Lord. They were driven from it on account of their transgressions, and until their transgressions cease they cannot return to it. From the general purport of scripture, and from the fact of the preservation of the Jews as a distinct people, I think God has a work for them as a people to fill in the world's history; but whether there will be a literal return to Jerusalem or whether they will come into the inheritance of spiritual Israel, with its blessings and favors, I pretend not to decide. An earnest effort ought to be made to bring the Jews to Christ.

### **ADAM, WHAT DEATH DID, DIE?**

God said to Adam: "For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." What kind of death did he mean?

There are two theories that are plausible, and I sometimes find myself holding to the one, then again cherishing the other. One is that man was sentenced to die, and Jesus Christ offered his life to redeem him, so obtained a respite and gave him an opportunity to live in Christ and as his servant. In accordance with this, Christ is said to be "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," and "was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times." The other idea is that he did become a dying, suffering, perishing being, cut off from the tree of life the day he sinned. Possibly they are both true. The death was both physical and spiritual; it affected the whole man.

### **ADDED TO THE CHURCH, HOW?**

The senior elder of our congregation takes the following position, which we wish to submit to your consideration: That faith, repentance, confession, and baptism prepare a person for addition to the church; or, in other words, when a person submits to all these, then God adds him to the church or translates him into the kingdom of God's dear Son. I argued with him that these conditions put a man

into the church, or kingdom, of God. In proof of his position he cites Acts 2:47; 5: 14; 11: 24; Col. 1: 12, 13.

God has two ways of doing things—one, directly by his own unseen power; the other, by or through persons as his servants, agents, or instrumentalities. When he works through the former manner, man has nothing to do, save to stand still and see the salvation of the Lord. In the latter way of work, God directs and man obeys. We can see and understand what is done. Now if God adds persons to the church by the former manner, no man can do anything in the matter. God decrees it by the fiat of his will without act on the part of the person added or of others. If by the second method, then he must give directions to somebody what and how to do it. Has he given any directions as to when or how this shall be done, save the things commanded them to bring them into Christ? If so, what are the directions and where are they found? God works through his own appointments, and not through man's. If he adds persons to the church by other means than those that bring them into Christ, he has not directed how it is done. If we add them by means of our own appointment, God does not do it. When a man is in Christ and a member of his body, he is such wherever he goes. The different congregations are manifestations of one and the same church. When a man goes to a congregation, he is entitled to the privileges and incurs the responsibilities, because he is a member of the body of Christ. Letters of commendation neither dismiss from nor add to a congregation. They certify the person is a member of the body of Christ and to be received as such. There is such a thing as the hand of fellowship. It is nowhere used to add to a congregation. It was given by the apostles at Jerusalem to Paul and Barnabas, who lived in a distant country, when leaving Jerusalem for their work. It was given as an approval and Godspeed in their work. (Gal. 2:9.) I can give a Christian the hand of fellowship who belongs to a different congregation as freely as if he worshiped at the same congregation with me. I can give the hand of fellowship when he comes among us or when he leaves us, if he is a Christian. But this is not to add him to the church. If he is a Christian, he is a member of the body of Christ wherever he goes. See Letters of Commendation.



**ADDING TO OR TAKING FROM GOD'S WORD.**

Rotherham translates the last clause of Rev. 22: 19, "things which are written in this scroll." Does that mean the book of Revelation only, or does it refer to the New Testament?

I think it probable that only the book of Revelation is referred to in this passage. This shows that this book was made equally sacred with other scriptures. This prohibition to add to or take from the word of God was given to all the commands of God. It was often repeated in the law of Moses. "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish from it, that ye may keep the commandments of Jehovah your God which I command you." (Deut. 4: 2, American Revised Version.) "What thing soever I command you, that shall ye observe to do: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." (Deut. 12: 32, American Revised Version.) These are general declarations showing these prohibitions to be true of all scriptures of God. This is often repeated under various forms in the Old Testament. He tells, them the laws of the New Testament are much more sacred than those of the Old Testament. "For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven." (Heb. 12: 25; see also Heb. 2: 2, 3.) The same warning is given: "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." (Matt. 15: 9.) "Every plant, which my Heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up. Let them alone: they be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch." (Verses 13, 14; see also Col. 2: 20-22.) The supreme authority and inviolable sanctity of the word of God in all its parts are taught of all parts of that word, especially of that dedicated by the blood of Christ.

**ALTAR, LEAVE THY GIFT BEFORE THE.**

Please give us a full explanation of Matt. 5: 23, 24: "Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." Does this scripture apply to the children of God now or not? If so, what is the gift that we are to offer? It is denied by some that this is applicable to the people of God now, because they say we have no altar on which to make our offerings, nor gifts or sacrifices or offerings to make.

An altar is the place where God meets man. No one can approach God save through an altar. The earthly altars of the patriarchal and Jewish ages all typified and pointed forward to Jesus Christ, who is our altar. "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle. . . . By him [Jesus, our altar] therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to his name." (Heb. 13: 10-15.) Jesus Christ is our altar, and we can meet God only in coming to him as our altar; and all the offerings of prayer, praise, and service of every and all kinds that we bring to God must be in and through our altar, Jesus Christ. "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." (Rom. 12: 1.) "But I have all, and abound: I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odor of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God." (Phil. 4: 18.) "By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to his name." (Heb. 13: 15.) In these the thanksgiving and praise of the lips, to do good, and all service to God are called "sacrifice.":' Ye [Christians] also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." (1 Pet. 2: 5.) All the service we render is sacrifice, and must be offered upon our altar, Jesus Christ. In this passage (Matt. 5: 23, 24) the gifts offered at the altar of God under the Jewish law are used to illustrate a principle held sacred and required by Jesus Christ. It clearly means that you cannot make acceptable offerings to God when you have wronged your brother until you go and correct that wrong so far as you are able to do it. If you have cheated or defrauded him, go and restore the wrong, or, if you are not able to do this, confess the wrong and ask his forgiveness—be reconciled to him. If you have slandered, insulted, or in any way wronged him, go and confess and undo the wrong to the extent of your ability. Ask his forgiveness and be reconciled to him. Until you do this, God will not accept an offering at your hand. He will not accept your gifts, your prayers, your thanksgivings, or any service you bring him. A sister recently put the question to me: "Will God accept the

service of a person while he is guilty of one unforgiven sin?" Why should any being rest with even one unforgiven sin? Repent of it, turn from it, undo the wrong, clear your conscience, and then God will accept your service. So long as we refuse to repent and seek forgiveness for every sin, God refuses to accept our service. This, of course, means a conscious sin. "He that offends in one point is guilty of all." Solomon says: "To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice." (Prov. 21: 3.) While he failed to do justice to his fellow-man, no one could make an acceptable sacrifice to God. Hence, when an offering was made for a trespass against a fellow-man, it must be preceded by a restitution for the wrong done, with a fifth added thereto, "If a soul sin, and commit a trespass against the Lord, and lie unto his neighbor in that which was delivered him to keep, or in fellowship, or in a thing taken away by violence, or hath deceived his neighbor; or have found that which was lost, and lieth concerning it, and sweareth falsely; in any of all these that a man doeth, sinning therein: then it shall be, because he hath sinned, and is guilty, that he shall restore that which he took violently away, or the thing which he hath deceitfully gotten, or that which was delivered him to keep, or the lost thing which he found, or all that about which he hath sworn falsely; he shall even restore it in the principal, and shall add the fifth part more thereto, and give it unto him to whom it appertained:, in the day of his trespass offering." (Lev. 6: 2-5; read also the following verses.) This passage of scripture clearly teaches that there is no forgiveness without restitution, and that God required a fifth part added thereto. Of the same meaning is this passage: "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord: but the prayer of the upright is his delight." (Prov. 15: 8.) God cannot hear a man's prayers or accept of any offering that he brings, so long as he leaves a wrong against a fellow-man uncorrected. (Read Isa. 1: 11-20; also, 6, 7, and 8.) Jesus Christ demands holiness with increased emphasis. With what measure you mete, God will measure to you. "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." (Matt. 25: 40.) Then this passage under consideration clearly says that if you bring the gift unto the altar (Christ; we can approach God only through him as our altar) and there re-

member that you have wronged your brother or that he has aught against you, leave there thy gift, be reconciled to thy brother by undoing the wrong thou hast done him; then come and offer thy gift of prayer, praise, supplication, or contribution of money or personal service to God, and he will accept the offering through Christ, our altar. "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" Love, as used in the Bible, is not a mere sentiment, but a practical doing good and serving. No man loves his brother who refuses to correct a wrong done his brother. So he says that he that claims to love God and serve God while he is doing wrong to his brother is a liar. As long as a man refuses to rectify a wrong done to another, he hates, instead of loves, him. God will not, cannot, accept service from a man that has wronged another and refuses to correct that wrong.

### AMUSEMENTS.

What does the Bible teach us as parents about letting our children go to play parties and candy breakings? Can a member of the church find any scripture that will bear him out in giving a candy breaking at his house? If so, please give chapter and verse. As for myself, I do not believe that there is one verse that will bear him out in giving one. If there is, I never have been able to see it that way. I ask you these questions that I may get all the light on them that the Bible gives and that it may do good here in this world and also in the world to come.

The Scriptures say nothing about play parties or candy breakings (whatever that is). But the Scriptures nowhere deny all amusement and recreation to children. It is not anticipated this should be done. Paul said to Christians: "If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye be disposed to go; whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no question." (1 Cor. 10: 27.) This clearly intimates that feasts at the houses of idolaters may be attended if care be taken not to encourage the idolatry. To deprive children of all amusements is not wise. It is much better that parents furnish and attend the amusements to see they are kept within proper bounds than to let the children go where they will be led into excesses. A Christian parent may attend and hold at his house any parties it is proper for his children to attend. In saying

this, we recognize the danger of these statements being used to justify excesses that are wrong.

### ANGELS, FALLEN.

Please give an explanation of 2 Pet. 2: 4: "For if God spared not angels when they sinned, but cast them down to hell, and committed them to pits of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment."

Three words are translated **hell** in the Bible—Hades, Gehenna, and Tartarus. Hades refers to the unseen state generally. This unseen state was supposed to contain two apartments, or conditions—the good and the bad. Paradise was supposed to represent the good state; Tartarus, the evil. The good spirits were supposed to go into paradise; the evil, into Tartarus—to await the final sentence. Then the good went to heaven; the evil, to hell—the final abode of the two classes. The word Tartarus is used in this passage in 2 Pet. This would indicate the fallen angels occupy the condition of the evil spirits until the final separation. Bloomfield says: "Tartarus being a part of Hades, in which criminals were supposed to be confined till the day of judgment. Now they are not represented as being in actual torments, but only adjudged to them, and in the meantime committed to the security of chains of darkness—i. e., to places where utter darkness holds them, as it were, enchained." The idea seems to be that some angels in heaven sinned. They were cast down from heaven to earth. (See Rev. 12.) They are as disembodied spirits in this world, which is the state of the dead. Many think these angels cast down from heaven constitute the demons of the time of Jesus. While adjudged unworthy of heaven and cast out into the outer darkness, they have not yet been assigned to the last final punishment of the wicked. At the judgment they will enter into the final state of woe. This accords with the language of the demons to Jesus: "Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" (Matt. 8:29.) They knew the day of torment would be in the day of judgment; and when Jesus cast them out, they seemed to think he would torment them before that time. Jude states the same truth: "And angels that kept not their own principality, but left their proper habitation, he hath kept in everlasting bonds under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." (Verse 6.) Heaven was their own principality. They sinned, and did not keep it; so they are kept in bonds under darkness, the darkness of

the unseen world, unto the last, final judgment, when they, with the spirits of the finally impenitent, will enter the final state of the lost. There was rebellion in heaven, as there now is on earth. The rebellion was suppressed. The devil and his angels were cast out. They came to earth, and will be cast out from it and find their home in the place prepared for the devil and his angels. See **Satan**.

### ANGELS, GUARDIAN.

Is the idea that men are attended by guardian angels in this world taught in the Scriptures?

We do not know of any passage that so teaches, yet many excellent brethren think they find this taught in the Scriptures. The passage most confidently relied on to teach this idea is: "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" (Heb. 1: 14.) This is construed to mean that angels are sent into this world to guard and watch over and hold back from sin the children of God. Many maintain that each Christian has his guardian angel, that accompanies him and guards him, holds him back from paths of evil and leads him in the ways of righteousness. If we examine the scope and connection of this passage, I think we will see it does not teach this. It is a part of the contrast between the Jewish and the Christian dispensations. The one came through the hands of angels, the other was introduced by the Son of God. God shows the superiority of Christ to the angels: "To which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool? Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" Jesus was to sit on the right hand of God until his enemies were put under his feet. The angels were to minister to, or serve, those who are heirs of salvation. But when and how did they so serve? The next verses show this: "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord?" (Heb. 2: 1-4.) Then, in verse 5, he returns to his superiority to the angels. The context

seems to place it beyond doubt that the angels ministered to the heirs of salvation in bringing and administering the Mosaic law. That law was the schoolmaster to train the Jews for Christ, and the angels served them in administering that law. This is all that this passage teaches.

"Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, That in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." (Matt. 18: 10.) This is relied on to prove it; but for this to have any bearing on the subject, it must be first assumed that persons have guardian angels—the question under investigation. It may be the spirits of persons after death become angels, and those who humble themselves as little children in the future state become angels and stand nearest the throne of God. This would be more consoling than the other idea. Is there any ground for supposing the redeemed spirits become angels? Jesus said: "In the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven." This does not say they become angels, but it does say they become as angels—are conformed to their state in important particulars.

"For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit: but the Pharisees confess both." (Acts 23: 8.) Jesus and the apostles seem to accept the idea of the Pharisees as the true one. This resurrection of the angel seems to mean that when resurrected they were angels.

"And they said unto her, Thou art mad. But she constantly affirmed that it was even so. Then said they, It is his angel." (Acts 12: 15.) This was when Peter was imprisoned. The disciples prayed for his safety, and Rhoda told them he was at the door. Many think this meant his guardian angel assumed his likeness and they thought the angel appeared in his place. This is again assuming the point in question without any proof of its truth. It seems to me these people thought Peter had been slain in prison, and his spirit, as an angel, had appeared.

"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.) This tells the destiny of the spirits of the wicked after death is a home in the place prepared for the devil and his angels. If their home is with the devil and his angels, it is probable that they become angels

of the devil. If the wicked become angels of the devil, is it not probable the righteous become angels of God?

These are the only scriptures that occur to me as having any bearing on the subject I do not think, when properly construed, they even suggest the idea; hence I find no proof whatever of the idea. If Christians or others have guardian angels, what do they do for them? Do they suggest thoughts? When a thought comes into the mind, how can we tell whether it was suggested by an angel or not? Are we not liable to accept evil suggestions as made by the angels? Who is responsible for our actions, ourselves or our guardian angels? It seems to be fraught with the same danger that direct spiritual influence is. We are liable to attribute our fleshly emotions and desires to the guardian angel. Does the angel make suggestions or exert an influence and give us no rule by which to test when the influence is from the angel or from something else? When man sins, who is responsible—the man or the angel? In the parable of the man who sowed good seed and evil plants grew in the field (Matt. 13: 24-30), the servants, who were the angels, asked: Shall we gather up the evil plants? He said: No; let them grow together until the harvest; then the reapers will separate them. This seems to me to teach that there will be no superhuman interference with men until the judgment. I do not find the idea taught. It seems attended with some evil. It is best not to teach it.

### ANNIHILATION.

Is the following argument, used by those who teach that the wicked shall be annihilated, scriptural? If not, how would you answer it? God planted the tree of life in the midst of the garden, giving him (Adam) the right to eat of it and all the trees of the garden, save one. (See Gen. 2: 9.) "In the day that thou eatest thereof [of the tree of knowledge] thou shalt surely die." (Gen. 2: 17.) "She took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat." (Gen. 3: 6.) "And the Lord God said. Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever: therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life." (Gen. 3: 22-24.) Thus we find old Father Adam outside the garden, with his wife, without a taste of the fruit of the tree of life, which God, in his mercy, guarded with a flaming sword, lest they should eat thereof and live forever. Nothing was left them but toil and sorrow and death (the opposite of life), save the one ray of hope found in Gen. 3: 15—the only hope for the now fallen,



dying race—viz., the dim outline of a promise of a ransom, a Redeemer, who said: "I am the way, the truth, and the life." (John 14: 6.) Let us look at a few of the "exceeding great and precious promises" to the righteous—those who love God and obey his commands, taking Christ as their Ransomer, Redeemer, High Priest, and Judge. (John 3: 16, 17; 1 John 5: 12, 13; Ps. 37: 18, 19; Matt. 18: 14; John 11: 22-30.) See the latter clause of Rom. 6: 23—God's best gift to man—"eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord"—the only name under heaven, or among men, whereby sinful man may attain to eternal life. (Isa. 35: 10; 51: 11; Matt. 19: 29; Luke 18: 28-30; John 20: 30, 31; 4: 14; 5: 24, 25; Rom. 6: 22.) Every promise ever made to mankind of life eternal, or life everlasting, was made through Christ, who was the promised ransom who should redeem his people from their sins. This accomplished, what will become of those who finally reject him and turn their faces away from the only hope ever given to the fallen race—redemption through Christ? Let us see if God has made us a revelation, and left us in the dark on this point. We read: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." (Ezek. 18: 4; see also Acts 3: 22, 23; 1 John 3: 8; 3: 15; Ps. 1: 6; 37: 10, 18-20; 49; Luke 13: 3-5; 2 Pet. 3: 9, 10; Nah. 1; Mal. 4: 1-3.) From Rom. 6: 23 we learn that "the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." (Prov. 10: 25; John 3: 36.) See Acts 13: 46, where the Jews counted themselves unworthy of everlasting life, and Paul turned from them to the Gentiles. (Gal. 6: 7, 8; 2 Thess. 1: 8, 9; Rev. 21: 6-8.)

The scriptures quoted prove men will die away from the tree of life, which is found in Christ. Most certainly they do. But is death annihilation? The writer assumes it is, and assumes when persons die they are annihilated—that is, he assumes the very point he undertakes to prove. Where is death in the Bible or by God represented as annihilation? If death means annihilation, all who die are annihilated. Christ died. Was he annihilated? Moses and Elijah died. Were they annihilated? If not, death cannot mean annihilation. If it means annihilation, every one who dies must be annihilated. If any one dies who is not annihilated, then death does not mean annihilation, and that people die does not prove they are annihilated. This shows beyond doubt that the assertion that they die does not prove they are annihilated. If people are annihilated, cease to exist, they cannot be raised or resurrected. If they cease to be, or are annihilated, there is no body, no person, nothing to resurrect. If once they are annihilated, they must be created again, if they ever exist. But they are nowhere said to be created again if they once die. They are said to be raised. The same person that dies is raised; it is changed, but the same person.

The rich man and Lazarus both died. One was good; the other, wicked. Neither was annihilated by death. They both

existed after death in the spirit land—one in bliss, the other in torment. The death of the righteous translated him into a state of bliss; the death of the wicked translated him into a state of torment. "I am tormented in this flame" was his piteous cry. He was not annihilated. Some may say they are annihilated by the second death. How is this proved? The first death does not annihilate; why should the second? The second death is a repetition of the first, only it adds another degree, and is hopeless, since from it there is no resurrection. If death does not annihilate, a thousand deaths could not annihilate a single soul.

The truth is, death does not mean annihilation, does not lead to annihilation, has no connection with it, and the fact that persons die does not have the least bearing on the question as to whether they are annihilated or not.

Christ said: "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.) Both the just and the unjust will be raised from the dead. Then death did not annihilate either. The unjust are raised to damnation. Damnation means condemnation to the second death. But if they existed after the first death, why not after the second? The second death is a state of punishment. Into this they go finally and forever by the second death. That state into which they go by the second death is described by the Savior: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. . . . These shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." (Matt. 25: 41-46.) It is the same word translated everlasting describing the punishment that is translated eternal with life. The second death passes the wicked into a state that lasts as long as the state into which the righteous go. The same word describes the duration of both. Again Christ says: "The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." (Matt. 13: 41, 42.) Again he says: "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." (Mark 9: 44.)

There is nothing in that that looks like annihilation. John said: "And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." (Rev. 14: 11.) And in the last chapter, after describing the future joys of the good around the throne of God, he says: "For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie." (Rev. 22: 15.)

We are unable to find a remote allusion to annihilation in connection with the future of the wicked.

Paul says of the wicked: "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints." (2 Thess. 1: 9, 10.) That does not say the man himself shall be destroyed; it says when Christ shall come to be glorified of his saints, these wicked persons shall be punished with a destruction from his presence that shall be everlasting. The thing that shall be destroyed is not the man, but his presence with God shall be destroyed. His presence with God will be destroyed forever. The destruction of this presence with God will be his punishment from God's presence forever. Destruction does not mean annihilation. To destroy means to pull down or demolish, so that as a structure it no longer exists. To destroy man from the presence of God means to destroy the arrangement by which his presence with God was maintained.

The whole trouble arises over a misconception of the meaning of death. Death does not mean annihilation. It means the separation of the spirit, the vital principle, from the body.

Temporal death is the separation of the spirit or living principle from the body. Spiritual death means the separation of soul and body from God, the vitalizing principle of spiritual life. Eternal death is the final and everlasting separation of soul and body from the presence and glory of God. Thus separated, it is not annihilated. It is subject to perpetual and eternal suffering. Nothing looking toward annihilation is found in the Bible when we rightly use terms. This idea is not found in the Bible. Whence does it come? It comes from a disposition to mitigate rebellion against God and to find a softer punishment than God has prescribed. Why

should this be done? Is man too fearful of sinning against God? Lighten the sin and ameliorate the suffering, and will it make men dread sin and rebellion more? We may well suspect our position and our spirit when we find ourselves excusing sin or ameliorating the woes that come from sin against God. See **Future Punishment**.

**ANOINTING WITH OIL.** See **Divine Healing; Mormon Pretensions (5, 6)**.

### **ANTITYPES.**

Aaron typified Christ. Who did his sons typify, and who did the Levites typify? The sons were priests, the Levites were servants to the priests; but whom did each typify? Again, I find nothing in regard to the age at which the priests should begin to serve; yet Christ, the antitype of Aaron, began at the age of thirty. How is this? Next, we find that the Levites were to be numbered for service, under the priests, from the age of twenty-five up to fifty. (Num. 8: 24.) In Num. 4 it is stipulated that the Kohathites, Gershonites, and Merarites were to serve from thirty years old to fifty. Why this difference?

I do not think our brother will ever be able to make out what he is trying—an antitype in the Christian dispensation for every person, character, and office in the Jewish dispensation. Indeed, it is not safe to rely with certainty on these types, except where the Holy Spirit has pointed them out as existing. No one person in Jewish order typified in all points its antitype of the Christian institution. Aaron typified Christ as a priest; Moses, as a lawgiver and mediator; David, as a king. I sometimes think each prophet, priest, and king of Judaism typified some one quality or character of Christ, but I never could make many of them out.

The priests typify Christians, so do the kings. "Ye are a royal nation, a holy priesthood." "Royal nation" means a nation of kings. But if the priests and kings, the highest orders of the Jewish people, typify the lowest order of the Christian kingdom, how can the lower orders of Judaism typify anything in the church of Christ?

The priests were from infancy raised in the temple service. They inherited the succession from their fathers. At what period they performed the priestly functions is not told. Possibly there was no specific age, but they were competent at any

time, and the necessities of the case determined the time. From 1 Chron. 23: 27 it appears that they served at twenty.

### **APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS.**

The following paragraph is a part of an article published in the Bakerville Review:

"Some days ago I chanced to be reading Cain's 'Tennessee Justice,' when at Section 880 I found reference to the foundation of the practice of putting witnesses 'under rule,' as it is termed in lawsuits. He (Cain) referred to Dan. 13. As I was anxious to know something of the origin of this practice, I got my Bible, and, turning to the book of Daniel, found that it has only twelve chapters, neither of which gives the desired information. I went to a Catholic neighbor and asked permission to examine his Bible, which he readily granted. Turning to the book of Daniel, I found fourteen chapters, chapter 13 giving the information as stated by Mr Cain. For my own satisfaction, I then examined the number of books in the Old Testament (Catholic), and found that it contains forty-six books, with ten hundred and seventy-three chapters; while our Old Testament (Holman) contains only thirty-nine books, and not so many chapters as the Catholic Old Testament. Now, in compiling what is known as the Protestant Bible from the original, or Catholic, Bible, why should not all of it have been taken instead of only a part? If a part of it was good, why was it not all good? Why should Dan. 13 and 14 be left out, while the other twelve chapters are put in? Why should 3 Kings and 4 Kings be refused, while 1 Kings and 2 Kings are taken? Why should 1 Maccabees and 2 Maccabees be rejected entirely, as were others? In view of all this, has anything been added to or taken from the word of God? I do not know. Verily, man knows little."

Now, as I know that you are competent to explain this, I ask you to do so, and shall await with interest your answer.

The Protestant, or common, Bible was not derived from the Catholic one; it is the translation from an older text than the Catholic is. The Old Testament was written in Hebrew; the latter portions of it, in a later form of the Hebrew, the Aramaic. The Hebrew greatly went out of use about two centuries before Christ. A version in the Greek, the then current language of Western Asia, Europe, and Northern Africa, was made. This was called the "Septuagint," from the number of persons engaged in the translation. This Greek version was used generally by the Greek-speaking people until the beginning of the fifth century A.D. Then a Latin version of both the Old Testament and the New Testament was compiled by Jerome. This version is commonly known as the "Vulgate," and is the basis of the present Catholic version of the New Testament. When God first gave the law, he required it to be placed in the side of the ark, and it was watched over and guarded by the Jews with jealous care. Additions

were made to these writings by Joshua and Samuel and David and Solomon, and the records of the kingdom of Judah and Israel were kept by the kings, and from these were compiled, as is believed, by Jeremiah, the two books of Samuel and two books of Kings. The four books of Kings of the Catholic version are the same as the two books of Samuel and the two books of Kings of our Common Version. Then Ezra doubtless translated these into the Chaldee (or Aramaic) language, and compiled the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, with the later prophecies. These were regarded as the sacred, inspired, and canonical books of the Old Testament by the Jews. This collection, as made by Ezra, is given as the list of sacred books by Josephus and all Jewish writers. They constituted the Old Testament as we have it in the Common Version.

None of the additions of the Catholic version were in the Hebrew text, nor are they yet regarded by the Jews as part of the sacred text. These added books and the added chapters to Daniel and Esther are sometimes published in the common Bibles, but are always separated and called "The Apocrypha." These writings of the Apocrypha were written in Greek by Jews, and some of the writings are regarded as fairly correct histories of the efforts of the Jews to maintain their independence after the close of the Old Testament writings, before the coming of Christ. There were a number of these writings, and they were regarded as helpful as histories and for example, but were not regarded inspired. The Greek version of the Old Testament was used until the beginning of the fifth century A.D. During the ages from the birth of Christ to the compiling of this version a number of writings had been made by prominent Christians, that some claimed as sacred. It was a period of ignorance and darkness. Jerome compiled out of the mass the true inspired Scriptures of the New Testament, that from the beginning all Christians regarded as inspired, and rejected all others. This was, no doubt, at the time, the best and purest collection of the New Testament Scriptures.

There arose a dispute in the churches as to the text of the Old Testament. None doubted what is now embraced in our common Bible, but how this mass of writings known as "The Apocrypha" should be regarded was a question of discussion for several hundred years. The undisputed portions were

called the "proto-canonical;" the Apocrypha, the "deuterocanonical" Scriptures. None regarded them as equally inspired. Finally the Catholic Church, by a vote of its council (A.D. 1546), ordered them all to be published in the book and to be regarded as canonical. Up to this time their own scholars rejected this, as scholars among them still do, but submit to the decree of the council.

The Protestants cling to the old Hebrew text and reject all these apocryphal additions to the Old Testament. If any one will carefully read these apocryphal additions, he will see the difference in style between them and the inspired writings. In the inspired writings an elevated and impartial style of writing is preserved even in telling the simplest matters; only the essential points are given in few words. The style of the apocryphal writings lacks this elevated style of impartiality, and, like merely human production of a dark age, indulges in non-essential particulars. The additions to the Catholic Bible are of recent date and apocryphal.

### **APOSTATIZE, CAN THE CHILD OF GOD?**

Please explain Matt. 24: 24; John 10: 28, 29; 1 John 2: 19. Do these scriptures teach the impossibility of the child of God falling? There are some Baptists here that say they do so teach.

I do not think they do. The reason I think so is that these passages are not very clear as to their teaching, while other passages very clearly and plainly teach that the child of God can sin and fall away and be lost. Jesus says false Christs and false prophets shall arise and do wonders and signs, so as to deceive, if possible, even the very elect. (Matt. 24: 24.) That does not say a child of God cannot fall away. Many children of God may fall away and not be counted among the elect. "No man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." (John 10: 29.) The Bible teaches everywhere that if a man is faithful no power can snatch him from the protection of God, but that is very different from saying a child of God cannot be unfaithful to God. Then God will thrust him away, spew him out of his mouth, and reject him. In 1 John 2: 19 it is said certain ones went out from them because they were not the true disciples, or the persevering disciples. They lacked steadfastness, and their going out showed this lack of steadfastness before the day of judgment. This does not say they were never believers. "If a man abide not in me, he is

cast forth as a branch, and is withered; . . . and they are burned." (John 15: 6.) Paul labored to keep under his body, lest he "should be a castaway." (1 Cor. 9: 27.) Read Gal. 5: 4; 2 Tim. 2: 13; Heb. 6:4-6; 10: 26-29; 2 Pet. 2: 20-22. Individuals fell; whole churches (Rev. 2:4, 5; 3: 15-18), whole nations (Ezek. 18: 21-28), fell from their steadfastness. Indeed, the whole Bible is a warning of God to his people of the danger of turning into sin, falling away from God, and being rejected by him. Just read some of these passages and ask these people to harmonize their teaching with them. Adam and Eve are both examples of falling away from God. A theory that cannot be harmonized with the plain teaching of the Bible is false. See **Falling Away, Danger Of.**

### **APOSTLES, WERE THE, BAPTIZED?**

Were the apostles ever baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus? If so, when? We understand that this does not excuse us in any way from being baptized.

There is no doubt but what the apostles of the Lord were baptized by John the Baptist. John baptized that he might make manifest Jesus as the Christ. "Then went out unto him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about the Jordan; and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins." (Matt. 3: 5, 6.) In John 1 we find that Jesus selected disciples from among those of John. In verses 35-42, two of John's disciples followed Jesus. Andrew and Peter became his disciples. On the next day two others, Philip and Nathanael, followed Jesus. Jesus chose all of the twelve from among those baptized by John. Peter, after the resurrection, said one who took the place of Judas must have been with them from the baptism of John to the ascension of Jesus. Peter asked, Which of these two men which have journeyed with us from the baptism of John hast thou chosen? showing they all began with the baptism of John. (Acts 1: 21-26.) They were not baptized in the name of Jesus, because they were baptized before he began his public ministry or had been recognized as the Son of God. But of the disciples of John it was said: "But as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name." (John 1: 12.) There can be no doubt that the apostles were baptized of John. But it is hardly probable that John was ever baptized. But this



does not mean others could be saved without baptism. Before Christ, men were saved without believing on Christ; but after he came it is true that he that believes not in Christ is condemned already, because he believes not in him.

### **APOSTLES, DOES THE TESTIMONY OF THE GOSPELS APPLY TO ANY BUT?**

There are members of the church of Christ at this place who claim that the teaching of Christ, as recorded by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, applies only to the apostles, and not one word of it applies to us in this age. Will you kindly give your views on the subject?

I have once or twice in life heard that idea suggested, but am entirely at a loss to know from what it is drawn or why it should be held. Very little of the teaching of Jesus was addressed to the apostles alone. Usually Jesus taught the apostles and others with them. Then he told the apostles they were to "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." (Matt. 28: 19, 20.) Here he commands the apostles to teach others who were baptized to observe all that he taught them. Then, to carry out this part of the commission, he told them the Holy Spirit "shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." (John 14: 26.) Then the apostles, in teaching others, did command others to follow all that Jesus commanded them to do, unless it was some incidental commands given to them in telling them to tarry at Jerusalem or directing them how to act when the Spirit came. I know of no principle of action or manner of life given by Jesus to the apostles that is not repeated by them to other disciples; I know of not one duty laid on the apostles that was not repeated to the disciples. Paul told them to follow him as he followed Christ. Christ was the great Example, not for the apostles alone, but for all Christians in all ages and countries of the world. Does any one know why an apostle should be a better Christian than any other follower of Christ? I do not. The aim was to fit all the followers of Christ to dwell with him. The idea that he had one set of rulers for one class and another set of rulers for a different class is contrary to the teaching of the Bible, and without reason, so far as I know. We are to be governed by the same moral and spiritual truths that his personal fol-

lowers were, and it is important that we be schooled to the same standard of likeness to the character of Jesus as his apostles were. He schools and trains us here that we may be fitted to dwell with him there. If we are not schooled as they were, we are not fitted to dwell with him and enjoy the home and blessings as they were; and we are so much the worse off by the lack of training. That would be to treat us worse than he treated them. But he is no respecter of persons. The idea is hurtful to man. It is put forward to excuse men of this age from faithful obedience to God's will, from full conformity to his character, which would leave them unfitted for his highest blessings, and it makes a false and unjust impression concerning God.

### **ASK, AND IT SHALL BE GIVEN.**

What is meant by saying: "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you?" (Matt. 7: 7.) To whom is he talking?

It seems to me three plainer sentences cannot be found in the Bible. They mean exactly what they say, meaning always, as Christ so often declares, that we shall ask according to God's will, seek where he has directed, and knock at his appointed door, and the blessings asked, sought, and knocked for shall be obtained. There is nothing mysterious or singular or difficult to understand that I can see. This is laid down as a general principle. Many specific directions involving this same principle with the modifications are presented in the Bible.

"If we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us." (1 John 5: 14.) "Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss." (James 4: 3.) "Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able. . . . Ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us; and he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are." (Luke 13: 24, 25.) These show that the asking, seeking, and knocking must be done according to the will of God, else they cannot meet the promise.

### **ASSISTING OTHERS TO DO WRONG.**

We have a young woman in the church here who left her husband without a Bible reason. She is now seeking a divorce. Her lawyer

is an elder in the church. Can he find any scriptural reason for this act? And is he worthy the place of elder if he persists in carrying this matter to a finish?

Jesus said: "It is impossible but that occasions of stumbling should come; but woe unto him, through whom they come! It were well for him if a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were thrown into the sea, rather than that he should cause one of these little ones to stumble." (Luke 17: 1, 2; read also Matt. 18: 7, 8; Mark 9: 42.) These passages clearly mean that a Christian had better directly disobey the command of God than to help or encourage another, and especially a weak and erring member, to do it. If it is wrong for this sister to separate from her husband or to marry again, the brother who encourages or helps her to do it is more guilty in the sight of God than she is. Let us understand, a lawyer may be consulted by a Christian man or woman in such cases, but he ought to advise to follow the law of God. The law of God with every Christian should stand higher and above all other laws. Sometimes conditions may be such that it is necessary for married people to live apart, but the Christian should do nothing to separate them or to hinder a union if it becomes practical. Paul says: "Unto the married I give charge, yea not I, but the Lord, That the wife depart not from her husband (but should she depart, let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband); and that the husband leave not his wife." (1 Cor. 7: 10, 11.) This passage undoubtedly teaches that the believer is to take no steps to hinder the restoration of the marriage relations, but to be ready and to seek to restore them. Divorce is intended to make the separation permanent and to make unlawful marriages possible. No married Christian can do this, and it is a greater sin for another Christian to urge this on one troubled with evil surroundings. It seems to me none can fail to see the Scriptures teach this. A lawyer is no more at liberty to recommend a sinful course than a preacher or other Christian. The question frequently arises: Can a Christian practice law? As lawyers usually practice, it is difficult to say he can. I know lawyers who have great trouble along these lines. If a lawyer will be governed by principles of right and make it a rule to ask or insist on that which is right, and refuse to go farther, then the practice of law would be elevating and purifying. When a lawyer asks all he can get for his client, regardless

of right or wrong, he works evil. He is a corrupter of both himself and the public morals. The tendency with lawyers in their practice is to run into this evil. And God will punish all violations of right by lawyers as rigidly as if the wrong was done personally for themselves. A Christian must be governed by the love of Christ in all he says or does. See **Marriage and Divorce**.

### **ASSOCIATING WITH SINNERS IN BUSINESS.**

How far can we as Christians associate with sinners in our business without doing violence to our Christian profession? That you may fully understand the point I am driving at, I will specify a little. Brother A is running an express wagon for a living. Is it right for him to haul intoxicating liquor to and from the liquor house? Brother B's business is selling sewing machines. Can he afford to go among that low class of women to sell his machines? Or can Brother C, who makes his living with his dray, afford to move these women from house to house? And is it right for me, as a carpenter, to build a house that I know will be occupied by them or for a saloon? As these are practical, everyday affairs, with which we have to deal, we would like to have your opinion concerning them.

Paul says: "I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators: yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolators; for then must ye needs go out of the world. But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such a one no not to eat. For what have I to do to judge them also that are without?" (1 Cor. 5: 9-12.)

Paul makes a classification of sins here. I would not know how to single them out and say one is worse than another. If it is right to build a house for a railer, an extortioner, a covetous man, or an idolator, I do not see why it would not be for any other of the classes. All corporations, as a rule, greatly extort. When they catch a poor, oppressed fellow, they are merciless. The man that buys whisky of the saloon keeper is as bad as the saloon keeper. When I am justified in buying whisky of him, he is justified in selling it to me. It is just as much sin to build a house for the one that buys it as for the one that sells it. Railroads carry whisky, bad women, and worse men. The wealthy men that grow rich through inducing poor men to put their money into corporations and then squeeze and freeze them out are no better in the sight

of God than saloon keepers or bad women. Officers of companies who grow rich while the stockholders grow poorer are not honest men. They may act according to business principles, but the principles are dishonest. They may stand high in church, but they are no better in the sight of God than the saloon keepers or the bad women. So there is just as much sin in working for these corporations or the men that run them, in building offices, roads, and making machinery to build them up, as there is in building houses for whisky or whisky sellers. There is just as much sin in moving them, in hauling around their goods and the means by which they build up their business to oppress others, as there is in doing the same for the saloon keepers and the bad women.

The Savior preferred associating with those publicans and sinners that made no pretense to religion than with the pretentious religionists that devoured widows' houses. These fashionable women that sell themselves to lecherous men for the sake of money to make a display in the world are just as great sinners before God as the abandoned women who sell their virtue for a living. The Savior had more sympathy for the plain, unvarnished sinner than he did for those with a religious veneering.

Once when the cholera was raging in Nashville and I was at work with others to relieve the suffering, I gave a poor woman an order on a public store for a little flour, bacon, and coffee. The keeper of the store, very pretentious for morality, told me that the woman to whom I had given the order was a bad woman and he could not fill it. I told him I hoped I had given orders to a number of bad women.

It is folly and sin to talk of condemning one class of sinners because other sinners as wicked in the sight of God turn up their noses at them. These poor women are no worse sinners than many of the men with whom we associate. As Paul says, if we refuse to associate or deal with sinners of the world, we must needs go out of the world. If we follow a legitimate business, if others pervert it to bad ends, the sin is theirs. I would as soon sell a machine to the bad women or move them as to sell a horse to or move a rich extortioner and idolator. If we refuse to sell a machine to or move bad women, what about the men who seduce them? Jesus thought as well of the poor woman caught in sin as he did of her accusers, every

one guilty of the same sin. Let us be kind and just to them and ask them to sin no more. See **Yoked Together with Unbelievers.**

### **BAPTISM, ACT PERFORMED IN.**

There is a Methodist preacher in our midst trying to prove by the expression, "divers baptisms" (Heb. 6: 2), that any mode of baptism is valid, laying stress on the fact that baptism is in the plural. He tries to show the fallacy of the arguments in favor of immersion, depending chiefly on Paul's statement with reference to the baptism of the Israelites in the following passage: "All our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." (1 Cor. 10: 1, 2.) He says immersion would have been impossible in this case, since they all went over "dry-shod." Please give the two subjects your attention.

It is a bad sign for the truth of a proposition when its advocates go to doubtful passages to prove them when there are so many plain and clear ones.

The persons who passed through the Red Sea did not have water sprinkled or poured upon them. The cloud was not a rain cloud, but one of smoke, that presented at night an appearance of fire and by day a cloud to guide the children of Israel. (See Ex. 13: 21-25.) The water from the sea did not wet them, for a strong east wind blew the waters back and congealed them, and they went over on dry land. (Ex. 15: 8.) The baptism was: they had a wall of the sea on each side and the cloud covered them. So they were covered and overwhelmed with the two.

The baptisms spoken of (Heb. 6: 2) have been matters of doubt in the minds of Bible students—not the act, but the occasions. Some think they refer to the baptisms of John and of Jesus: some, to the baptism of the Holy Spirit and water baptism, by which the church of God was introduced; some, to the divers washings and purifications of the Jews; while others think they refer to the baptism of the many different persons, as the three thousand baptisms on the day of Pentecost. But the word cannot refer to different modes of performing this one baptism; for if the act is indifferent, it would be the one baptism, no matter how performed. Paul says (Eph. 4: 5) there is one baptism, and the baptisms cannot mean different modes of baptism, but the different occasions of persons or things baptized.

No reputable lexicon ever defined **baptism** to sprinkle or pour; always to dip, plunge, or immerse, to overwhelm. All

the uses of it in both sacred and profane literature correspond to this meaning. Here are the definitions from a Greek lexicon: "**Baptizo**—to dip, immerse; to cleanse or purify by washing." "**Baptisis**—a dipping, a bathing, a washing." "**Baptisma**—that which is dipped;" or, "**immersion**—baptism, ordinance of baptism." "**Baptismos**—an act of dipping or immersing; a baptism." "**Baptistees**—one that dips." "**Baptisterio**—a bathing place, a swimming place." "**Baptos**—clipped, dyed." "**Bapto**—to dip, to dip under, to dye." The word, in all of its variations and kindred words, means the same thing. No dictionary defines these words differently. It will be noted sometimes, as a secondary meaning, "to wash, to purify, to dip, to dye," are given. In all such cases the secondary meaning grows out of the first and fundamental meaning and conforms to it—that is, it means the dyeing, washing, wetting, is done by dipping or immersion. **Rantizo** means "to sprinkle, besprinkle, to wet, cleanse, purify." Notice these are given as secondary meanings of **rantizo**; it means this wetting and cleansing is done by sprinkling. In all such cases the secondary meaning follows the primary and grows out of it. No candid scholar ever doubts this, or that baptism, as commanded in the Bible, is an immersion.

The places it was performed indicate immersion. They "were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." (Matt. 3: 6.) "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him." (Verse 16.) "And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins." (Mark 1: 5.) "And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan." (Verse 9.) "And John also was baptizing in Ænon near to Salim, because there was much water there: and they came, and were baptized." (John 3: 23.) "And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? . . . And they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw

him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing." (Acts 8: 36-39.) "And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a riverside, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither. And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshiped God, heard us; whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the thing's which were spoken of Paul. And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there. And she constrained us." (Acts 16: 13-15.)

Paul and Silas were brought out of the jail by the jailer, who "took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway. And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." (Acts 16: 33, 34.) They went out of the jail and out of his house to find water sufficient to wash their stripes and for his baptism. Saul was in the house in Damascus believing and sorrowing over his sins when Ananias said to him: "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." (Acts 22: 16.) He had to arise, that he might be baptized. This would not have been necessary to have water poured or sprinkled upon him, but was necessary in order to be immersed. Then his baptism was a washing; neither sprinkling nor pouring could be regarded as a washing. Immersion must be a washing or bathing. Inasmuch as immersion is the act of faith in which God forgives sins, and it is a washing, it is called a "washing away of sins." The facts all make immersion sure. Then Paul says: "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." (Rom. 6:4, 5.)

These show that not only the circumstances connected with the places of baptism indicate immersion, but that the terms used as equivalents of baptism show it was immersion. Paul and those Roman Christians were buried in their baptism and raised again; were planted in the likeness of Christ's death



and then arose in the likeness of his resurrection. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3: 5.) To be "born of water" is to come forth from it after having been enveloped in it. "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." (Col. 2: 12.) Then the Israelites "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea," as explained already. Jesus said to his disciples: "Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? They say unto him, We are able. And he saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with." (Matt. 20: 22, 23.) This baptism of suffering that Jesus endured was not a mere sprinkling, but an overwhelming of suffering that pressed his soul down to death. The baptism of the Holy Spirit was a complete overwhelming of them with the power of God. All the facts and circumstances connected with baptism, all the figures used to illustrate it, forbid the idea of anything save the immersion, the overwhelming, the burial of the person baptized. It seems to me nothing could be plainer. What is more reasonable than that when one is dead to sin he should be buried out of the body of sin and raised in Christ Jesus?

The founders of all the churches say that baptism, as taught in the Scriptures, was immersion. Luther says: "The term baptism is a Greek word; it may be rendered into Latin by *mersio*; when we immerse anything in water, that it may be entirely covered with it. . . . It were proper those should be deeply immersed who are baptized." John Calvin, the founder of the Presbyterian Church, says: "It is evident that the term baptize means to immerse, and that this was the form used by the ancient church." ("Institutes," Book IV., Chapter 15, Section 19.) Zwingli, the leader of the Swiss reformers, says: "When ye were immersed into the water of baptism, ye were ingrafted into the death of Christ." ("Commentary"—Rom. 6: 3.) John Wesley says: "'We were buried with him'—alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." ("Notes on New Testament"—Rom. 6: 4.) Mr. Wesley so wrote and published, but this sentence has been dropped out of some editions by the Methodist publishers.

Mr. Wesley was asked to baptize a child of Mr. Parker, in Savannah, Ga., on May 5, 1736. He refused to do it, because they would not certify it was sickly. They indicted him before the grand jury. He was tried and found guilty for refusing to sprinkle a baby; he believed it ought to be immersed.

There is not a respectable scholar in the world that does not admit baptism is immersion, and was so practiced in apostolic times.

If the preacher is correct, and any way will do, it is both a folly and a sin to do anything else than be immersed. All persons acknowledge immersion is baptism; many believe sprinkling or pouring is not. The first is certain and safe; the latter is doubtful. It is only a foolish man that will risk the uncertain and doubtful while he can have the certain and the safe way, especially in a matter of so great moment as obedience to God and the salvation of the soul, and in which a wrong course cannot be corrected after we reach the judgment.

Again, it is a sin to divide the church and people of God. All can unite on immersion, since all believe it acceptable baptism; all cannot unite on affusion, since some believe it sets aside the law of God. None believe it essential to baptism. To divide the people of God on a nonessential is sinful; hence to insist on affusion is sinful. No excuse exists from any standpoint for advocating affusion, save to sustain a practice received from Rome in the Dark Ages, to sustain a party. To make and keep up parties and divisions in the church is the highest crime against God and man.

### **BAPTISM ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION.**

Will you please show one the necessity of baptism, if, indeed, it is essential to salvation? I am convinced that immersion is the best mode, and, if I could see that baptism is essential to salvation, would be immersed immediately. I wish to get right if I am in the wrong. I am desirous to know the truth and to do it.

God commanded, through John the Baptist, baptism as a starting point to a new life with God. Jesus submitted to it as a duty he owed to God. God recognized him as his Son before the world when he submitted to it and bestowed on him the fullness of his Spirit. Christ himself ordained baptism as the act in which he would be confessed. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark 16: 16.) The believing is par-

amount to accepting Christ in the act of baptism as the leader and the Savior. The Holy Spirit came to guide man into the remission of sins. He commanded those who believed in Christ to "repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." (Acts 2: 38.) From that time forward every one—Jew, Samaritan, Gentile, rich and poor, prince and beggar—who came to Christ believing on him was required to be baptized as a condition of acceptance with God. Cornelius, the centurion, "a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God always," was told to be baptized as a means of his salvation. (Acts 10: 48.) No one from that time forward was ever recognized as a child of God or in a saved state until he had believed, repented, and had been baptized into the names of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.

God requires this of every mortal that would come to him and receive his blessing. We know of no higher, better, or stronger reason that any man can have for doing anything. If he cannot do it because God requires and commands it, he ought not to do it at all. Acts submitted to or works done in religion on any other ground are presumptuous, and presumption is the highest of sins in the sight of God. The human family has sinned against God and has rebelled against his authority. God demands every one should take this oath of loyalty, thus expressing abnegation and denial of self and thus putting on Christ as his Lord and Master, before he will accept any service from him.

We suspect from the tenor of this letter that our friend does not feel himself a sinner, lost and ruined, dependent on God for salvation. The tendency of the philosophy of this age is in the direction of the sufficiency of humanity to discover and work out its own salvation without the guidance of God. If one thinks so, no service is acceptable to God. The weakness, sinfulness, the lost and ruined condition of humanity, must be realized before man can come to God in an acceptable frame of mind. If man was not lost, ruined, undone, doomed, the death of Christ was a meaningless farce. It takes but little knowledge of the world's past history and present condition to see that without Christ and the revelation of God to man that man is lost, degraded, worse than brutal, tending contin-

ually downward, and that the knowledge of God and his word is the only influence that has ever lifted him up, elevated him, given tone and vigor to his moral and spiritual nature, quickened his intellect, and given him character as a moral and spiritual being.

If he was and is thus dead in trespasses and sins, without the knowledge of God, and God through Christ alone can quicken him, he must accept Christ as his helper and his Savior on Christ's own terms; and it is not whether immersion is the best way of being baptized, but is it what God has commanded? If it is, man must accept it. For him to do what God commands is merely to accept God's help on God's own terms. This he must do or God will not accept him. If God refuses to give help, man must be lost. He may by the influences and institutions of the religion of Christ remain a respectably moral man in this world, while defaming the influences that lifted him up; but when he passes beyond this world and all these helpful influences are withdrawn, he must sink down into the degradation and ruin prepared for the devil and his angels. Our only hope is to do just what God tells us, and he said: "Be baptized every one of you." See **Baptized into Christ.**

### **BAPTISM IN FIRE.**

What is meant by baptism in fire in Matt. 3: 11; Luke 3: 16?

To baptize in water is to overwhelm in water; to baptize in the Spirit is to overwhelm in the Spirit, to bring under the control of the Spirit; to baptize in suffering is to overwhelm in suffering. These are the scriptural uses of the term **baptize**. Analogy and the meaning of the word would say baptism in fire is to overwhelm in fire, to consume and destroy in fire. The connection in which the expression is used also requires this meaning. "But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance: and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And now also the ax is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and

cast into the fire. I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire: whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." (Matt. 3: 7-12.) He is speaking to the Pharisees and Sadducees. He calls them a "generation of vipers." He tells them to repent, not to rely on being fleshly children of Abraham to save them. The ax is at the root of the trees. Every one of the children of Abraham that does not bear good fruit will be cut down and cast into the fire. In this figure the evil are to be destroyed in fire. He gives another illustration of the same truth: I baptize with water; he that comes after me will baptize with the Holy Spirit, and with fire. The baptism of the Holy Spirit in this figure is for those of the last verse, who bring forth good fruit; the baptism of fire is for those who do not bring forth good fruit, and are cast into the fire. Then he gives still another illustration of the same truth: He will gather the wheat into the garner; he will destroy the chaff—the tree that does not bear fruit, that is baptized with fire—with fire unquenchable. The connection will allow no other possible meaning than this. The baptism of the Holy Spirit embraces all the blessings and favors of earth, ending in the salvation in heaven of those who repent and bring forth good fruits meet for repentance; the baptism of fire embraces the destruction that would come upon the unbelieving Jews, the "generation of vipers," ending in their eternal ruin in hell. These are three statements and illustrations of the same truth: the good will be saved, the wicked will be destroyed in fire.

### **BAPTISM IN THE HOLY SPIRIT.**

You say that persons baptized with the Holy Spirit were overwhelmed by the Spirit, so that the human spirit was overpowered and brought fully under control of the Holy Spirit. Now is that not the case in conversion to-day? You say that not only was the human spirit brought under control of the Holy Spirit, but it was endued with the power and strength of the Holy Spirit. Is the power and strength of the Holy Spirit not imparted to the "new creature" in conversion to-day? Jesus says: "For John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence." (Acts 1: 5.) You seem to think this promise was only to the apostles; but it is called "the promise of the Father" (Acts 1: 4),

and in Acts 2: 16-21 we find "the promise of the Father" was to "all flesh." John says: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." (Matt. 3: 11.) Now, I think the promise of the baptism of the Holy Spirit is clearly promised there to all that John baptized with water, and it is said: "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan; and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins." (Matt. 3: 5, 6.) Peter says: "And I remembered the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit." (Acts 11: 16.) Now the promise of Acts 1: 5 included Cornelius and his kinsmen and near friends, and it is the same promise of Matt. 3: 11; and both of these promises being the fulfilling of Joel 2: 28, I believe that every one that John baptized had the promise of being baptized by Christ with the Holy Spirit.

All the different gifts and manifestations of the Spirit are fulfillments of the prophecy of Joel; but all these gifts and manifestations are not the same. "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. . . . To one is given through the Spirit the word of wisdom," and the different gifts and manifestations. (1 Cor. 12: 4-11.) To say all the gifts and manifestations of the Spirit are in fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel determines nothing as to the order of the different measures, manifestations, and gifts of the Spirit.

I do not think it is true that when one is converted he is brought fully and completely under the control of the Holy Spirit. I have never seen a person so converted, brought completely and fully under the power of the Holy Spirit or enabled to manifest the power of the Spirit's presence. Nor do I believe the ordinary conversions mentioned in the New Testament show such presence and power.

Where were the apostles baptized in the Holy Spirit? When they were sent out as apostles, they were endowed with miraculous gifts of the Spirit that enabled them to work miracles. "He called unto him his twelve disciples, and gave them authority over unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of disease and all manner of sickness." (Matt. 10: 1.) Yet, with all this power of the Spirit to preach, to heal, and to cast out demons, they were not yet baptized in the Spirit. After the resurrection of Jesus Christ, he said: "John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days hence." (Acts 1: 5.) They were believers in and followers of Christ, endowed with gifts of the Spirit, but not yet baptized in the Spirit. This was to

occur "not many days hence." A baptism is an overwhelming.

The baptism in the Spirit is an overwhelming of the Spirit. On the day of Pentecost the apostles were overwhelmed by the wonderful outpouring of the Spirit. They were filled with the Holy Spirit, so that their own spirits were subject to the Holy Spirit, and their bodies were moved and controlled by the Spirit of God instead of by their own spirits.

The apostles were subject to the Spirit when baptized by the Spirit. When the miraculous gifts of the Spirit were bestowed upon the different characters as recorded in 1 Cor. 12, 13, 14, the spirits of the prophets (the highest of these gifted persons) were subject to the prophets; but when they were baptized in the Spirit, they were subject to the Spirit. At the house of Cornelius, "as I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them, even as on us at the beginning. And I remembered the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit." (Acts 11: 15, 16.) Without doubt these are the only two cases in which it is said that the Holy Spirit was poured out, which means it was sent directly from heaven by God, and the only cases that are called baptisms in the Spirit. In all other cases it came through the intervention of men; and while miraculous gifts were bestowed, these gifts were only partial—that is, revealed special truths and enabled each to perform special kind of works. The overwhelmings or baptisms, of the Spirit led into the fullness of all truth and enabled those endued with the power to work all miracles. There is this difference in the bestowment of gifts: The Scriptures call one the baptism of the Spirit—a baptism performed by God; the other is called "the gift of the Holy Spirit," or the gifts of the Spirit which come through man. I accept the names given in the Scriptures to distinguish the different measures of the Spirit.

After the Holy Spirit had been poured out on Peter and the other apostles, they, guided by the Spirit, told the people who sought terms of forgiveness to "repent, and be baptized . . . in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise [of the Holy Spirit] is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." (Acts 2: 38, 39.) This did not mean the people would

always receive the Spirit in this miraculous manner by an outpouring, but that those who hearken to the call of the gospel would receive the Holy Spirit, that in obeying the truth they would drink into the Spirit of God and become obedient to God in life and like him in character. The same Spirit comes to us that came to the apostles, but with a different manifestation. All Christians are begotten by the Spirit—quicken, made alive, by the Spirit. This is done through the word of God, just as the Holy Spirit was poured out on the apostles and caused them to give the terms of salvation to the people and promise them that all who heard these laws should receive the Holy Spirit in obeying the words commanded; and not only they, but all who would obey these words would likewise receive the blessing. It is to be observed in the study of this question there was to be a gift of the Spirit—the Spirit would be given; and there were also gifts of the Spirit, or spiritual gifts, bestowed on individuals to guide the early church in its work until the perfect will of God was made known to guide them. See this as discussed in 1 Cor. 12, 13, 14.

John the Baptist says: "He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire." (Matt. 3: 11.) The context undoubtedly shows that he meant: You who hear me shall be saved in heaven or destroyed in hell; you shall as the barren tree be burned up, or as the chaff and the wheat be saved or destroyed. This most likely means: You as subjects of my baptism in water will either be brought finally under the complete influence of the Holy Spirit in heaven or will be finally and completely destroyed by fire in hell. Or it may mean: You shall receive the full benefits of the outpouring of the Spirit—of the salvation in heaven of the obedient, in hell of the disobedient. But there can be no mistake as to the distinction of the baptism and gifts of the Spirit. To ignore it brings confusion.

### **BAPTISM OF CHILDREN, VALIDITY OF.**

There are a great many persons who went into the church when they were young—say, ten or twelve years old—who, when they get older, have doubts about their baptism being valid. Their doubts are not as to the mode of baptism which was used in their cases, but as to whether they were sufficiently instructed in the Scriptures and were penitent believers. What would you advise such persons to do?

All are sinners, and need to repent; but the different conditions in which people are who believe and repent must affect the intensity of their sense of sin when they repent. On the



day of Pentecost the masses spoken to had crucified the Lord Jesus. Their sense of guilt when they believed him to be the Son of God must have been more intense than that of Cornelius, who had been living up to the best light he had and was devout in the service of God according to his surroundings. So, too, Saul had been "breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples" (Acts 9:1), and with a mad fury casting them into prison and giving his voice for their death (Acts 26: 10). He must have felt a more intense sense of guilt when he was convinced that Jesus was the Christ and the risen Lord than the twelve at Ephesus, who had obeyed the Lord according to their knowledge in John's baptism, could have done. (Acts 19: 1-7.) This much is said to suggest that a child ten or twelve years old, reared to do the best it knows, and while the heart is still uncontaminated with gross or heinous sins, cannot feel the sense of sin that an older person, sinning through years against light and knowledge, feels. This goes without saying. In after years children are liable to look back and see that their sense of guilt, and consequently the depth of feeling of penitence, was not as deep and pungent as it would be in later years, and they, forgetting that they were then children, conclude that it was not what it should have been. Another reason is that there has of late been undue stress laid upon the knowledge that baptism is for the remission of sins. They remember that this thought was not before their minds, and it causes fear. Again, there are no doubt cases in which young children act from sympathetic feelings, without faith and a proper appreciation of their duties to God. In the first two cases they ought to be reminded of these conditions; and if they fall under either case, it will satisfy them. If they come under the last, they should be baptized into Christ. Care should be taken that children understand why they act.

### **BAPTISM UNTO REPENTANCE.**

Please explain Matt. 3: 11. Does unto mean **because** of or in order to?

It means into. Repentance is a life work of turning to God. Baptism is the act in which one enters into that life work. Hence, John baptized them into this life of repentance. Luke (3: 8) says that he told them to "bring forth therefore fruits

[do works] worthy of repentance." This means the same. You are baptized into a life of repentance; act so as to show your repentance in your life. There is another expression like this: The Ninevites "repented at [eis] the preaching of Jonas." (Luke 11: 32.) The meaning is: they repented into this preaching of Jonah, they turned into the practice of what Jonah preached.

### **BAPTIST CHURCHES, ARE, CHURCHES OF CHRIST?**

(1) Our claim is that the Missionary Baptist is not the old party, but has departed, using new and unscriptural departures; and hence we claim we are the original people. I suppose you claim to be identified with A. Campbell, in the main, on doctrine and order.

The dispute between the Primitive and Missionary Baptists, as to which is the old and which the new party, is not a very profitable one, since all parties among Christians, old or new, are sinful. An old party is no better than a new one, nor is a new one worse than an old one. "Baptists" as a party among the followers of Christ was unknown for fifteen hundred years after Christ died. A party three hundred years old is no more approved by God than one fifty years old. Both Primitive and Missionary and all other Baptist Churches are parties, schisms, divisions among the children of God, and are sinful.

Those claimed as ancestors of the Baptists, for fifteen hundred years after Christ, called themselves Christians, or disciples of Christ, and refused to be known by any other name. Then they all taught baptism was the act in which God forgives sins. Our Missionary friends, in hunting up testimony that persons were immersed before 1640, to prove Whitsitt wrong, find they baptized into the remission of sins.

Our querist is mistaken. We claim no identity with A. Campbell or any one else, save the writers of the Scriptures. We seek identity in teaching, in faith and practice, with Jesus and the apostles. We never seek identity with others. It rejoices us greatly to find A. Campbell or any one else identical with Jesus and the apostles. All who are identical or in harmony with Jesus and the apostles are identical or in harmony with each other. "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (1 John 1: 7.) If we would cease to strive to be identical with others

and all seek identity with Christ Jesus, we would be united one with another by virtue of this union with Christ. That would be union in Christ Jesus. No other union is desirable or pleasing to God.

(2) Do you believe that the kingdom was with the Baptists till Campbell's day?

The expression, "the kingdom was with the Baptists," is ambiguous. I do not believe that the church of Christ ever called itself the Baptist Church. To do so would be disloyal to Christ. A church of Christ is a congregation of believers in Christ, governed in all things by his law, or the New Testament. This is a definition to which none will object. But no church ever lived perfectly up to the law of Christ; no person ever perfectly lived up to the requirements of the Bible. This is just as true of the churches of the apostolic age as of churches of this age; but they were churches of Christ. So churches not living fully up to the law of Christ may be churches of Christ. Where can any one draw the line? A church that consciously sets aside the law of God is disloyal to God, or it may unconsciously so far depart from God's order as to cease to be a church of Christ. God alone can make laws for his church or kingdom. A church that forms organizations and enacts laws for itself, legislates for itself, and sets aside God as the only lawmaker of his church. To make laws or consciously to change his laws or order is to reject God as the lawmaker. Small things, as well as large ones, test loyalty. God chose the eating of the apple as the test of the loyalty of our first parents. The failure to obey God in this was a rejection of God that he should not rule over them. This was a small thing, to eat the apple, but it tested the loyalty and brought death on the whole world. If one is not faithful in little things, who will trust him in great things? To consciously claim or exercise the right to change the law of God is to prove itself not a church of God. Do Baptist Churches do this? They have set aside God's law in calling churches by a name that God never gave to his people or churches. This is a legislative act; even if not formally clone, still it is a change of God's order that tests whether we are loyal to him or not. They change the order of the churches in that in all the churches of the New Testament there was a plurality of elders; the Baptists have one elder to a number of churches.

The New Testament churches met to observe the Lord's Supper upon the first day of the week, and all Christians observed it. The Baptists changed the order in both these respects. They do not meet upon the first day of the week to observe the Lord's Supper. When they do observe it, they forbid some they admit to be Christians from observing it. In apostolic times no one was recognized as a Christian until he had believed in Christ, turned from his sins, and been baptized into Christ. Baptists teach that men are Christians while not complying with this order. The apostles left the churches without organization other than simple churches of Christ. The Baptists have formed organizations over and above the churches that sit in judgment on their faith and decide their orthodoxy or heterodoxy. These points in which they displace the order of God with their legislation might be multiplied. Churches, even though they adopted these unscriptural practices thinking they were doing God's service, cannot be properly called churches of God, and no one should remain in affiliation with them who seeks true loyalty to Christ. While all these things are true, Baptists do preach Christ as the Son of God, the Savior of sinners; that they must repent of sin, be baptized by the authority of Christ into Jesus Christ, and in so doing become Christians or servants of the Lord Jesus Christ. After obeying God, they do wrong in remaining where God's law is set aside. The Baptist Church is not and never was the church of Christ. Christians may be in it, as they are in other places they ought not to be; but they ought to change the church to accord with the law of God, or they ought to get out of it.

Many persons among the disciples, since the separation from the Baptists, have thought they ought to be rebaptized; many persons from the beginning have been baptized again. When it was done simply because the persons did not understand baptism was in order to the remission of sins, when they had been baptized to put on Christ, to fulfill the divine righteousness, or to obey God, they did wrong. Such persons mistake God ordained the baptism of one who believes in Christ with all his heart as the condition on which he would accept and forgive him. For the remission of sins is what God promises and obligates himself to do. To enter into Christ, to fulfill the divine righteousness, to seek a good conscience, is to take

obligations on ourselves. It is not reasonable; it cannot be more important that man should understand what God obligates himself to do than it is to understand what man obligates himself to do in coming to Christ. The brethren have made a mistake in this matter that they will not continue in longer than the party feeling excited in the discussion subsides.

### **BAPTIZE, DO WE, A SINNER?**

(1) I would like to have your views as to whether or not a person is a sinner after ceasing from sin. If a person is a sinner after believing and repenting, do we baptize a sinner into Christ? If a person in this condition is not a sinner—that is, after turning away from sin and doing God's will—will such a one's prayers be heard and answered?

Certainly a man is not a sinner after he ceases to sin; but when does he cease to sin? I am afraid very few of us cease to sin while we live in the flesh. There are different classes of sins—sins of weakness and sins of presumption. When we think we are strongest, then we are often in greatest danger. "Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." (1 Cor. 10: 12.) When a man feels most confidence in himself, then there is the greatest danger that he will be presumptuous and commit the greatest sin. Poor in spirit, contrite and humble in heart, are qualities that God loves in man. With such he dwells to lift up and comfort. We sin in deed, in word, and in thought. Not often do we pass a day without sinning in some one of these ways. It is easier to control the acts than the words; it is easier to control the words than the thoughts. Then to bring the thoughts into captivity to the will of God is the highest attainment in the divine life. Hence Paul says: "Though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh (for the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh, but mighty before God to the casting down of strongholds); casting down imaginations, and every high thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God, and bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ; and being in readiness to avenge all disobedience, when your obedience shall be made full." (2 Cor. 10: 3-6.) The perfection is attained when the thoughts have been all brought into perfect obedience to the will of Jesus Christ. I think there are but few of us that can keep our thoughts for one day in captivity to the obedience of Christ. Sins

are of two kinds—sins of commission and sins of omission. If we commit no positive sin, we omit some positive good. This is sin. Do any of us pass a day without omitting some opportunity or means of learning more of God's will or of doing some good to our fellow-men? I have never passed the day when at its close I felt I had used every opportunity and means in my power to bring myself into closer union with God, to become more like him in my life and character, to benefit and help my fellow-men, and to honor God. That means I never, at the close of a day, felt that I had passed the day free from sin, and I have but little faith in the truthfulness of the man who claims he has passed a day without sins of omission or commission in word, thought, or deed. That sinless life would be equal to the life of the Son of God. He lived a sinless life. Who else attains to this? When a person ceases to sin, he is not a sinner; but Solomon, in his dedicatory prayer to God, says: "There is no man that sinneth not." (1 Kings 8: 46.) Only Jesus lived a sinless life, and he refused to be called good until the sinful propensities had been purged out by suffering; so that he was made perfect and became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him. (Heb. 5: 8, 9.) Paul said: "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus." (Phil. 3: 12.) He continually pressed forward toward the mark for the prize of the high calling in Christ Jesus.

(2) Whom do you baptize—a child of God or a child of the devil? I have heard some brethren illustrate in this way: That when one has repented or made the good confession, he passes into a transitional state; and when he is in that state, he is neither a child of God nor a child of the devil. I do not understand the Bible to teach that a man can get into a state in which he is serving neither God nor the devil.

This question grows out of an effort to make an illustration intended to present one point in the work of conversion apply in all its parts to conversion. It is as if a man were to ask how Herod had four feet like a fox, since Jesus called him a "fox." (Luke 13: 32.) I baptize one who believes in Christ and shows his faith by demanding baptism into Christ. The Bible plainly requires this. This is the plain, literal requirement, about which there can be no mistake. To these, and not to the figurative, illustrations we must go for clear definition of duty. The birth of the water and the Spirit is a figure

illustrating relations, but does not plainly state duties. An illustration is not an argument; it may make plain and enforce an argument, but it is not one. Paul says: "We who died to sin, how shall we any longer live therein? Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life." (Rom. 6: 2-4.) This seems to me to illustrate the man dies to sin, and then the old man of sin is buried, and the new man is raised to walk in a new state—in Christ. That is about as plain as I can make it. To make things used to illustrate one point in a figure apply to every feature will result in confusion.

These questions have come up as puzzles and quibbles by those who insist persons are children of God without baptism. They insist that a man is an accepted child of God before baptism; but they involve themselves in burying a living, active child of God. But there are plain scriptures denning duty without going to figures and puzzles.

### **BAPTIZE, PAUL NOT SENT TO.**

Can any one preach Jesus without preaching baptism? A brother here claims he can, and quotes the language of Paul: "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." (1 Cor. 1: 17.)

An inspired man could not preach Christ without preaching baptism. None ever did. Paul was not sent to baptize. He usually had some one with him to do the baptizing; but when no one was present, he did it himself. Read the preceding verses to that quoted. Of those claiming to be followers of Paul, he said: "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanas; besides, I know not whether I baptized any other." Paul preached, and "many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized." (Acts 18: 8.) This shows, while Paul did not baptize, he preached the necessity of baptism, and it was so important that there were others with him whose special mission it was to baptize those to whom he preached. This certainly indicates that it was necessary, in that they had special persons to do the baptizing. When they were not present to do it, he did it himself. To preach Christ is to

preach him as the ruler and representative of God, and no one can preach Christ as he is presented in the Scriptures without preaching all the teaching of Christ. Paul could only claim to be free from the blood of all men by declaring "the whole counsel of God." (Acts 20: 26, 27.)

### **BAPTIZE, WHO HAS A RIGHT TO?**

Have I the scriptural right to baptize? I have been trying to **live** the life of a Christian for ten years, having accepted Christ when I was eighteen years of age, and am so situated that if one should desire baptism at this place I would have to do it or send for a brother.

In scripture times the disciples of Christ were scattered from Jerusalem and went everywhere, preaching as they went. (Acts 8: 1, 4.) I am constrained to believe that no one preached the gospel unless he accepted in Christ those who believed. To do this was to baptize them. Ananias, who baptized Saul, is called "a certain disciple." (Acts 9: 10.) This, together with the fact that baptism is nowhere restricted to any class, constrains me to believe it is the privilege of any Christian to teach the way of righteousness and baptize those who desire baptism. While this is true, good order demands that when there is an established church, it is better that the elders or some one appointed by the church should do this work. But where one brother is off to himself, I am sure it is his duty to teach and baptize any who will hear and believe in Christ and ask baptism at his hands.

### **BAPTIZE WITH WATER.**

Please give an exegesis of this scripture: "I indeed baptize you with water." (Matt. 3: 11; Mark 1: 8; Luke 3: 16; Acts 1: 5.) This language was used three times by John (Matt. 3: 11; Mark 1: 8; Luke 3: 16); it was used once by our Savior (Acts 1: 5). One of our brethren thinks that the pedobaptists have a good argument in this scripture. If in the action of baptism the water is used, the New Testament is a mystery indeed. I hope that you will give a full explanation, especially of the words **with water**.

Baptize with water does not imply sprinkling or pouring; it only leaves the act undefined. It is common to say that one cloth was dyed with blue; another, with black or brown; leather is tanned with ooze—in all of which we mean that the thing dyed or tanned was dipped in the dye. When we tell the substance in which the baptism was performed, it is legitimate to use **with**. We are baptized **with water, with the**



**Spirit, with sorrow, or with suffering**, is legitimate and proper. The word translated **with** is the same as that translated in in other places. While, then, **with** does not imply that water was applied to the person instead of the person to the water, it leaves it uncertain. It would make it certain to use in. The American Revised Version so translates it in all these places, although some of the revisers, probably a majority, were pedobaptists. Using **with** only fails to show, in the example used, how it was done. Then we determine what was done from the meaning of the word as shown in other uses of it, and this leaves no doubt. It is very unfair to select a few examples which leave the meaning in doubt to determine the meaning of a word, when there are a number of cases that leave no doubt and when the meaning of the word is well established.

### **BAPTIZED BY ONE SPIRIT.**

Does 1 Cor. 12: 13—"For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit"—refer to the baptism of the Spirit, or does it mean, led or guided by one Spirit, we are baptized into one body?

The commission, if properly studied, it seems to me, ought to settle this question with every one. Verse 10 enumerates the different gifts bestowed on the different members of the church; verse 11 tells that one and the same Spirit bestowed all these differing gifts upon the different members; verse 12 tells that these different members constitute one and the same body of Christ, just as the different members of the fleshly body, animated by one spirit, constitute one body; verse 13 tells that, guided or led by the one Spirit, we are all baptized into the one body of Christ, so become one body. The Spirit is the agent leading in all these things. In verses 10 and 11 the active form is used and "Spirit" is in the nominative case. In verse 13 the passive form is used, and hence "Spirit" is placed in the objective case. To say the Spirit baptizes or directs us to be baptized and we are baptized by the Spirit mean the same thing—one expressed actively; the other, passively. Then the next clause, "and have been all made to drink into one Spirit," requires the same construction. To be baptized into the Holy Spirit is to be overwhelmed and filled by the Spirit. One overwhelmed and filled with the Spirit would

hardly afterwards be required to drink into the Spirit, to gradually partake of its influence.

This corresponds fully to other passages. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3: 27, 28.) "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." (Rom. 6: 1-5.) These teach the same truth. They have been baptized into the one body of Christ. Bloomfield says: "By being baptized [say almost all commentators, ancient and modern], we are all made members of the body of Christ, and united one to another under him, our Head; and thus, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, bond or free, we are all one in Christ, who, by baptism, have been admitted into his church; and this union of ours one with another is testified and declared by our communion at the Lord's table, which is here called a drinking into one spirit, referring to the sacramental cup." ("Notes"—1 Cor. 12: 13.) I think there can be no doubt that the passage means, led or directed by one Spirit, we are all baptized in water into one body; then being members of his body, we all drink into one Spirit. In this passage it is told that we are led by one Spirit to be baptized into this one body.

### **BAPTIZED FOR THE DEAD.**

Please give your idea of 1 Cor. 15: 29—that is, "baptized for the dead."

To determine the meaning of a sentence, we must look at its connection, purpose, and scope. This is one of a number of arguments to prove the resurrection from the dead. After giving other arguments, he asks: "Else [if the dead rise not] what shall they do which are baptized for [in view of their resurrection from] the dead, if the dead rise not?" He was

giving reasons why they should believe in the resurrection. We are baptized and enter into Christ because we must die, and in order that we may be fitted to be raised in him and live with him forever. Why are we baptized in order to<sup>1</sup> death, if the dead rise not? If the dead rise not, what shall they do who are baptized in view of the resurrection from the dead? In view of their dying, they are baptized; so are baptized in order to their well-being after death. If they are not to be raised, why are they baptized to fit them for the resurrection? This is Paul's argument. Verse 30 is similar. Why do we stand in jeopardy of life every hour, if there be no resurrection and future judgment?

### BAPTIZED INTO CHRIST.

I have read and reread your article on "Baptism and Remission of Sins," and I have great confidence in your knowledge and honesty. Will you please give me a list of all the English words translated from the Greek preposition **eis**? I have long thought that **with** and **by** come from **eis**. If not too much trouble, give me a full list.

The preposition **eis** is used over fifteen hundred times in the New Testament. It is translated **to, into, unto, at, in, for, on, upon, among, against**. Counting one column of the list, **I find** it is translated, out of eighty uses, **into** fifty-three times; two-thirds of the other times it is translated **in, unto, to**. These are substantially the same with **into**. To come to a place, unto a place, into a place, or on a place, are the same. The nature or character of the place or thing to which one comes determines which shall be used. If it is "Come **eis** a rock," we know it is **to, unto, upon, or against**, as we cannot go in or into a rock. Again, "She fell down **eis** his feet." We know it is not **into**, but **at** or **by**, his feet. So it is translated **at** in such cases.

The lexicons define it: "Direction toward, motion to, on or into." It follows usually a verb of motion, and the noun governed by it points out the place or end on or in which the motion terminates. "Depart hence, and go into [**eis**] Judea." (John 7: 3.) Go is a verb of motion; Judea denotes the place where the motion ends or terminates. "Was baptized of John in [**eis**] the Jordan." (Mark 1: 9.) When it refers to time, it is translated **then, till, or until**. "He that endureth to [**eis**] the end, the same shall be saved." (Matt. 10: 22.) Connected with verbs of thinking or purposing, it points **to** the

end aimed at or to the state or condition sought. "All we who were baptized into [eis] Christ Jesus were baptized into [eis] his death." (Rom. 6: 3.) "Baptizing them into [eis] the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." (Matt. 28: 19.) "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you . . . unto [eis] the remission of your sins." (Acts 2: 38.) It is sometimes translated **that**. "Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that [eis] your sins may be blotted out." (Acts 3: 19.) **That** has the force of "in order that" or "into the blotting out of your sins." With believe it is translated **on** or in; as, "Believe on [eis] Christ" or "Believe in [eis] Christ"—"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." (Acts 16: 31.) But nine-tenths of the time it is translated **unto, in, or into**, and this same meaning is contained in all the different words by which it is translated. A few times it is translated **against**. "Saul, yet breathing threatening and slaughter against [eis] the disciples." (Acts 9: 1.) Threatening and slaughter unto them would be against them, and it is so translated here.

To one who studies these things carefully the meaning is clear and uniform. But the idea that the masses of the people must understand these distinctions and variations of the meanings of the terms is too absurd and ridiculous to entertain for a moment. It shows a sad misapprehension of the character of God. He has made his will known to the unlearned and the simple-minded and single-hearted. For a man to contend that a person should understand these distinctions and variations is clear evidence that the man himself does not understand them. If he did, he could not think God requires people to understand them in order to obey him.

All agree that the use of baptism is to test and declare faith. Why is it that to be baptized because God commands it, without knowing what blessings will be received in the act, does not test and show faith as great as to be baptized knowing what blessings are received by it?

We call attention to the following. Jesus, in his commission to the disciples, commanded them: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into [eis] the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." (Matt. 28: 19.) In some texts Acts 2: 38 reads: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you into [eis] the name of Jesus Christ into [eis] the remission of your sins; and ye shall re-

ceive the gift of the Holy Spirit." At Samaria, when Peter and John had come down, they "prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Spirit: for as yet it was fallen upon none of them: only they had been baptized into [eis] the name of the Lord Jesus." (Acts 8: 15, 16.) Paul, at Ephesus, asked the disciples: "Into [eis] what then were ye baptized?" They said: "Into [eis] John's baptism." "They were baptized into [eis] the name of the Lord Jesus." (Acts 19: 3-5.) Again: "All we who were baptized into [eis] Christ Jesus were baptized into [eis] his death." (Rom. 6: 3.) "Were ye baptized into [eis] the name of Paul?" "Lest any man should say that ye were baptized into [eis] my name." (1 Cor. 1: 13-15.) "Were all baptized unto [eis] Moses in the cloud and in the sea." (1 Cor. 10: 2.) "For in one Spirit were we all baptized into [eis] one body." (1 Cor. 12: 13.) "For as many of you as were baptized into [eis] Christ did put on Christ." (Gal. 3:27.)

These are examples of **into (eis)** connected with baptism. **Eis (into)** means exactly the same connecting baptism with remission of sins that it does connecting baptism with the name of Christ, the body of Christ, the death of Christ, and the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It connects baptism and remission of sins once. It connects baptism and these other names or persons or states twenty times. Why is it more important to understand the relation baptism bears to the remission of sins than it is to understand the relation it bears to these other persons and states? Can any one tell? It is sectarianism to exalt one duty or requirement of God above others when God has made no difference.

Christ was baptized "to fulfill all righteousness," or to obey all the commands of God to make man righteous. (Matt. 3: 15.) It is difficult to improve on the examples of Christ. All blessings and all the promises of God connected with the service of God ought to be proclaimed to encourage men to trust in and obey God. But when man does so trust God as to do what he commands, God accepts that service from the humblest of mortals, and man should throw no stumbling-blocks in the way of these little ones of God. There is no greater hindrance to the cause of God at this day than magnifying things not taught by God into questions that create strife among the people of God and divert their minds from the great

work of saving men and women from death. See *Believing into Christ*.

### **BAPTIZED, MAY A PERSON WHO BELIEVES HIS SINS FORGIVEN BE SCRIPTURALLY?**

May a person who believes his sins forgiven submit to a scriptural baptism while thus believing?

There is something unscriptural in the case as presented; but what is it? Is it the baptism, or is it the understanding of when a person is pardoned? If the latter, does that invalidate the former? This is the point of issue in this question, and it is continually ignored. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16: 16.) The thing to be believed is that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. A person that believes this, and, on this faith, is baptized, is scripturally baptized; but if he believes he has been forgiven before he is baptized, this faith is unscriptural—that is, he mistakes the point in the path of obedience at which pardon is promised and can be claimed. Does a mistake as to the point at which God bestows the blessing cause God to withhold the blessing from one who, through faith, does what God tells him? If so, where is the precept or example that shows it? If it is so, it must be because God requires a person to understand at what point in the path of obedience a blessing is promised before he can receive it. Does any one believe this? I have never found one that would affirm it. I have asked for a single precept or example in the New Testament or the Old Testament that would prove it. I have never seen one produced that was claimed to teach it. I can produce scores of examples and precepts from the Old Testament and the New Testament showing that a misunderstanding on the part of man as to when, in the path of obedience, a blessing was promised, or even of what the blessing was, did not prevent God bestowing the blessing when the point was reached. To deny the blessing would be given in this instance because the person mistook the point at which the blessing was bestowed is to set at defiance the teachings of God through the Old Testament and the New Testament, which were written for our example and admonition. God is pleased with the faith that does what He tells to be done without waiting to know when and how God will bless. See **Baptized into Christ**.

**BELIEVING INTO CHRIST.**

Does the New Testament teach that men believe into Christ? If you answer, "Yes," then please harmonize it with our teaching that it takes both faith and baptism to put a person into Christ. If men believe into Christ, did all (even among us) learn this design of faith before they were baptized? For some brethren teach that a person must know all the designs of a command before he can obey the command. Then have these brethren (perhaps thousands) who have not learned the design of faith obeyed the command to believe?

The word **believe** is connected with Christ in Greek by the same word (**eis**) with which baptism is connected with him. We are said to believe **eis** Christ and to be baptized **eis** Christ. **Eis** properly marks the relationship of each act to Christ; and yet no translator ever translated the words the same in the two connections. The reason is that **eis**, following a verb of action or motion, denotes that the subject of the verb changes its relationship to the object of it. Sometimes it follows a verb indicating "mental or spiritual action. It is usually translated **on** or **upon** in such cases. He believed **eis** Jesus—**upon** Jesus. The meanings are essentially the same, modified in the form of expression by the nature of the thing moved. Believe is an active verb, but the action is that of the immaterial or unseen part of man, his mind and heart. So the action is not recognized by our bodily senses. To "believe upon Christ" means that the confidence or trust is transferred from some other person and reaches out toward and rests on Christ. But the body is not yet moved into Christ; so **eis** is translated **on**, **upon**, instead of **into**. The heart, the thing that believes, is transferred to Christ. When **eis** follows a verb expressing desire or purpose, it is usually translated for or **in order to**. But it means the purposes or desires of the heart are transferred to the thing desired. "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for [eis] the remission of sins" (Matt. 26: 28), means the blood was shed that many might enter the remission of sins, a new state. **Eis** indicates a change from one place, time, relation, or condition, to another.

The Scriptures say we believe **eis** Christ, **eis** remission of sins, **eis** salvation. They also say we repent **eis** Christ or God, **eis** remission of sins, **eis** salvation. They also teach that we are baptized **eis** Christ, **eis** remission of sins, and imply **eis** salvation. Faith, repentance, baptism, are all connected with entrance into Christ, God, salvation, by this same word, **eis**. It shows all of these acts are joined together, stand on the

same side of remission of sins, entrance into God, Christ, and stand similarly related to these. Faith leads to' repentance and to baptism. Repentance and baptism are fruits, the outgrowth, the embodiment of faith. Faith, ruling the heart, produces repentance; controlling the body, it leads to baptism. Repentance and baptism are successive steps of faith, are parts of faith, and hence must stand related to remission of sins, to entrance into Christ, and to salvation, as faith is.

The relation of these acts to each other and the connection of each of them to the remission of sins, entrance into the name of Christ, God, and salvation by the same word, settle beyond dispute that they are for the same end or thing. Man must believe into Christ. But his believing carries him through repentance and baptism before he is in Christ. Repentance comes from faith, but it leads through baptism to the remission of sins. Faith that stops short of repentance and baptism does not carry the believer into' Christ. These facts settle the offices of faith, repentance, and baptism. See Baptized into Christ.

### **BESETTING SIN, THE.**

What is the besetting sin of Heb. 12: 1, 2: "Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith? "

The "witnesses" are the men of faith and fidelity to God mentioned in the preceding chapter, who had been faithful and true to God under trials and persecutions. Seeing they were blessed in obeying God under all persecutions and trials, let us lay aside every weight that hinders fidelity in us and the sin that does so easily beset or turn us from God. Paul then tells us how we are to avoid this besetting sin by running with patience the race that is set before us—that is, the path marked out for us by God. To keep faithfully in that path is to avoid the besetting sin. He tells us further we are to look to Jesus, who is the beginner and the finisher of the faith. All contained in the faith, from beginning to end, is given by Jesus. These are directions by which we are to avoid the besetting sin. The besetting sin is the disposition of man to turn from God, to turn from the ways and teachings given by God, and to turn to the wisdom of man. This has been the



besetting sin of man in all ages; it was in Eden. Our first parents turned away from God and his commands to that which seemed to them better and wiser than God's arrangements; so did Cain, in the next generation. Abel was true to God, and is named as a witness showing it is good to walk with God. All the peoples of earth turned from God to their own wisdom, except Noah and Abraham and Jacob and his family.

We are to look to Jesus as an example by which we are to learn how to avoid the besetting sin. He came to do not his own will, but the will of him that sent him; he cultivated the spirit of having no will but that of his Father. He said: "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me." (John 4: 34.) His food—that which gave him strength, on which he relied to perpetuate life—was to do the will of Him that had sent him. So we should avoid turning from God and find our spiritual food in doing the will of God.

The besetting sin, then, is to turn from God through an evil spirit of unbelief and follow ways not pointed out by God. No warning is more constantly kept before the people, both in the Old Testament and the New Testament Scriptures, than the danger and the evil of adding to or taking from the appointments of God. This was presumptuous on the part of men and easily led to the presumptuous sin, for which there is no forgiveness. The Bible begins with an example and warning against turning from God to ways and wisdom of our own, and it closes with the same warning, and almost every intermediate chapter is devoted to the same end, urging men to do what God commands, warning them against turning from his ways to, the ways of man. That has been the besetting sin from the beginning, and will be to the end of man's probationary state.

### **BIBLE, REQUIRING CHILDREN TO STUDY THE.**

Certain brethren have plans laid for the establishment of a Bible school. They are beginning on a solid basis. The outlook is hopeful, and I have been unanimously asked by the board of trustees to accept the first place in the faculty. I have decided to do so on condition that it be made one of the unchangeable and fundamental laws of the school that every student, during his entire time as a student, be required to recite at least one daily lesson in the Bible. Some good brethren connected with this school and others at other places seem to think we have no right to require students to study the Bible. To my mind, this is not a question. We have the same right to require

the study of the Bible that we do reading, spelling, and arithmetic. We compel students not to lie, steal, curse, or get drunk. Every school in the land has conditions of matriculation. You are likely to be called on for your views on this subject. While I know you have a great amount of work to do and you must reserve your time and strength, yet your influence is such, and your judgment growing out of more than a half century of experience with schools and observation of school work is such, and this work is so important and far-reaching in its results, that I want to request that you give these brethren the full benefit of your views.

I have so often expressed myself on this subject that I do not see the good of doing it again. Then there are some things so simple and self-evident that it is difficult to argue them. If a man were to ask me to prove two and two make four, I could not argue it much. I know of but one way of explaining the fact that a man claiming to believe the Bible can doubt the duty and obligation of parents to require their children to study the Bible. It is this: I knew an experienced and thoughtful lawyer that insisted every man had his crazy spot, and on some subject and at some point everybody is crazy.

God commanded the children of Israel: "And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." (Deut. 6: 6, 7.) Solomon, the wise man under that law, said: "He that spareth his rod hateth his son." (Prov. 13: 24.) This means that if it required the use of the rod to teach his son the word of God, it ought not to be spared. To spare it and let him grow up in ignorance of the word of God was to send him to ruin. That is to hate him. The Holy Spirit directs parents, the fathers especially: "Fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." (Eph. 6: 4.) While the spirit of the rod is not so prevalent in the New as in the Old Testament, still it is a plain, specific command, not only to teach them, but to train them, bring them up in the nurture and instruction of the Lord. It does not say to let them learn the will of God if they feel like it, but instruct and train them in the teachings and admonition of the Lord.

For a man that claims to believe the Bible and God to say that he doubts if it is right for a parent to require a child to study the Bible, I can find an explanation for this only in the lawyer's claim. That is his crazy spot, and it is useless to

argue with a crazy man. So I do not argue much with such persons. Tell them God requires them to teach and train their children in the practice of the word of God.

As suggested, if it is not right to require children to study and learn the Bible, still less is it right to require them to practice what the Bible teaches—"Thou shalt not lie," "Thou Shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not kill."

For a parent to require a child to wash its face and keep its body clean, and not require it to learn and obey the Bible, is to teach it that the body is worth more than the soul, cleanness of body is worth more than a pure heart and a clean and holy spirit. For a parent to require a child to learn spelling and reading and arithmetic, and not require it to study the Bible, is to teach it, by a forcible object lesson, that it is much more important to be qualified to live in this world than to be fitted to live in heaven. There is no evading these simple truths. The parent that so treats and impresses his child is the worst enemy that child has. He will be made to feel this when he meets that child at the judgment of God. It is better to face the question honestly now.

This all applies to the family and the school. It is just as much the duty of the parent to see that his child is taught the Bible when away from home, at school, as it is to require it at home. The teachers in the school occupy the position of the parents to the child, and are under the same obligation to require the children to study the Bible and to teach the Bible to the children that the parents are. I very much doubt the right of any Christian to teach a school in which he does not teach the Bible. He is to teach "every creature" in "all the world." How can he excuse himself from teaching children with and under him from day to day and from month to month? While I am sure it is the lawyer's crazy spot that leads to the conclusion that it is wrong to require children to study the Bible at home and at school, this craze is excited by the desire of the parent to shirk his duty, and with school-teachers and managers it is greatly intensified by the fear that it will hurt the popularity of the school and cut off its patronage and pay.

But it is wrong, it is deception both of the school and family and the public, to call a family or a school a Bible or Christian family or school which requires children to wash their faces or study arithmetic, and does not require them to study

the Bible. The Bible places the study and teaching of the word of God above everything else, and he is not a true friend to the Bible, to God, or to man, who gives it a secondary or inferior place. A Bible or Christian family or school is that which places the study and practice of the Bible above everything else.

### **BIRTH OF THE SPIRIT BEFORE OR AFTER THE RESURRECTION, IS?**

Some of our preachers in this part of the country have been preaching, and are yet, that there is no birth of the Spirit in this life; that we are born of water in this life and of the Spirit at the resurrection. They quote, "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit," and then say: "How could I be born of the Spirit unless I was a spirit?"

I know of no law, human or divine, to keep men from believing and teaching unreasonable and unscriptural things if they desire to do so. There is no ground for such a position, I am sure, but many scriptures that flatly contradict it. "But as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name: who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." (John 1: 12, 13.) These people that believed on his name became his sons—were born of God in this world. Paul says: "I write not these things to shame you, but to admonish you as my beloved children. For though ye have ten thousand tutors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus I begat you through the gospel." (1 Cor. 4: 14, 15.) He calls them his children, for he had begotten them through the gospel. Are they addressed as children before they are born? James says: "Of his own will he brought us forth by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of his creatures." (James 1: 18.) Were they not born of God—begotten by the word of truth through the Spirit? "Having been begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the word of God, which liveth and abideth." (1 Pet. 1: 23.) Every Christian is a child of God. How could he become a child unless he had been begotten and brought forth into the family of God? To deny this is absurd.

**BLASPHEMY AGAINST THE HOLY SPIRIT. See Sin Against the Holy Spirit.**

### **BLOOD OF CHRIST, HOW DO SINNERS REACH THE MERITS OF THE?**

How do sinners reach the benefits of the blood of Christ in their cleansing from sin?

No material, or earthly, type perfectly represents the spiritual church, or antitype. The letter to the Hebrews is very greatly devoted to showing "the superiority of the church of Christ in all of its parts to the earthly type. "For the law [of Moses] 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.) While the representation is not perfect, the points of comparison give true ideas of the spiritual temple.

The blood of Christ, shed for the remission of sins, means that the life of Christ was given for the sins of the world. He gave his life for our lives that had been forfeited through sin. Man sinned and was under sentence of death. Jesus interposed and gave his life to secure a respite from the sentence and to open a way by which man might return to the favor of God and enjoy eternal life. The privilege of enjoying this favor depended upon man's accepting this favor in faith and submitting himself to the conditions imposed by Jesus, who had given his life to redeem man from eternal death. "Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you, who by him do believe in God." (1 Pet. 1: 20, 21.) Before the manifestation of the death of Jesus this sacrifice and the acceptance and appropriation of the sacrifice was set forth in type by the death and shedding the blood of animals. The blood was placed upon the book of the law to show it was dedicated, made sacred, as the law of God; it was placed on the tabernacle or temple, after the temple was built, to show it was made sacred as the dwelling place of God, or the place where God would meet man to forgive his sins; the people were sprinkled with the blood to show they were made sacred, or dedicated to God, and could approach him in his dwelling place and at his mercy seat and receive the forgiveness of sins, so far as they could be forgiven by the blood of animals. This blood could not secure final forgiveness. There was a remembrance of sin every year, which required the continual shedding of blood.

"Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation [the coming of Christ]." (Heb. 9: 9, 10.) Sins were forgiven only typically and temporarily under this law through the typical blood until Christ came and by the shedding of his blood took away these sins forever.

Not only were the law, the people, and the tabernacle dedicated with blood, but all the vessels of service in the tabernacle were dedicated with blood. The blood on them marked them as purchased and made sacred to the service of God by the blood. Once dedicated to God, they could no more be used for common and profane purposes. "Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book [of the law], and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry. . . . It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these [bloods of animals]; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." (Verses 18-26.) In this the points of likeness and of unlikeness between the types and the antitypes are pointed out.

The blood of the animals typified the blood of Jesus as "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world;" the tabernacle typified the church of God, dedicated by the blood of Christ; the holy place, the church on earth; the most holy, the dwelling place of God in heaven. The law of Moses, dedicated with the blood of animals, typified the law of Christ,

dedicated with his blood; and the vessels of service, all sprinkled with blood, typified the ordinances and services of the church of God, dedicated and confirmed to us by the blood of Jesus Christ, our Lord.

No Jew could come to God unless he was purified with blood; no person can come to God acceptably until he is purified from his sins by the blood of Christ. To meet God, he must come to the spiritual temple in which God dwells and in which he will meet to bless those who trust him.

Under the law of Moses they had the material blood of the animals. It was sprinkled upon the material bodies of the persons and things dedicated to God. It was typical of this blood of Christ. But we do not have the material blood of Christ; nor, if we had it, could we apply it to our immaterial, spiritual being, our hearts and our consciences, that need the cleansing. So Jesus, once for all, in the end of his ministry, shed his blood and dedicated with it all the laws, ordinances, and institutions of the new covenant; and the only way man can come to or appropriate the cleansing efficacy of the blood of the Son of God is to come to and by faith take these laws into the heart and let them control and govern the life. No man can reach or be cleansed by the blood of Christ so long as he refuses to come to the spiritual temple—the church of the living God, sealed with the blood of Christ—and refuses to take into his heart and follow the laws and ordinances sealed by his blood. So the Holy Spirit tells the Hebrew Christians: "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 firstborn, 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." (Heb. 12: 22-24.) In coming to the church of God, they came to all these things, including the blood of Christ.

Then, Peter says, "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. 1:2), showing they came to the blood of Christ in the obedience of God. John says: "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the

blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (1 John 1: 7.) As we "walk in the light," do the will of God, dedicated by the blood of Jesus, we are cleansed from all sin. Again: "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." (Col. 1: 13, 14.) The redemption that is purchased by the blood is in Christ; and into him, his spiritual body, one must enter to reach this redemption of the blood.

There are other passages of scripture, but they all point to the same truth: Man can reach the cleansing efficacy of the blood of Christ only by taking into his heart the blood-sealed truths and obeying the blood-sealed laws and ordinances dedicated by the blood of Christ. Whoever turns from these laws turns from and rejects the blood of Christ. And whoever brings a service not ordained by God into the service or church of God brings the unclean and the unholy into it; defiles the temple of God; treads "under foot the Son of God;" counts the blood of the Son of God, "wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing," and does "despite unto the Spirit of grace." (Heb. 10: 29.)

While Jesus, as our great High Priest in the holiest, in the presence of God, does not have his material blood to offer, he does plead the sacrifice that he made to redeem men as the ground for the justification of every penitent sinner that comes seeking mercy through the blood of Christ.

### **BONDAGE IN EGYPT.**

(1) How long were the Israelites in Egyptian bondage?

They were in Egypt probably not over two hundred and fifty years. Before they went to Egypt they were sojourners and wanderers in a land not theirs. From the time of the promise to Abraham until the return from Egypt was four hundred and thirty years.

(2) What is intended to be taught in Gen. 15: 13; Ex. 12: 40; Gal. 3: 17?

Gal. 3: 17 tells that the giving of the law at Sinai was four hundred and thirty years after the promise was made to Abraham in the gift of Isaac; and as they were in a land not their own, pilgrims and sojourners, it is all counted as part of their



bondage. Gen. 15: 13 is a general statement of the same truth, only it is spoken of in general terms as "four hundred years," not the exact number. Verse 14 means that God would afterwards punish the Egyptians who held them in bondage. He did this in the destruction of Pharaoh and his army in the Red Sea and the after evils that were brought upon them. The Israelites, notwithstanding their bondage, came out of Egypt with much substance. Ex. 12: 40 gives the exact time of the sojourn in Egypt, counting from the sojourn in Canaan as pilgrims. The Bible sometimes speaks in general terms, as people do.

### **BORN AGAIN.**

(1) What is it to be "born again?" (John 3: 1-8.) A birth, as a begun and completed process, is the impartation of a principle of life to matter and a bringing forth of the material being into a state suited to its perpetuation and growth. Jesus, in this illustration, likens the change that takes place in one becoming a Christian to a birth. He says that he "must be born again;" he was once born of his fleshly parents, but he must now be born of the Spirit in order to see or become a citizen of the kingdom of heaven. Nicodemus did not understand, and asks: "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 replies: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." What was born of your fleshly mother is your flesh; it is your spirit that must be born of the Spirit. So this is to be a spiritual birth, as the former one was a fleshly birth. Verse 8, which has been made the ground of much controversy, is but a continuance of the illustration that the new birth affects the unseen spiritual part of man. That which is affected by the Spirit in the birth is the spirit of man, unseen, like the wind that blows.

The essential elements of a birth are a begetting and deliverance. These necessitate a father and a mother. The father begets, imparts to the mother the seed, the life germs, that under favorable conditions are quickened and grow into a new being. The mother's womb furnishes these conditions that nurse the seed into life. The life comes from the father

through the seed. The birth of the Spirit involves similar agents and conditions.

There must be a begetting and a bringing forth, or a deliverance, to constitute a birth. God himself, through the Holy Spirit, begets or imparts the spiritual seed. A new life through this seed must be imparted to the heart or soul of the person to be born into the kingdom of God. The word of God is the seed of the kingdom. (Luke 8: 11.) It is the seed in which the germinal principle of spiritual life dwells. It must enter into proper conditions to cause it to be quickened into life. A good and honest heart furnishes these conditions. So when the word of God is received into a good and honest heart, it is quickened into life and produces fruit. The word of God is given by the Spirit of God, and in it the Spirit dwells to impart life to the heart into which it is received. "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life. But there are some of you that believe not." (John 6: 63, 64.) The father imparts the seed to the womb of the mother. The seed is impregnated with the life of the father. This life is dormant until it comes into favorable conditions in the mother's womb, when it is quickened and begins to grow into a new being. Now, the word of God is the seed, given by the Holy Spirit and impregnated by the Spirit, that is dormant in the word until it comes into favorable conditions in the heart, when it germinates and produces a new life. The life is in the seed. "The spirit giveth life." (2 Cor. 3: 6.) Paul says: "For in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." (1 Cor. 4: 15.) The Holy Spirit in Paul preached the word to the Corinthians; they received it into the heart as the incorruptible seed, and by it they were begotten or made alive. James says: "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of his creatures." (James 1: 18.) Peter says: "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." (1 Pet. 1: 23.) Connect this with what Jesus said to Nicodemus, and it is clear that the Holy Spirit begets by imparting the word of God, the incorruptible seed, to the heart of man, and it germinates and becomes a new spiritual being.

Sometimes it is asked: "What represents the mother in the

new birth?" The seed is imparted by the father to the mother. The seed is implanted in the heart of man by the Spirit of God. Then the heart of man that receives the word of God fills the place of the mother in receiving and nourishing the seed into favorable conditions for its germination and growth into a new being. Then, in order that this new spiritual life may be manifested to the world in its character as a new spiritual being, God commanded that it should be brought forth of the water in baptism. So the birth is completed, or the deliverance made, in baptism.

Life is not imparted to the child by the deliverance. The life is imparted by the father, quickened by the favorable conditions of the mother. The birth, or deliverance, only passes the preexistent life into a new and favorable state for its growth and development. So baptism imparts no life; it only delivers the life that has already been developed in a new state and relations suited for its growth.

This representation of the new birth is figurative, but the explanations correspond to the literal facts in conversion as taught elsewhere in the Scriptures.

To receive the word of God into the good and understanding heart is to believe with the heart. The influence of that word in the heart leads to repentance, and then the requirement is: "Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." (Acts 2: 38.)

The man who complies with these conditions is born of God, is born of water and of the Spirit. He is a child of God, and he is to grow to be a man in Christ Jesus—that is, the principle of life imparted to him through the reception of the word of God into his heart is really a part of the life of God, imparted to him, and it is his duty to cherish that principle of the divine life, to feed it on the sincere milk of the word, that it may grow thereby and transform the whole character of the man into the likeness of God. The child thus grows into the likeness of his Father; and when he attains to the growth that he is able to attain in the flesh, he is transferred to a higher state of being in which the transformation begun on earth will be completed and perfected into the perfect likeness of Jesus Christ, our elder brother and the first begotten of our Father, "who is the image of the invisible God." "We shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is," and God will share

his blessings and glories with us forever, because we are the sons and daughters of the living God.

(2) Were John's disciples and those made by Jesus born again? If not, why not?

The kingdom of God was preached from the days of John the Baptist, and men pressed into it. The disciples of John and of Jesus were so begotten of the word as to believe in Christ. While all claiming to be his disciples were not so begotten as to believe in Christ, only those that were so brought to believe were begotten, and only those are embraced in this question, and they were born into the kingdom, then only partially completed, perfected, and furnished. The kingdom, by the mission of Christ and the Spirit, was perfected and completed. Many who, seemingly, were disciples of John rejected it in its perfected state. Those who accepted it and fed upon this teaching under the personal teachings of Jesus and his disciples became fitted to enjoy it in its completed and perfected state.

This growth and adaptation could not be called a birth. If so, the Jew was first begotten and born into the kingdom in its preparatory state, then was again begotten and born into it in its perfected state. The birth fitted and brought the one born to the remission of sins. Its purpose was and is at once to secure remission of sins and to bring the purified soul into the state suited for its growth when its sins are forgiven.

John's baptism, and certainly that of Jesus, brought the soul to the remission of sins and introduced it into that state in which it could find favorable surroundings and divine help for maintaining freedom from sin and growth in a holy life.

Now if a man was in a state of forgiveness, why should he be born again? Into what new state is he to be introduced? He, by fidelity in the privileges granted in the preparatory state, was schooled and educated for enjoying the privileges and opportunities of the perfected kingdom, but he was not born into a new state or kingdom. See **Water, Born Of**.

### **BORN, HE THAT IS, OF GOD CANNOT SIN.**

Please explain 1 John 3: 9. Does this passage teach that it is impossible for those who have been born of God to commit sin?

It is a passage that there is always difficulty over. We answer it, on an average, every three months, I think. It can-

not mean that it is impossible for a man to sin. That contradicts too many other passages of scripture. The greatest sin is to think a man cannot sin. That is the presumptuous sin. The best construction I can put on it is that so long as the word of God, which is the seed of the kingdom, remains in his heart, he cannot intentionally live in a course of sin. John, in this Epistle, has been discussing those who claim to have no sin, and so need not the blood of Christ to take away their sin, in contrast with those who are cleansed by his blood through walking in the light as Jesus is in the light. This contrast he keeps up here, and speaks of those who accept the word of God and cannot live in that course of sin that denies they need the blood of Christ to cleanse them from sin. God warns, "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall" (1 Cor. 10: 12)—that is, when he becomes confident he cannot sin, he is in greatest danger of committing the presumptuous sin. Man in the flesh never gets above the weaknesses of mortality. To live free from sin of omission or commission is to be equal with Christ Jesus the Lord.

### **BRANCHES, WHO ARE THE?**

(1) Please explain John 15: 2-5: "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away: and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit. ... I am the vine, ye are the branches." To whom did Jesus refer as "the branches?"

This language was spoken directly to the apostles. They were the branches that received life from him, and they bore the clusters of fruit in the churches planted. Judas was a branch that bore no fruit, and he took him away, severed his connection with the vine, and he went to his own place. Peter and the other apostles were tried, pruned, and disciplined; and by the trials through which they passed they were fitted to do more and better work for the Lord. While these illustrations applied primarily to the apostles, I do not doubt but they in a secondary sense apply to all Christians. All Christians receive life from Christ, as the branch from the vine. Those who do nothing and bear no fruit in his service will be lopped off and burned up; those who are active and alive are trained, pruned, their evil habits cut off, so they come to bear more fruit.

(2) I heard a Methodist preacher say that the **branches** mentioned in John 15: 1-6 are the different denominations. Was he right? I think he was speaking of his disciples.

It is very clear that Jesus was the vine and the disciples were the branches. There is no allusion to the churches in the connection. It was before the church was opened to the world. The disciples each was a branch, and, if severed from Christ, must wither and perish. The church was established, was the spiritual body of Christ; and the individuals were members of that body. Such things as denominational churches were unknown in the days of Jesus and the apostles. They are foretold as the man of sin, the mystery of iniquity, the germs of which had begun to work in Paul's day, but which he hindered until he was taken out of the way. These prophecies are usually referred to the Romish Church, but they embrace all denominational churches alike. They all have their origin alike in efforts to form a closer union than the apostles left. Romanism had its origin in delegated meetings to consult for the common good of all the churches in a given district or country. Out of this start grew by degrees Romanism. These delegated meetings to consider the good of all the churches, advise and direct, grew into the ecclesiasticism of the Roman Catholic Church. It took several hundred years to grow into the papacy, but the same kind of meetings was the basis of all denominations. Churches, as God left them, had no other bond of union or fellowship but a common faith in Jesus Christ and mutual love for one another. Whatsoever is more than this cometh of sin. Denominational churches constitute no part of the body of Christ. They are all sinful and presumptuous, and ought to be abolished. See **Man of Sin, The.**

### **BREAD, SHOULD THE, BE BROKEN BEFORE PASSING TO COMMUNICANTS?**

Some of the brethren here believe that' after thanksgiving the loaf should not be broken before passing it to communicants; that each is required to break it for himself or herself. In each of the examples given it is said that Jesus took bread, and, after giving thanks, broke it and gave it to them, saying: "This is my body, which is broken for you." The question is: Should the loaf be broken, as the examples show, or should it not?

I have never seen one word in the Bible regulating these things; so I think they are indifferent. I never think of such

questions unless some one asks them. There is nothing in the Bible to suggest them. They are questions of which the Bible says nothing, and so must be indifferent to the Lord. But there are so many duties of weight and importance demanding attention. I used to see preachers directly called of God break the loaf into small pieces, so each member could take a piece. They seemed to think they stood in the place of Jesus and administered the Supper to the laity, who had no right, save to partake of what the high official administered; but I thought and hoped all that idea of official grace and authority had been left behind by the disciples, and that all, as kings and priests of the Lord, could partake of it each for himself. I hope nobody assumes to stand in the place of Jesus before his brethren and all will partake without contention over untaught questions. The expression, the body "broken," or the "broken body," is found only once in the Common Version, and it is left out of the American Revised Version as an interpolation. The body of Christ was pierced and bruised, but a bone of him was not broken.

### **BREAD, WHAT SHOULD BE DONE WITH THE, LEFT AFTER COMMUNION?**

It has been customary at our Lord's-day meetings after dismissing the congregation to give the remainder of the loaf of the Lord's Supper to the little children. One of our members believes this to be wrong, and will not permit her child to eat it. Not wishing to offend any brother or sister by our actions in this matter, and especially wishing to discontinue the habit if sinful, we would like to know what disposition ought to be made of the remnant of the Supper.

I do not think the Bible teaches anything as to what is to be done with what remains of the loaf. So it is a matter of indifference. Still, I think it very bad taste, and it grates harshly on my feelings, to see children running up to the table for the bread so soon as the audience is dismissed. They would not do it if they were not accustomed to it. If the children need feeding at the meetinghouse, bring them a biscuit, and nobody's sense of propriety is offended. It is easy to settle these indifferent questions when each esteems the other better than himself and is anxious to offend the feelings of none.

**BREAK BREAD, SHOULD FOUR?**

When as many as four who claim to be Christians can meet on the first day of the week and they refuse to do so, can they be saved? What is just one to do who has the courage and no one will meet with him? Can he be saved?

When there are **four** or three or two who can meet together and worship, and they refuse to do it, they fall under the condemnation of the Lord. How much he will overlook our failures to perform his will, I cannot tell, but it is a fearful thing to take such risks in neglecting the service of God. That one can be indifferent to this service of God shows a lack of fitness for enjoying the blessings of God. He never sends blessings on those unfit to receive them. One alone may acceptably serve God, and this example, with continued admonition, might move others to the performance of duty. Christians are poorly taught who think they will be excused from serving God because only a few are willing to engage in the service.

**BURIAL AND THE LORD'S-DAY SERVICE.**

Do you think it is right for a congregation to set aside the worship of God to attend to the funeral services of one of its members?

The burial service of one of its members ought not to be so arranged as to interfere with the Lord's Supper. The idea that a burial must set aside everything else is a wrong idea. Jesus says: "Follow me, and let the dead bury their dead." While this does not mean that no attention is to be given to the burial of the dead, it does mean that there are more important matters. When a Christian dies, the burial ought to be so arranged that it will not interfere with other duties and services. In the same line bereaved Christians often make the death of a friend an excuse for staying away from the service of God. This is a strange course. It seems that bereavement and sorrow should lead us closer to Christ, to a more faithful observance of his appointments. In that service we can find comfort and solace for the sorrows of life. A true estimate of service will make us draw closer to God when trouble and sorrow come upon us.

**CAIN'S WIFE.**

When God put the mark on Cain, lest any man should kill him, who was in that land to kill him? (Gen. 4: 15.) Whose daughter was the wife of Cain? (Gen. 4: 17.) And who were the sons of God



and the daughters of men that were taken for wives, as spoken of in Gen. 6: 2? The scientific world at one time advanced the idea, and chose the quotations as proof, that the world was peopled before the days of Adam, thus destroying the Mosaic account of creation.

God has purposely left things so that those who wish to disbelieve in him can find ample excuse for so doing. He has left ample ground for all who desire to serve and honor him to do so. He wishes service from the heart and no other. He has given ground for men to believe in him, although difficulties exist in the way. God never made a smooth path for man to travel through life. He wants a faith able to surmount obstacles and to overcome difficulties. It is a poor, weak, and worthless faith that halts and staggers at every difficulty it finds in the way. Yet it is strange that men should rely upon the statements of Moses to overthrow the account of Moses. We might prove by Moses that a theory men adopt concerning his statements is incorrect; but unless we convict him as untrustworthy, we could not set aside his statements by his statements. If he is untrustworthy, his statements can prove only his untrustworthiness.

The trouble in all the questions propounded is in men assuming that they know what they do not. They assume that Cain was the firstborn of Adam and Eve, but nobody knows this. God created man to "be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it." They were healthy, vigorous, prolific. How long they remained in Eden we do not know. Children may have been born to them in Eden even. Their first and chief business was to "be fruitful, and multiply." There is no evidence that Cain was the firstborn. He may or may not have been. Moses mentions only those whose examples teach, instruct, warn, or encourage men. He gave a record of the line of descent to Abraham and Jesus Christ. They may have had a hundred children before Cain was born. These, in the days of strength and vigor that would perpetuate life for nearly a thousand years, would begin early to bear children. We do not know how old Cain was when the occurrences took place. Moses said, "in process of time," which would indicate a long period. No death had occurred save that of Abel, so far as the record shows, and there may have been thousands of the descendants of Adam living at the time Cain murdered Abel. Some of these may have been in the

land of Nod. Among these, Cain no doubt found his wife, and these might kill him.

"The sons of God" were probably the sons of the families that remained faithful to God. The sons of men were of the rebellious families, like Cain. The families generally had become wicked. The members of the faithful families married the daughters of those unfaithful, and so all were corrupted, and God brought the flood of destruction upon them.

No one knows or can know anything of these matters, save what is written in the book of Genesis. Only fools build theories on what no man can know. Speculations about the tilings of which we can know nothing are unprofitable. Men who make these things of which there can be nothing known a ground for objecting to the word of God will never make Christians. Christians are not made of people who reject God's statements with theories based on their ignorance.

### **CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.**

Some think that the Bible teaches it is right to hang people. I, for One, do not believe it right under the law of Christ. Can the advocates of capital punishment sustain their position by the New Testament teachings?

I have no doubt but that God intends, in the present sinful condition of men, that they should hang and kill and destroy one another until they learn to trust and obey him. War and capital punishment are the same in principle. War is the effort of a nation to execute capital punishment upon a multitude of offenders. Executing a criminal is society or the government waging war upon one who has offended against society. God says that the human government is his minister to execute wrath on the evil doer. (Read Rom. 12: 19-21; 13: 1-7.) I do not think society is in a condition that the world can get along yet without war and bloodshed and executing criminals, but the Christian should have no part in it.

The New Testament gives no rule regulating civil governments or civil officers. It gives rules and regulations to govern Christians. Christians cannot take vengeance or execute wrath. The weapons of the Christian's warfare are not carnal, but spiritual, and "mighty before God to the casting down of strongholds." (2 Cor. 10: 4.) Christians cannot use carnal weapons. But the civil ruler is God's minister "to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil" (Rom. 13: 4), which shows

Christians cannot become rulers. So Christians cannot execute capital punishment, and nothing is taught on the subject in the New Testament. There is not a word in the New Testament telling how persons as civil rulers shall act. This is the best evidence that no Christian should participate in managing human governments. The Scriptures tell how a Christian should act as father, son, brother, sister, neighbor, stranger, friend, enemy, toward the poor and the rich, and how he should act as a subject of human government, but not a word as to how he should act as a ruler or active participant in human government. What does such a condition mean?

### **CARD PLAYING AT HOME.**

Is there any harm in a church members' playing social games of cards at home? Does the Bible condemn such?

Playing cards under such or under any circumstances is undoubtedly wrong. Christians are commanded to avoid the very appearance of evil. "Destroy not with thy meat him for whom Christ died. Let not then your good be evil spoken of. . . . So then let us follow after things which make for peace, and things whereby we may edify one another. Overthrow not for meat's sake the work of God. . . . It is good not to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor to do anything whereby thy brother stumbleth." (Rom. 14: 15-21.) "And thus, sinning against the brethren, and wounding their conscience when it is weak, ye sin against Christ. Wherefore, if meat causeth my brother to stumble, I will eat no flesh for evermore, that I cause not my brother to stumble." (1 Cor. 8: 12, 13.) Certainly card playing comes under the condemnation of these scriptures, with a number of others. Card playing is the commonest method of gambling, stands associated with it, and leads to it. People learn to play cards and are then continually tempted to gamble. This is especially so with the young. I do not see how a man could encourage gambling more effectively than by encouraging them to play cards. It would be more effective than to encourage gambling directly. If this were done, men would see the evil and draw back; but they are encouraged to play cards as an innocent pastime, and then they are brought under the influence of the gambler. Many youths are tempted and led into gambling by virtue of having learned to play cards. No Christian can set an ex-

ample that so certainly leads into the most ruinous sins and practices that carry so many down to ruin. The Christian is to set examples of good, not of evil; examples that draw men away from the paths of ruin, not those that drag them down. The social game of cards, the social dance, and the social dram are all of a class that lead to much evil and no good. It would be hard to tell whether gambling or drunkenness or lewdness is the more corrupting and widespread evil. They go hand in hand, and the young are led into the temptation by these social games in which they engage, and to which they are encouraged at the homes of professed Christians. But no one whose heart is under the influence of the Spirit of God can encourage in these practices that bring evil. A man cannot do this and maintain the respect of his fellow-man as a Christian. See **Race Course, Christians at The.**

### CHILDBEARING.

Is it not rebellion against God when it comes to parents' refusing to rear a family—to increase? I know a sister who says that she had rather die than give birth to another child. I know mothers who advise their children not to allow their families to grow larger. Could you state if parents can "overdo" the matter—rear more children than they can properly look after and educate?

A woman that is not willing to bear children ought not to marry. It is too late to come to this conclusion after marriage. People marry to gratify the lusts of each other, and Paul says: "Because of [or to avoid] fornications, let each man have his own wife, and let each woman have her own husband. Let the husband render unto the wife her due: and likewise also the wife unto the husband. The wife hath not power over her own body, but the husband: and likewise also the husband hath not power over his own body, but the wife. Defraud ye not one the other, except it be by consent for a season, that ye may give yourselves unto prayer, and may be together again, that Satan tempt you not because of your incontinency." (1 Cor. 7: 2-5.) This defines that the husband and the wife are to seek to gratify each other, and not themselves, in the relations, lest through inability of one or the other to restrain the lusts they be led into fornication. This, with healthy people, usually leads to childbearing. The effort to avoid childbearing while in the marriage relation is to fight against the order of God. It destroys a living, though

unborn, child, and endangers the health of the mother. To prevent conception is to prevent the existence of a being that would be eternal. Then, when does a child become a person? For a mother to destroy the child that has been begotten and to slink an unborn child in her own womb is close akin to child murder. Efforts to avoid conception, slinking the unborn child, and child murder seem to be kindred acts. The course is closely connected with the most degrading forms of lasciviousness. A woman's slinking the child in her own womb is a degrading and disgraceful thought.

This aversion to childbearing arises from the unnatural and false life people are now living. The family and home life is neglected and despised. Children and the home life go together; they cannot exist separately. A boarding-house, or gad-around, life of the present day is not favorable to bearing and training children. The religious life of women of the present day is not promotive of child rearing and training. Women who attend conventions and manage societies and whoop up the religious meetings of the present age have no time or taste for being "keepers at home" or bearing and Training children. The society life of the present day is also inimical to childbearing and true home life.

But, despite these influences and tendencies, it is true that the true mission of women is to marry, bear children, guide the house, and be "keepers at home;" and their highest happiness and greatest usefulness are found in their fulfilling this God-given mission. The country, true social good, and the church of God can never attain to permanent good until women seek their truest good in being "keepers at home" and in bearing and training children for the Lord.

**CHRIST OUR ALTAR.** See **Altar, Leave Thy Gifts Before The.**

### **CHRISTIANS, ARE THEY?**

We have a people in this community who have submitted to the form of doctrine (Rom. 6: 17) delivered unto them, and seem to be very zealous for the spread of the gospel, and are very charitable; but in their zeal they have changed God's order of worship, turning it into a musical entertainment, and have formed societies of every kind through which to do the work God has assigned to the church, admitting at the same time that they have changed from the original order; but they justify themselves on the ground that other people

have these things and that they must keep abreast of the times; and since there is liberty in Christ, they have a right to change this order as the exigencies of the case may require. In view of what I have said, are these people entitled to be called Christians in the true sense?

A follower of Christ is a Christian. One must take Christ as his only Lawgiver, Ruler, Leader, and Governor; his Prophet (teacher), Priest (intercessor), and King (ruler). We must seek to think like Christ, to feel and purpose as Christ did, act as Christ acted, and in all things seek to follow him. That we might do this, he was clothed in flesh, that we, while in the flesh, might see and know him and his actions and might follow his example in his fleshly walk.

The heart, the inner man, thinks, feels, purposes. Solomon says: "Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life." (Prov. 4: 23.) This means all the purposes and courses of life originate in and flow out from the heart. If the life is to be kept right, then the heart must be guarded, must be kept true and pure, with all diligence. If the fountain is impure, the stream must be defiled. If the heart is impure, the life must be corrupt and sinful; hence, guard it, keep it, with all diligence.

The heart is composed of the mind, the emotions, and the will. The mind must be taught properly, that it may enlighten and direct the emotions; and the emotions, rightly directed, guide the will and form the purposes of the heart that control and guide the life of man. We must begin with the heart, enlighten the mind, purify and direct the feelings and emotions, and so rightly form the purposes of the heart.

To follow Jesus, we must first be like him in heart. Our minds must be enlightened by his teachings, our feelings and emotions must be moved by the same motives that prevailed in his heart, and then the purposes of the will must be like his will and purposes. The highest desire of Jesus was to do the will of his Father. "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." (John 6: 38.) "I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me." (John 5: 30.) His prayer, facing the agonies of the cross, was: "Not my will, but thine, be done." (Luke 22: 42.) The constant prayer of all the children of God must be: "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." (Matt. 6: 10.) The fundamental, ruling desire of

every child of God is to do the will of God, to subjugate his own will to the will of God in all things. The heart that is pure toward God desires this above all things.

The heart, then, that desires to change the law and order of God in anything is not right in the sight of God. This has been the test of fidelity to God in all ages and under all dispensations of God to man. It was so in Eden; the desire to substitute something else for the will of God despoiled Eden of its purity and sent the human family down the course of sin and sorrow and death. In the days of Abel, Noah, Abraham, David, Jesus Christ, and Paul, this was the rule and the test of fidelity to and acceptance with God. The person that does not seek to do the will of God is no servant of God, no matter how kind and charitable he be. A man's heart may be perfect, and yet he fall into sin. David was a man after God's own heart, yet fell into grievous sin. "The heart of Asa was perfect all his days," yet he fell into sin that brought the punishment of God upon him. It means that, while the desire and purposes of the heart are to serve God, the fleshly appetites and passions may tempt a man into sin. So there is always necessity for watchfulness and carefulness, lest, with the best intentions and purposes of the heart, we sin through fleshly temptation and desire.

There are two classes of sins—one, the sin of the spirit, or heart, that sets aside purposely the law of God; the other, the sin of the flesh, that is drawn into sin contrary to the desires of the heart. The latter sin, if it is persisted in, overcomes and perverts the spirit, or heart, and drags the man into willful sin. The sin of the heart is the presumptuous sin. It consciously and purposely sets aside the law of God and substitutes for the law or appointment of God something that the person thinks will do better or is more effective in honoring God and saving men. The motive of doing good may prompt it. But it is presumption that dares to think man can improve on the appointments of God. It shows a lack of appreciation of God as the all-wise and omnipotent Ruler of the heavens and the earth; it exalts the frail judgment of man above the wisdom of God; it is presumptuous assertion of man's superiority to God. God cannot tolerate this. He cannot forgive it when it is deliberately planned and persisted in.

It was a sin of this character that Saul committed in changing the order of God to slay the fatlings in the land of Amalek. It is this character of sin that James condemns: "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." (James 2: 10, 11.) The setting aside the law in one point was the presumptuous turning from God's commandment to the wisdom of men. This is a sin that rejects God, and he who does it in the least commandments of God is not a true servant of God. He is not worthy to be called a "Christian."

There is much meaningless and hurtful talk of Christians that depart from the order of God. All talk of men who change the order, or law, of God in the slightest particular being Christians, or children of God, is vain and misleading. It deceives them; it deceives and misleads the public. Men who consciously change, or modify, add to or take from, the law of God in the slightest particulars are not Christians; it is misleading to call them so. Churches that change, add to, or take from the commandments of God are not churches of Christ; it is sinful to so call them. There ought to be a clear and wide distinction between those who follow God's laws and those who depart from them. He who is not for God in such issues is against him. Be true to God.

### **CHRISTMAS.**

(1) Please answer the following question: Give an account of the true origin of Christmas. Has it any connection with the church of Christ?

McClintock and Strong's "Encyclopedia" says: "The observance of Christmas is not of divine appointment, nor is it of New Testament origin. The day of Christ's birth cannot be ascertained from the New Testament, or, indeed, from any other source. The fathers of the first three centuries do not speak of any special observance of the nativity." It grew up in the latter part of the third century and the earlier years of the fourth century. The "Encyclopedia" further says: "The institution may be sufficiently explained by the circumstance that it was the taste of the age to multiply festivals, and that the analogy of other events in our Savior's history, which had



already been marked by a distinct celebration, may naturally have pointed out the propriety of marking his nativity with the same honorable distinction." There has never been agreement as to the day or month of his birth; it has been fixed by different writers for every month in the year. The churches of Western Europe finally settled on December 25. It was at the end of the year, the time of festivity and giving of gifts among the heathen nations, and it has grown into use by the Catholic Church and the Episcopal Church, and gradually by all the Protestant churches.

(2) Should any true Christian recognize and reverence this day above any other?

There is no authority for its observance, and its observance is no more binding than that of any other day; indeed, it is a misfortune to have a day of this kind observed religiously that is not appointed by God. It has a tendency to destroy the distinction between things human and divine. There is no sin in observing it as a day of thanksgiving and for giving gifts as thanks for the blessings of the year, but it is a sin to observe it as consecrated to God.

### **CHURCH AND SUNDAY SCHOOL.**

I want you to tell me the difference, if any, between the church and Sunday school as organized bodies. Should they be run separately, or should the church control the school—I mean literally?

It is the privilege and duty of every Christian to use every opportunity that offers to teach the word of God to others. This teaching may be done to one alone, to a class, or a promiscuous audience, as the qualifications of the teacher and the surroundings may suggest is best. This is all to be done in accordance with the laws of Christ, in violation of no law laid down. It is to be done in the name of Christ, as a member of his body. We cannot do a thing in the name of Christ when it is done as a member of a body not authorized by him. Christ never ordained any organization except his churches. In these, as members of his body, his children must work. No Sunday school or missionary or charitable organization outside of his church has ever been authorized. No Christian has a right to work in any of these human organizations. He must do what he does as a member of the body of Christ. Acting as a member of that body, he must do it with a proper

regard for the members of that body. The elders are made the rulers, to see God's laws carried out.

Work ought to be done in harmony with this position of the elders. This does not mean that they should never work save as the elders direct, or that they should wait for the elders to tell them before they work. Unfortunately, some get in as elders who never direct or advise work. In the church the elders should see all work is done as the Bible directs, teach the Bible, do all in the name of Christ. But when men are away from the church and opportunity offers, they should teach—teach individuals and classes as opportunity offers. They should do it as members of the church, and not as members of some human organization. Paul and Barnabas preached thus, and then reported their work to the church. It is a good example to follow. These inspired men of God honored God's church, and, notwithstanding their inspiration, they honored the elders of the churches. We would do well to follow their examples and in all things honor the church of God, and do all that we do as members of that church, and all in the name of Christ Jesus. Then no one should work as a member of any association save the church of Christ. All should be under the direction or oversight of the elders. A Sunday school should be nothing more than the church through its members teaching the word of God.

### **CHURCH, THE, COMPARED TO THE HUMAN BODY.**

An apologist for the innovations that are being pressed into the churches compared the church to the human body in this way. He said: "The human body is composed of different organs and members. Some of these organs, or members, are vital, necessary to the life of the body—such as the heart, the liver, the lungs, and the stomach. Without these the body cannot live or exist. Then there are other members—as the hands, the feet, and the eyes—that are not vital organs; they are not necessary to the life or existence of the body. The body may exist and live without these. So the church, as the body of Christ, is composed of parts, or organs. Some of these are vital, necessary to the existence of the church—such as faith, repentance, and baptism. Others are not vital or necessary to the life or sustenance of the church—such as the organ, societies, etc." Is this illustration an apt one?

The illustration is an apt one if rightly applied. In the first place, every organ or member set in the human body by God is vital or necessary to the performance of the work God appointed it to perform. The foot is essential to walking; the eye, to seeing; and the hand, to doing the work of the hand.

That work of God ceases when the member God appointed to do it is destroyed. Sometimes when the member God appointed is destroyed, an artificial or man-made member is supplied, but fails to do the work the natural or God-made member performs. An artificial foot or hand is a poor substitute for the God-given one. An artificial eye may deceive the people, but can never see. What this man calls the organs not vital to the church are not organs or members of the church, or body of Christ. They are artificial, man-made members. The organs God gave to do the work are the churches themselves, with the members for the work and the human voices for the worship. These, like the hands and feet of the human body, may not be necessary to the bare life or existence of the body, but are vital and necessary to the work and worship and the growth and vigor of the body. Sometimes the church fails to use its natural members to do the service God ordained them to do, and then substitutes artificial members or man-made substitutes to do the work the real organs or members fail to do. The whole thing is a miserable makeshift and a failure. No life or warmth or vigor can ever dwell in or pass through these artificial limbs; no spiritual life or warmth or vigor can ever dwell in or pass through these artificial additions to the church of God. The whole work of substituting these man-made or artificial organs, or works, to do the work of the church destroys the true work of God, drives out the Spirit and life of God. The whole business of mending the body of Christ, of patching up and changing the church of God, drives out the Spirit, and is an insult to God.

### **CHURCH ESTABLISHED.**

When was the church of God set up? Give a complete answer. I am a new reader, and want to know the truth.

The preparation for the establishment of the church was going on from the sin of Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden. The patriarchal dispensation down to the days of Moses prepared for the dispensation of Moses. During the patriarchal age the promise of a Savior was made to Abraham. The Jewish law was then added because of transgressions, and it was intended to prepare more specially for the establishment of the church of God. John the Baptist was then sent as the forerunner of Christ. He preached, "The kingdom of heaven

is at hand"—close by. It was said from the days of John the Baptist the kingdom of heaven was preached, and all men press into it. John prepared a people for the coming of Messiah. Jesus came, taught those prepared by John, and chose his twelve apostles that were to go forth and preach to all the people. He told these apostles to tarry at Jerusalem until they were endued with power from on high. The Holy Spirit would guide them into the fullness of all truth and call to their remembrance all things taught by Jesus. They remained at Jerusalem for about ten days after the ascension of Jesus, when the Holy Spirit descended upon the apostles, and under his direction the apostles taught the people and made known the conditions of salvation to the world. This is recognized as the opening of the church to the world. (See Acts 2.) See Kingdom, Has the, Been Established?

### **CHURCH FAIRS AND SUPPERS.**

There has been much talk and a great deal written that I have seen about church suppers, fairs, and the like. They have been very much condemned by some, I among the number. Because raffling, extortion, and other things are frequently forbidden by the Scriptures, therefore I condemn all together, judging the supper by the company it generally keeps. Would it be out of harmony with the teaching of the Scriptures to make cake and ice cream to sell at reasonable prices, also to sell cakes and bouquets at auction? Is it wrong when honestly conducted? The Book teaches us to "work with our hands the thing that is good, that we may have to give to him that needeth."

The Bible clearly teaches that all gifts to the Lord shall be freewill offerings of that which is honestly made. Selling cakes and bouquets and ice cream is a legitimate business for any individual to follow; and if they do it in their own names and then freely give the money made to the Lord, no one would ever object. But to do it as a church festival to raise money for the church is sin, no matter how honestly conducted, because that is not the Lord's way of raising money. That is feeding the flesh, pampering it to induce those not willing to give to the Lord to part with their money for the Lord. If the fair is held for the benefit of the church, and is so advertised, the money does not belong to those who hold the fair. They cannot give it. It was held for the benefit of the church. The man who paid the money did not give it to the church: he gave it for the supper. It is the church held up as a beggar, and men's appetites are appealed to to induce them to give

what they are not willing to give the church. Mind you, if a sister would sell the things legitimately in her own name to make money, and then give of her money, it would be all right. If the Savior scourged those who sold doves in the earthly temple, doubly he would scourge the traffickers out of his spiritual temple. If it polluted that, doubly so it does this.

### CHURCH IN THE WILDERNESS.

Please explain Acts 7: 38. Who is it "that was in the church in the wilderness?" If it was Christ, did not his church exist before Pentecost, and even before John the Baptist? In what sense did the church exist at that time?

This says Moses was with the church in the wilderness. But Christ was with them, too, just as through Noah he preached to the spirits in prison. The word church did not in primitive times have as specific meaning as we give it. The word *ekklesia*, which is translated church, came nearer corresponding to the word assembly, or congregation. It applied to any assembly or separating of one class of people from another, no matter whether the separation was for religious purposes or not. In Acts 19: 32-41 we have an account of an unlawful assembly in Ephesus that sought to kill Paul. It is called in the original tongue **ekklesia**, and is translated **assembly** in English. The word church then meant an assembly or a body or class of people separated from others. The children of Israel, separated from all other people called out of Egypt, were an *ekklesia*, and it is translated church. It would have been just as proper to have called it the assembly, or congregation. The translators called only those separated to the service of God church; others, assemblies. It only means that the people in the wilderness, of whom Moses was the leader, were an assembly separated for the service of God. There was probably then a Jewish church, or assembly, and a church of Christ. One was regulated by the law of Moses, the other was regulated by the law of Jesus Christ. One was in many respects an earthly type of the other, but a type and the thing typified are not one and the same; so while there was a church in the days of Moses and one in the days of the apostles, they were not the same church. One prepared for the other and is typical of the other.

**CHURCH RECORD.**

Ought a church to keep a record of the names of its members and the amount of money received and how spent?

The church must know its members, and each member must know and work with each other. This knowledge is absolutely necessary to the work of the church. Then the list must be kept. It must be kept in the memory or by notches on a stick, recollecting whom each notch represents, or it must be written in a book. God has not said how it should be done, but "let all things be done decently and in order." Most men of sense would prefer the list in a book.

Paul shows a high degree of caution, lest his good name should be spoken evil of. He would not carry the means collected at Corinth to Judea, but insisted they should send their own approved messengers. No man or set of men who regard their own character will handle money for a church or any one else without keeping such an account of receipts and expenditures, with proper vouchers as to how it was used. A man who would not do this is not fit to handle money for any one. When the contribution is made, it should be the duty of one to count it and turn it over to the treasurer and both keep an account of it. This is necessary to the protection of the treasurer's character. Things are not done decently and in order that do not protect the characters of the servants. These are small things, but proper attention to them saves big troubles.

**CHURCH TREASURY.**

(1) I would like for you to inform us whether or not it is right to have a treasury in the church, for it is our purpose, through God's assistance, to carry into effect the teaching of God.

It is singular to me how a doubt about this can arise in the mind of any sane man. God's people always had a treasury. Its fullness and use were always the tests of fidelity to God. Among the Jews the first fruits, the tenth, the freewill offerings and the thank offerings, and all the devoted things taken in war went into the treasury. (Read Lev. 27: 30-32; Num. 18:26; Deut. 14: 22-24; 1 Chron. 29: 8; Ez. 2: 69; Neh. 7: 70; etc.) Then in Mal. 3: 8-11 God charged them with robbing him in withholding the tithes from his treasury. "Jesus sat over against the treasury," and saw the rich cast in their much

and the poor widow cast in her all. (Mark 12: 41-44.) It was not lawful to put the blood money of Judas into the treasury. (Matt. 27: 6.) Jesus and the disciples had a treasury out of which they paid for things needed in the worship of God and gave to the poor. (John 13: 27-29.) Then in the first church at Jerusalem they "had all things common." (Acts 2: 44.) "Neither was there any among them that lacked: for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles' feet: and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need." (Acts 4: 34, 35.) This means a common treasury from which the poor were helped under the direction of the apostles. The apostles could not give needed attention to the distribution of the treasury, so they appointed seven persons to do this. (Acts 6: 1-6.) The first fruit of an earnest church was a full treasury, and these men were appointed to distribute it. These are generally supposed to be deacons, and without a treasury there is no work for deacons in a church.

"And the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren that dwelt in Judea: which also they did, sending it to the elders by the hand of Barnabas and Saul." (Acts 11: 29, 30.) It does not say it was first gathered into the church treasury, but it was sent to the elders of the churches and constituted a treasury under the elders of the churches in Judea until it was distributed to the poor. From proceedings in similar cases, we may know it was first collected into the treasury of the churches before sent by Barnabas and Saul. Afterwards there was widespread famine throughout Judea. "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I gave order to the churches of Galatia, so also do ye." (1 Cor. 16: 1.) The order had been given to the churches of Galatia, and is now given to the church at Corinth and throughout Achaia, to raise contributions. These contributions were cast into the treasury, that no collections should be made when Paul came. Then the churches were to choose those they desired to carry their bounty to the church at Jerusalem. "Moreover, brethren, we make known to you the grace of God which hath been given in the churches of Macedonia." (2 Cor. 8: 1.) He tells this grace of these churches were the contributions they gave of their own accord to help

the poor. The churches were doing this. "And we have sent together with him the brother whose praise in the gospel is spread through all the churches; and not only so, but who was also appointed by the churches to travel with us in the matter of this grace, which is ministered by us." (Verses 18, 19.) Those who were sent out to gather up and carry this collection—they "are the messengers of the churches, they are the glory of Christ." (Verse 23.) This collection was made by and in the churches by putting it into the treasury. The churches chose those who carried it to the needy, called "the messengers of the churches." None of this could be done unless the churches had treasuries to receive and dispense.

Paul says: "I robbed other churches, taking wages of them." (2 Cor. 11:8.) Churches could not pay wages unless they had a treasury out of which to pay them. He says the church at Corinth was "inferior to other churches," in that he had not been chargeable to them; other churches had supported him. (See 2 Cor. 12: 13.) "When I departed from Macedonia, no church had fellowship with me in the matter of giving and receiving but ye only; for even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my need." (Phil. 4: 15, 16.) The churches sent to him to relieve his necessities. Churches could do these things only through church treasuries.. Paul says: "Let none be enrolled as a widow [to be supported by the church] under threescore years old." (1 Tim. 5: 9.) "If any woman that believeth hath widows, let her relieve them, and let not the church be burdened; that it may relieve them that are widows indeed." (Verse 16.) All these, as plain as words and deeds can, show these churches not only had treasuries, but they cannot do any of the real work of a church of God without a treasury. A church that has no treasury is not a church of God.

I have been careful to note these statements and facts because I believe the calling in question these things that are so plainly taught and that enter into the whole work of a church of God indicates a morbid state of mind and hinders instead of helps the church. The agitation of this and kindred questions diverts the mind from the vital work of churches of God, and will destroy churches that encourage such questions. Paul says: "But him that is weak in faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations." (Rom. 14: 1.)



He shows the doubtful disputations are over untaught questions, such as eating herbs or meat. It means that men who have trouble on these questions are weak in the faith, and in receiving them they are to be prohibited from troubling the church with the discussion of these questions. The discussion of such questions diverts the mind from the true work of the church, and, if kept up, will destroy any church. Men who call in question plainly revealed truths and facts, as the treasury in the church, are perverted in faith; and the agitation of such questions, if kept up, will ruin any church in the world, and the man who does it makes himself a factionist that ought to be checked or avoided.

(2) If you say it is right to have a treasury, does it not follow, as is expressed by the word used in 1 Cor. 16: 2, that each one is to lay his contribution by him at home, where it is to be kept until there is a demand for its use?

There certainly is a word that means "putting it into the treasury." First they are commanded: "Upon the first day of the week let each one of you place [**titheto**, a verb meaning "to place," in the imperative mood] by itself, . . . putting it into the treasury [**thesauridyon**, a participle from the verb which means "to treasure up," or "to place in the treasury for safe-keeping"]." **Thesauridyo** is defined "to store, to treasure up, to lay up in store, to preserve." The noun, **thesauros**, is defined "a store laid up, treasure, a storehouse or treasure house, magazine;" in Herodotus, especially, "the treasury of a temple, any receptacle for valuables, a chest, a casket."

The word meaning "put it into the treasury" after it is placed by itself is certainly in the sentence, and the only question that can arise is: Was it to be placed in the man's own treasury or that of the church? To place by itself means "to separate it from what he keeps for his own use;" after this is done, it is to be treasured, or put into the treasury. The separation from what he kept took it out of his treasury; then he was to place it in the treasury. Is he to put it in his own treasury or the church treasury? The context, the scope of the passage, and the common-sense view of it settle this question. First, when he placed it by itself, he separated it from his treasures, took it out of his treasury—not to put it back immediately, certainly.

Then, too, the first churches are addressed as "churches." "As I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye." It was something the churches must do. The purpose was: "That there be no gatherings when I come." If it was in every man's private treasury, it would have to be gathered up, as if no collections had been made. It was under the control of the church. "Whomsoever ye [the members of the church] shall approve by your letters, them will I send to bring your liberality unto Jerusalem." (1 Cor. 16: 3.) Speaking of these same persons, Paul says they were "appointed by the churches to travel with us in the matter of this grace." (2 Cor. 8: 19.) "They are the messengers of the churches, they are the glory of Christ. Show ye therefore unto them in the face of the churches the proof of your love, and of our glorying on your behalf." (Verses 23, 24.)

The command was given to the churches; the churches selected those who should carry it, and they are called "the messengers of the churches" and "the glory of Christ;" and it was done "in the face of the churches." The contributions must have been put into the church treasury, thus to be directed and controlled by the church.

This is in perfect harmony, too, with the use of the word in the Bible. "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, . . . but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven." (Matt. 6: 19, 20.) This means: "So live that God keeps blessings in store in heaven." The same word is here translated "lay up treasures" as is translated "lay by in store" in 1 Cor. 16: 2. It is used in the same way in Luke 12: 21.

In the Septuagint Old Testament the same word is used. "The Lord shall open to thee his good treasure." (Deut. 29: 22.) "They with whom precious stones were found gave them to the treasure of the house of Jehovah." (1 Chron. 29: 8.) "Gave after their ability into the treasury of the work." (Ez. 2: 69.) "The governor gave to the treasury a thousand darics of gold." (Neh. 7: 70.) "And some of the heads of fathers' houses gave into the treasury of the work." (Verse 71.)

We could give many such examples. While the word sometimes refers to laying up treasures to be hoarded by and for self, most usually it refers to placing things in a public, or common, treasury kept and guarded by public functionaries

for the use of all. The meaning and use of the word, the context, and the scope of the sentence in 1 Cor. 16: 2 force the idea that it was placed in the church treasury.

(3) Would it be right, if a brother conscientiously believes he could bestow his means in a more worthy way, to do so in a quiet manner and try to avoid offending any one?

It is not presumed that a person will cast all the means he has into the church treasury. Christians are to do good, as they have opportunity, to all men, especially to those of the household of faith. (Gal. 6: 10.) If a person put all he has into the church treasury, he would have nothing to give when opportunity for doing good presents itself. There are demands upon one, such as caring for poor widows connected with the household, that come even before casting into the treasury. Those who neglect such duties are those who deny the faith and are worse than an infidel. I would say, then, that these duties are to be discharged before casting into the treasury. And yet there is danger in putting other than the most pressing personal obligations before the duties we owe the church of God.

### **CHURCHES AND PREACHERS.**

(1) Is it right for a preacher of the gospel to have regular monthly, semimonthly, or weekly appointments at the same church?

Paul preached three years at Ephesus. He says to the elders: "Ye yourselves know, from the first day that I set foot in Asia, after what manner I was with you all the time, serving the Lord with all lowliness of mind, and with tears, and with trials which befell me by the plots of the Jews; how I shrank not from declaring unto you anything that was profitable, and teaching you publicly, and from house to house." (Acts 20: 18-20.) The public teaching, I take it, was in the assemblies of the church. He further says: "Wherefore watch ye, remembering that by the space of three years I ceased not to admonish every one night and day with tears." (Verse 31.) By day and by night and from house to house. Barnabas and Saul assembled themselves a whole year with the church at Antioch. (Acts 11: 26.) Paul continued a year and six months at Corinth, teaching the word of God among them. (Acts 17: 11.)

These examples show that Paul remained one, two, or three

years at a place; that he taught in meetings of the church and publicly on every occasion that offered. He also threw himself with such energy and devotion into the work that both day and night and from house to house he warned and admonished both Jew and Gentile to repent and turn to God.

Public preaching, monthly or weekly, is a poor substitute for the earnest labors of the early preachers and teachers. These early preachers kept constantly in view the preparation of the church to live, worship, and edify itself without the presence and help of a preacher or teacher from a distance.

A preacher may by weekly or monthly appointments aid and instruct a church how to worship and develop its ability to worship and serve the Lord. I cannot see that weekly or monthly appointments, if this is kept in view, are wrong. There is danger, if this is not kept in view, that the church accept this as the permanent conditions of things and all its worship degenerate into a routine of monthly meetings, or merely a meeting to be entertained by a speech from the preacher.

(2) Is it right for such a church and preacher to have an understanding between themselves as to the amount he is to receive as support from them?

Paul, when introducing the Christian religion in a place and preparing them to worship for themselves, did not take support from those whom he was trying to convert, although he certainly asserted the right to do so, according to their ability. He communicated with other churches as to his wants and they sent to his necessities. What they failed to supply, he supplemented with his own labor. He pursued this course lest the gospel should be hindered; and it was always a matter of rejoicing to him that he did it without cost to the destitute. He not only gives it as his rule (2 Cor. 10: 13), but he states that he acted on that rule among them. (1 Thess. 2: 6-9.)

But it is lawful for a church to support a teacher to convert sinners in their midst and to supply what is lacking in their work, as well as to support him to go to the destitute. Paul asserts the former in these words: "What soldier ever serveth at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock? . . . Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn. . . . If we sowed unto you

spiritual things, is it a great matter if we shall reap your carnal things? . . . Nevertheless we did not use this right; but we bear all things, that we may cause no hindrance to the gospel of Christ. Know ye not that they that minister about sacred things eat of the things of the temple, and they that wait upon the altar have their portion with the altar? Even so did the Lord ordain that they that proclaim the gospel should live of the gospel." (1 Cor. 9: 7-14.) Here it seems to me the order of the Jews is reasserted, and the true and proper way is for each Christian, as he is able, to contribute to the treasury of the Lord, and, as the church is able, out of these offerings to sustain those who give themselves to the service of the Lord.

(3) If the church and preacher thus have an understanding, is not that what is called a "stipulated salary?" Some of our churches do not think it right to have an understanding with their preacher, even in the neighborhood as to what he is to expect as support.

Paul wrote to the Corinthians admonishing them of their duty to support those who preach the gospel. He sent Tychicus to the Ephesians, "that ye may know our state, and that he may comfort your hearts." (Eph. 6:22.) He sent Epaphroditus to the Philippians, and they returned help by him to Paul. (Phil. 2: 25; 4: 18.) He sent Tychicus, Onesimus, and others to the Colossians, saying: "They shall make known unto you all things which are done here." (Col. 4: 9.) The Thessalonians sent Timothy with "a good remembrance of us" from them. (1 Thess. 3: 6.) Paul and his companions received help from, but did not depend wholly on, the churches. They sent messengers to let them know their wants, and each contributed as it was able; then what was lacking they supplemented with their own labors. It was, of course, legitimate for one church to have sustained a laborer in the field, if able; and if not one, two or more. If a church undertakes to do this, it is necessary for them to know how much will be required to sustain him and how much they likely are able to give. God never countenanced a man or church promising to do something, they did not know what, and whether they were likely to be able to do it or not. I do not believe in paying so much money for so much preaching. That makes merchandise of the gospel; but support the man, that he and his family may live comfortably, that he may give his time to the

gospel. Nor do I think a man who refuses to preach unless guaranteed a support is fit to preach. It seems to me an understanding of what is needful for a support is a necessary condition of supporting a man. See **Preachers**.

### **CIVIL LAW, APPEALING TO, FOR PROTECTION.**

Is it right, tinder any circumstances, to appeal to the civil law for protection? A case in point: A man who is thought to be dangerous and vengeful, after having threatened the life of a man and his wife, goes to their house and raises a row. Has a brother the right to prosecute him for so doing?

I think it right at times for a Christian to appeal to civil law for protection. Paul gave us an example of this when he appealed to Caesar to protect him from the Jews who were using the law and the offices of the law to punish him. (Acts 25: 1-11.) As they bound him with thongs, Paul asked the centurion that stood by: "Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned?" (Acts 22: 25.) He appealed to his rights as a Roman citizen on this occasion to save himself from punishment. At Philippi he said: "They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison." (Acts 16: 37.) He made them come and bring them out, but he did not prosecute them. To prosecute them, if I understand the meaning, is not to protect yourself from injury, but to take vengeance for wrong done. To bind him over to keep the peace, or to have him so confined as to prevent injury, might be to protect yourself against him; but to prosecute and punish him is to take vengeance on him for injury. "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord." (Rom. 12: 19.) If a Christian knows of a crime committed, it is right for him to make it known, that society may be protected, but not that he may be avenged for wrong done him.

### **CLASSES, DIVISION INTO.**

Is there anything in the Scriptures that could be taken as forbidding us to have more than one class reciting at one time in our church assemblies? One good brother in our Bible class contends that the classes should be heard one at a time, as we were commanded to speak one at a time in the church. His plan is tedious and inconvenient; but if any other is forbidden, we will follow his.

Paul says: "If a revelation be made to another sitting by, let the first [speaker] keep silence. For ye all can prophesy

one by one, that all may learn, and all may be exhorted." (1 Cor. 14: 30, 31.) This applied to inspired teachers receiving and revealing messages direct from God. If they failed to hear what he said, they would be deprived of what God had revealed to them. Such a condition of affairs cannot exist now, since no one receives direct revelations from God. All have his full revelation in the Scriptures, and no one will be deprived of a knowledge of God's will by failing to hear the speaker now. He can read the whole will in the New Testament; so the reason for one speaking at a time then cannot exist now. "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets; for God is not a God of confusion, but of peace [or order]." (Verses 32, 33.) This is a case in which a number were trying to speak to the same persons at the same time. This would be confusion now as then, but it cannot refer to persons in different parts of the house speaking each to his own class. This does not create confusion, and is only one speaking at a time to the same persons. It violates no law of God of which I have any knowledge.

### **CLEANLINESS OF THE BODY.**

Does Christ enjoin bodily or physical cleanliness in Matt. 23, as he does the tithing of anise and cummin (verse 23)—that is, does he mean to teach that we are to be clean both within and without? Does Paul enjoin bodily cleanliness as well as spiritual cleanliness in 2 Cor. 7: 1? If either or both of the above questions are answered in the affirmative, could these passages be urged against filthy bodies, clothes, homes, and filthy habits, such as tobacco using, etc.?

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye cleanse the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full from extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first the inside of the cup and of the platter, that the outside thereof may become clean also." (Matt. 23: 25, 26.) This is intended to teach that both the body and the heart should be kept clean and pure. The law of Moses laid great stress on bodily cleanliness. Much bathing and washing of the hands and the body were required of the Jews. They were required to wash the hands before eating, so it grew into a religious practice, condemned as such by Jesus. (Matt. 15: 1-20.) The Jews laid stress on the external in bodily cleanliness, to the neglect of the cleanliness of heart and purity of spirit. The external without the spiritual is of no avail in Christ. So he urged the conjoining of the internal purity with

the external bodily cleanliness, or that the bodily should be the outgrowth of spiritual purity. Paul seems to work the two as inseparable. (2 Cor. 7: 1.) True spiritual purity will work bodily cleanliness. "Laying aside all filthiness" (James 1: 21) seems to me another admonition indicating that the two must go together. "Yes" to all your questions. Moses taught the most complete system of bodily cleanliness that is to be found in the world. As the Jewish dispensation was the material and earthly type of the spiritual kingdom, this bodily cleanliness no doubt typifies the spiritual purity and cleanliness of heart that was to prevail in the spiritual kingdom of God, Dr. W. K. Bowling, the founder of the first medical school in Nashville, said to me more than once: "The system of hygiene given by Moses surpasses all others found in the world to this day." He said with all the discoveries and deductions of science and the experience of the world of these later centuries, nothing to compare with this has been presented. He said he was inclined to skepticism; but when he asked himself where these isolated, provincial people, not noted for their learning or scientific investigations, obtained such a system in those dark ages of the world, he was compelled to answer: "They obtained it from a wisdom above that of man." And he claimed this consideration saved him from skepticism and unbelief. The Bible, if obeyed, will bless man both fleshly and spiritually, will bring good upon him both in this world and in that to come.

### COMMUNITY OF GOODS.

Please explain Acts 2: 44-46: "And all that believed were together, and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart."

That language telling what was done is about as plain as words can make it. I suppose it is not to explain what was done that is wanted, but to know why we do not urge Christians to do the same thing now. The reason is it is clear that this example was not followed **in** other churches mentioned in the New Testament. In chiding Ananias for his lying to the Holy Spirit, Peter asks: "While it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?"



why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." (Acts 5: 4.) This shows plainly there was no law requiring him to sell and to cast it all into the treasury, hence there was no excuse for pretending to do it when not doing it. And it is clear that it was not done at other churches. It was doubtless a voluntary thing among them arising from the two facts—the money was all needed to supply the wants of the poor, and the early flight from Jerusalem and the destruction of the city were apprehended. It would not be wrong for men to do this now, I presume. It would likely end in confusion, disappointment, and trouble, and there is no law requiring it.

### **CONFESSION, IS A FORMAL, NECESSARY?**

Is it essential, in order to remission of sins, that the confession mentioned in Rom. 10: 10 be made before baptism?

"The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (Rom. 10: 8-10.)

This is the scripture requiring confession. It is addressed to the Christians at Rome. Whether it refers to a formal confession before baptism, I somewhat doubt, for the following reasons: In the commission, in its fulfillment on the day of Pentecost, and in the examples of conversion, presented in Acts of Apostles, there is no example of a formal confession being required as a precedent to baptism, unless the case of the eunuch be regarded as such. In reference to this, it is claimed by the textuary critics generally that the confession there recorded is an interpolation. The context and circumstances would indicate that just such a confession was made. It is also clear that Philip was not seeking a formal confession, but evidence of faith. Whatever confession was made came in response to this seeking. The natural evidence of faith in the heart is the confession with the mouth. When Philip said, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest," the natural response would be: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." But it was made to manifest the presence of

faith, not to make a formal confession. But if this does not require the confession, the singular fact is presented that in the Scriptures a condition of salvation is left out of all the precepts and examples concerning remission, and is to be found only in a reference in a letter to Christians as to what had been required. Then it is necessary that at every step of the religious life, even after one has grown old in the service of the Lord, with the mouth confession must be made unto salvation, and with the heart he must believe unto righteousness. He must live by and walk through faith unto the end. It is just as necessary that man should believe unto righteousness with the heart the last day he lives as the first. By faith man is led forward at every step in the path of righteousness, and at every step man must confess his faith in the Savior. It is necessary that confession of Christ should be made at all times or Christ will not own us. But that any specific or formal confession was required before baptism, more than at any other step of his religious life, is not clear. Confession of Christ in our words is necessary. It is necessary in coming to Christ. It is necessary in all the Christian life. I am sure the questions and obedience on the day of Pentecost was an acceptable confession. So at the house of Cornelius and in all other instances.

People become very easily ritualistic. Once an old lady, infirm in body, sent for me to baptize her. In telling why she sent for me, she said, in the presence of a number of persons: "I have believed in Jesus as the Savior for some time and have been hoping to get able to be baptized." On this statement I baptized her without asking a formal confession. After it was over, a brother came to me and said: "You forgot to take that sister's confession." I told him that she did not forget to make it, and referred to her statement before us all. He still seemed to be doubtful because I had not followed the ritual of asking the question and making her repeat the answer. He valued the form above the substance. I do not believe there is a necessity for a formal confession, so the actions and conversation declare it and there is no shrinking from confessing it before all men wherever occasion offers. It is needful when a man baptizes another that he have assurance that the subject believes in Jesus as the Christ. The easiest,

most direct way to learn this is to ask him the question; but this should not grow into an essential form, a ritualism.

### **CONFESSION OF SIN, AND FORGIVENESS.**

You will greatly oblige me by giving your views on the confession, as the cause is being greatly crippled by some who set themselves up as teachers. They have done away with the confession. I have always thought it right and necessary for the returning prodigals to confess their mistakes to the brethren or congregation in order to show to the world that we do not recognize the works of the flesh or ways of the world in the church. These brethren—if I should call them brethren—make this proposition: Just let the past be the past. This, it appears to me, would be encouragement to worldly-minded members to go on in sin and wickedness. It does not matter what they do, they can come up with the plea: "Let the past be the past." Will you be so kind as to give us all the light you can on the returning prodigals' duty and obligations to the church, also the duty of the church toward the returning prodigals?

I hardly think our brother would find a church that would adopt, as a rule, what he says his has adopted. In some exigency, supposed or real, such a course might be pursued. I think this is wrong. To observe the law of God is always right, and it is always wrong to neglect or set it aside. No emergency ever arises that justifies this. It is always best for the sinner, for the church, and for the world, that the law of God be complied with. That law is that a man that sins shall confess his sins, not that he is a sinner in general terms, but the special and specific sins of which he has been guilty.

"Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed." (James 5: 16.) The confession is not to show the world that we do not approve sin. That is a wrong motive. It is that we may be forgiven by God. No man has repented of his sins sincerely and honestly until he is willing to confess them; and to keep impenitent sinners in the church is to defile and corrupt that church.

Sam Jones did good in his denunciations of immorality in and out of the church. But his preaching, "quit your meanness and give me your hand," ignoring all true and earnest confession of sin, had a hurtful influence. The confession of sin is the point of departure from sin, and it is a condition of pardon of sin. God has nowhere promised forgiveness to a sinner without confessing his sins. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (1 John 1: 9.) Our being

cleansed from unrighteousness depends on our hearty confessing our sins. "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper: but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy." (Prov. 28: 13.) It is a moral condition of pardon that pertains to all ages and dispensations. "I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." (Ps. 32: 5.)

The prodigal said: "I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants." (Luke 15: 18, 19.)

So, too, Paul and all the true and worthy that sinned confessed their sins openly and freely. No repentance is sincere and true that does not freely and gladly confess the sin and ask God and his brethren to forgive him. When he confesses his faults, his brethren should pray with and for him, and God will forgive him.

### **CONFLICT BETWEEN FLESH AND SPIRIT.**

Please explain what is meant by the conflict described in Rom. 7: 7-25.

Paul is presenting the truth that man is of a dual nature, the flesh and the spirit; they lust one against the other. What man desires and purposes to do in his spirit, the flesh opposes. He calls the spirit the real self. The good his spirit purposes to do, the flesh hinders. The flesh leads' him to do the evil the spirit opposes. It is no more the inner spiritual man who does the evil, but sin that dwells in the flesh. He finds when he would do good, a law of sin is present in the flesh to lead him into sin. After the inward man, he delights in the law of God; but he sees another law of sin in his flesh that wars against the law of his mind, and this law of sin in the flesh draws his spirit into captivity or bondage to sin, despite its desires to follow the law of God. Owing to this law of sin bringing into captivity his spirit, he exclaims: "O wretched man that I am [thus to be overcome by evil in the flesh]! who shall deliver me from the body of this death [in which sin rules]?" He answered: "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord [this deliverance comes]. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of

sin." Then he proceeds in the next chapter to speak of the deliverance in Christ: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law [of Moses] 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: 1-3.) The meaning is that under the Jewish law men desired to serve God. The law of sin dwelling in the members of the body hindered. In the struggles between the spirit and the flesh, the flesh would bring the spirit into bondage and condemnation, because the law of Moses was weak. Paul asks who shall deliver him from this bondage. He replies: "Jesus Christ." Then he says that in Christ no condemnation is found to those who walk after the Spirit. The law of the Spirit in Christ made free from the law of sin and death that dwells in the flesh. Then he explains since the law of Moses could not free from sin and death, Christ coming in the likeness of sinful flesh overcame sin in the flesh. So in him is deliverance from the law that rules in the flesh. Three laws are here presented: The law of sin dwelling in the flesh; the law of Moses, which could not overcome the law of sin in the flesh; what the law of Moses could not do, in that it was weak, Jesus Christ came and did through the law of the Spirit of life in Jesus Christ. This is a presentation of the law of sin ruling in the flesh, the inefficiency of the law of Moses to overcome it, and that Jesus did come, and overcame this sin that the law of Moses could not overcome. The division of the chapter breaks a close connection here.

### **CONSCIENCE, DOING VIOLENCE TO.**

If you believed that you ought to meet every first day of the week to break bread, and that you would commit a sin if you did not, if it was so you could, and you believed it a sin to worship God by machinery, and they got to using instrumental music at the congregation you worshiped with, and there was no other congregation close enough that you could meet with, what would you do?

There is no plainer truth in the Bible than that which a man esteems a sin is a sin to him. "To him that esteemeth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean." (Rom. 14: 14.) That is, if a man does a thing he thinks to be wrong, he vio-

lates his own conscience; and it is always wrong to do violence to one's own conscience, to go contrary to his own sense of what is right. God cannot be served by a man with a bad conscience. He must have a good conscience toward God. He must have a conscience that is good, must be true to his own convictions of right. It must be loyal to God and his sense of duty—must look to God. "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 Cor. 8: 7.) That is, persons had become Christians whose consciences looked to the idol as an object of worship, and for these to eat meat offered to an idol was to defile their consciences. "The end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned." (1 Tim. 1: 5.) If a man does not keep a good conscience, he cannot serve God. When a man violates his convictions of right, does things he believes wrong for the sake of peace or popularity, he debauches his conscience and unfits himself for service to God. God will not accept service from a defiled or debauched conscience; and to know the right and follow the wrong defiles and debauches the conscience. Those most offensive to God are those who compromise his truth and defile their consciences. The man who worships with an organ, believing it to be wrong, to be a sin against God, is a much worse man than he who worships with it believing it to be right. I know of no sin higher or greater than that of defiling our consciences by doing or countenancing what we believe to be wrong. God had much more respect for Paul persecuting the church of God with a good conscience, believing he was doing God's service, than he did for the men who believed him to be the Christ, yet failed to obey him. Then a man ought to do nothing he believes wrong. He ought to be firm for the truth. Paul's conscience was warped by prejudice. He respected it, was true to it, and God honored and blessed him for his fidelity to his conscience. He was such as God was pleased to call into his service. God delights in the service given by such men. Then, if a man believes an organ wrong and sinful, and it is brought into the church of God, he debauches his own conscience in approving it by word or act, and renders himself unfit for the service of God. Men that are true to their consciences are what the world needs and God delights in.

A man who believes it right to meet and worship on the Lord's clay, and fails to do it because he does not have a convenient place or crowd to meet with, does violence to his conscience, defiles it, and is in great danger of destroying his own soul. The man who knows his duty and refuses to do it defiles his conscience. It is no excuse for a man that others do not their duty or that he has not many to meet with him. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." (Matt. 18: 20.)

We ought not to countenance the wrong; we ought to practice the right. I would not whine about there being no congregation with which to meet. You should constitute a congregation yourself, or get one or two others and worship God according to his appointments. He holds us accountable for doing this. The results he will take care of.

### **CONTEND EARNESTLY FOR THE FAITH.**

In the Gospel Review, Brother Warlick says that all men should be careful to preach only the gospel of Christ, and to do this they should preach only those things found in the Bible. In the Gospel Advocate, Brother Elam says that affusion, infant baptism, counting beads, burning incense, worshiping the Virgin Mary, and keeping Lent are not in the gospel, are no part of the gospel; but he thinks that we ought to be allowed to preach them. Please tell us who is right.

Brother Warlick believes not only that we should preach what is in the Bible, but that we should preach all that is in the Bible. When a man does this as the Bible does, he will preach ten times as much to keep things not commanded by God out of the church and out of the practice of Christians as he will to enforce what is commanded. There are ten prohibitions and ten times as much space in the Bible taken up with warnings, penalties, and prohibitions of adding things to those in the Bible or doing things in religion not required by God that there is telling what we must do. The reason is that God understands what is in man, and he knows the propensity of humanity to assume authority and to displace the appointments of God with his own plans and projects. In the Sermon on the Mount itself ten times the space is devoted to warnings and prohibitions of changing and perverting God's laws and orders as is given to his positive requirements. The Scriptures forbid additions to the order of God, and this is more constantly urged than any one point connected with man's duty.

Those who oppose contention for the truth and opposition constant and unceasing to the introduction of error change the whole order and spirit of God's law in its vital point. Such a course condemns Jesus and all the apostles and betrays the truth of God. Jude said: "I was constrained to write unto you exhorting you to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." (Verse 3.) That faith had been perfected and delivered "once for all" to the saints. To "contend" for it was to oppose all modification or change of it by addition to it or subtraction from it. He who fails to do this is no true servant of God.

The life of Jesus was a life of contention and controversy unto death itself with those who opposed the truth or sought to teach things not required by God. He opposed the wrong and frequently denounced the opposers. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!" is a common style of Jesus in opposing those who would pervert or corrupt the scripture order in his day. I do not think we ought to use language so strong now, because none of us can know the hearts of those who oppose the truth as did Jesus. But when we object to opposing the introduction of things not taught in the Bible or of bringing any and all errors into the church of Christ, our right is against the Bible, against Jesus Christ and God; when we denounce contention for truth and opposition to error, we denounce Jesus Christ.

Brother Elam did not say we should preach organs and societies. Brother Elam thinks, as I do, that it is an essential part of the gospel to oppose everything not in the gospel; that we are compelled to preach against them when others preach or practice bringing them into the church; and he is right. Brother Warlick and Brother Elam do not disagree about it.

These brethren that are so afraid of controversy mean they will let the truth go rather than incur the displeasure of their fellow-men by exposing and opposing their errors. That is to betray the truth of God for the favor of men; that is to leave men in error rather than incur their displeasure by correcting their wrongs. That means you will let a man go to hell rather than risk his displeasure by warning him of his danger. This spirit is no akin to the spirit of Christ, of his apostles, or of any of the true and faithful servants of God of either the Old Testament or the New Testament. With all



this, there is ground for criticism of much of the religious controversy of this age and country. The most objectionable feature of much of it is its lack of truthfulness. Persons in controversy so often misrepresent the positions of their opponents. To<sup>1</sup> misrepresent a man's teaching is as mean lying as can be done, yet it is very common among religious people. Then it so often assumes the character of personal contest who shall triumph and an effort to injure him whose teachings we oppose. This is wrong, as a rule. Criticise as much as you desire the style of unfairness and misrepresentation now common in religious affairs and all unkindness and personality in religious discussions; but when you oppose discussion, the sifting truth from error, the exposure of error, and opposition to all practices not required by God, you oppose God and betray the truth of God. Jesus and Paul and all the apostles contended unto death. Arm yourselves with the same mind that was in Jesus, and we will contend earnestly for the truth and oppose all error unto death itself. Let us do this in the spirit of fairness and of love, but do not let us betray the truth for the sake of a false peace or for anything.

### **CONTRIBUTION, HOW TAKEN.**

Please explain how Christians should contribute. They have been passing the hat; but I do not think that is the correct way, for the Lord tells us to lay by in store as he has prospered us.

To "lay by in store" means to collect together so it would be safely kept until it could be sent where needed. The Scriptures do not say whether it is to be collected in hats, bonnets, baskets, or boxes. As the scripture says nothing as to this, I can say nothing, save when people seek to decide questions of this kind by divine authority they make little of God and his commandments. You had as well ask whether a man should eat with his fingers or a spoon, whether he should fasten his clothes with buttons or hooks and eyes. There is a sect of Christians that exclude their members for wearing buttons on their clothes instead of hooks and eyes. All which shows how anxious people are to make laws to govern God's people. Let us obey the laws God has made, and leave men free where he has made no laws.

**CORNELIUS, CONVERSION OF.**

I have been requested to ask that you explain the case of Cornelius. If he was a sinner, why did God hear his prayer, and why did he give him the Holy Spirit?

This has often been explained. The sinner whom God will not hear is one who willfully turns from obeying him. All the statements of Solomon in the book of Proverbs, the blind man (John 9), and all the declarations of God's unwillingness to hear sinners refer to those who claim to be his disciples, yet refuse to obey him. These are the sinners whom God will not hear. God has never said he would not hear one out of the kingdom desirous to know and do his will. Jesus showed his willingness to hear such when he heard the centurion's plea to come and heal his servant (Matt. 8:5), the Syrophenician woman who besought him for her daughter (Matt. 15: 22), and the Samaritan leper (Luke 17: 11-19). In this example the prayer and alms of Cornelius come up for a memorial before God. The truth is that God is always willing to hear sinners in or out of the church who are desirous of knowing and doing the will of God. He heard the publican who cried, "God be merciful to me a sinner;" but he rejected the Pharisee who did not think himself a sinner. Sinners anxious to do his will, whether in or out of the church, are the very persons he is ready to hear. God never turns a deaf ear to one who is desirous of doing his will. The evil of praying for forgiveness of sins is in praying for forgiveness while refusing to obey the commands on which forgiveness is conditioned. If any one teaches that God does not hear the prayer of one because he is out of the church, tell him he is wrong. Then, while God does not forgive and accept one as a child of God until he has been baptized, until he puts off his sins in baptism, until he is buried with Christ, he is not called a "sinner" when he believes and is seeking to know and do the will of God. While he has not put off his sins, he has ceased to commit sin and is following God. In the Scriptures no one is called a "sinner" while he is striving to know and do the will of God. There is a point at which, while he has ceased to sin, he has not put off his sins. Then there are two distinct manifestations of the Spirit. One, called the "ordinary gift," is received into the heart by receiving the word of God into the heart. This manifestation is received and enjoyed according to the fullness

of the dwelling of the word of God in the heart. When this dwells in the heart, it shows itself in obedience to the word of God that is in the heart. There was a miraculous manifestation of the Spirit, the direct gift of God, that is not given in believing; it came to the believers, but did not come through believing". It came to the disciples on Pentecost, long after they believed; so it did to the Samaritans. (Acts 8: 9-18.) The object of the miraculous gift of the Spirit was to show God was present with those on whom the gift was bestowed, and that what was done and spoken was from God and sealed with his authority. At the house of Cornelius the apostles had the gift of the Spirit; but it was important that God should approve the reception of the Gentiles, for it was generally believed he would not receive them. To settle this question he gave this direct and miraculous manifestation of the Spirit to them. So Peter asked: "Can any man forbid the water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?" (Acts 10: 47.) This shows that it was to serve this end of showing God accepted the Gentiles as well as the Jews. This was made even more clear when his course was called in question on his return to Jerusalem. He told of the gift of the Spirit, and asked: "If then God gave unto them the like gift as he did also unto us, when we believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I, that I could withstand God?" (Acts 11: 17.) This shows the object of the bestowal of the gift; it must needs be given before the baptism, to satisfy them that God had received them. The bestowal of this miraculous gift no doubt qualified these Gentile converts to know and teach the full will of God without being dependent upon the Jews for it.

### **COUNTENANCING SIN BRINGS GUILT.**

Is any minister of the gospel justified in baptizing a man who is guilty of adultery through having two living wives, when he knows such to be the case? How could God accept of either of these men, when John the Baptist refused to baptize the Pharisees who would not repent?

I do not think John the Baptist refused to baptize those Pharisees he denounced as a generation of vipers. The denunciation was to show how he regarded the Pharisees and scribes generally. These people were fleeing from the wrath they believed impending upon the Jewish people. John's mis-

sion was to warn them to repent, turn from their sins, that they might avoid the wrath of God. These Pharisees came to John anxious to escape the coming wrath impending over the Jewish people. He asked them who warned them. Then, having baptized them, he warned them to bring forth fruit worthy of the repentance they had professed, and not continue in the life of indifference to godliness, and not to' rely upon their fleshly descent from Abraham for the blessing of God. Then he told them that the ax is laid at the root of the tree ready to hew down "every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit." That is, Abraham's fleshly family will henceforth be judged, and all that do not bring good fruit, or fruit worthy of the repentance, will be destroyed as other nations. Notwithstanding I believe John baptized these persons on the assurance that they would bring forth fruit worthy of repentance, I do not think a Christian ought to baptize a man living in adultery, or any other known and habitual sin, without the assurance that he will bring forth fruit worthy of repentance—that is, that he will turn from his sin and live a righteous life. The shame of the church is that it receives men and women living in open defiance of the laws of God, without assurance of bringing forth the fruits of repentance. Every preacher and every Christian and every church that receives and encourages those guilty of known sins, without requiring them to cease to sin and to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance, becomes partaker of their sins. He who encourages another in a sin by countenancing him in the sin becomes a partaker with him in the guilt of his sin. "If any one sin, in that he heareth the voice of adjuration, he being a witness, whether he hath seen or known, if he do not utter it, then he shall bear his iniquity." That is, a man who conceals the sin of another when called on as a witness shall be as guilty and bear the same punishment as he who committed the crime. See **Assisting Others to Do Wrong.**

### COUNTING THE COST.

What is meant by "counteth the cost" and "he sendeth an ambassador, and desireth conditions of peace?" (Luke 14: 28, 32.) Has not any individual who has come to the years of maturity, is sane, and has heard the gospel, the power or ability to become and live a Christian? Will it ever be necessary for the humble and prayerful Christian, who has forsaken all, made a complete surrender of himself and all that he

has to God, to send an ambassage and desire conditions of peace with Satan?

We have long been satisfied that the two parables of the man building a tower without counting the cost and one king going to make war with another king are usually perverted to teach exactly the opposite of what the Master intended to teach by them. Certainly Christ never warned men to count the cost of coming to him. On the other hand, he taught them to come regardless of costs, to overstep all difficulties, surmount all obstacles, and cut loose from all ties to come to him. Nor did he admonish them to see whether they could fight their own battles against the devil. On the other hand, he told them if they would come to him, cast all burdens on him, he would fight their battles for them and be their strength and shield. He certainly did not advise any one, should he feel his own insufficiency, to send an ambassage and desire terms of peace with the devil. The meaning is: Come to God at all hazards and regardless of costs; but if you are thinking of fighting against God, then count well the costs, lest you begin to build not on his words and fail to finish and the world laugh you to scorn. Are you able to fight against the armies of the living God? Count well the cost; and if you are not able, then seek peace with God. Whosoever will may come to Christ, and such he will in no wise cast off. God will protect and shield from the wiles of Satan all who trust and continue faithful to him. We had better come to Christ and fail a thousand times than to refuse to come.

### **COVENANTS, THE.**

Please write an article on "The Old Covenant and the New Covenant," bringing out as clearly as possible their relation, or identity, to the Jewish Church and the church of Christ. In Heb. 8, 9, does the writer refer to old and new churches, or what? In other words, what are the old covenant and the new covenant?

The covenants—their relation to each other—were much discussed fifty years ago, and then it was difficult to find a disciple of any scriptural knowledge that was not sure of the distinction between the covenants—the close of one and the introduction of the other. The denominations around us had failed to draw the distinction, had confounded the two, and as frequently went to the old covenant as to the new to find the terms of acceptance with God at this day. As is natural

to human nature, extremes beget extremes; and when the disciples saw the error into which they had fallen, they ran to the other extreme and spoke of their being opposite the one to the other, and they ceased to study the law of the old covenant. This is wrong. The law of Moses was added because of transgression, and was a schoolmaster to train the Jews to receive Christ. The things written in the law and God's dealings with those under the law happened for examples and are written for our admonition, lest we sin as they sinned and fall under condemnation of the Spirit.

The basis of the covenants was God's promise to Abraham that he would give to his seed the land of Canaan for an everlasting inheritance and that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed. The promise of this covenant was repeated several times to Abraham—once, when he was tried by the offer of his son, Isaac: "And the angel of Jehovah called unto Abraham a second time out of heaven, and said, By myself have I sworn, saith Jehovah, because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heavens, and as the sand which is upon the seashore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice. (Gen. 22: 15-18.) But Abraham did not enter into the enjoyment of the blessings promised in this covenant in person. Stephen says: "And he gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on: and he promised that he would give it to him in possession, and to his seed after him." (Acts 7: 5.) "By faith he became a sojourner in the land of promise, as in a land not his own, dwelling in tents, with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise." (Heb. 11: 9.)

As a step toward the fulfillment of the promise, God made the covenant of circumcision with him to separate the family of Abraham from the nations of the earth and to prepare them to enter into the enjoyment of all the blessings of the promise. "This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee: every male among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall be circumcised in the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of a covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised

among you, every male throughout your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any foreigner, that is not of thy seed." (Gen. 17: 10-12.)

The children of Abraham did not enter into the possession of this land until the return from Egyptian bondage. On their return God renewed the covenant in a different form, on the tables of stone at Horeb. This giving and accepting the law of God through Moses on Mount Sinai, or Horeb, is called the "covenant." "Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be mine own possession from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine. . . . Moses came and called for the elders of the people, and set before them all these words which Jehovah commanded him. And all the people answered together, and said, All that Jehovah hath spoken we will do. And Moses reported the words of the people unto Jehovah." (Ex. 19: 5-8.) This was the covenant with the children of Israel, intended to prepare and fit them for receiving the promised seed—the Messiah. These ten commands were written upon the two tables of stone, and then the laws and judgments growing out of them were written in the book of the law. "He [Moses] took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that Jehovah hath spoken will we do, and be obedient." (Ex. 24: 7.) This covenant embraced the covenant of circumcision formerly given to Abraham, and secured the possession of the land of Canaan. It is henceforth spoken of as "the covenant with Israel" and "the everlasting covenant." This covenant bound both God and the children of Israel—the children of Israel to obey, and God to give the land and bless so long as they were faithful; but if they were unfaithful, he would withdraw his blessings and drive them out of the land he had given them. "But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of Jehovah thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day, that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee." (Deut. 28: 15.)

After enumerating a multitude of afflictions that would come upon them in their own country, he said: "And Jehovah will scatter thee among all peoples, from the one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth; and there thou shalt

serve other gods, which thou hast not known, thou nor thy fathers." (Verse 64.)

The covenant of God with the children of Israel secured to them the land of Canaan and abundant blessings if they would be faithful to him, but it required their banishment from the land given their fathers if they refused to obey God.

They broke the covenant of God, rebelled against his laws, and, as a people, forfeited the blessings of his covenant and called down upon themselves the curses of that covenant. While the nation as a whole broke his covenant and rejected his rule, there were a few that were willing to serve him, and he took the broken covenant out of the way and made a new and better covenant with them. Jeremiah foretold of this covenant: "Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith Jehovah. But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith Jehovah: I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people: and they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know Jehovah; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith Jehovah: for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more." (Jer. 31: 31-34.)

The old covenant was one of law to be obeyed, without touching and changing the heart. So it was imperfect, and he introduced one that would affect and enlist the heart and make the service a heart service. The laws would be impressed on the heart, so all the feelings of the heart would enter into the service and make that service one of joy and gladness, instead of fear and toil. The old covenant was fulfilled for man in Christ. He completely complied with its laws and took it out of the way and introduced the new covenant. "But now hath he obtained a ministry the more excellent, by so much as he is also the mediator of a better covenant, which hath been enacted upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then would no place have been sought for a



second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, That I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them forth out of the land of Egypt; for they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and on their heart also will I write them: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his fellow-citizen, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest of them. For I will be merciful to their iniquities, and their sins will I remember no more. In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. But that which is becoming old and waxeth aged is nigh unto vanishing away." (Heb. 8: 6-13.)

The covenant he made with them when they came out of Egypt is the law given by Moses. It was imperfect because the children of Israel, by their transgressions, were not able to appreciate or obey a better one. Both the covenants were made in pursuance of the promise made to Abraham. The one made through Moses was subsidiary and preparatory to the one made through Christ. Paul says: "A covenant confirmed beforehand by God, the law, which came four hundred and thirty years after, doth not disannul, so as to make the promise of none effect. . . . What then is the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise hath been made; and it was ordained through angels by the hand of a mediator. ... So that the law is become our tutor to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But now that faith is come, we are no longer under a tutor." (Gal. 3: 17-25.) God promised to bless the world through the family of Abraham. They transgressed, so were not worthy to receive or bestow the blessing, so God gave the law of Moses as a tutor to train them for Christ; but when Christ came, he took the law out of the way and offered them the privilege of becoming children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.

The two covenants are presented also in 2 Cor. 3: 6-11:

"Who also made us sufficient as ministers of a new covenant; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. But if the ministration of death, written, and engraven on stones, came with glory, so that the children of Israel could not look steadfastly upon the face of Moses for the glory of his face; which glory was passing away: how shall not rather the ministration of the spirit be with glory? For if the ministration of condemnation hath glory, much rather doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For verily that which hath been made glorious hath not been made glorious in this respect, by reason of the glory that surpasseth. For if that which passeth away was with glory, much more that which remaineth is in glory."

The covenant of Moses was fleshly, based on promise of temporal good, an earthly inheritance; the covenant through Christ is spiritual, based on promises of spiritual and eternal good, and of a heavenly inheritance that shall never fade away, of a spiritual and eternal companionship with God. Paul says: "And you, being dead through your trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, you, I say, did he make alive together with him, having forgiven us all our trespasses; having blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us: and he hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross; having despoiled the principalities and the powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it." (Col. 2: 13-15.)

These ordinances of the fleshly covenant were contrary to the people of God. So he took them out of the way, nailed them to the cross, and introduced them into the higher and better covenant. We could quote many other scriptures showing the distinctness of the two covenants, the superiority of the one over the other, and that one served its end, was contrary to the people of God, and was taken out of the way, with all its fleshly, material, "dead-wood" services, and was superseded by a living, spiritual covenant, in which all the services must be in spirit and in truth.

### **COVERED HEADS.**

Please explain 1 Cor. 11: 4-15. The male members of the church are reproved for praying and prophesying with their heads covered. With what did the men cover their heads? Was it with veils or some other covering; and was it the face, the entire head, or only the top

of the head that they covered? Is it known what covering, if any, men wore on their heads when out of doors? Do you think our Savior wore a covering of any kind on his head? I never saw a picture representing him with his head covered. With what did Paul require the women to cover their heads? Was this covering to be worn over the face, and was it in the church only, or at all times when men were present, that they were required to wear this covering? Is it uncommonly for a woman to pray in her own room with her head uncovered? How could a woman prophesy in the church, when she was not permitted to teach or even speak in the church? Verse 15 reads thus: "But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering." Is a woman's hair to be worn as a covering to her head or to her shoulders, as nature would seem to indicate? In other words, is she to let her hair hang loose, or twist it up in a coil upon her head? The painters of the fourteenth century (I believe it was) represented the women of the New Testament with the hair down. I do not suppose they had any authority for so doing, but I would like to know if there is any proof, as to what Paul meant and as to the way Christian women were required to wear their hair.

The men covered their heads with turbans, composed of a cap with a sash of cloth wound around it. The men wore no veils. The face was not covered with the turbans. When they uncovered their heads, they took off their turbans. The turban can be seen worn by Turks and Arabians who come to this country. The turban covered the heads as the hat now does. We know nothing of the clothing of Jesus, save as is given in the account of his crucifixion. The clothing of which the soldiers stripped him and for which they cast lots was such as was worn by men of that age, and the presumption is that he wore the turban, as was common with men. The women wore very much the same clothing as men, frequently only with a kerchief of cloth tied over their heads. The chief difference was her long hair. There were three styles to wear the hair: (1) To have the hair long; (2) to have the hair cropped, as is common with men; (3) to have it closely shorn, as with lewd women. Paul required that a woman should have her head covered with her long hair; or, if her hair was not long, she must have a veil or kerchief as a covering. For her to have short hair, like a man's, and to be without covering was the same as to be shaven like a lewd woman. The men and women in the days of the Savior, in going out, wore large, loose coverings. The women frequently drew these up over the head as a covering to the head. The Jewish women, from the days of Abraham, through the period of the Savior, down to the present time, have never veiled themselves in the presence of men, either of their own family or that of strangers.

Sarah did not go veiled when among strangers, nor Rebekah (Gen. 24: 15), nor Rachel (Gen. 29: 11). The women that journeyed around with Jesus and the apostles, that ministered to them, were not veiled. The facts mentioned by the Scriptures and the employment of these women prove they were not. They went very much as our women do. Paul was not telling them how they should appear before men, but before God. When they came before God to pray or to prophesy, they were to come with their heads covered in token of their subjection to men, Jesus was the head of the man; so he cannot approach God save in subjection to his head, Christ. Man is the head of the woman, and the woman cannot approach God save in subjection to her husband or man. The token of her subjection to man is her covered head. The head must be covered by having the hair long or having a veil over her head. The covering is for the head, not the face. Then a man must not have his head covered when he comes before God, either with long hair or with a hat, veil, or cloth of any kind. This would be a shame to him. He may have it covered at other times, but not when he approaches God to pray or prophesy in his name.

The woman, when she comes before God in prayer or in prophesying, must do it with her head covered either with long hair or with a veil or covering of some kind. Paul is telling how she must appear before God, not before men; and this applies to her appearance before God in the closet as well as in the public assembly. In the public assembly she may not lead in prayer or prophesy in public. There were spiritually gifted women who did prophesy or teach by inspiration. The four daughters of Philip, the evangelist (Acts 21: 9), did prophesy, but they did it at home. I do not doubt that Priscilla was a spiritually gifted woman; but when she taught, she took them to themselves to do it. The women commanded to be silent in the church (1 Cor. 14: 34) were inspired women. The whole chapter is about those possessed of spiritual gifts. Many women in the days of the apostles possessed these gifts. They exercised them in the private circle, never in the public assembly. The veiling of the face in the East is a Mohammedan custom, not a Jewish or Christian custom. To cover the head in the presence of God is both Jewish and Christian.

**CREED IN THE DEED.**

Is it scriptural or right to insert in deeds for properties on which to build houses of worship the restrictive clause—that is, that no organ or missionary societies shall ever be brought or organized on the said property?

Most certainly. There is not a deed made to a church in Christendom that does not contain in it the creed of the church to which it was made. When a deed is made to the Roman Catholic Church, the property deeded is made for the use of those holding the creed of the Catholic Church and the propagation of its faith; when a deed is made to the Presbyterian or Methodist or Baptist Church, it is made for the use of those holding the creed of the church to which it is made and for the propagation of the doctrines that church holds. There is not a court in the land that does not so decide. And property so deeded can be used by no other religious body or for the propagation of no other doctrines, except by the consent of those to whom it is deeded. He is very ignorant of a very common and patent truth that does not know in all such cases the creed is contained in the deed. Where is the opprobrium or wrong if a Baptist or Methodist or Presbyterian insists, when he gives means to build up what he regards the truth, that it shall be used for what he gives it? Or who would not say it is dishonesty to pervert property given to build up Baptist principles, to pull them down? All the decisions of all the courts in the world could not make it honest to pervert property given to build up Baptist churches and principles so as to destroy Baptist churches and principles and devote it to the upbuilding of Methodist churches and principles. These are the principles of common sense and common law and common honesty required by the Bible and the law of the land.

Among those claiming to be Christians only, fifty years ago, all agreed the fundamental principle was: "We will do the things required by the word of God, adding nothing thereto, taking nothing from it." This was the universally recognized principle of action. A change has come over many who have since come into the church. They now claim the right to add things not required by God. Some cling to the original ground. Persons led by these different purposes cannot walk together. It is impossible. It is folly to try. It is right to try to convince each other of his wrong. But if they cannot

be convinced, the separation must come. "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" The two paths lead in opposite directions. To do what God requires will lead to heaven; to add what man thinks is good will lead to hell. "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." "They be blind leaders of the blind." "Every plant, which my Heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." (Matt. 15: 9, 13, 14.) This is what Jesus says of those who add the teachings of man to the appointments of God. If there is truth in the Bible, this path leads to hell; if there is truth in the Bible, doing what God commands, adding nothing thereto and taking nothing from it, leads to heaven. There can be no compromise or union between the two principles. In this separation contention arose over the property acquired when all were agreed.

Many wish to give to build up the course that leads to heaven and oppose that which leads to hell. To protect this from the Methodists or Baptists or Catholics, it was deeded to the church of Christ, or, as it was called fifty years ago, "Christian Church." But people now claiming to be Christians, maintaining the right to add to the appointments of God, try ten times as hard to take our property from us as do the Methodists or Baptists. All deeds to churches are restrictive. The names indicate to whom the deed first restricts the property. But here are two distinct bodies, guided by diametrically opposite principles, traveling in opposite directions, but calling themselves by the same name. Shall those who oppose all additions to the word of God spend their money and time in building houses to be taken by those who oppose their work, without trying to preserve it to the cause of right by any peaceable means in their power? It is folly to so act.

Men who have known the truth and turn from it are worse and more dangerous than those who never knew it. As little as we can do is to throw restrictions around the property in the deed. This is writing the creed in the deed. We have good authority for this. God deeded the land of Canaan to the children of Israel. He wrote the creed in the deed. The creed then was the same we insist upon now. "What thing soever I command you, that shall ye observe to do: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." (Deut. 12: 32.) This creed was so often repeated in the deed, too, lest they should

forget. They did forget, and God issued an ouster and dispossessed them of the land he had deeded to them, because they forgot the creed, and to-day the Jews are murdered by the thousands in Russia as the result of their forgetting the creed that was written in the deed made by God.

God has also given to his children a deed to the heavenly Canaan. But the creed is written in that deed in letters of blood—the blood, too, of God's beloved Son. "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And he that heareth, let him say, Come. And he that is athirst, let him come: he that will, let him take the water of life freely. I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto them, God shall add unto him the plagues which are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the tree of life, and out of the holy city, which are written in this book. He who testifieth these things saith, Yea: I come quickly. Amen: come, Lord Jesus." (Rev. 22: 17-21.)

God never made a deed without writing the creed in it; and a failure to observe the creed was the forfeiture of the deed. Christians ought never to write a deed for themselves without writing the creed in it; and the oftener it is written, the better, "lest they forget." Write God's creed in every deed you can. He will bless.

### **CREEDS, DO HUMAN, MAKE CHRISTIANS?**

Is there a creed of the Christians published other than the Bible? If so, who is the author, and where may the book be found?

I never heard of any creed of the Christians, save the Bible; indeed, if they had any other creed, save the Bible, they would not be Christians. The Bible is the only creed that can make Christians.

I take it that the above answer is from the pen of Brother Lipscomb. The Methodists have "a creed, save the Bible;" and as those who have "a creed, save the Bible," are not Christians, the Methodists are not Christians. The Baptists have "a creed, save the Bible;" hence it follows as a logical conclusion that the Methodists, Baptists, and all others who have "a creed, save the Bible," are not Christians. How, then, can Brother Lipscomb receive such into God's church without baptism, since those who have "a creed, save the Bible," are not Christians? Can we receive into the church those who are not Christians? What is the difference between receiving a man into the

church on his immersion who has "a creed, save the Bible," and is not a Christian, and receiving a man who is sprinkled and has "a creed, save the Bible," and who is not a Christian? Those who have "a creed, save the Bible," have a conversion which must be "wholly of men;" hence, how can we receive such without baptism?

It is singular to me that a teacher of the Christian religion, of experience and biblical knowledge, should ask such a question as that. It is undoubtedly true that nothing can make a Christian, save belief in Christ and obedience to the teachings of the Bible. Even if the very acts the Bible requires are performed because taught in some creed or by some church or person, that service is not acceptable to God and cannot make a man a Christian. Fear of the Lord "taught by the precept of men" is displeasing to God. (Isa. 29: 13.) Whatever is believed or practiced because it is taught in the Methodist, Baptist, or Re baptist creed injures a man and separates him from God instead of drawing him to God. There are unwritten creeds as well as written ones, and whatever man believes or practices because some men or set of men teach it will not help that man religiously; indeed, it will injure him. "In vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men." (Matt. 15: 9.) "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. 14: 23), and the faith must be in God. I believe this as firmly as I believe the Bible.

The Baptists generally deny that they have any creed, save the Bible; and it is true that not one in five hundred of them have ever seen the creed or know what is in it, and many do not believe it. I remember while I was in debate with Griffin in 1870, in Gallatin, J. R. Graves stated before the audience that he had never seen or read the "Philadelphia Confession of Faith," and for some years I could not get a copy; it was out of print. But the Baptists do use, read, and preach from the Bible; they teach that God requires people to believe and obey the things taught in the Bible. If some, under Baptist preaching hear or read the Bible and do the things commanded in the Bible because God requires them, without any knowledge or thought of what the creed teaches, why is not that obedience acceptable to God? The obedience that was rendered to God among the ten tribes after they had ceased to go up to Jerusalem to worship was accepted of God when they returned and united with the Jews in the full service; they were accepted of God and were not required to be again cir-



cumcised. See Hezekiah's invitation to all to return to Jerusalem and keep the passover. (2 Chron. 30: 1-21.) God accepted them and made special allowance for those who had been unfavorably situated for knowing and doing his will. There is nothing of the Godlike spirit in proscribing those who seek to do his will because they have been unfavorably situated for learning and doing it.

What is true of the Baptists, as stated above, is also true of other denominations to a greater or less extent. What is done to comply with any human creed or to please any church or any human being is sinful; but obedience rendered to God among these sects will not be rejected because they are unfavorably situated for knowing and obeying God's will, when they seek the more perfect worship of God. These sects are usually counted spiritual Babylon. Christians are commanded to come out of Babylon. (Rev. 18: 4.) A. Campbell said: "Christians cannot come out of Babylon unless there be Christians in Babylon." God requires us to encourage, and not repel, all striving to do his will, even if they are unfavorably situated for knowing and doing his will. As we judge and treat them in their trials and misconceptions, so God will treat us in our weaknesses and mistakes. If any man thinks he understands and does the full will of God, he deceives himself, and needs to repent of his self-righteousness. (See Re-baptism.

### **CUPS, HOW MANY, SHOULD BE USED?**

Where I have been preaching recently the two leading brethren disagree as to how many cups should be used in the Lord's Supper, and they desire to hear from you on the subject. One brother contends that we ought to use but one cup, and that to use more than one is sinful; while the rest of the brethren think that the cup sustains the same relation to the wine that the plate does to the bread, and hence it is not the cup, but what it contains, that should be considered, though, out of deference to him, they use only one cup.

It is difficult to tell how to treat those who exalt such whims into matters of faith. They, as a rule, are good, morbidly conscientious men, who, to say the least, are like some of whom the Savior speaks, who "tithe mint and anise and cummin, and have left undone the weightier matters of the law, justice, and mercy, and faith." But these do not pertain to the law of God at all. God teaches nothing on the subject of whether there should be one loaf or cup or more. Matthew

says: "As they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it; and he gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins. **But** I say **unto** you, I shall not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." (Matt. 26: 26-29.) When Jesus speaks of this cup, "this fruit of the vine," he does not mean that special cup before him, but the wine used for the same purpose even till he comes again; he will drink of this cup when he comes again, which shows he means by this that which is like this and used for the same end.

The abuses that grow out of the Supper show that they did not all drink of one cup. One ate and drank before another, and each seems to have brought his own bread and wine and plates and cups; and, then, some got drunk, which they could not have clone if all drank from the same cup of wine; there would not have been enough in one cup to make them drunk. This was an abuse of the Supper, of course, but an abuse that could not have grown up if all had to partake of one cup. The truth is, this Supper was instituted at the passover, and the passover was a feast. Out of this feasting the abuses grew, and Paul (1 Cor. 11) corrects the idea of its being a feast to eat and drink, and makes it a memorial service to refresh our memory of the kindness and love of Jesus in dying for the world.

There is nothing taught as to whether one cup or more, or one loaf or more, was used. This cup or this loaf did not confine the Savior's language to the one cup or loaf he had in his hand, but it meant: This cup or this loaf used to commemorate my sufferings, whenever and wherever it be, till I come again. All efforts to make laws and restrictions where God has made none are as sinful as to annul those he has made. Both displace God's authority with man's. To bring in these untaught questions is to disturb the peace of the church, and falls under the law. "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations." Disputations over these questions are forbidden, and he who occupies his mind with these untaught questions cannot find time for the great and important work of saving a lost and ruined world.

**DAVID, A MAN AFTER GOD'S OWN HEART.**

(1) In what respect was David a man after God's own heart?

David was a man after God's own heart in that he sought to do the will of God without changing it as Saul had done. Saul was about to engage in battle. "And he tarried seven days, according to the set time that Samuel had appointed: but Samuel came not to Gilgal; and the people were scattered from him. And Saul said, Bring hither the burnt offering to me, and the peace offerings. And he offered the burnt offering. And it came to pass that, as soon as he had made an end of offering the burnt offering, behold, Samuel came; and Saul went out to meet him, that he might salute him. And Samuel said, 'What hast thou done? And Saul said, Because I saw that the people were scattered from me, and that thou earnest not within the days appointed, and that the Philistines assembled themselves together at Michmash; therefore said I, Now will the Philistines come down upon me to Gilgal, and I have not entreated the favor of Jehovah: I forced myself therefore, and offered the burnt offering. And Samuel said to Saul, Thou hast done foolishly; thou hast not kept the commandment of Jehovah thy God, which he commanded thee: for now would Jehovah have established thy kingdom upon Israel forever. But now thy kingdom shall not continue: Jehovah hath sought him a man after his own heart, and Jehovah hath appointed him to be prince over his people, because thou hast not kept that which Jehovah commanded thee." (1 Sam. 13: 8-14.) Saul changed God's law and made an offering himself when Samuel failed to come at the appointed time, when he knew it was not lawful for any save a priest to offer. He did it through an excess of religious zeal. He was again guilty of the same sin when God sent him to destroy the Amalekites (chapter 15), when he changed the command of God to slay everything, man and beast, in their own land. Saul thought to honor God more by bringing the fatlings back to Israel and making a sacrifice to God. This he did, and God gave him up and had Samuel to anoint David king. David would not change the appointments of God; and when he violated them through fleshly lust, he made no effort to justify or excuse himself, but confessed his sin freely and without excuse. Men frequently commit greater sins in trying to excuse and justify their wrongdoing than the original sin. God loves the man

that desires to do his will without changing it, and when he does wrong will freely confess the sin. David was in these points a man after God's heart. Saul changed God's appointments and then sought to excuse and justify himself in it. This shows a bad heart toward God.

(2) Was David an inspired man?

David was inspired in certain things. Inspiration bestows certain gifts. A man is inspired along certain lines, not in others. Samson, a wicked and loose man in some respects, was inspired in some others. Judas Iscariot was inspired. Inspiration taught the truth along certain lines, but did not prevent sinning. Paul, with all his inspiration, had to keep his body under, his lusts, lest, after having preached to others, he should be a castaway. (1 Cor. 9: 27.)

### **DAY, HE THAT REGARDETH THE.**

Please explain Rom. 14: 6: "He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks." This verse I have studied much, but cannot understand it.

This is one of those passages of scripture that can be understood only by understanding the Old Testament Scriptures. Under the Jewish law there were many days held as holy days, among them the first day of every month, the new moon, with other feast and fast days. After the establishment of Christianity, the questions came up: Shall these days still be observed to the Lord? Shall the meats and sacrifices be offered to the Lord? The meats were eaten by the people to the Lord. Paul tells them it is a matter of indifference. Those who desire to observe the day can do so, if they will spend it in true worship to the Lord; others, who do not desire to observe these days, may refrain from it, if, in their failure to do it, they are still serving the Lord. The meats used in the observance of this day may also be eaten or not. The same days are referred to in Gal. 4: 10, only here they had been used to turn the people away from Jesus back to Judaism; so were observed, but not to the Lord, and worked injury. The principle taught here, I think, authorizes a Christian to devote any day he chooses to the service of God, but he must

not impose it upon others. This has no reference to the day God has set apart for worship. That all must observe. But if any desire to devote other days to the worship of God, they may do so for themselves, but must not impose them upon others. Col. 2: 16 also refers to these days that were held to be sacred among the Jews. God did not object to their worshipping him on these clays. Here he says: "Let no man therefore judge you" as to these days and services that have been done away in Christ. He means by this: Do not let any lead you into condemnation by turning you, through these observances, back to Judaism. Read this whole connection in Colossians. They had been made complete in Christ. These days and feasts were all types or shadows of truths to come, therefore do not turn back from Christ to them. Yet, as said above, if any man wished to devote the new moon or any other feast day to the worship of the Lord, he might do so. If a man wishes to devote Saturday to the worship of God, he may do so; but he must not let it interfere with the worship God has directed on the Lord's day, nor must he impose it on others. See **Doubtful Disputations**.

### **DAY, WHAT, IS IT?**

To what day is reference made in Heb. 10: 25? The verse is: "Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another: and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching."

One interpretation is that it refers to the first day of the week. On this day they met for worship. Some then, as many now, failed to meet; and as they would meet each other as the day approached, they should admonish and exhort one another to be faithful in the meeting. This would require them to be more diligent in exhorting one another toward the latter part of the week than during the early part of it, much more diligent on Friday or Saturday than on Monday or Tuesday. I do not think this is correct. There were prophecies of the speedy destruction of Jerusalem among the Christians. Jesus had foretold this and had given signs of the coming of the day. He had warned them that when they saw these signs imminent, they must flee the city. They were watching for the signs of the coming of this day. But I think this was the day of which they were to watch the approach and be ready to leave the city before the evil came upon it. The

early histories of the churches state that no Christian suffered in the destruction of the city, although the Jews perished in great numbers. Eusebius, the earliest of the church historians, gives this account: "The whole body, however, of the church at Jerusalem, having been commanded by a divine revelation, given to men of approved piety there before the war, removed from the city, and dwelt at a certain town beyond the Jordan, called Pella. Here those that believed in Christ, having removed from Jerusalem as if holy men had entirely abandoned the royal city itself and the whole land of Judea; the divine justice for their crimes against Christ and his apostles finally overtook them, totally destroying the whole generation of these evildoers from the earth." ("Ecclesiastical History," Book III., Chapter 5, page 86.) The destruction was by the Roman army in accordance with the prophecies of Daniel (9: 26) and of Jesus (Matt. 24.) These historic accounts may be exaggerated in some parts; but the destruction was looked for and did come not a great while after the writing of this letter to the Hebrews, and I think the reference was to this day.

### DEACONS AND THEIR WORK.

In 1 Tim. 3 we find the character qualifications of deacons in the church, and in Phil. 1: 1 we find there were deacons in the church at Philippi; but we have failed to find (to our understanding) the work of the deacons outlined. What is their work? Some tell us that the seven that were chosen to look after the wants of the Grecian widows were deacons, and to serve tables is the work of deacons. Is this true? We do not know where they are called deacons, and we find that in a very short time two of that number (Stephen and Philip) were preaching the gospel very successfully.

These seven are not called by any name or official designation. Shall we, therefore, conclude that they had no work to do? No one is given an official designation in the New Testament service. **Apostle** is not an official designation. It simply means "one sent," and it would be applied to any one sent, regardless of the mission. So also of elders, bishops, deacons; they all designated the work they did, or the characters of the qualities they possessed, rather than an official position. **Diakoon**, translated **deacon**, means simply a servant or minister. It does not make any difference whom or what he serves. If he serves, he is a minister or servant or deacon. That means that the work to be done was the important thing, not

the official authority. While the name **diakoon**, or servant, is not used in Acts 6, the verb **diakonein**, to serve, is mentioned, and diakoneo, the service rendered, is spoken of. To say a man served, or did service, is about as definite as to say he was a servant. That is what is done in Acts 6. A deacon, then, is a servant of the church. These seven served the church; they did service. Hence they have been called **deacons**, or servants—I suppose, justly. The elders were the overseers, the teachers. The seven were appointed to look after the neglected poor and needy, which the teachers could not do without neglecting their duty as teaching". "It is not fit that we should forsake the word of God, and serve tables" (Acts 6: 2), said the apostles who were teaching. It would seem that it is not right to quit teaching' the word to serve tables. This service needed did not last long, because the disciples were scattered abroad. These seven were designated to supplement the work of the teachers in looking after the poor. We find that the deacons were associated with the teachers or the elders to do the work, to help on the affairs of the church. Those who served the church did look after the poor and see that their wants were supplied. Some of them preached; all of them did, I suppose; so did all of the disciples who were scattered abroad.

### **DEBT, PAYING.**

If a Christian owes me or any other person a sum of money and pays no part of the debt, can he contribute acceptably on the Lord's day? If he contributes to any public enterprise—such as building an academy or a church or to the need of any person—is the gift accepted of God? Is he not giving the money of another, and should he not first pay such money on his just and honest debts, and then, after having paid his just debts, contribute to worthy enterprises? Can any man take the oversight of a congregation acceptably who thus acts? Can any man oversee or teach and discipline a congregation who fails to teach and impress the truth upon his own family? Can a Christian make his wife a freeholder to hold property against his indebtedness?

It is wrong for any one to refuse or fail to pay his debts when it is in his power. God set the seal of his condemnation on it in the Old Testament. It was common then and recognized as right for a man to sell himself and family to pay his debts. (Ex. 21: 7, 8; Lev. 25: 47; Deut. 15: 12; Neh. 5: 8.) In one case it is commanded that he should be sold. (Ex. 22: 3.) In the New Testament we are commanded: "Owe

no man anything." There are many admonitions and requirements that cannot be fulfilled save by avoiding debt. It is sin for any man to make arrangements with his wife or any one else to avoid paying his debts—that is, to defraud his creditors; and all fraud to avoid paying debts is dishonesty. A man who owes others and is not able to pay ought not to give money to the service of God. God likes clean offerings, and will accept no other kind. But sometimes wives have property left them and their children by parents or others that they have no right to use in paying their husbands' debts, and their husbands are misjudged in reference to these matters. I have known cases of both kinds—where a husband put his property in his wife's name to avoid paying his debts, and where wives have property given them and their children which they have no right to use to pay their husbands' debts. I have known husbands improperly blamed in these cases. It is right to be sure of the wrong before it is charged; but, with this caution, I think there is no point at which the cause of Christ suffers more than in the dishonesty and indifference of church members to act honestly and uprightly and to be faithful in paying their debts, or in trying as far as able to pay them. Then the church treats these cases with indifference, honors men that do not pay their debts, and the cause of God suffers. A revival of honesty is greatly needed among Christians.

## DECENT, WHAT IS HEALTHFUL AND?

In our school one of the teachers conducts a physical culture class for young men. In this class the limbs and shoulders are exposed so as to give more freedom to the muscles. After the exercises, all take a shower bath. When this work is done orderly and for the benefit of our health, is it either indecent, immoral, impure, unchaste, low, or wicked? Some think we are guilty of all these crimes when we engage in it. If it is either of these, we wish to drop the work at once. Please tell us if you think we are doing wrong. What makes a thing indecent, immoral, impure, or unchaste?

It is not true that clothing hinders the use of the muscles. Of course, clothing might be so made as to hinder the use of the muscles, but ordinary loose clothing does not. This is a deception that professionals practice on themselves and the public.

With this out of the way, the latter of the two questions should be first answered. To determine what is evil as announced, we must have a standard. Things are good or evil



according to the standard used. Brutes do not have a sense of right or wrong, nor a sense of shame, and the exposure of all parts of the body is regarded as proper.

When man was first created, he was naked and without shame. He was then very much of an animal and had no sense of right and wrong. When he sinned and his sense of right and wrong developed, his sense of shame came with it, and Adam and Eve made aprons of fig leaves to hide their nakedness. God sympathized with their sense of shame when they came to know good from evil and made for Adam and for his wife "coats of skin, and clothed them." (Gen. 3: 21.) God thought people who knew good from evil ought to clothe themselves so as to hide their nakedness. Again, one possessed with demons "wore no clothes." The demons were cast out, and he was "clothed, and in his right mind." (See Luke 8: 27-35.) This seems to settle it that people in their right mind will clothe themselves. To this the judgment of the world conforms. Uncivilized and savage nations, as a rule, go partially clothed. As they rise in the scale of education, civilization, and refinement, they wear more clothes.

If it be claimed this bareness of clothing is only for a short period, the answer is: To return to a state of savage and brutal indifference for only a short time leaves its evil influence upon the character of those doing it and upon all accustomed to it.

In addition to this, the whole fad of gymnastics and violent exercise is a hurtful mistake, physically and morally. The development of the external organs and muscles does not add to the life force or vitality of the person. The life force comes from the internal organs—the stomach, heart, liver, and others. The office of the external organs, including the muscles, is to work off and expend the surplus force and effete matter supplied by the internal organs. If the external organs become disproportionately large and expend the life force more rapidly and more constantly than it is supplied, weakness and exhaustion and permanent debility ensue. To suggest these things is to prove them. The persons who live long are those with good heart and lungs and other internal organs, with a good venous system, indicated by large jugular veins, with moderate muscular power. Athletes or persons with large muscular development seldom live long. The reason is that

they expend life force more rapidly than the internal organs that eliminate it from the food taken can supply it. Exhaustion, disease, and premature death follow. There is no surer indication of a short life than weak internal organs coupled with large muscular form. If a man can develop and strengthen his internal organs and take such moderate exercise as will keep them in healthy activity, the pores open, working off the effete matter without exhausting them, he will secure the best guarantee of health and long life that is possible to man.

But what is indecent? Anything is indecent that suggests and creates improper thoughts and desires. Seeing a woman half naked suggests improper thoughts and creates lustful desires in man, hence it is indecent for a woman to appear half naked before men. The same is true of half naked men before women. It is indecent for either sex to appear half naked before the other. It is also true that for those of either sex to appear half naked before others of their own sex destroys their sense of shame and modesty and educates them to have no shame or to be indecent before the other sex. My judgment is that the half-naked and violent practices are not good to give strength and vigor to the body, but its tendency is to destroy modesty and refinement of feeling and to produce coarse and unrefined feelings and manners. These violent exercises bring no good, but evil, to body and spirit.

### **DESPISERS OF GOD.**

What is meant by the terms "hate," "love," and "despise," as applied to God and his law? In other words, is it possible for one to think he loves God, when, as a matter of fact, he despises him?

God and the Bible deal with questions and use words in a practical sense. We use them in a sentimental, emotional sense, and often mistake their meaning and wrongly judge ourself and our conduct by them. The words "hate" and "love" are so misunderstood and misapplied. Many persons who hate the Lord, through a false standard, think they love him. Many who love him, through the false standard, are much troubled lest they fail to love him. We treat and judge them simply as emotions or magnetic attractions or repulsions. One whose heart (and the heart is the inner spiritual man that coolly judges and determines) is willing deliberately to serve

the Lord, deny himself to obey and please the Lord, but is lacking in emotional and magnetic sympathies, frequently distresses himself with the thought that he does not love the Lord. Another, who has quick emotions and excitable sympathies, but will not give up his own ways to serve the Lord, imagines he loves the Lord with a pure heart fervently. This one frequently deceives his soul to his own undoing; the other needlessly harasses his soul with doubts and fears.

God's test of love is the willingness to do what God commands out of respect and reverence for the will of God. "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." (1 John 5: 3.)

It matters not what a man's emotions, sympathies, and attractions may be, if he is not willing to deny himself and reject his own wisdom and will to obey God, he hates God. According to this rule so strongly emphasized by God, if a man do the things commanded by God as the dictate of his own wisdom and not as obedience to the will of God, that doing is not accepted as service to God. The principle and test of love become simple under the law of God. Whenever a man will forego earthly ends to obey God, he loves God better than he loves these ends. The woman that is willing to disobey husband and so displease him in order to obey and please God loves God better than she loves the husband—nay, in the language of Jesus, she loves God and hates the husband. To hate is to be willing to displease and break harmony with the husband. When she is willing to disobey God to please the husband, she hates God—is willing to break union with him for the sake of the husband.

The word despise has much the same meaning of hate. We use the word despise as an emotion that holds in contempt and dislike a person or thing. That is not its Bible use. Many persons who are very devout in their services to the Lord really despise him; they would be insulted and horrified at the idea, but they will be turned aside at the last day as despisers of Almighty God.

Moses says: "But if ye will not hearken unto me, and will not do all these commandments; and if ye shall reject my statutes, and if your soul abhor mine ordinances, so that ye will not do all my commandments, but break my covenant; I also will do this unto you: I will appoint terror over you.

even consumption, and fever, that shall consume the eyes, and make the soul to pine away." (Lev. 26: 14-16.)

To so reject the word of God as to refuse to do all that he commanded them was to despise God—that is, when a man is wise enough to set aside any part of God's law, he despises the law of God.

Solomon says, "The foolish despise wisdom and instruction" (Prov. 1:7)—that is, they refuse to follow them. "Despise not thy mother when she is old" (Prov. 23: 22)—do not lightly regard and neglect her when she is old, infirm, and helpless.

Malachi says: "A son honoreth his father, and a servant his master: if then I am a father, where is mine honor? and if I am a master, where is my fear? saith Jehovah of hosts unto you, O priests, that despise my name. And ye say, Wherein have we despised thy name? Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar. And ye say, Wherein have we polluted thee? In that ye say, The table of Jehovah is contemptible. And when ye offer the blind for sacrifice, it is no evil! and when ye offer the lame and sick, it is no evil!" (Mal. 1: 6-8.) These priests were worshipers of God. They had come to set aside his commands in their strictness, and did not bring the best to the Lord. This was to despise him.

Jesus Christ said: "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other." (Matt. 6: 24.) To neglect a master and his will is to despise him. A man cannot make a master of his conscience and of God, too. If he follows his conscience as a master, he despises God and rejects him. Every man who sets tip his conscience or his judgment or reason or experience as a rule, or as deciding the right, rejects God and despises him and his law. Jesus said: "He that heareth you heareth me; and he that rejecteth you rejecteth me; and he that rejecteth me rejecteth him that sent me." (Luke 10: 16.) Here rejecting is placed as the opposite of hearing. Every man that refuses to hear and be guided by the words of the apostles despises both Jesus Christ and God his Father.

Many preachers who are eloquent and pathetic in their appeals for God will be turned aside with the sentence: "Behold, ye despisers, wonder and perish!" A man can worship

God with zeal and pathos, with earnestness and deep feeling, and yet despise him. A man who prefers his own wisdom to the wisdom of God, a man who thinks the provisions of God in any respect inefficient, lightly esteems that wisdom. When he turns from God's appointments to the ways of man, he despises the wisdom of God; and when he despises the ways of God, he despises God. At best, we approach God only in his ways and in his appointments. To turn from these or to reject them is to dishonor and despise God.

Jesus gives us an example of these: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name, and by thy name cast out demons, and by thy name do many mighty works?" (Matt. 7: 21, 22.) These persons are zealous and devoted worshipers of God. They are so full of zeal and devotion, of earnestness and consecration, that they think they are able to prophesy in his name, to cast out devils in his name, and in his name do many wonderful works. Yet they were despisers of God. They did not follow his will, but substituted their own ways of worship; were eloquent, devoted, zealous, and pathetic in their service, but they despised God. They showed it in failing to do his will. Paul says, "Therefore he that rejecteth, rejecteth not man, but God, who giveth his Holy Spirit unto you" (1 Thess. 4: 8)—that is, God had given to the apostles his Holy Spirit that they might know the mind of God. The apostles delivered this mind, or will, of God to men; and when they rejected or set aside the teachings of the apostles for the wisdom of man, they did not despise man, but God. All the efforts to exalt human wisdom and experience to a rule of action for man is to despise the wisdom of God, is to despise God himself; and those who despise God, God will despise and condemn them with an everlasting destruction.

It is folly for men to go forward worshiping God, it matters not how great the zeal and devotion, while they are failing to do his will and are exalting any other rule or standard of right and justice. "A man that hath set at naught Moses' law dieth without compassion on the word of two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, think ye, shall he be judged worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath

counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?" (Heb. 10: 28, 29.) We have shown that to despise Moses' law was to turn from it—to neglect to do all the things that he commanded them. To tread under foot the Son of God is to set at naught his precepts; to count his blood unholy is to regard that which is not sealed with his blood as sacred as that which is sealed with his blood. Whenever man regards service not sealed with his blood as good as that sealed with it, he counts the blood unholy, without sanctifying power; and when he turns from the things revealed by the Spirit of God, he does despite to the Spirit of grace. The Spirit of God reveals the terms of mercy, the means of grace. When we turn from them and rely on other ways to obtain mercy, and when we seek for grace in other ways than those given by the Spirit of God, we do despite to the Spirit of grace, we despise God and his provisions of mercy and love.

Many of us who imagine we love God and give our service to him, and are willing to give all that we possess and our body to be burned, will wake up in the last day (when it is too late) to the consciousness that, with it all, we despised God, had not charity; that God rejects all the service we render and will despise us as unworthy of his love and pity in the day when, above all others, we shall need the love and pity of One able to help and to save.

#### **DIFFICULTIES, RULES FOR SETTLING.**

Some of the members of the church at this place have requested me to write to you and ask you to explain Matt. 18. Is that the rule by which members are to adjust their differences?

I think the rule and spirit given in Matt. 18 the rule for settling difficulties between brethren and in the church. This direction was given especially for that purpose; and if not used for this end, I can see no use for it in the Bible. If this is not the direction for settling difficulties, I do not know where rules for doing this can be found. "And if thy brother sin against thee, go, show him his fault between thee and him alone." (Verse 15.) Whenever a man feels that his brother has sinned against him, wronged him in any way, the first duty is to go to him alone and tell him of the wrong. It ought to be done promptly. "If he hear thee, thou hast

gained thy brother." If he listens to your remonstrance and corrects the wrong, you have "gained" him in the sense of delivering him from sin. It gives him the opportunity, too, of showing the aggrieved one that he may be mistaken and has not been wronged. This step is the first and most important one to be taken. It is one that men are least inclined to take. It is easier to make public accusation and to talk before others; but God's law is to talk first between yourselves and try to reach an agreement. If this were done promptly, nine-tenths of the difficulties would be settled at once. Instead of this, we generally refuse to do this, and let the matter ferment and fester and grow into an ugly sore before an effort is made to heal it. "But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or three every word may be established. And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church." (Verses 16, 17.) This shows that brethren are not only to hear the facts, but to decide what is right and urge the wrongdoer to do right, else he could not be said to "refuse to hear them." "If he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church: and if he refuse to hear the church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican." Sometimes it is thought that this telling it to the church is merely for information, and, if it is well known, that there is no call to report it to the church; the church may act from its knowledge without conferring with the erring one. But the report to the church is not to give information alone, but to call into exercise the influence and weight of the church to induce the erring one to correct his wrong. He is to hear or refuse to hear the church before any action is taken in the case. To "hear" is to act in accordance with the judgment of the church; to "refuse to hear" is to refuse to be guided by the decision of the church. It is only when he has thus refused to hear the church that he is to be withdrawn from and is to be to them as a Gentile and a publican. The Jews had no dealings or fraternal associations with these classes. The question frequently comes up: Is to report the case to the elders to report it to the church? It ought to be reported to the church through them, or those acting as elders, and under their supervision the church should reach a conclusion. This decision may be announced by the elders or under their direction; but the decision should be as nearly as possible that of

the whole church, that harmony and union may prevail. Special efforts should be made to have accord in the church. See **Disorderly, Dealing with The.**

### **DIGRESSIVES, WORSHIPING WITH.**

If a Christian is located and has no chance to worship with loyal brethren, should he worship with "digressives?"

I do not think a man is ever placed where he cannot worship God acceptably without worshiping with those who add to the appointments of God. I do not believe one can worship God acceptably with those who add to the appointments of God, especially one who knows it is wrong. To do wrong knowingly is worse than to do it in ignorant unbelief. One can almost always find one or two to meet and worship with him as God requires; and when two or three are gathered together in the name of the Lord, he is with them. A Christian diligent and anxious to serve God will seldom be placed so he cannot find some to worship with him according to the will of God. We get it into our heads we must have a church with large numbers to meet and worship God, and the great mass of professed Christians will not attend if there are only a few meeting at a private house. These, unless they can be converted and better taught, cannot worship God acceptably anywhere. I do not believe people ought to encourage or participate in what they believe wrong under any circumstances. I believe that if a person is diligent and faithful in serving God in the right way, God will not leave him without facilities for serving him aright. Do not worship wrong with others; try to get others to worship aright with you.

### **DISCIPLINE OF PREACHERS.**

A is a Christian preacher. He travels far and near. He is a bad character. Where he goes and holds meetings, he often conducts himself so badly that the cause is injured. He leaves the community, and the brethren talk about his ungodly conduct to every other preacher that comes along. In the meantime he is somewhere else pursuing the same course. What should be done with such men? Should not all Christian preachers be required to identify themselves with some congregation where they can be dealt with by churches having been imposed on as in the case of A? If a report is in circulation among the churches that a certain preacher is guilty of a grave sin, and some are opposed to encouraging such a character, while others think the charges false, how can a number of congregations investigate the charges and take action in the case? Should they compel said preacher to name his "home congregation" and then refer all evidence to that



congregation? Can an assembly of elders be called and the charges investigated by them? I am persuaded that if some plan is not better understood and some action taken to stop the ravages of ungodly men, the churches must suffer greatly.

Christian people, like all others, run from one extreme to another. Some years ago great stress was laid upon persons, preachers as well as others, having their names on the church books, and having formal letters in going abroad or to other places. I knew a preacher to live with and preach for a church for a dozen years. He did badly; the church proposed to discipline him; and he coolly told them he did not belong to that church, he had never put his letter in, and they had no right to deal with him. The position was that a man is not a member of the church unless he is formally received into the church and his name enrolled on the church list. Afterwards it was contended that when a person is a member of the church in one place, he is a member wherever he is, and that a letter was a certificate of his membership, and not to dismiss him from one congregation to enable him to unite with another. This is true of the letters mentioned in the Scriptures. This position involves another truth that stands with it, but that is greatly ignored. That is, if a Christian is a member of the church wherever he is or goes, he is subject to the discipline and control of the church wherever he is or goes. This is the true ground. If one claims the rights and privileges of a church, he must bear the responsibility of membership as well as receive the privileges of the church. The privileges and responsibilities of church membership go together. Where a man worships with a church, he is accountable to that church for his conduct. If he comes among them, acts as a Christian, worships with them, they ought to commend him if he does well; if he does ill, they ought to condemn him. When a man comes into a congregation and worships with them and acts unworthily, they ought to deal with him; and if unworthy of confidence, they ought to publish him to the world. It does not require the assemblage of elders from different congregations to deal with him. The elders where he commits the wrong should discipline him. That is the way the civil authorities do. When a man goes from Nashville to Texas and commits a crime against the laws of Texas, they do not send him back to Tennessee to punish him. Indeed, the authorities in Tennessee cannot punish a man for a crime committed in

Texas. Where a man commits a wrong, he ought to be disciplined or dealt with for that wrong, and all other churches are under solemn obligation to abide by the action of that church. When the church acts as God directs, the decision of the church is the decision of God.

There is no greater hindrance to the gospel than the failure of professed Christians to live up to its requirements of morality, uprightness, and honesty. Elders and preachers often forget their obligations and are untrustworthy in their dealings and their associations with their fellow-man. So often it is said a preacher is not truthful, a preacher does not pay his debts and is disregarding of his promises and obligations. We need a reformation on the line of integrity and honesty among Christians generally. It is especially needed among the elders and preachers. It should begin, but not end, with them. It is more especially needed among them because they are more conspicuous and exert a wider influence, both upon the church and the world. Preachers traveling over the country with evil reports following them ought not to be countenanced, and the principles of honesty and truth ought to be enforced on all church members.

It is vain to talk of converting the world when the church shows it is not converted, and tolerates, if it does not encourage, untruthfulness and dishonesty among its members. These are often shown in other than overt acts and words. Young preachers sometimes come to school and set in to work their way. Sometimes we hear such reports as these: "They do as little work and count in as much time as possible." A man who does this in any affairs of life is lacking in truthfulness and honesty. Every service that a Christian renders on earth should be rendered as to God. Every contract should be faithfully carried out. God will recompense us for our fidelity or lack of fidelity in every relation of life. "Servants, obey in all things them that are your masters according to the flesh; not with eyeservice, as menpleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing the Lord: whatsoever ye do, work heartily, as unto the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that from the Lord ye shall receive the recompense of the inheritance: ye serve the Lord Christ. For he that doeth wrong shall receive again for the wrong that he hath done: and there is no respect of persons." (Col. 3: 22-25.) That means that God will reward or punish

for the fidelity or lack of fidelity in all our transactions and relations with our fellow-men. When we wrong them, God will punish us. When we are faithful and render full service, God will reward us. If the other party is exacting and unjust and we still do faithful service, God will abundantly reward us. All trying to put in time without faithful service, all slighting of work we undertake, God punishes us for. God demands his servants should show all fidelity in all our business affairs and in all our relations with men. When we refuse to do this, we reproach and dishonor God and his church.

### **DISCREPANCY HUNTERS.**

Please harmonize Luke 14: 26 with 1 John 3: 15. Infidels in this country are making capital out of it, and claim it is a flat contradiction, and say it is impossible to harmonize the two.

Lack of brains and dishonesty of heart cause the greater number of the contradictions of scripture to be seen. I cannot remove these unless I could give honest hearts and a little common sense. "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." Hate is the opposite of love. To refuse to keep the commandments is to hate him. This is the true and Bible use of the terms **love** and **hate**. A child dishonored, hated, cursed his parent when he disobeyed the parent. Then Christ means that unless a man will disobey parent, husband, wife, break the obligations of any relation of life to serve and honor God, he cannot be the disciple of Christ. But when a man wishes to be an infidel, answering his objections is casting pearl before swine. God always allows a man to be a fool when he wishes to be. And "the fool hath said in his heart, There is no God." Reconciling scripture for the benefit of those who do not wish to see it reconciled is the poorest business a man ever engaged in, except hunting discrepancies. See **Mote Hunters and Hobby Riders**.

### **DISORDERLY, DEALING WITH THE.**

(1) Who controls a congregation of Christ, the voice of the majority or the elders? How would you proceed in dealing with a disorderly member after all means have been exhausted in trying to save him? If the elders in their wisdom have decided that a member should be withdrawn from, can they do so as long as there is one dissenting voice in the congregation? How much authority does the eldership have in matters of discipline?

The voice of God must control a congregation if it is a church of Christ. This is the only test of fidelity to God. If the voice of God does not control, it is not a church of Christ. Elders are the older members, familiar with the Scriptures, of good judgment, and imbued with the Spirit of God, whose duty it is to see that all obey the word of God. If any one violates the law of God, it is the duty of those who know it either to see him in person or to see that some one who has influence with the sinner warn him of his evil course and point out the law of God he has violated, and admonish him that he should repent. The elders are the head, or overseers, of the church. If those who see the wrong fail to induce the sinner to turn from it and confess it, it is their duty to take others with them to remonstrate. If they fail (see the order, Matt. 18), tell it to the church. To do this is to report it to the elders, the heads or rulers of the church. They are to examine the case and determine what wrong, if any, he has committed, seek to show him his wrong. If he hears them, they have gained him. The elders should report the case to the church, give the facts in the case, lay before the members the charges and the evidence on which they are based, the Scriptures violated, and the law requiring the action taken. The vote ought never to be put to the congregation as to whether they will withdraw from him or not. There is no authority for such a course, and such cases ought not to be decided by vote of the congregation, but by the law of God. This question might properly be put: Does any one know any reason why the conclusions set forth here are not true and scriptural? If so, the elders will hear the reasons. And if they are found just, they should have their influence. If not, the elders should seek to show the truth both as to the facts and the scripture teaching to those who do not see it, that all may act with unanimity in the decision reached. This conference between the elders and those dissatisfied will be much more free from passion and feeling if private, yet the whole congregation is entitled to know the facts. Patience and persistence should be exercised in trying to get all to see the truth, that all may heartily agree in the course. I will not say that no action should be taken while one dissents. This might be proper if all were led by the spirit of the gospel; but many let their family pride and fleshly feelings, rather than the word of God, control them in

such matters. Some think they show love and kindness to kindred and friends when they object to the church enforcing the law of God. on their families or friends, but this is a mistake. A father or mother shows true love for a child by desiring the laws of God to be enforced when he does wrong. God's laws are for the good of all who. sin. True love for the sinner, even if he be our own child, will prompt us to see the law enforced, that he may get the good that comes through the law of God. We are real enemies to our children when we object to their being dealt with according to the law of God. The parents should be as ready to report the sins of a child that they cannot correct to the church as any one else would be or as they would be to report any one else. True love for the child seeks the true good of the child, and that is promoted by the discipline of the law of God; but many are not willing for the law of God to be enforced with reference to their kindred or friends, and to say the discipline shall not be enforced as long as one objects is to place it in the power of one such to veto the enforcement of the law of God. It is true that parents that object to the law of God being rigidly applied to their own child, relative, or friend, are not worthy to be members in the church of God, but they are often; and when this spirit manifests itself, such should be dealt with in patience to save them from this sinful course; but such should not be permitted to hinder the enforcement of the law of God. When the elders have labored patiently with those who are unwilling to see the law enforced, and they fail to get them to do right, then the facts should be stated to the congregation, the Scriptures read, and the congregation should sustain the elders in their decision heartily and cheerfully. If the friends and kindred remain perverse and fractious after all patience and effort to get them right, they should be disciplined; for no one who objects to the law of God being enforced upon a child, a husband, a sister, a brother, or a parent, is a true believer in the Lord Jesus Christ. But all this work must be done by the elders in a spirit of Christian love and freedom from personal or partisan feeling or partiality; the good of all, the salvation of those who sin, should be the one leading object of all true servants of God. So all must be done in kindness and love, that the sinning one may be made to feel that the elders are his true friends and seeking his good. When

he is made to feel this, then their work will be almost sure to prove effective. The elders, acting according to the law of God, have the full authority of God, just as the representative of a government, acting according to the laws of the government, carries the full authority of that government. If not acting according to the law of God, they have no authority whatever. What the proper representatives of a State do the State does. No one would think that to enforce or execute the laws of a State upon a violator of that law the people must take a popular vote on trial of every case. That would be clumsy; and, left to a popular vote, the laws would not be executed with any certainty. It would depend upon the prejudices and excited feelings of the multitude. These are notoriously unreliable. What the legally constituted representatives of a people do in accordance with the laws governing that people the people do. The New Testament is the law of the church, and the elders are the scriptural representatives of the church. The duty of the elders is to teach and enforce obedience to the Scriptures.

(2) In the last issue of the Gospel Advocate it is stated that the withdrawal of fellowship should not be left to the congregation. If the New Testament supports this conclusion, please give us the passage, with explanation.

God decides all questions in his kingdom. He is the law-maker and the executor. He executes through his servants. Through what class does he execute his will or law in the church? Under the patriarchal age he did it through the father of the family. The father gave the law, taught the law to his family, punished for the infraction of the law, and was the executor of God's law to his family. God made Moses the lawgiver to the children of Israel, and he was first made judge of the infractions of the law and the executor to inflict punishment on those who disobeyed the law of God. It was God deciding the cases and executing the sentence of the law on its violator through Moses. The elders, as an official body, seem to have grown out of the suggestion of Jethro, father-in-law of Moses: "And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses sat to judge the people: and the people stood about Moses from the morning unto the evening." He suggested: "Thou wilt surely wear away, both thou, and this people that is with thee: for the thing is too heavy for thee; thou art not

able to perform it thyself alone. Harken now unto my voice, I will give thee counsel, and God be with thee: be thou for the people to Godward, and bring thou the causes unto God: and thou shalt teach them the statutes and the laws, and shalt show them the way wherein they must walk, and the work that they must do. Moreover thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating unjust gain; and place such over them, to be rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens: and let them judge the people at all seasons: and it shall be, that every great matter they shall bring unto thee, but every small matter they shall judge themselves: so shall it be easier for thyself, and they shall bear the burden with thee. If thou shalt do this thing, and God command thee so, then thou shalt be able to endure, and all this people also shall go to their place in peace. So Moses hearkened to the voice of his father-in-law, and did all that he had said. And Moses chose able men out of all Israel, and made them heads over the people, rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens. And they judged the people at all seasons: the hard causes they brought unto Moses, but every small matter they judged themselves." (Ex. 18: 13-26.) So God set Moses and the elders the judges to decide the difficulties that would rise among the Jewish people. These elders in the different tribes, families, and cities continued to adjudge difficulties and settle differences until the days of Jesus Christ. This order of elders, with their duties, was by Jesus and the Holy Spirit transferred to the churches of God, and the same duties seem to have followed them. Paul told the elders at Ephesus: "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, to feed the church of the Lord, which he purchased with his own blood." (Acts 20: 28.) They were to oversee the flock, keep it in order, settle the difficulties that arise, and enforce the laws of God. The apostles associated the elders with themselves in deciding questions. (Acts 15: 4-6, 22, 23; 16: 4.) The elders were to rule. (1 Tim. 5: 17.) They are admonished to take the oversight of the church, not for lucre, and to be examples unto the flock. (1 Pet. 5: 1.) Christians are exhorted to obey them that have the rule over them, and submit to them; for they must give account for their ruling. (Heb. 13:

17.) The elders have been made the rulers, overseers, mouth-pieces of God to his people in all dispensations of God to man. They are the persons through whom God decides cases and enforces his laws in the church, God has never in any age left the decision of questions and difficulties that arise among his people to the vote of majorities—of the young, the thoughtless, the untaught, and inexperienced. To do this is to govern his church by impulse, favor, passion, prejudice, not by the law of God. No civilized people ever decided guilt by popular majorities. While this is true, it is the duty of the elders to satisfy all of the justness and uprightness of their decisions, that there may be unity of feeling and harmony in the actions of the church. The younger members ought to be taught to respect and defer to the judgment of the elders. The body acts in all things through its head. See **Difficulties, Rules for Settling.**

### **DIVINE HEALING.**

I wish you would tell what the New Testament says in favor of divine healing as indicated in James 5: 13-15. Some claim that this is applicable to churches nowadays. I would like to know what you think of it.

I have often given my opinion of James 5: 14, 15. I do not believe the healing was ever miraculous, or that all the sick on whom hands were laid recovered. If so, why should any ever have died? If men could all be healed now by laying on of hands of the elders and anointing with oil, who would die or remain sick? All would comply with the conditions and live. They were just as anxious to live and keep well in the days of the apostles as they are now. When one got sick, he would have sent for the elders and would be living now. The only way for people to get to heaven would be to be translated, as was Abel; yet we find persons sickening and dying with the elders and the apostles with them. (Phil. 2: 26; 2 Tim. 4: 20.) What is the meaning, then? Anointing with oil was the common curative agent of that period and time. The command was while using this to connect with it the prayers of the elders. They represented the church, and through them the church prayed for the sick. In the use of these means, combining the prayers of Christians with remedial agencies, all who could be cured would be. I think it certain that there was no miraculous healing then and has been none since. All



pretenses among Roman Catholics, Mormons, or faith healers have been deceptions. Some have imagined they were healed. This is common. There have been so-called relics of saints among Catholics, the touch of which would heal diseases. It has been thought that these would be confined to the ignorant and superstitious of Europe, and that such things would be unknown in America. But they are growing as common here as in Europe. Take Schlatter and Dowie and see what a number of followers each found, and how readily they enriched the pretenders. Take this account, too, of those who visit the relic of St. Anne in New York City. The New York Mail and Express says: "There is no falling off in the number or fervor of the pilgrims to the Shrine of St. Anne, at the Church of St. Jean Baptiste, Seventy-sixth Street, near Third Avenue, the crowds to-day differing only from those of the past three days in the increased number of men and sick children. At times the men venerating the relic outnumbered the women. The most notable cure of the novena came to the attention of Canon Petit this morning. All through the year a woman, who was a hopeless cripple, has made pilgrimages to the shrine. She was brought in a carriage and carried into the crypt. On Thursday the relic was applied to her, and she was carried home. Yesterday she came to the church with the aid of her niece, on whose shoulder she leaned. This morning she made her way unaided to the shrine to kiss the relic. She knelt down and rose again without aid, her face beaming with joy. Canon Petit, who related this incident, says that the name of the woman is not known to the priests, but they are sure she will make herself known before the novena is over." See on what slight evidence a report of a wonderful cure will be sent out to the world by the priests and the canon of a Catholic congregation, men of eminence in the church. Out of the thousands who visit this so-called relic of St. Anne, one is claimed to be healed, and yet no one knows her name or who she is. Such testimony would not be heard in a court where thirty cents was at stake. The trouble is, in religion people are ready to believe without certain testimony. They are willing to accept the most unreasonable statements on loose reports. The healings and miracles of the Bible were definite and seen and known by many. See **Mormon Pretensions (5, 6)**.

**DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE.** See **Marriage and Divorce.****DOUBTFUL DISPUTATIONS.**

What is meant by: "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations?" (Rom. 14: 1.)

Paul gave this counsel to his Roman brethren. A man's faith is weak when it is troubled over untaught and doubtful questions. A clear and strong faith looks to God and his teachings without doubt or misgivings, and is not troubled with untaught and unimportant questions. He gives two examples of those weak in faith. The first is that one has troubles over whether a man should eat flesh or only vegetables. It is a weak faith, and a morbid conscience growing out of that weak faith, that troubles itself over this question. Another example is that one man esteems one day above another; others esteem all days alike. This does not refer to the first day of the week, appointed by God for his worship; but there were other days not set apart by God under the Christian dispensation that some thought ought to be observed to God. They were likely the days regarded as sacred under the law of Moses. Many thought these days should be observed; others thought that they were not more sacred than other days. The faith that was troubled over such questions was weak. The church and Christians were not to reject or refuse to receive persons of this weak faith as brethren, but they were not to receive them to engage in disputation over these untaught questions. No decisive conclusion could be reached on such questions, for they were indifferent to God, and so nothing is taught on them. The man is no better in the sight of God for eating meat, and he is no worse for not eating it. If any one wished to eat, none should hinder him; if any did not desire to eat, none should require him to eat. Let each be persuaded in his own mind on these untaught questions, and so act for himself, but he must not insist on others doing as he does.

It was the duty of Christians to receive these persons of weak faith and morbid consciences, but Paul forbade that they should engage in the discussion of these doubtful questions. It is sin to disturb the peace and harmony of Christians over these untaught questions. The continual discussion of ques-

tions of this character will destroy the harmony and zeal of any congregation, and Paul told the church in Rome that they were not to permit it. On these untaught questions he says, "Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God" (verse 22)—that is, if one has faith, as he esteems it, let him keep that faith to himself before God, not disturb the peace of the church with it. It was wrong for the church to let a man teach and argue and lead astray the weak and destroy the harmony and zeal of the church with such questions. He who persisted in it was a factionist, and was to be dealt with as a disturber of the peace of the church. These questions mentioned are only examples of many of the present day.

The questions that oftener disturb the peace of congregations are untaught questions. The order of worship, whether Christians should build meetinghouses, what hour of the day they should engage in the worship, the effort to prescribe how and where the Scriptures should be taught, are all efforts to enforce a rule where God has made none. Such questions are untaught, and it is a sign of weak faith and morbid conscience, and none should be permitted to destroy the harmony and zeal of Christians by doubtful disputations over them. Paul does not pretend to decide which party to either of these questions is right. He decides the questions are untaught, and there is no profit, but much harm, to Christians in discussing them; so Christians ought to treat such questions in this age. The churches, from the beginning, have been divided and weakened over such questions. We are sometimes blamed for refusing to permit endless controversies over such questions in the Gospel Advocate. We have always given room for the fair statement of what a brother thinks is right, with his reasons. We have objected to continued repetition of the same impracticable and divisive thoughts. My conscience has hurt me much more for what I have admitted than for what I have excluded on these questions. Let us study and urge things clearly taught, and then we will be on safe ground. See **Day, He that Regardeth The.**

### **EAGLES GATHERED TOGETHER.**

Please explain Matt. 24: 28. What are the eagles that will be gathered together?

The usual meaning of the expression is that, as the eagle or vulture is a bird of prey, wherever a carcass or body of an animal is, there they will gather. It is used to illustrate when a nation has run its course and lost its energy and activity, the other more vigorous nations are ready to destroy it and divide its effects. At or before the coming of Christ nation will destroy nation, the stronger will destroy the weaker, and his coming will destroy the last and strongest of all the kingdoms of earth.

### **EARTHQUAKES AND CYCLONES.**

Are earthquakes and cyclones sent on people of this age as a punishment for their wickedness?

All disturbances in the material or moral world come as the result of sin. Unto the woman he said: "I will greatly multiply thy pain and thy conception; in pain thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." To the man he said: "Chirked is the ground for thy sake; in toil shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." (Gen. 3: 16-19.) All the sufferings of men, all the disorders of earth, all disturbances of the harmony of the universe, come from sin, violation of God's law. How man's sin affects the workings of God's law in the physical universe, I cannot tell; but I am sure, from the statement of the Bible and the workings of the laws of the physical world, it does. When man sinned under Moses' law, the rains were withheld or came in harvest time. It was so that physical evil came as the result of the violation of the moral laws. There is a close relation and interweaving of the moral and physical laws of God. They both emanate from one source and are enforced by the same authority. All evils in the material world come as the results of sin; and when sin ceases, all physical evil will pass away. Jesus said: "Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and killed them, think ye that they were offenders above all the men that dwell in Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." (Luke 13: 4, 5.) This does not

say it was not the result of sin. But though they had perished, it was no indication that they were sinners above others. It was a warning that others would perish as they had, unless they repent. So of all these catastrophes. They come as the result and warning for sin. But why it falls on them rather than others we know not. All will perish unless they repent.

### **ELDER, SHOULD A PREACHER BE CALLED?**

Was Timothy an elder? The discussion came up in our congregation on last Lord's day, and two preaching brethren said he was not. They also said it was wrong for a preacher to be addressed as "elder."

Timothy is nowhere called an "elder." He is exhorted: "Be thou sober in all things, suffer hardship, do the work of an evangelist, fulfill thy ministry." He is here called an "evangelist." This is the latest report we have of Timothy. He was evidently doing the work of an evangelist—that is, preaching the word and setting in order the churches. This was not the work of an elder. "Elder" means "older." It means the elders, or bishops, were composed of the older persons. It seems ridiculous to call a young person "elder." I do not see why a preacher should be called an "elder," or should have any title, any more than that a farmer or carpenter should have a special title. Paul seemed to desire no higher title than that of "servant of the Lord." When the Campbells started out to return to the primitive order, all titles of honor and dignity to preachers were ignored and rejected as unbecoming to saints. The titles and honors came from the Catholics, with their different orders and classes. But among Christians, who are all priests in the house of God, there is no occasion for titles and honors of one before or above others. If preachers were treated as men, and not as a special class, they would be more practical and manly in their lives and characters, and would exert a better influence among men.

### **ELDERS, QUALIFICATIONS OF.**

Can a member of a congregation act as an elder except he possesses all of the qualifications that Paul speaks of to Timothy? It appears to my mind that if a man should assume the office of elder without the proper qualifications, as set forth by the apostle in 1 Tim. 3, he would be a self-constituted elder, and that his actions as such would be void. While I am of this opinion, there are many good brethren who differ from me and say that if we have not the proper material we must do

the best we can and appoint to the work the best material that we have, whether they possess all of the qualifications or not. Now the apostle says that a bishop must possess certain qualifications. The question is: Can we place a man in the office, under any circumstances, who does not possess all of these qualifications? Our congregation has dispensed with the eldership in consequence of not having men who possess all of the requirements.

Do you mean that your congregation has dispensed with the work that elders should do? That nobody instructs the congregation or looks after the weak members? That you have no rule or discipline in the church? Do you mean that nobody leads in the worship? Nobody asks another to give thanks at the table or to lead in prayer? Nobody urges other members to meet to worship God, or to live honestly, uprightly, and deal justly and fairly in the world? If you have given up these things, you have given up being Christians.

A people cannot live Christians without doing all the work for one another and the community that God requires. They cannot do this without doing the work of elders and deacons in a community. You cannot live as Christians in a community without looking after the spiritual interests of the church and the public and without helping the poor and the needy, without teaching the ignorant and reproving the wrongdoers. When this is done, the work of elders is done, and it is much more important that the work of the elders than that the office of elders should be looked after. We often so pervert the religion of Christ that we esteem the office of more importance than the work. This is the world's order of things. It is only in one sense that the word **office** is applicable to the work in the church. It is not used in the church as it is in the government of the world. In this it means that when a man is inducted into office, he is authorized to do certain things that it would be a crime for him to do if he were not in this office. Now in the Scriptures it has no such meaning. The man's becoming an elder authorizes him to perform no act that he was not authorized to do before. It only makes it his business especially to look after the work now. He is to be chosen because he has shown his fitness for the office by doing the work beforehand. This shows it is not an office in the sense of an office of a civil government; but it is a duty imposed growing out of a fitness developed for the work needed to be done. Any one who does this work of an elder is in fact an elder, whether he is appointed to it or not. The appointment

gives him confidence and assurance in the work and makes him feel it especially his duty to do the work.

Sometimes men are elected that have no fitness for the work, and others do it who have a natural fitness for it, but are not elected. A church in this condition has two sets of officers—a man-made set and a God-made set. The man-made ones are always a curse and a hindrance to the church. Better not select any if you will not select the God-made ones. These will do something of the work without appointment from men; and when the work is done, the office is filled.

But our brother says that they have none fitted for the work. If so, there are no Christians there. A number cannot live the Christian life and not develop the characters needed to do Christian work. It is frequently said that nobody fills this bill, when it is not true. You occasionally find a wicked man who says there is no Christian; and it is just about as hard to find a Christian, according to the fault-finder's standard, as it is to find one fitted for an elder. When the Holy Spirit requires qualifications, he specifies them as they develop themselves and exist among men, not as they exist among angels. The man who expects perfection among men is an impractical visionary. God does not expect it. When he says they must be blameless, he means that they are blameless as weak human beings. Abraham was a model of God's men. We form visionary ideas of Abraham's excellence; but when we come to solid facts, he was a weak, erring human. Twice under fear of his life he lied. He occasionally went without God's direction. He and his family suffered for it. I have no doubt we have thousands of Christian men and women who are the equals of Abraham and Sarah in fidelity and trustworthiness before God and man. Peter was not faultless. He prevaricated. I have no doubt that our very exacting brethren, had they lived in the days of Peter, would have said that he is not fit to open the doors of the kingdom; he denied the Savior; he is not fit to teach or be a leading apostle. When the Jews came to Antioch, Peter dissembled and refused to eat with the Gentiles, although God had taught him by a miracle that he must receive and treat them as brethren. Yet God accepted him as the leading apostle. God held him blameless as a man with human weakness and infirmities, when, as an angel, he would have been blameworthy. It is not blame-

worthy for a human being to err sometimes; it is for him to persist in the wrong. I have no doubt we have thousands of men—probably some in that very church—who are or may be the equals of Peter in firmness and fidelity to truth. Inspiration gave knowledge, but not moral strength. When we dispense with the elders, we dispense with the work of God, and many Christians are in moral character the equals of Peter, or Paul, or John, or James, or Abraham, or Isaac, or Jacob. This fault-finding and depreciation of everybody else usually arises from undue exaltation of self. It is not a healthy state.

The hypocritical sinner who stands off and carps at everybody in the church as wicked means to say that he is very righteous and very perfect. He is usually a self-deceived hypocrite. The same spirit in the church belongs to the self-righteous. It is not healthy to be overmuch righteous or to demand it of others.

Acknowledge your own and your fellow-men's humanity, your liability to err; get clear of the foolish idea that men with faults and human weaknesses are unfitted for the service of God. He adapted his service to and for weak men liable to err. Be willing to confess your faults when you do err. I have noticed it in men, I have noticed it in papers, that when one starts out to be over sweet-tempered, to keep out all humanity, it becomes one-sided, unfair, and the bitterest and most intolerant of men and papers. They do not show goodness in an honest, open, human, brave way. A paper that starts out to have no controversies, to be overly peaceable, is as sure to be filled with unjust insinuations and innuendoes as that tomorrow's sun will rise. You cannot crush the humanity out of men. Do not look for perfection in human beings, nor dispense with the work of God while pretending to be Christians. When you do the work, you fill all the offices of his servants.

### **ELDERS, WHEN, DISAGREE, WHO IS TO DECIDE?**

If there are a number of elders in a congregation who disagree in their judgment concerning certain matters, the majority standing together and one standing alone, can a number of the members of the congregation authorize the one who stands alone to exclude the others from the eldership?

Nothing is said in the Scriptures of how decisions are to be reached. They do not seem to provide for divisions and dis-



sensions among elders or even among disciples generally. The elders should seek unanimity among themselves and among the members. They ought all to be of one mind and one judgment in the Lord. Paul told the elders of Ephesus (Acts 20: 30) that from among themselves should arise false teachers to draw away disciples after them. It seems to recognize that when they fail to agree and harmonize, one party draws away from the truth, and this must result in separation. Then no direction is given for the separated party, save to repent and return to God. In returning to God, they come back to those faithful to God.

The church can give the elders no authority. The church is not the source of authority for elders or other Christians. The authority the elders possess is from God. They must be guided in all things by the word of God. Neither the elders nor the church can set this law aside. One elder following the law of God has more authority as the servant of God than a dozen elders and a hundred members without the law. Difference and division between elders, if they are striving to do their duty, is a difference as to the requirements of the Bible. The way to remove the difference is not by vote of the elders or the members, but by studying and learning the will of God. No elder or elders ought to enforce a decision by their authority; that would be to lord it over God's heritage. They should seek to enforce it as the will of God, by his authority, and, in complying with the law, serve as ensamples to the flock of God. Personal feelings and preferences should be kept out when difficulties are to be settled, and in such cases the only question asked: What is the law of God? When this is done, it will not often be the case that disagreements on vital matters will exist.

When either party is not willing to submit to the law of God, that party ought not to be regarded the servant of God. The law of God must be every Christian's rule. If they disagree as to what this law is, unless this disagreement can be healed, I see no other course than separation; yet this ought to take place only on differences on vital matters. So long as a person or persons can remain in a church and do the will of God, without approving things contrary to that will, he cannot leave it. When he cannot do this, I see no alternative but to separate from it. When a separation takes place, each

will claim to be the church of God. In such case, others, as they come in contact with them, must decide which is entitled to be recognized as Christians. The one that follows the law of God is the church; the one that sets it aside, whether composed of many or few, are heretics and factionists. There ought to be, and will be, but little difference in interpreting the law of God if all are trying to follow it. Frequently in these divisions both parties do wrong—violate the law of God. When this is the case, the thing is to get each to see and correct its own wrongs. But the word of God, not members, must decide who is right and who is wrong in troubles, as in all service to God.

### **ELDERS, WORK OF.**

Is an elder the ruler over a congregation of disciples? Is he the pastor or shepherd and general supervisor? Do the elders constitute an ecclesiastical court, from whose decision there is no appeal? Has any of the laity any right to teach, admonish, exhort, administer the Supper, or do anything in the church without the consent of the elders? Has a congregation any moral right to send out a preacher or call on a preacher to work with them, or should the elders look after this matter? Do the elders oversee the flock as a master workman oversees hands or as a superintendent would oversee the working hands in a cotton mill or workshop? Would it be right to ordain an elder who has no ability to teach, but is naturally disposed to rule?

"The elders therefore among you I exhort, . . . Tend the flock of God which is among you, exercising the oversight, not of constraint, but willingly, according to the will of God; not yet for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as lording it over the charge allotted to you, but making yourselves ensamples to the flock." (1 Pet. 5: 1-3.) "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that were wanting, and appoint elders in every city, as I gave thee charge: if any man is blameless, the husband of one wife, having children that believe, who are not accused of riot or unruly. For the bishop must be blameless, as God's steward; not self-willed, not soon angry, no brawler, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but given to hospitality, a lover of good, sober-minded, just, holy, self-controlled; holding to the faithful word which is according to the teaching, that he may be able both to exhort in the sound doctrine, and to convict the gainsayers." (Tit. 1: 5-9.) The same statement of the qualifications and work of the bishop is given in 1 Tim. 3: 1-7.

"Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit to them: for they watch in behalf of your souls, as they that shall give account; that they may do this with joy, and not with grief: for this were unprofitable for you." (Heb. 13: 17.) Paul said to the elders of Ephesus: "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, to feed the church of the Lord, which he purchased with his own blood." (Acts 20: 28.) It does not seem to me that I could make the points clearer or plainer than they are made here. One point I think is not clearly brought out in either translation. "If a man seeketh the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work." There is no word in the original for **office**. A literal translation would be: He who desires overseeing desires a good work. Of course this is an office in the sense that the performance of any duty is an office. But the work, rather than the position, is what he is to seek. The elders are to rule, but it is to be according to the will of God, or their rule is to consist in enforcing the law of God. An elder has no more right to enforce anything save the law of God than any one else has. If the elder has no right to enforce, the members are under no obligation to obey what God has not commanded. Each must determine what is God's law—that is, a man who believes the decision of the elders is contrary to the law of God must obey God. This leads to rejection of the decision of the elders. If it is a practical and vital matter and harmony of judgment cannot be brought about, I see no alternative but that in such cases separation must take place. In matters of mere expediency, involving no question of fidelity to God, the elders, as the rulers, should decide, but they should seek to unite and harmonize all. The decision of the elders should be the decision of the whole church. They should voice the judgment of the church. They can do this only by consulting all. The elders are not a separate and distinct party from the church, with separate and antagonistic interests, any more than the parents are separate and distinct from the children. They must have a common interest in, and direct for, the good of all. The Scriptures especially condemn arbitrary rulings resting on the authority of the elders. "Neither as lording it over the charge allotted to you, but making yourselves ensamples to the flock." **Lord** means **ruler**. To tell them that they are not to rule as lords

means that they are not to show their power or try to exercise authority by virtue of their office. It means about the same as the adage, "He rules best who rules least," or he who rules without letting them know they are ruled is the wisest ruler. Instead of seeking to show authority, let them, as fellow-workers, lead in every good work and persuade by example.

The man who sympathizes with the weak and the tempted, who in a spirit of meekness is found trying to save those who have been overtaken in faults, considering that he is liable to be tempted himself, is the one that seeks the work, not the position of honor, and he is fitted for an elder. The work of the elder, like that of the father, is to save every child from his sins and the evil that comes with the sin. No elder who is fit to be an elder will ever object to a member's doing any work in teaching or instructing or conducting the worship of the church that he is capable of doing, unless there is some moral obliquity that unfits him. The work of the elders is to encourage and develop and strengthen all the members of the church in all lines of Christian work. It is not a supposable case that a true elder should object to Christians doing any Christian work.

The body of Christ should act as a unit; the elders are but the head of the body. The elders should not act independently of others of the church, nor the church of the elders. They are one, and must act as a unit.

The elders should seek to encourage and develop the talent of every one in the church, and should encourage and advise all in every work as each has a taste or inclination to do. This does not mean that a member is to do nothing until he first consults the elders. What he has a talent and inclination to do is what the Lord calls him to do. In the doing of this the elders should give such suggestions and encouragement as they think will improve and strengthen him in a work. The combination of all into one body in the church does not destroy the individuality and personal responsibility of each person to God, to do what he feels is his duty. The work of the elders is to encourage and instruct the others in the work they do. See **Disorderly, Dealing with The (2)**.

### **EMBLEMS, SHOULD ONE PARTAKE OF, MORE THAN ONCE THE SAME DAY?**

Is it right for a brother to commune more than one time on the first day of the week? Is it right for one who has met and communed on the first day of the week to meet with and wait upon a brother (who was not able to meet with the brethren at the regular meeting) at his home in the communion service on the same day? Cannot two or three gather together in the Lord's name except when they come together on the first day of the week to partake of the Lord's Supper?

I have under the circumstances mentioned communed twice the same day; sometimes I declined under the same circumstances. I have a few times communed with congregations of whites in the forenoon and met with negroes in the afternoon; and lest they think I was unwilling to commune with them, I have partaken of the emblems again with them. All of which proves nothing, save that I am not very decided in my mind on the question. The Bible teaches nothing directly on the subject. But one observance fulfills the requirements of the Scriptures, and to observe it twice goes beyond God's requirements. I think satisfying the Scriptures is enough, and to go beyond is to tread on dangerous ground.

### **EVANGELISTS AND THEIR WORK.**

(1) Is the evangelist to be selected and sent out? If so, by whom?

I have never found in the Scriptures where a person or persons were commanded to send out a preacher or evangelist. Sometimes the apostles or a church, as the brethren at Antioch, sent a preacher or preachers to places on special missions to do certain work. But I have not heard of a place where one was pronounced worthy to preach and started out on a preaching tour. The apostles were told to teach all "to observe [or do] all things whatsoever I commanded you." (Matt. 28: 20.) Under this commission every one baptized has the same commission and authority to preach that others did. The same eldership that counsels and controls them in trading horses or making a living controls them in this work of preaching the word. It takes no more authority to regulate their preaching than it does to regulate their lives in other ways.

(2) If not selected and sent out, to whom is he answerable for his conduct and preaching?

He is answerable to the church where his membership is or where he preaches.

(3) Who shall say whether or not a man has the scriptural qualifications for an evangelist?

Why not the elders of his church as much right to try and test him as a preacher as any one else?

(4) If this important decision is left to the one aspiring to be an evangelist, how shall the church protect herself against the unscriptural, incompetent, self-styled "evangelist?"

Every Christian ought to realize that he is sent of God to preach the gospel. The world will never be converted to Christ until they do it. The idea that a man must orate is a foolish whim. Any one can learn to preach the gospel that can tell the way to town. If he will become earnest and faithful, he will soon learn how. There is much more trouble in getting men to preach than in keeping them from it. Occasionally a man will preach who is incompetent, but he preaches anyhow.

(5) If "the care of all the churches" came upon Paul "daily," who should bear the burden to-day?

All Christians should daily bear the burden of the churches for the Lord.

(6) When is an apostle an example to us?

Whenever the apostle obeys God. We cannot do everything an apostle did; but when he commands us to use our faculties and abilities, we should do it as a duty to God, just as an apostle did.

(7) If apostles are examples in some things and not in all things, how may we determine when they are and when they are not examples?

When God commands us to do things, we can do them. That is all that an apostle can do. "The harvest indeed is plenteous, but the laborers are few. Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he send forth laborers into his harvest." Let us not strive to keep them out of it.

(8) What is the work of an evangelist?

The work of the evangelist is to evangelize. That means to make known the gospel. This includes all the teaching

needed to make that gospel effective in the salvation of men. There was originally a distinction in the meanings of the words **preach**, **evangelize**, and **teach**. But the same person was called to all to such an extent that the words greatly lost their distinction and are used almost indiscriminately to refer to all the preaching and teaching needed to save men.

### **EVANGELIZE, HOW TO.**

If a church has a young brother that wants to preach and has the talent, and the church refuses, or rather fails from neglect, to send him out, and he is too poor to go at his own charge, and ten men of different congregations hold a consultation and agree for one of their number as their agent to send him out, and they guarantee him a certain amount of money, would not said ten men be a "missionary society?" If not, why not? Would it be right to so act? If not, why not?

I think there are two things in the supposition that are un-supposable—impossible to be true. First, it is not true that a young or old man can be so poor that he cannot preach Christ. Poverty cannot prevent a man's preaching Christ. Christ himself and Paul have proved this true. No one can be poorer than was Christ. He had not where to lay his head, and for forty days and nights had no food. Paul was so poor that he suffered nakedness and hunger, and wrought with his own hands to support himself and his companions while they preached. Paul said to the Corinthians: "Are they ministers of Christ? ... I more; in labors more abundantly, in prisons more abundantly, in stripes above measure, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of rivers, in perils of robbers, in perils from my countrymen, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in labor and travail, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness." (2 Cor. 11: 23-27.)

No man is justified in ceasing or refraining from preaching until his want and poverty exceed those Paul endured. Paul tells Timothy: "Suffer hardship with me, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ." (2 Tim. 2: 3.) "Suffer hardship with the

gospel." (2 Tim. 1: 8.) Jesus said: "A disciple is not above his teacher, nor a servant above his lord." (Matt. 10: 24.)

No man is too poor to preach the gospel. The great want of the age is men who are in earnest, who are consecrated to the service of God, who can suffer all things for the sake of Christ. We are only playing at preaching the gospel, not willing to suffer for it. I feel certain that if we could be earnest, ready to deny self as the early preachers did, the result would be much greater now than it was then.

These early preachers were endued with miraculous power, but neither Christ nor any inspired prophet or apostle ever used this power to avoid persecution or suffering or to supply his bodily wants. But is it the preacher's duty to suffer, while his brethren do nothing? It is not our duty to measure ourselves by others. It is our duty to measure ourselves by the laws and examples that Christ and his inspired apostles gave us. He will certainly hold us to account if we fail to follow these. He will do the same to these brethren and churches who refuse to help those who deny themselves to preach the gospel. He requires the sacrifice from all. It seems to me that the great mass of professed Christians must fall under condemnation.

"Many are called, but few chosen," is spoken of Christians. God cannot approve the Christian that sees his brother striving to save men and fails to help him. But their failure will not excuse the preacher. He must do his duty, though it brings on him the suffering of Paul. His example of self-denying devotion to the service of God and the faithful warning of their duty may be what these cold Christians need to save them. At any rate, a willingness to suffer and to endure want in order to preach Christ must be in us in order to save ourselves; and the example of fervor and zeal will excite some others. Then the preacher ought not to wait for any one to send him; he ought to go and do his duty. So long as he waits for some one to guarantee against suffering he encourages these cold churches in their lukewarm, indifferent state. He is in just that state himself, else he would not wait for a support to be guaranteed. If he would lift himself out of it, he would do much to lift them out of their coldness and lifelessness. Then there are ten brethren who see the evil of this lifelessness and are anxious to do something. How shall they



go about it? This is a dangerous point in the life of churches and Christians. Hitherto these Christians and churches have failed to do their duty. They now start out to do something. The churches have been indifferent; men are so liable to lay all the blame on the plan of work and to adopt some new method. This is the way all societies begin. But we can work through the churches just as easily as through any association or organizations of men. Under just such conditions the Jews demanded a king. The judges appointed by God "took bribes, and perverted justice." Yet to change God's order when so perverted and corrupted was to reject God. If these brethren will say to their churches that the church ought to help that brother who is sacrificing to preach the gospel, and that here are ten, twenty, or fifty dollars that we wish the elders to use in helping him, I do not believe that there is a church in the world that would refuse it. If he will bring the matter before the church as the duty of the church and lead in the work, some of the others will be stirred to join with him in it. He will encourage those who can give only a little to join theirs with his and increase the fund. He will lead the church to activity in this work and help to warm to life and so save these cold, lifeless, and lost brethren. It is as important to save them as to save the unbaptized sinners, and they are just as sure to be damned if they do not do something to save others as is the unbaptized infidel. I cannot see why the God-appointed elders cannot do the work of conferring with the preacher as well as the one selected by the ten brethren. This seems to me the natural, reasonable way, as it is the scriptural way for proceeding; and if it were not for man's love to organize and work through something of his own, instead of God's appointments, I am sure he would never think of any other way.

If half the time were given to presenting the matter to the churches and interesting them in work that is given to meeting and organizing and arranging new plans to work through, ten times as many persons would be led to participate in the work and the means would be greatly multiplied. God and his appointments would be honored. But when the ten live men draw off into a combination of their own, to work through it, they deprive the church of their life and earnestness, leave the cold members to grow still colder and the church of God

more and more lifeless. The poor members who can give but a little are discouraged, are made to feel that they have no part nor lot in the work of spreading the gospel, are made to feel that they are an ostracised class, and the preacher is taken from under the control of the elders and from his connection with the church and is placed under the control of the rich men. I can conceive of nothing that can more effectually destroy the church of Christ than such a course.

It is as though the eyes (if it were possible) in a number of human bodies were to refuse to discharge their functions in cooperation with the other members of the body, but were to combine and make a new body—all eyes. This new body could perform but one work. The old bodies deprived of these members would be maimed and helpless.

While the regular work of contribution should go through the church, and the church should communicate with the teacher concerning giving and receiving, it is scriptural for individuals, as they have opportunity, to do good to all men; and if a brother sees one engaged in the Lord's work, he may as an individual, as a member of the body of Christ, help him. But if he enters into another organization to do it, he does it not as a Christian, a member of the body of Christ, not as a member of the church, but as a member of this new organization, which supplants the church, usurps its work, deprives it of its earnest and active members, and leaves it a mutilated and helpless body.

Now, under the circumstances proposed, we will give a clearly scriptural order for these members to go to work in sending out the gospel. Here is the preacher, two or ten churches, cold and lukewarm, with one or ten men who realize that something ought to be done to have the gospel taught. The preacher is or ought to be at work, preaching what he can, but is hindered by having to give his time to "tent making" or some other calling. A brother in a lukewarm church sees that he ought to be helped. His duty may be first as an individual Christian to improve the opportunity and help him if the demand is pressing, but it is his duty to bring the matter before his church and to insist that every member according to ability should aid in this work. He ought to insist that it is the duty to sacrifice, not merely to give after gratifying all desires. The scriptural order, first, is to have the church communicate with the teacher as concerning giving

and receiving; that the church should send to his necessities, inquire as to his wants, and in sympathy seek to share in his labors. Every member according to his ability should aid. He should—kindly, forbearingly, but earnestly and persistently—bring the matter practically before them by contributing freely to the church treasury to be used in this way. It would be an exceedingly cold and dead church if this did not lead some to unite with him in this work. Persisted in, the good fruits from it will draw others into it until the whole church is enlisted in the work. Paul says to the Corinthians that Titus, "being himself very earnest, he went forth unto you of his own accord." "We have sent together with him the brother whose praise in the gospel is spread through all the churches." "Whether any inquire about . . . our brethren, they are the messengers of the churches, they are the glory of Christ." (2 Cor. 8: 17-23.) These were to stir the churches of Macedonia up to the duty of giving to the saints at Jerusalem.

This interested individual may himself visit other churches, and, as the above scriptures show, may lay the matter before them and induce these churches to engage in this work. A church engaging in the work may send a messenger to one or more churches to ask aid in the work and to stir them up to their duty. The teacher himself may send to the churches, make his wants known, and communicate with them as concerning giving and receiving. This is done by messengers, not delegates. Delegates meet and form a new organization. A messenger delivers a message to a congregation, receives the answer, and returns. There is no authority vested in him, there is no organization formed. Delegate or representative meetings, or meetings of churches in one representative body, necessarily form a new organization above and stronger than the churches, because this meeting is composed of delegates representing two or more congregations. Two or more are superior to one. This necessarily grows into an ecclesiasticism.

For a number of individuals from one or different congregations to unite and form an organization of their own through which to work is to withdraw the means and activities devoted to this organization from the churches, so weaken and destroy the churches. Both plans dishonor the church and its founder.

God's plan, for which there is clear scriptural example, reaches and presses upon and keeps before every member of the body of Christ that it is his duty to help in the work. The human plan withdraws the zealous and separates them into a new body—leaves the cold and indifferent members to grow colder and more indifferent till they die. The plan will destroy the church of God. If these ten individuals should fail to enlist any one else in the service, each could communicate with the teacher and each help him as he is able and as the teacher needs. This would give no organization supplanting the church.

### **EVIL, DOES GOD CREATE?**

Please explain Isa. 45: 7: "I make peace, and create evil." In what sense does God create evil?

God creates evil in the sense of bringing punishment, affliction, and evil on people when they violate his laws or in any way sin against them. The sin is not called the evil, but the affliction that comes is the result of sin. When the Israelites crossed the Jordan, they took the city of Jericho without loss. In disposing of the spoils of Jericho, a sin was committed against God. They then attacked the village of Ai. They were defeated, and some of them slain. "And Joshua rent his clothes, and fell to the earth upon his face before the ark of Jehovah until the evening, he and the elders of Israel; and they put dust upon their heads. And Joshua said, Alas, O Lord Jehovah, wherefore hast thou at all brought this people over the Jordan, to deliver us into the hand of the Amorites, to cause us to perish? would that we had been content, and dwelt beyond the Jordan!" (Josh. 7: 6, 7.) The defeat is the evil that they say God has brought upon them. He brought the evil, their defeat, on account of their sin. Again (1 Sam. 4: 1, 2) a battle is fought with the Philistines. Israel is defeated. "The elders of Israel said, Wherefore hath Jehovah smitten us to-day before the Philistines?" (Verse 3.) "Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us, and upon this city? yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the sabbath." (Neh. 13: 18.) They sinned; God brought punishment or evil upon them for the sin. In this sense God brings all the good and all the evil that come upon man—the good for their obedience, the evil for their dis-

obedience. "Shall evil befall a city, and Jehovah hath not done it?" (Amos 3: 6.) Look back a verse or two and see it is God punishing them for their sins. So he created the evil to punish their sin. All the evils brought upon persons, cities, or countries are brought by the Lord to punish them. He does it often through wicked, idolatrous nations and people. David says: "The wicked, who is thy sword." (Ps. 17: 13, marginal note.) See **Sin and Evil**.

### **FAITH AND REPENTANCE, ORDER OF.**

Does faith or repentance come first? The Baptists say repentance comes first.

I do not think there is or can be much difference between Baptists and disciples on the order of faith and repentance when they define their words and understand each other. **Faith** means belief in God through Jesus Christ. **Repentance** is a godly sorrow for sin—that is, such a degree of sorrow for the sins we have committed against God that we turn from these sins, seek forgiveness, and strive to sin against him no more. No sane mind can believe a person sorrows for sin against God until he believes in God. No man can turn to God in his feelings or purposes until he has some faith in God. "Without faith it is impossible to be well-pleasing unto him; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek after him." (Heb. 11: 6.) Here faith and believing are used as referring to the same thing. It states, too, that a person must "believe that he [God] is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek after him," before he can come to him. Repentance, or turning to God, is the fruit of faith. There is a growth of faith. There are degrees in faith. "Your faith groweth exceedingly." The fruit it bears marks the degree of its growth. Repentance marks a degree of faith. The mistake which the Baptists make is that they do not call the growing plant, that springs from the word of God in the heart, "faith" until it manifests itself in repentance. The Bible calls it "faith" from the beginning. The Baptists maintain that it becomes a saving faith when it produces repentance; and when they say repentance precedes faith, they mean it is belief, or, as they sometimes call it, "historical faith," and not a saving faith until it produces repentance. The Bible clearly teaches that faith is not a saving

faith until it produces repentance. So far, with a proper understanding of each other's use of words, the Baptists and disciples agree. There is a growth in repentance as well as in faith. Faith and repentance act and react on each other. Faith leads to repentance and repentance strengthens faith. Repentance affords a deeper soil in which faith may take root and grow more vigorously. Faith not only leads to repentance; it leads through repentance to baptism. Repentance marks the degree at which faith changes the affections, the purposes, the will. Baptism marks the degree at which faith, strengthened by repentance, brings the flesh, the body, the entire man, into submission to the will of God. The disciple maintains that the faith becomes a saving faith only when it obtains the mastery over the flesh and brings the soul, mind, and body into submission to the will and consecration to the service of God. The Baptist, then, believes that faith becomes a saving faith when it declares itself in repentance. The disciple or the Bible teaches that faith becomes a saving faith when it is strengthened by repentance and declares itself in baptism. The difference between Baptists and disciples is not as to the order in which faith and repentance come, but first as to whether the belief is called "faith" before it becomes a saving faith, which is a verbal difference. The real difference is whether the faith becomes a saving faith when it manifests itself in repentance or when it declares itself in baptism. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16: 16.)

### **FAITH AS A GRAIN OF MUSTARD SEED.**

Please give the point of comparison between the mustard seed and faith in Luke 17: 6.

There are few passages that I have studied more closely than the point involved in this query, yet I have not been able to reach a satisfactory conclusion. "For verily I say unto you, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you. Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting." (Matt. 17: 20, 21.) This power they were to be enabled to exercise by possessing faith as a grain of mustard seed was the greatest. Nothing would be impossible to the power that

came through the faith as a grain of mustard seed, and such power went forth only through prayer and fasting. The office of prayer and fasting in such cases, we understand, is to increase the faith, subdue the resistance of the flesh, and to bring the person into unresisting submission to the will of God. When man is brought into a state of unresisting submission to the will of God, he has the greatest spiritual blessing and power. This was true of both the miraculous and the ordinary gifts and influences of the Spirit. I once thought I could solve it in this way: Regard it as elliptical, and let it read: He that has faith as a grain of mustard seed has can remove mountains. The grain of mustard seed has no faith, no power to believe; but it submits unresistingly to the laws of God in the conditions in which it is placed. This is what a perfect faith leads man to do. So the faith of the grain of mustard seed would represent a perfect faith. This construction and exegesis requires "seed" to be in the nominative case, but in the Greek it is not in the nominative case; it is not the subject, but the object; and so it must be construed: If you have faith like to the mustard seed. The "faith" is compared to the "mustard seed," and what the point of comparison is is difficult to see. He could not mean the smallest amount of faith, as the mustard seed is "the smallest of all seeds," for these disciples did have a small measure of faith. Dr. Clarke thinks "our Lord means a **thriving** and **increasing faith**; which, like the grain of mustard seed, from being the **least** of seeds, becomes the greatest of herbs." This seems far-fetched; at least the passage does not suggest the thought. Some say it was a proverbial expression, meaning that the greatest results flow from the smallest beginnings. This is true; still the point of comparison between the "faith" and the "grain of mustard seed" is not apparent. It may mean a faith trusting and full of vitality as is the mustard seed; but there is difficulty in determining the point of comparison, yet it seems to me that it must imply a faith complete and active in itself.

**FAITH, HOW IS THE HEART PURIFIED BY? See  
Heart Purified by Faith.**

**FAITH, HOW MANY KINDS OF?**

Is there but one kind of faith mentioned in the Bible? If not, is that faith produced by testimony, or is it miraculously shed abroad by the Holy Spirit?

The Holy Spirit produced faith by giving testimony. (See Acts 2.) The Spirit produced faith in those wicked persons by presenting (1) the testimony of the works which Jesus had done among them, as they knew; (2) the prophecies that had gone before; (3) God "hath shed forth this, which ye now hear and see;" (4) "we all are witnesses" of his resurrection from the dead. ' Therefore [that is, in consequence of these testimonies] let all the house of Israel know assuredly [believe with all the heart], that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." (Acts 2: 36.) The Holy Spirit produces faith by giving testimony. Paul says: "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." (Rom. 10: 17.) John says: "These [things] are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." (John 20: 31.) I cannot conceive of God's even giving faith, save by giving the testimony to produce faith. Some think that there was a common and a miraculous faith in the days of miracles, as Paul speaks of the common faith; some conclude that there was an uncommon one to contrast with the common. Of this I have always had misgivings. The apostles were all brought to believe on Christ through the testimonies given. Thomas saw his pierced hands and sides; and Christ prayed for those in after ages who should believe on him through the words of the apostles. (John 17: 20.) Paul himself was brought to believe in Christ through testimony addressed to his senses. That testimony was miraculous, as much of the testimony of the early days was, to substantiate the truth of the gospel. But the miracle was addressed to the senses, and reached the heart only through this testimony addressed to the senses. There is certainly no way of obtaining faith now, save through hearing the testimonies concerning Jesus Christ given in the Scriptures, receiving this into the heart, and so believing in him as the Son of God.



**FALLING AWAY, DANGER OF.**

Please explain Heb. 6: 1-6. Some of the brethren think it has reference to us now, while others think it has reference to the apostles. Please turn on the light, as we are anxious to be a unit on the question.

I do not think it difficult to understand, if we will consider to whom it was written. It was written to Jewish converts to Christianity. After the first glow of enthusiasm had subsided and the converts met with the double persecution from the Gentiles and their own brethren, they were discouraged, disheartened, and disposed to give up Christ and go back to Judaism; and this letter was written to show them the superiority of the law of Christ to that of Moses and the ruin they would bring on themselves by such a course. The letter must be studied with this thought. In chapters 1 and 2 Paul shows that the angels brought the one law; that the Son of God brought the other, and that he partook of the nature of man that he might be tempted in all things as man is. In chapter he shows that Moses, a servant, was mediator and lawgiver of one; Jesus Christ, the Son of God, of the other. In chapter he contrasts the rest in the earthly kingdom with the better rest that remains to the people of God in the heavenly Canaan, and tells that our great High Priest has entered before us into that heavenly rest. Chapter 5 is a contrast between our High Priest and the earthly high priests.

I have often spoken of the meaning of chapter 6. The first three verses are the difficult ones: "Wherefore leaving the doctrine of the first principles of Christ, let us press on unto perfection; not laying again a foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God." To understand this passage, we must remember this letter was written to the Hebrews who had been converted from Judaism to Christianity. Judaism, or the law of Moses, had been superseded by the law of Christ. The law of Moses was the tutor to bring the Jews to Christ; when Christ came, the law was done away. The works of the Jewish law then became dead works. When the law was done away, the works of the law were no longer in force. This law could not make the comers thereunto perfect. "For there is a disannulling of a foregoing commandment because of its weakness and unprofitableness (for the law made nothing perfect), and a bringing in thereupon of a better hope, through which we draw nigh unto God." (Heb. 7: 18, 19.)

The Jewish law was the beginning of the doctrine of Christ; it could not make perfect. Let us leave it, therefore, and go on to perfection in the service of Christ. The practice of the Jewish law was the foundation that demanded repentance from the works of the Jewish law, now no longer in force, so dead. When they turned from the Jewish law to Christ, the first things were faith in God, the teaching of baptisms, laying on of hands in the beginning to impart spiritual gifts, and resurrection from the dead, and of eternal judgment. The tendency of these»Jews was to go back to Judaism and lay again the causes out of which the necessity of these things grows. Do not do this; but having passed out of Judaism by faith in Christ, go on unto perfection in him. The apostle says: "This will we do, if God permit." (Verse 3.) A strong assertion that he and the faithful will do it. This much is difficult; the rest is plain. If you Jews who have become Christians and have been once enlightened by the gospel of Christ, have tasted of the blessings bestowed in Christ, have been the recipients of the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, as these Jewish Christians had done, and tasted of the good word of God and the powers of the world to come (they had enjoyed all these things in enjoying the miraculous gifts of the Spirit as they had done)—now, if after these things you deliberately give up Christ as the sacrifice for your sins, in this you crucify him again to yourselves afresh and put him to open shame. Those who thus turn to Judaism after they have known Christ cannot be renewed to repentance. They reject Christ as their sacrifice, and there is no other sacrifice to save them. The same idea is presented in Heb. 10: 29. The man who rejects Christ as the Mediator and Savior has no other that can save. This is true. When he rejects Christ, it is impossible to renew him to repentance. But neither of these passages has the least reference to persons being renewed again to repentance who, while believing in Christ, fall through temptations into sin. This is too clearly taught in many places of the Scriptures for a moment to be doubted. This speaks of those who give up Christ. They have no other approach to God. I suppose the principle taught is applicable at all times and places. When a man has come to know the gospel, with its privileges, blessings, and hopes, and deliberately gives it up and turns back to another religion, or to no religion, he is guilty of the same crime and sin that those who gave up Christ

and went back to Judaism were. See **Apostatize, Can a Child of God?**

### **FAN, WHAT WAS THE?**

What was the fan that Jesus had, and how did he use it? (Matt. 3: 12.)

John the Baptist told that "he that cometh after me is mightier than I: . . . whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his thrashing floor; and he will gather his wheat into the garner, but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire." (Matt. 3: 11, 12.) The fan, was a winnowing fan that was used to separate the chaff from the wheat. Jesus came under the law of Moses. He came to fully obey that law, fulfill it, and take it out of the way. Like all laws and institutions touched and used by man, it had been defiled by many additions and changes by men. In the very beginning of his public ministry Jesus began to separate the true laws of God from the teachings and modifications of man that had been added to this law by man through tradition handed down from the elders. The Sermon on the Mount is a separating the true teachings given by God from the additions and changes by man. Even the things not approved by God, but tolerated on account of the hardness of the hearts of the people, were purged out from the law of God. These all constituted the chaff that was purged out and burned up by the unquenchable wrath of God. The truths that were pleasing to God and that were eternal were brought over by Jesus Christ in the kingdom of God. He purged and purified the law from all human additions and obeyed the undented law of God before he presented it to his Father as fulfilled and to be taken out of the way, nailing it to his cross. "Unquenchable fire" declares God's wrath at adding to his order. The laws and institutions given through Christ, while being operated by man, will be contaminated by his touch and defiled by his additions, as was the law of Moses. This church will undergo the purifying process before it is given up to the Father. The "wood, hay, stubble" of man's additions will be burned up, and the "gold, silver, precious stones" will remain—proved—"yet so as through fire." (1 Cor. 3: 11-15.) Of the same purport is the following: "Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when

he shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power, For he must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet. . . . And when all things have been subjected unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subjected unto him that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all." (1 Cor. 15: 24-28.) Again, Jesus said: "Every plant which my Heavenly Father planted not, shall be rooted up." (Matt. 15: 13.) God's wrath at changing his appointments and order is unappeasable.

### **FASTING.**

Is fasting enjoined on Christians now? Please give all the information on the subject you can.

Fasting is nowhere commanded. It is spoken of as a service acceptable to God and helpful to men. It is certainly, too, spoken of as though God expected it to be observed. Jesus tells them when they fast, how it is to be done. (Matt. 6: 16-18; 9: 14; Mark 2: 18; Luke 5: 33; Acts 13: 2; 14: 23; 1 Cor. 7: 5; 2 Cor. 6: 5; 11: 27.) If Christ, the apostles, and the early Christians needed to fast, why do we not need it now? The teaching of the Bible is that fasting connected with prayer and humiliation is intended to draw us nearer to God, that we may be fitted to receive a fuller measure of God's blessing. The fullness of his blessing depends upon our fitness to receive and properly use the blessings bestowed. Fasting humbles us, makes us feel our dependence upon God, and causes us to earnestly and faithfully seek his help. When we are in distress and sorrow, it does us good to fast and pray. When we grow cold and indifferent, when the fleshly appetites and lusts and the selfish ambitions get the mastery over us, we should fast and pray, humble ourselves and draw near to God, that he may draw near to us, find a home in our hearts, and bless and strengthen us. There are no commands given as to when or how long we should fast and pray; but I do not think the apostolic and primitive order of fasting and prayer was a mere matter of form, as it usually is at this day. The fasting now, when observed at all, is to miss one meal and call it "fasting." They usually miss breakfast, attend church at eleven o'clock, and go home and eat a hearty dinner at one. Not much spiritual strength is gained by missing one meal. I am satisfied that the fasting of primitive times extended over several days,

eating but little and abstaining from fleshly indulgence during the season. Missing but one meal requires little self-denial and makes us feel but little humility or excites no great feeling of dependence. To miss one meal and call it "fasting" is very much to make an empty form of it. I think the season of fasting and prayer extended over several days, and during this time but little was eaten. The length of time, however, depends upon our condition, our needs, and our desire to serve God. Fasting is a means of grace to enable us to overcome the flesh and to be filled with and led by the Spirit of God. But fasting, whether of one or more, should never be done with ostentation or display; it should be done quietly, as a service rendered to God, not to be seen of men.

### **FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK.**

(1) How may we know from the Scriptures which day is the first day of the week?

The Bible does not tell which is the first day of the week. It tells that we are to do certain things on the first day of the week, taking it for granted that every accountable being knows which is the first day of the week. If the meaning be, How do we know the day we call the first day is the same as was called the first day in the Scriptures? the proof is on the man who says it has been changed. But this question arises only with persons who have not studied the question. Suppose some men were to undertake to change the first day in the week, how would they go about it? How could they get all the peoples and families of all the earth to agree to such a change? Could it be done, if done at all, without world-wide controversy and persuasion? Could it be done at once? When did such occur? As well undertake to make the sun spread abroad darkness. World-wide practices cannot be changed without world-wide commotions that leave their marks in history. Astronomers can tell of the changes of the sun, moon, and stars for a million of years to come. They can calculate the times of those that occurred thousands of years past. The passover or the day of resurrection is regulated by the movements of the moon. The passover day for every year since time began can be fixed just as easy as Easter day ten years from now can be told.

But ask the next man who tells you we do not know whether

we keep the same day for the first day that was kept nineteen hundred years ago to try to change a day now, and see that he will have to change the records—political, religious, and social—of every nation and family under the sun. This is as impossible to do without leaving clear signs as it is to blot the sun out of existence.

(2) Is there a positive command anywhere in the New Testament to observe the first day of the week?

"Not forsaking our own assembling together, as the custom of some is." (Heb. 10: 25.) Is that a positive command? What assembly has been established, and for what purpose? There are very few positive commands in the New Testament. It is not a system of slavery, but one of voluntary service from the heart, and God touches the heart of man by the gift of his Son, so that man desires to know and do the will of God. He loves God, and because he loves him he desires to do what will please him. He does not need a positive command; he only needs to know what will please God, and as a loving and dutiful child he is anxious to do it, whether there is a positive command to do it or not. God will never save a man because he did this or that, and so brought God under obligation to him. He will bless and save because man so loves God as to conform his life and character to the will and character of God; and obedience to the commands of God is the test, the only test and discipline of man's love for his Maker. A man who does what he knows will please God only because there is a positive command to do it is a poor sample of a true child of God.

A man who desires to do God's will, who will study the references to the meeting on the first day of the week, will see that the apostles and early Christians met on every first day. He who does not desire to obey God, but wishes the day as a day for visiting, pleasure, and fleshly gratification, will find no authority for it. God purposely leaves things thus. Whenever any man will find authority for meeting on any first day, he will find it for meeting every first day. The authority that requires me to meet the first Sunday in the month requires me to meet every Sunday in the month and of every month and of every year. God nowhere tells us to meet or says that the disciples met on one Sunday or another, but on the first day. If there is authority for neglecting the meeting on any first day, the same authority will permit us to neglect it

on every one. Every first day represents the resurrection day. Not one in a month, not one in a year, but every first day represents the resurrection. The day is meaningless without service in memory of Christ. The Jews were to observe the Sabbath. The disciples met to break bread on the first day of the week. Did the Sabbath mean every Sabbath to the Jews? Why not the first day every first day to the Christian? One Jew probably thought it did not mean every Sabbath, so went out to gathering sticks. He had observed one Sabbath; he might take a little privilege on this one. He died. I do not believe the man who neglects it only as it suits his convenience can attend to it at all acceptably.

(3) What is the teaching of the New Testament on the subject of keeping the first day of the week? How are we required to observe it?

The teaching of the New Testament is that Christ was raised from the dead on the first day of the week. He met with his disciples on three succeeding first days of the week after his resurrection, and at no other time during the period. I do not recall any evidence that Christ met with his disciples after his resurrection at any time save on the first day, or Sunday. The Holy Spirit descended on Pentecost, the first day of the week. The disciples met together on the first day of the week under apostolic teaching. (Acts 20: 7.) Paul said : "Upon the first day of the week let each one of you lay by him in store, as he may prosper." (1 Cor. 16: 2.) "Not forsaking our own assembling together, as the custom of some is." (Heb. 10: 25.) The assembly on the first day of the week to engage in the apostles' doctrine, fellowship, and breaking of bread is clearly set forth. It is the only regular service for which we have precept or example in the New Testament. The admonition not to forsake the assembling together must, then, refer to this assembly for these purposes. To study the apostolic teaching, break bread, engage in the fellowship and prayer, are the services in these meetings.

God had plainly told under the Jewish law that both man and beast needed one day of rest out of seven. This remains, true so long as the nature and needs of man and beast remain as they are. He showed plainly, too, that for man to worship God, a day must be set apart for that service. If he attended to secular business on that day, he would neglect the worship of the Lord. So long as man's nature is unchanged

this is true. Observation now will soon satisfy any man that he who attempts to attend to worship and secular business on the same day will crowd the worship out. God knew what was in man when he provided for him, and all attempts to change will show man a fool.

### FOOT WASHING.

(1) When Jesus Christ washed the feet of his disciples and said unto them, "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet," what did he lack of making **foot washing** an ordinance? If the early disciples ought to wash one another's feet, why ought not we? What is the proper explanation of John 13: 14, 15?

Jesus ordained foot washing, and what Jesus ordained is an ordinance of God. Anything Jesus ordained is an ordinance of God. Jesus required his disciples to visit the sick. That is an ordinance of God. He required parents to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. That is an ordinance of God. But neither of these is a public church ordinance like attending the Lord's Supper. An ordinance is a rule established by authority. Rearing children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord and visiting the sick are ordinances of God, but they are not stated church observances.

Now, foot washing is an ordinance of the Lord; and just as Jesus observed it, and for the same ends, Christians should observe it now. The question is: Did Jesus ordain it as a stated public ordinance of the church, or as a private Christian duty or good work? A good and safe rule is to let the Scriptures explain themselves. When we do this, we find, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, that the Supper was observed as a church ordinance. We so observe it because the Holy Spirit led the disciples so to do.

The apostles, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, are the best interpreters of the meaning and intentions of the Savior's language. They observed the Lord's Supper as a public ordinance. (See Acts 2: 42; 20: 7; 1 Cor. 11: 20-24.) About this there can be no doubt. They did not so interpret the admonition to wash one another's feet. We have no account of their having a public foot washing. The only account we have of it is 1 Tim. 5: 3-10: "Honor widows that are widows indeed. But if any widow hath children or grandchildren, let them learn first to show piety towards their own family, and to re-



quite their parents: for this is acceptable in the sight of God. Now she that is a widow indeed, and desolate, hath her hope set on God, and continueth in supplications and prayers night and day. But she that giveth herself to pleasure is dead while she liveth. These things also command, that they may be without reproach. But if any provideth not for his own, and specially his own household, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an unbeliever. Let none be enrolled as a widow under threescore years old, having been the wife of one man, well reported of for good works; if she hath brought up children, if she hath used hospitality to strangers, if she hath washed the saints' feet, if she hath relieved the afflicted, if she hath diligently followed every good work." (1 Tim. 5: 3-10.) Here it is placed among entertaining strangers, rearing children, administering to the sick and afflicted, and in engaging in all good works. These were all personal and private duties. The apostles interpreted it to mean that it should be a private and social duty to be performed when needed. So I think it ought to be observed now. The apostles did not seem to think Jesus established a new ordinance, but gave a new meaning to an old social custom. It had in the days of Abraham been the custom to give water to wash the feet. It was sometimes done by the servants for the great. Jesus had told that among his disciples he who would be greatest of all should be servant of all. In this he gives an example that they should perform for each other the humblest services. In washing the feet, he who washes makes himself a servant and honors him whose feet he washes. We do it to be seen of men. Jesus desired it so done that God would see it and reward. If a humble brother comes to your house and needs his feet bathed, do it for him; if a brother has been plowing in the field and needs his feet bathed, do it for him. This is what Christ meant as interpreted by the apostles.

(2) You say that foot washing is an act of hospitality and kindness and was for the purpose of cleansing the feet. Why did Christ tell Peter that unless he washed his feet he had no part with him? And after he had washed their feet, he says they are not all clean. Had he half done his work and showed partiality?

The habit was for the servant to wash the master's feet. Now the Master reverses the order and washes the feet of the servant. This was what troubled Peter, and he said to Jesus: "Thou shalt not wash my feet." Jesus said: "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." (John 13: 8.) If you do

not submit to my order, you are not my disciple. It most likely carried a spiritual significance. Unless you are cleansed from sin by me, you have no part with me. Peter then ran to the other extreme, and wished him to wash him all over. Jesus replied: "He that is bathed [or washed, as they kept themselves] needeth not save to wash his feet"—meaning only the feet need washing as liable to defilement in travel; but when the feet are washed, you are "clean every whit." This shows that the object was to make them clean. Then he adds: "Ye [disciples] are clean [referring to the spiritual meaning], but not all [not all of you are clean]. For he knew him that should betray him." This shows that he meant that Judas was not spiritually clean.

### FORBIDDEN FRUIT.

(1) Did Adam and Eve eat of the fruit of the **tree of life**? My understanding is that they ate of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. "And now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever: therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden," etc. (Gen. 3: 22, 23.) I understand that death (separation) was the penalty for eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

"And Jehovah God planted a garden eastward, in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground made Jehovah God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." (Gen. 2: 8, 9.) The two trees were, by superior importance, worthy of special mention.

"And Jehovah God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." (Gen. 2: 16, 17.) They were certainly permitted to eat of the tree of life. It was good to perpetuate life. It would be strange if they did not eat of a tree so important and helpful. The woman knew their privileges. They ate of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. (Gen. 3: 6.) "And Jehovah God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever: therefore . . . he **drove out** the man; and he placed at the east of the garden

of Eden the Cherubim, and the flame of a sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life." (Gen. 3: 22-24.) Had he eaten of the tree of life at his sin, he would have still lived; to prevent it, he was cut off from it. He was permitted to eat of the tree of life, and did eat of it until he sinned. God then cut him off from it, and he became a dying, perishing mortal.

(2) I have noticed that you refer to the apple as the forbidden fruit. How do you know it was an apple?

It is commonly regarded as an apple. And since it teaches precisely the same lesson to us whether it be an apple, a pear, or a cherry, if I thought the public was mistaken on the subject, I would not criticise or controvert the question, when no good could possibly come out of the criticism. But really the word apple, in its generic use, is a word of wide application. It embraces the apple as we call it, the pear, the quince, the orange, the pomegranate, the tomato, the apples of Sodom. The Greek word corresponding to our **apple** is **malum**. Smith's Bible Dictionary says: "It was used by the Greeks and Romans to represent almost any kind of tree fruit." The Latin word for **apple** is **pome**, and means any kind of a fleshy fruit in contrast with a nut. Our word **pomace**, crushed fruit, comes from it. **Apple**, then, in its broadest sense, means any kind of a fleshy or soft fruit, instead of a nut. I do not think it was a hickory nut or a walnut, or any kind of nut that had to be cracked, that beguiled Eve or with which she led Adam into transgression; but it was one of the attractive fruits, good to look upon and pleasant to the taste, that comes under the broad designation **apple**. While I do not think there is anything in the question calling for discussion, yet I think it was one of the many fleshy fruits that the Greeks called **malum**, the Romans **pomum**, and the English **apples**, and not of the nutty genus.

**FOREKNOWLEDGE.** See **God's Foreknowledge**.

**FORGIVENESS UNDER THE JEWISH LAW.**

You say: "Sins were not forgiven, but only rolled forward and sentence suspended, under the Old Testament, until the blood of Christ was shed, which alone could take away sin. So, then, no sin from that of Adam in Eden has been forgiven, save through the death of Christ." I am unable to make these remarks harmonize with some passages of

the Old and New Testament Scriptures. If no sin was forgiven before the death of the Savior, what did God mean in saying: "I have pardoned according to thy word?" (Num. 14: 20.) And what did the Savior himself mean when he said: "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee?" (Mark 2: S.) And what did he mean when he said: "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven?" (Luke 7: 47.)

There was a forgiveness that freed from sin, or from the remembrance of sin, for the year for which the offering was made. The offering for sin was made every year because there was a remembrance of sin every year—remembrance of the same sin. There was a continual remembrance of a sin committed until an offering or atonement was made for it. After this was done, there was no more remembrance or holding the sin against him until the year closed; then the sin came against him as if no offering had been made for it. When the offering was again made, this secured forgiveness of the sin for another year. It was the high priest's duty to make the yearly offering for the sins of the people—to roll forward from year to year this forgiveness. This forgiveness did not become so completed or perfected that the yearly sin offering could be dispensed with until Christ, once for all, came and offered himself as a Lamb without blemish for the sins of the world. Then there were no more offerings for sins.

Hence, Paul says: "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin. [Nothing required in the law could justify any being in the sight of God.] But now the righteousness of God [God's order of making men righteous] without the law [without the requirements of the law] is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God [God's plan of making men righteous] which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness [his plan of justifying] for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." (Rom. 3: 20-25.)

These sins past were those committed under the Jewish dispensation, passed over through the forbearance of God, now taken away by the blood of Christ. The American Revised Version brings out the idea more clearly: "Whom God set

forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood, to show his righteousness [plan of making men righteous] because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the showing, I say, of his righteousness at this present season: that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus."

Paul says that according to the law "were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." (Heb. 9: 9, 10.) If the offerings could not make the worshiper perfect (or wholly free from sin), it could not secure final and everlasting forgiveness.

" 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. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshipers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." (Heb. 10: 1-4.)

These passages plainly set forth that there was no final and complete forgiveness of sins under the Jewish law.

" For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." (Heb. 9: 13-15.)

It is here plainly told that the death of Christ must occur for the redemption of the transgressions that took place under the first covenant, that they might inherit the promise of everlasting life, showing that they did not inherit the promise of eternal life under the first covenant, and could not until they were fully redeemed by the blood of Christ.

The blood of animals was typical. It only secured a tem-

porary forgiveness or respite from the condemnation of sin until the blood of Christ was shed to take away sin, and then there was no more offering for sin.

"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 [as an offering] for sin, condemned sin in the flesh." (Rom. 8: 3.)

Under the Jewish law an offering for sin was made. It secured the forgiveness for a year, or to the date of the next sin offering. Then it must be again atoned for, which secured a respite for another year. If the person died with sin atoned for, it, of course, held it in that condition until the shedding of the blood of Jesus Christ, which finally and perfectly took away the sins and gave promise of the eternal inheritance. Such seems to me the teaching of the Bible. See **Law of Moses and Law of Christ.**

### **FORNICATION, DAUGHTER COMMITS, WHAT SHOULD MOTHER DO?**

A sister, who is a widow, has two daughters living with her, both of whom are members of the church of Christ. One of these has twice been guilty of fornication. The church has withdrawn from her. Now, what is the duty of the mother to her daughter? Would she be justifiable in putting her away from her home? Would it be any sin to keep her as one of the family? If so, what action should the church take toward the mother? Would 1 Cor. 5: 9-11 condemn her in keeping her daughter as one of the family? What is the meaning of "with such a one no, not to eat," in verse 11?

"If any man that is named a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a reviler, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such a one no, not to eat." (1 Cor. 5: 11.) The Christian is forbidden as much to eat with these other characters as with the fornicator. This crime ought not to be singled out and dealt with more severely than the others. If the daughter was guilty of these other sins, as extortion, reviling, or railing, would they ask how the mother should be required to treat her? Again, were it a son that was guilty of the same sins, would the same question arise? I ask these questions not to say the law of God should not be obeyed, but to ask whether it is the law of God or public sentiment that is having its weight in this case. Public sentiment condemns this sin above the other sins, and in woman rather than in man. But if we are following the law of God, we will deal with all alike.

Some of the commands of God are more important than, and take precedence of, others, because they regulate higher and more important relationship. The command to obey God is more important than the command that wives obey their husbands in all things. It regulates a higher relationship. The law to train a child in the way it should go defines a duty of a parent to a child higher than the showing disapproval of a wrong course in a Christian. It takes precedence of it and regulates it. A daughter does not cease to be a daughter when she is guilty of fornication. The duty still rests on the mother to do what she can to save her daughter. If refusing to eat with her or driving her from home would help to save her from her sinful course, the mother should do it. If it would dishearten her, discourage her, and drive her deeper and more surely into sin, it would be wrong for her to send her away. The law regulating the duty of the mother to the child takes precedence of the duty to show disapproval of sin, and should govern in the case. The mother should do what she can to save the daughter, and the members of the church and the elders should show their sympathy for both the mother and the daughter in their trials and weaknesses, and encourage to a better life, instead of pushing the weak and tempted one off where she will find no help to withstand temptation. I emphasize this because, as Christians, we do so little to encourage a woman who has sinned to "go, and sin no more." We are more like the Jews, ready to stone the sinner, than the Savior, to say: "Neither do I condemn thee: go thy way; from henceforth sin no more." (John 8: 11.)

If this were a man instead of a woman guilty of the sin, would it occur to us that we should insist on the mother driving him from home? The guilty woman is no worse than the guilty man, and should be more carefully guarded, because the world condemns her more severely and gives her less encouragement to repent.

I think it the duty of the church, and of the elders especially, to show sympathy for both the mother and the daughter, counsel and pray with and for both, and seek to help and strengthen the mother in leading the daughter to a better life, and the daughter in her efforts to resist temptation and live a life of purity and virtue to God. "Brethren, even if a man be overtaken in any trespass, ye who are spiritual, restore such a one in a spirit of gentleness; looking to thyself, lest

thou also be tempted. Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ." (Gal. 6: 1, 2.) This is especially applicable in such a case as this.

### **FORSAKING GOD TO FOLLOW WIFE.**

A certain brother has a Baptist wife. In order to be in the church with his wife, he proposes to join the Baptist Church. In order to get into this sectarian organization, it will be necessary for him to submit to baptism at the hands of a Baptist preacher. This he will do, not because he believes the Lord has commanded it, but in order that he may enjoy church fellowship with his wife. Please point out the sin committed in this case.

If that be a true statement of the case, he will forsake God to follow and obey his wife. He will be baptized professedly in the name of the Lord; but he cannot do things to please men in the name of the Lord. It is not and cannot be in his name if he believes he has been baptized in the name of the Lord, because a man cannot twice be baptized in the name of the Lord. If the preacher knows the facts when he holds up his hand before God and says, "I baptize you in the name of Jesus Christ," he will tell a falsehood in the name of Christ the Lord. Whether the preacher knows it or not, the man baptized does, and he will be guilty of going through a farce to please his wife, claiming that it is in the name of the Lord, will cause the preacher to tell a lie in the name of the Lord, and will incur all the guilt of such a lie in the name of the Lord. It is a fearful thing to be doing things that God has not commanded in his name and so trifling with his holy name and sacred appointments.

### **FRATERNAL ORDERS, SHOULD CHRISTIANS JOIN?**

Is it right for a Christian to join the Odd Fellows' society? The reason I ask you is because a bishop that has been serving us for years has joined them. One of our preachers has also joined them.

It depends very much on the kind of a Christian a man proposes to be whether it is wrong for him to join the fraternal orders or not. If he intends to make an earnest, faithful, devoted Christian, he has no time, taste, or service for anything, save the church of Christ; if he intends to live the Christian life and make himself a follower of Christ and fit himself in character for heaven, he will give his talent, means, time, and love to the church of Christ, with none to bestow on any other



association or brotherhood; but if he only intends to profess to be a Christian, not to make a strict member, and live a life of ease and pleasure and trust to church membership to save him, without a godly and holy life, he had as well join these brotherhoods and divide his time and means with these as to take any other course of life that will not develop the Christian character. A prominent Mason, not a Christian, once told me that while he was a Mason himself and thought Masonry did good in a temporal way and in various ways, he did not see how a preacher or member of the church of God—which is claimed to be the perfect organization, able to bestow all good and entitled to all the service, time, and means of a person—could join another institution and divide with it his time, means, and affections. He said it in speaking of the death of one of the most prominent preachers that ever lived in Nashville, who died and was buried with Masonic honors. He clearly intimated that his respect for that man was lowered by his joining a human society while claiming to be a leader and teacher in a divine one. Preachers and others often join organizations of this character thinking it will give them influence, but it seems to me it declares to the world that they do not find their religion and their church as good as they claim to believe it, else they would not divide their time, service, and means with other institutions, seeking the little good they give. It seems to me that an elder or preacher who does this weakens his religious influence and character in so doing with all who know the claims of Christ and his church. Teachers that do this certainly do not love the Lord with all the strength and the mind and the soul, else they would have no time to devote to these worldly institutions, and in this fail to set the example Jesus requires of his teachers, as such lack the essential qualifications of elders and teachers. The best way is to teach them better. Show them the example of earnest fidelity and singleness of purpose to serve the Lord. Perhaps you show a failure to hold the church of God and his religion in high esteem in some other way as displeasing as this. Let us try the healing and saving process rather than the destroying one. But Christians should do all they do in the name of Christ and as members of his body, not as members of other bodies. Christ provides for all good to his servants in his church.

**FUTURE PUNISHMENT.**

We would like an article from you on the fate of the wicked after death. We have some brethren here who take the position that the wicked are annihilated, destroyed at once, and that there is no eternal punishment. It seems to be a very wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort to some.

I have never been able to see why any good man desires to convince people that wickedness would not meet a terrible punishment. This effort to convince them that the only penalty for sin is to pass into nonexistence and forgetfulness encourages and satisfies people to remain in wickedness. Is not that the meaning, the purpose, and the effect of it? Why object to the idea of eternal punishment? Is not the answer: It gives an idea of terrible punishment of sin and of cruelty of God toward impenitent sinners? To whom does it give such an idea, and who is it that draws back from the idea of that punishment? Is it not the wicked? Yet it does not seem terrible enough to deter them from wickedness. But God intended the punishment he inflicted on sin to deter the wicked from sin. John the Baptist warned them to flee from the wrath to come. Paul says: "Knowing therefore the fear of the Lord, we persuade men." (2 Cor. 5: 11.) Everywhere God represents himself as a God of terror to the wicked. The future punishment of the wicked, so far as time is concerned, is described by exactly the same words that describe the duration of the happiness of the righteous: "These shall go away into eternal punishment: but the righteous into eternal life." (Matt. 25: 46.) John says of those who worship the beast: "The smoke of their torment goeth up forever and ever." (Rev. 14: 11.) Jesus says: "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." (Matt. 10: 28.) "The sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness: there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth." (Matt.-8: 12.) "So shall it be in the end of the world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the righteous, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth." (Matt. 13: 49, 50.) "Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels." (Matt. 25: 41.) Take these expressions, and suppose God had intended to teach eternal suffering; what

words could he have used to teach it if these do not? God used the words that, in their common and natural meaning, convey the idea of eternal suffering. He could easily have used words that mean annihilation. Why did he use those which mean eternal suffering or punishment if he intended to convey the idea of ceasing to exist at death? These persons who now insist that he means ceasing to exist at death never use the terms God used, except to try to explain them away and break their force. Then the wicked are raised from the dead. Why raise them from the dead to annihilate them? They were to be punished with a punishment much sorer than death without mercy. (Heb. 2: 2, 3.) There is a life after death, a punishment worse than death; and when does that punishment after death end? It exists "forever and ever;" it is eternal. No language has terms indicating a longer existence than this in happiness or in woe.

It is said the wicked shall be destroyed. But destruction does not mean annihilation; it means the relations that the person holds to other things will be broken and the associations and connections that have hitherto brought good will bring evil. A nation is destroyed by being broken up in its relations and disorganized. It is doubtful if the idea of annihilation of any thing or being is found in the Bible. Paul describes the punishment that shall be inflicted upon those that obey not the gospel: "Who shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might." (2 Thess. 1: 9.) This plainly says that the destruction shall be from the presence of God, and this destruction shall be an eternal one. In the presence of God are blessing and joy and all good; away from that presence are sorrow and woe and all evil. This is to be eternal. These scriptures are so clear that it seems to me none willing to receive the truth can doubt them. In making the punishment for sin light, we make the sin itself a light and indifferent matter. To make sin against God a light matter is to derogate from the honor, majesty, holiness, and power of God; it derogates from the importance of the mission and death of Christ. Is it likely that Christ would have left heaven, with its glories, and have come to earth to suffer and die to save men from a state of unconsciousness? All effort to minimize or lighten the punishment of sin destroys the enormity of the sinfulness of sin; lessens the majesty, dignity, and

holiness of God; lessens the magnitude and the grace of Christ and the importance of his death. It derogates from man and makes him only a brute; it destroys the difference between virtue and vice, sin and holiness, in men. The Bible affords no ground for such a position and leads to no such conclusions. If men would study to avoid sin instead of trying to excuse it, it would be much better for men. See **Annihilation**.

### **FUTURES, DEALING IN.**

Is dealing in futures gambling? Should a Christian deal in futures?

All trade or business with others that is legitimate for Christians is that which helps both parties to the trade; the trade which helps me, but injures another, is not lawful for a Christian. Only that business is legitimate for a Christian which benefits and helps both parties or all parties affected by it. What injures or wrongs any one, a Christian cannot engage in. All gambling schemes or games by which one gains and another loses are sinful. One gains without any adequate or just returns; another loses all, gets nothing in return. No Christian can engage in such games. Men are led into such by the love of money. They love money better than they love justice, fairness, uprightness; better than they love God. Under this head of gambling come all speculation and buying of futures. This is gambling upon what may be the price of goods or values of any kind in the future. In this trading, you get or lose money without any compensating good. Selling and buying wheat or cotton is legitimate business. The owner needs the price of his wheat or cotton and is accommodated by the sale. The man buys for use or to hold and sell to another when he needs it, and accommodates him by buying and holding until he is ready to use it. He is entitled to pay for taking and holding it. All parties trading are accommodated and benefited by this trading; but when a person "buys a future," he buys nothing that accommodates any one, has nothing to sell that will benefit any one. He stakes his money on what the price of the article will be in the future. What he makes, some one else loses, without anything in return; or, if he loses, some one gets it without giving a consideration in return. It is in all essential features gambling, getting something for nothing; and this is not honest, tested by Bible principles. That the others agree to take the

chances does not change the moral character of the transaction. If a dozen men were to agree that they would engage in stealing one from another, and they would not prosecute one another, and he who succeeded in stealing the most could hold it, this would not prevent it being stealing or change its moral character in the sight of God. Nothing of value is bought or sold in buying and selling futures; no one is profited, save he who gets his fellow-man's money for naught, and they who lose are injured. This is gambling; it is getting another's goods for naught; it is dishonesty. This is more hurtful than other forms of gambling or dishonest gains, because it is regarded as more respectable and honorable than these. Men are led into this kind of business by the love of money. Let all such heed the exhortation: "Let him that stole steal no more; but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing that is good, that he may have whereof to give to him that hath need." (Eph. 4: 28.) It is injurious and hurtful to the man engaging in it in many ways. He is badly injured in his moral and spiritual character when he becomes willing to make a living for himself and family out of the losses of others, for which they get nothing in return. The gains are generally from the most needy and helpless classes. The habit of making a living by these futures begets a feverish state of mind that disqualifies the person for regular productive business of any kind that will bring good to all; it unfits him for the regular habits of worship and for attendance upon the services of God; it violates the laws of the land, and so violates the law of God, which commands Christians to "obey the powers that be;" it sets a bad example to others, young and old, especially the excitable and the young, to lead them to seek to make a living by chance or gambling, that injures all and helps none, and unfits them for regular habits of industry in that which is good; it is not only sinful, but it is supreme folly from a business standpoint. Where one succeeds, a thousand fail—spend their all and become pecuniary wrecks. A man is a fool to engage in a business where the chances of success are so few; those of failure, so many. No sensible man would think of engaging in any industrial calling with the chances of success so few. It is only the gambling mania that leads them to risk so in dealing in futures.

**GAMBLING.** See **Card Playing at Home; Futures, Dealing In.**

### **GATES OF HELL SHALL NOT PREVAIL.**

Please answer the following question: What was it that the gates of hell should not prevail against? (Matt. 16: 18.) We have this up in our Bible class, and we want some light on the subject.

There has been substantial agreement among students of the Bible that Jesus meant the gates of hell should not prevail against the church. If the scripture in its context alone was looked to, no other interpretation would ever suggest itself, but the necessity of positions has suggested other theories. One of these is that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the rock, Christ, on which the church is built. This is usually extended to mean that the grave should not prevent the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. Another theory is: The gates of hell shall not prevail to hinder the establishment of the church of Christ. But the meaning that an unbiased mind would naturally draw from the statement is: The gates of hell shall never prevail against the church which Jesus Christ said he would build on the truth confessed: that he is the Christ, the Son of God. The indestructibility of that church is so clearly taught elsewhere that there is no reason for refusing to accept the plain, natural meaning of the language here. Of this kingdom Daniel says it "shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." The trouble is that people, in looking for this kingdom of God in the world, look for a big, general, and overshadowing organization. The kingdom of God was never to come in this form, nor has it ever existed in it. It came without outward show or display; it exists in the humble followers of Christ, without organic display. These general organizations are the perversions and corruptions of the churches of God. I do not believe that there has ever been a time when there were not true and humble followers of Christ on earth since the establishment of his kingdom, nor do I believe there ever will be. These humble followers of Christ, worshiping without display or show, constitute the church of God on earth.

**GENTILES, ARE ALIEN, UNDER GOD'S LAW?**

Are alien Gentiles under law to God? We know they are not under the law of Moses. If they are under God's law, what law is it—the gospel or some other law? If they are under the gospel, when were they placed under it? Does God recognize as subjects of his law the citizens of Satan's kingdom? If all are under law to God, what does Paul mean by the expression: "To them that are without law?" (1 Cor. 9: 21?)

All peoples and things in the universe are under the general government and rule of God. God gives men the privilege of obeying him and being saved, or of rejecting him as ruler and being condemned by him and punished for rebellion against God. If they were not under the dominion and rule of God, he could not punish them. Satan himself is under the dominion of God. God is the sole ruler of the universe. He permits man to rebel, to refuse to submit, for a time; but if he does not repent, God, as the ruler of all, will punish him. Every man now living ought to be under the gospel law. The reason he is not is that he is unwilling to obey God. God permits him to live a while in the state of rebellion; then if he refuses to repent and obey him, in the execution of the laws of the universe, he will punish him in hell. God forbears with men for a time, giving them time and opportunity to repent. He gives laws only to those willing to serve him. Those unwilling to serve him he leaves without law, not that they are not accountable, but because they reject him as ruler.

Read Rom. 1. He gave laws to the Jews because they were at times willing to serve the Lord. The Gentiles were not willing to serve him. He left them without law. When any Gentile was willing to obey God, he entered the Jewish family and came under the Jewish law. Just so now; any soul that is willing to obey God comes into the church of God and under his law. If a man is not under law, it is because he is not willing to obey God.

The Gentiles, who were without law in the days of Judaism, became willing to obey God under Christ; hence they were said to be without law, were not under the law of Moses.

**GIFT OF GOD.**

Please explain Eph. 2: 8: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." What is the **gift**? Some say it is grace, some say it is salvation, and others say it is faith.

**Grace means favor, mercy, kindness.** Out of mercy, or fa-

vor, to man God proved he could be saved through believing, or through faith; that salvation was not originated by ourselves, nor was it gained by any merit in ourselves, but was the gift of God. Neither was that salvation of works, lest any should boast; for we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto, or to do, good works. Salvation is the subject of all the clauses, and the only one that makes sense with them. The same word that is not of ourselves, but is the gift of God, also is not of works, lest any should boast. No one would think of saying grace, or faith, is not of works; yet if either be the subject of one clause, it is of all. Grace is not of ourselves; it is the gift of God—not of works, lest any should boast. It is nonsense to say that grace is not of works; it is the favor of God. Substitute faith for grace, and it is as bad. Salvation is the subject of all the modifying clauses. Grace, or favor, of course, is the gift of God. So is faith. God gives man the capacity to believe, gives him the thing to believe, and the testimony on which he believes. So grace and faith, in a sense, are both gifts of God; but in this sentence he says salvation is the gift of God.

### **GOD A SPIRIT.**

The Philadelphia "Confession of Faith" says: "God is a being without body, passions, or parts." God is spoken of as having parts of the body—eyes, mouth, feet, hands; and man is said to have been created in the image or likeness of God. Can a person worship a being described as in the "Confession of Faith" and at the same time the God of the Bible?

If a man must understand all that is said in reference to God in the Bible before he can serve him, no one will be saved. But much of the confusion in the religious world results from a misunderstanding of the language of each other. It seems the confounding of the language at Babel rests upon the religious world to-day. So it is always well to define our terms that we may understand each other. What is a **body**? Webster defines it: "The frame of an animal; the material organized substance of an animal, whether living or dead, as distinguished from the spirit, or vital principle." This is the first and principal meaning. In this sense of a material substance as distinct from spirit, no one believes God has or is a body. The makers of the creed used it in this sense and meant God is a Spirit without a material body, or material parts, or the passions that rage in our fleshly bodies. The discussion over



this question arises from a failure to understand as simple and common a word as **body**.

A spiritual body is spoken of as distinct from the fleshly body. Jesus says: "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having." (Luke 24: 39.) The spiritual body is not material substance. I take it that there is a spirit that corresponds to each material body in such way that other spirits will recognize it as having dwelled in and animated that body on earth. This is called a **spiritual body**—a figurative use of the term body.

At any rate, the creed makers used the word in its first and common meaning, and in that sense their statement is true. We ought not to misrepresent for their own sakes, but much more for our own sakes. To misrepresent is a greater sin and crime and shame than to be misrepresented. God loves the man that "swaereth to his own hurt, and changeth not;" that will always tell the truth, even if it injures himself or helps his opponent. The world is now waiting for a people that will be just and upright and truthful and just to all.

**GOD HAS MERCY ON WHOM HE WILL.** See *Mercy*.

### **GOD'S FOREKNOWLEDGE AND MAN'S RESPONSIBILITY.**

If God sees the end from the beginning and knows all that will come to pass, how can men change that order or be responsible?

It is not my business to tell how God can do this or that and be consistent with the ideas we form of right and justice. I may fail utterly to comprehend how he can do it, but that does not alter the facts as to what he knows and does. Some one propounded this difficulty to Paul, or he saw that it would be asked and forestalled the trouble others would have in answering it; so he gave the answer, approved by the Holy Spirit: "So then he hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth. Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he still find fault? For who withstandeth his will? Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why didst thou make me thus? Or hath not the potter a right over the clay, from the same lump to make one part a vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor?" (Rom. 9: 18-21.) That is pre-

cisely the question: If God foresaw it as it is, who hath resisted his will? How could it be helped? I am not called on to give a different answer from Paul's. If our faith rests on our understanding of how God does this or that, it is not acceptable. But why should not God know all things from the beginning? Did he order affairs that he did not know how they would work? Does he foreknow anything? If he sees one thing in the future, as we call it, why not everything? What hinders? Man foresees some things, but not all things. Why? Because his vision is feeble; he has only one-sided views of premises; some things are too high for him to see over them, some difficulties too dark for him to see through them. But are any of these things true of God? Is his vision feeble? Does he have to take one-sided views of things? Are hills too high for him to overlook them? Are not all the premises and conditions laid bare to him? What hinders him from seeing the results that flow from the causes he has himself set in motion? We must not attribute human weakness to God. God has foresight; he did foresee and foretell many things that would come to pass. If he could foresee one thing in the future, why could he not foresee everything? Man can foresee some things, and not others, because his vision is weak, partial, one-sided, and he understands but few of present conditions from which future results flow; but none of these weaknesses are true of God. He sees the end from the beginning, and our not seeing how to reconcile it with other things that we think are true is not sufficient ground for denying these qualities and this power. Man can see everything within the range or scope of his vision, save what imperfection or weakness of that vision hinders; God can see everything in the range or scope of his vision, time, and space, unless imperfection prevents. Is God's vision weak? If God can look down the vista of time and see one thing that will happen one thousand years hence, what can hinder his seeing everything that can happen during that thousand years? But God is an eternal I Am. Time and space with him are nothing. Study these things, and do not measure the perfection of God by our frail and weak senses and imperfect reasonings. See **Mercy.**

**GOLDEN RULE.**

Is the Golden Rule (Matt. 7: 12; Luke 6: 31) the standard by which Christians may measure, judge, and justify themselves in matters of church discipline?

The Golden Rule, properly understood, is a rule for settling all difficulties and matters in the church or out of it, if a Christian can have a difficulty not a matter of church discipline. That law does not require us to do what our fleshly impulses and passions would prompt us to desire one would do to us. It means to do to others as we, enlightened by the word of God, desirous of doing his will, would desire them to do to us. This would lead us to do what would promote the spiritual good of the other. Certainly this is what should be done in discipline.

**GOSPEL AND GRACE, DIFFERENCE BETWEEN.**

What is the difference in meaning between gospel and grace?

**Grace** means **favor**. Grace prompts all the favors of a material or spiritual nature that God shows to man. The highest and greatest act of favor God ever bestowed on man was to send Christ on his mission to man. This mission constituted the gospel. The gospel is the highest manifestation of the grace, or favor, of God to man. Hence, it is called "the grace of God." (Tit. 2: 11.) Luke (2: 40) says that the grace of God was upon the child Jesus. God's favor rested upon him. Christians are said to be "good stewards of the manifold grace of God" (1 Pet. 4: 10)—that is, they are to dispense the various boons and trusts bestowed on them for the good of others. Grace properly means the disposition to do kindness and to favor others. The acts which grow out of this disposition are acts of grace. Gospel, by itself, means good news. The gospel of Christ is the good news that he came to earth to save the world. This was an act prompted by his and his Father's love for man, and hence an act of grace.

**GOSPEL, HOW REACH THE PEOPLE WITH THE?**

How shall we reach the people with the claims of Jesus Christ?

Manners and customs and methods of living often change. But human nature is essentially the same in all ages and among all peoples. Jesus in the days of his flesh gave an

example of true wisdom in the work he came to do, that of reaching the lost with the truth of God and so saving them. He was born among the humble and lowly; he was reared and trained to labor among the common laboring people; and after he was anointed by the Holy Spirit and began the work of preaching the gospel, he lived among the poor and humble, commingled with them in their homes, and was one of them in all his feelings and sympathies. He went among the publicans and sinners, showed sympathy for them in their weakness, temptations, and sins, and by personal contact with them showed his love for them and his desire to help them. This class learned to love him, and the common people heard him gladly. We cannot improve on his methods. Then, as now, there were self-righteous Pharisees and scribes who felt it was contamination to go near these weak, sinful classes, and even refused to countenance Jesus when he was working signs and wonders, because he went among these weak and sinning classes. It was a serious charge they made against him, that "he eateth with publicans and sinners." His response is wisdom and instruction to us if we will hear and be guided by it: "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Jesus did not seek the rich or the fashionable, the learned or the elite, but he came to call sinners to repentance. To those who felt and acknowledged themselves to be sinners he went, and they heard. "Many publicans and sinners" sat with him at meat. The self-righteous asked: "Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners?" "The publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you." "The publicans and the harlots believed" on the preaching of John, while the respectable religious class refused both John and Jesus. Among his chosen twelve was a publican; among his most beloved and faithful followers was a woman out of whom seven demons had been cast. The apostles followed the example of the Master and went to the lost, the poor, the outcasts of earth, and suffered hunger and nakedness, and with tears and entreaties from house to house besought the people to serve the living God. This is God's way of reaching and converting men and women. These classes converted make the most active and faithful servants of God and are efficient in saving others. The poor and industrious of one generation are the leaders and rulers of the next. If a preacher is a true follower of Christ and the apostles, when he goes into a com-

munity to preach the gospel, he will go to the poor and the humble, and he will seek to save these, and in saving these he will save all others willing to be saved. The rich, especially those whose heart is set on riches and who pride themselves on their riches, more often than otherwise prove a hindrance and not a help to the gospel. "Not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called." (1 Cor. 1: 26.) Go to the common people. See **Evangelize, How To**.

### **GOSPEL, WHAT IS THE?**

What is the **gospel**? Some preachers who make it clear that man should obey the gospel do not give a clear definition as to what is the **gospel**. I am greatly surprised that preachers give different answers.

It is nothing strange that persons should give answers to the questions that differ in form and in words. Possibly fifty answers may be given to the question differing in words, but meaning the same things. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son [to die], that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life" (John 3: 16), is one form of telling the gospel. Another is: "Even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life." (Verses 14, 15.) The gospel is often presented in a series of statements and illustrations showing that Jesus came into the world to save sinners, as in the case of the woman of Samaria. Then the Holy Spirit preached the gospel on Pentecost, the same things expressed in different words. There are many examples of the preaching of the gospel in Acts, hardly ever presented in exactly the same words, but always giving the same ideas. Paul gives a definition of the gospel. (1 Cor. 15: 1-10.) **Gospel** means **good news**. The good news is that, when man was a sinner, God so loved him as to give his Son to die to save him from his sins. In the development of that gospel the conditions on which that salvation could be enjoyed are given. The gospel can be appropriated and enjoyed in complying with the conditions laid down. All these things enter into the gospel as opened to man. So in one sense the mission of Christ to the earth with all his teachings and requirements constitute the gospel, and to fully preach the gospel is to preach Christ and all the teachings and requirements be made to save man. It would be strange if men now did not give answers differing in word and form, but agreeing in

thought, when Jesus and the Holy Spirit expressed it in so many varied ways. When we restrict meanings to terms to which God has not restricted, we do violence to God's order.

### **GUILÉ.**

Please give us some light on the word **guile** as found in Ps. 32: 2; 34: 13; 55: 11; John 1: 47; 1 Thess. 2: 3; 1 Pet. 2: 1, 22; 3: 10; Rev. 14: 5. Some members of the church say that the word **guile** is not here used in the sense of sin, or wickedness; so I want you to give the true definition of the word.

Webster defines **guile** thus: "Craft, deceitful cunning, artifice, duplicity, wile, deceit; used usually in a bad sense." This shows that it is sometimes used in a sense not bad. All craft, cunning, is not bad or used for bad ends, though it is most frequently used in that sense. When Paul claimed to be a Pharisee and turned the wrath of the Pharisees and Sadducees away from him and against each other, he used craft, or guile, in protecting himself; but I do not think there was any wrong in it. If two fierce dogs were after me, and I could divert their attention from me by making them fight each other over a piece of meat, I would use guile, or craft, or cunning, or artifice, in doing it; but this would be no sin. The seventh-day observers lay great stress on the apostles' attending the synagogue and preaching on the Sabbath to prove that it is the proper day to observe. In discussion with one on a Sunday afternoon, I asked him if they had preaching that morning. He said: "Yes." I then asked: "Will you have preaching again to-night?" "Yes, sir," he replied. I then asked him how many times he had services on Saturday, or the Sabbath. He replied: "Only once." I then said: "It is singular that—if you believe Saturday, instead of Sunday, the proper day for worship—you should meet for worship on Sunday so much oftener than on Saturday." He said: "We do it because the people are accustomed to meet on Sunday, and turn out to hear so much better than on Saturday." I had used guile, or craft, or cunning, to make him answer by his own argument why the apostles met on the Sabbath to teach the people—because they could get a hearing that day. Every time we set a trap with bait to entice an animal into it, we practice guile. Is it always sinful? I think not. Yet the word **guile** is used generally, as the dictionary says, in an evil sense; and while I have not examined, it may be so used in

all the other passages referred to. Many think that 2 Cor. 12: 16 means: My enemies say that I was crafty and caught you with guile. Believing, as I do, that there is a good sense in which the terms **crafty** and **guile** are used, I see no necessity for straining the language to mean this.

**HAND OF FELLOWSHIP.** See **Right Hand of Fellowship.**

**HEADS COVERED.** See **Covered Heads.**

**HEART, ALL SERVICE MUST BE FROM THE.**

Please explain 2 Cor. 3: 3; also Heb. 8: 10; 10: 16—whether it be a fleshly heart or a heart of mind.

The word heart, as generally used in the Bible, means the inner, spiritual man, as distinct from the outer, fleshly one. So the different powers of thinking, perceiving, loving, hating, purposing, desiring, rejoicing, sorrowing, willing, fearing, hoping, fainting (or giving up), being courageous and persevering, or believing and understanding, are attributed to the heart. It is used to represent the whole spiritual, or inner, man, and all the faculties and powers of the inner, or spiritual, man are attributed to the heart. It occasionally refers to the fleshly heart, but the context clearly shows this, as "Joab thrust a dart through the heart of Absalom." The examples in which it is so used are few.

In 2 Cor. 3: 3 Paul tells them that instead of needing an epistle of commendation to or from them, since they had been converted by the Spirit of God through him, that their lives and work were his commendation of him that could be seen and read of all men. His work as shown in the lives of these Corinthian brethren would commend him instead of written letters on paper, and they were converted by the Spirit writing or impressing his truths upon their hearts instead of upon the tables of stone, as the Mosaic law was written. We frequently say a man's children are his best letters of commendation. The other two passages referred to are quotations of the same prophecy (Jer. 31: 33), that in the new covenant that he would make with them he would write his laws on their hearts instead, of upon stone, as he had written the law of Moses. The writing it on the hearts would be to so impreg-

nate the heart with the love of God as manifested in the death of Christ that the hearts of all believers would desire to obey God, and would love God because he first loved us. The hearts of people under Christ would be touched and aroused as they were not under the law of Moses. So all service under Christ must be from the heart—a glad, joyful service to God.

### **HEART, THE, PURIFIED BY FAITH.**

Please explain Acts 15: 9; 1 Pet. 1: 22. Is the heart, in a Bible sense, purified by faith before obeying the truth? Some teach that faith purifies the heart, that repentance changes the life, and that baptism changes the state. Could one's heart be said to be purified by faith before he is baptized?

"Faith, if it have not works, is dead" (James 2: 17)—that is, it ceases to be faith when it dies. A dead faith will not purify the heart or work any other good. A faith that works through love purifies the heart and justifies from sin by bringing the person into Christ. Faith purifies the heart by working in the heart. It is not faith alone or faith without works, but a working faith, that purifies the heart. The same faith produces repentance. Repentance is a fruit, or development, of faith; and through repentance faith changes the life, and, changing the life, directs or controls the body and causes the person to be baptized. So baptism is the fruit, or result, of faith. But faith brings to baptism only after it has passed through repentance. Repentance and baptism are fruits of faith, marking the degrees, or growth, of faith. Baptism is the outgrowth and manifestation of faith. So is a holy life and godly walk. "For whatsoever is not of faith is sin." (Rom. 14: 23.) Faith is the great, leading, consecrating principle that connects man with his Maker. It leads to and consecrates all service to God. It might be proper, with a true understanding, to say that repentance is the change of purpose and life, and baptism is the change of state. They are all the outgrowth of faith, and mark the growth and development of faith in the heart and life of the child of God. It is difficult to separate faith, repentance, and baptism, or their fruits, because they are so intimately associated and blended in one. A man's heart must be pure when he comes to baptism. The faith that brings him to baptism purifies his heart in the bringing. There is no separation of faith from the serv-



ice to which faith leads. "Without faith it is impossible to please him [God]." (Heb. 11:6.)

### **HEATHEN, WILL, BE SAVED WITHOUT GOSPEL?**

Will the heathen be saved without the gospel, or will he be saved if he is never taught? If not, what does Paul mean in Rom. 4: 15; 5: 13?

What is the use of their hearing the gospel if they can be saved without it? The gospel does them no good if they do not hear it. Why should Jesus have died to save those not lost? Simon Peter said: "To whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life." (John 6: 68.) "I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for except ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." (John 8: 24.) "He that believeth on him is not judged: but he that believeth not hath been judged already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God." (John 3: 18.) Jesus came and suffered and died because men were lost and ruined. "The wicked shall be turned back unto Sheol, even all the nations that forget God." (Ps. 9: 17.) The heathen are the nations that forget God, and Paul tells why they are in sin and without the knowledge of God: "Because that, knowing God, they glorified him not as God, neither gave thanks; but became vain in their reasonings, and their senseless heart was darkened." (Rom. 1: 21.) Because they were unwilling to honor God when they knew him he withdrew his knowledge from them, and left them to worship the creature more than the Creator. When they become willing to honor him, he will send his law to them. "And in none other is there salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved." (Acts 4: 12.) I could not make it plainer or stronger than these Scriptures, with many others.

The Scriptures (Rom. 4: 15) say that where no law is there is no transgression. There are two classes of sins in the Bible. Transgress means to go beyond and add to the laws of God. Where there is no law this sin cannot exist. From Adam to Moses there was no code of divine laws, so no transgression. Yet they sinned and died. God gave no law, because they would not hear, and he did not cast pearls before swine. Paul says: "Sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from

Adam until Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression, who is a figure of him that was to come." (Rom. 5: 13, 14.) Adam's transgression was setting aside a positive law. From Adam to Moses there was no code of laws, so they did not sin as Adam did. Yet they were wicked beyond measure; so God destroyed them. The sin of transgressing law was not imputed, but the sin and wickedness prevented God giving law, and they perished without law. (See Gen. 6: 11-13.)

### **HIS OWN.**

Please explain John 1: 11: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not." To whom does **his own** refer? If to the Jewish nation, as most of our commentators say, how do you reconcile that with verse 13, where it is affirmed that they "were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God?"

I have long thought **his own** referred to those prepared by John for him. They embraced a large portion of the Jewish nation, but only those who voluntarily took upon themselves the obligations by being baptized. This was a radical change in the order of God's dealings with the Jews. Hitherto those he recognized as his servants were born after the flesh. All that were born of the fleshly family of Jacob were his servants. Now the voluntary principle was introduced by John. None were his, save those who, through faith in John's teaching, voluntarily took on themselves the obligations imposed in baptism. This principle introduced into the provisional and introductory stages of the kingdom was to be the distinguishing principle of God's government henceforth. Hence these to whom Christ came were his own, prepared for him by John, and they "were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God," inasmuch as they were begotten by the word of God preached through John.

**HOBBY RIDERS. See Mote Hunters.**

### **HOG MEAT, IS IT WRONG TO EAT?**

Please explain whether it is a sin to eat hog meat or not, and whether we are under the old law yet or not. We have an elder in our country who says it is unscriptural to eat hog meat. He is getting up strife among us. He also says we are still under the old law.

The apostles and disciples wrote to the Gentiles: "It seemed

good to the Holy Spirit, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things: that ye abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves, it shall be well with you." (Acts 15: 28, 29.) If it is necessary to refrain from eating swine's flesh, the Holy Spirit forgot to mention it. Then read Jer. 31: 31. Paul said to some who insisted that the Gentiles should keep the law of Moses: "Now therefore why make ye trial of God, that ye should put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, in like manner as they." (Acts 15: 10, 11; see also 2 Cor. 3: 1-12; Gal. 3: 1-10; Gal. 4.) The first ten chapters of the letter to the Hebrews are devoted to showing the difference between the new and the old testaments, and that the old was done away. I do not see why brethren cannot refer to passages like these to settle such questions themselves. If they do not know of them, they are very ignorant of the Scriptures and ought to study them. But if the elder wishes a question on the hog to create disturbance in the church, I can give him one that is much better for the purpose than whether it is right to eat the flesh. It is this: Does a hog lose his teeth before he is three years old? I knew a good, strong church "busted up" over that question. It is better for the purpose of an angry dispute, because the Bible says nothing about it. That kind of a question is much better to quarrel over than one concerning which the Bible teaches. Let the elder get them in a disputing spirit and I will warrant it to succeed. I have seen it tried. If he wishes pointers as to how to manage it, if he will get his church in a real quarreling spirit and write to me, I will give him pointers as to how it was done. A church that will have elders that are so spoiling for a fuss deserves to be "busted up" or prayed for very faithfully.

**HOLINESS.** See **Sanctification.**

**HOLY SPIRIT BAPTISM.** See **Baptism in Holy Spirit.**

**HOLY SPIRIT, DIFFERENT MEASURES OF.**

There are some scriptures that seem to contradict each other, which I wish you to reconcile. Isaiah (63: 10) says that after the

children of Israel crossed the Red Sea, God gave them his Holy Spirit; David (Ps. 51: 11) asks God not to take the Holy Spirit from him; Luke (11: 13) says that God gives the Holy Spirit to those who ask him; Paul (Eph. 1: 13) speaks of being "sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise," and tells them (Eph. 4: 30) to "grieve not the Holy Spirit of God;" John (7: 39) says that the Holy Ghost had not yet been given; and Christ said that when the Holy Ghost should come upon the apostles they should be witnesses to him, both in Jerusalem and Judea and Samaria. Now, Philip had the Holy Ghost and went down to Samaria and testified relative to Christ. Now it seems to me that Philip had something that David did not have.

The difficulty about saying David possessed the Holy Spirit or the Spirit of God came upon persons, and then Christ saying the Holy Spirit was not yet given, arises from there being different degrees and manifestations or gifts of the Spirit. "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." (1 Cor. 12: 4.) Under the Jewish dispensation there were spiritual influences or gifts, including prophecy and other gifts; but when Christ ascended to his Father, he sent the Holy Spirit himself, who became henceforward the representative of God in the church. "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you." (John 16: 7.) The gifts and influences of the Spirit were sent to them before Christ returned to the Father; but when he returned, he sent the Holy Spirit to his disciples. The Spirit in person came on the day of Pentecost, took up his abode in the church of God, and dwells in the church. We are under the ministration of the Spirit. The same Spirit dwells in the church and in the apostles that was with David, but in a different measure and manifestation; the same Spirit dwells in the church now that dwelt in the apostles, but a different measure and manifestation. The Spirit came to the apostles directly from God, as life came to Adam; the Spirit comes to us through the laws God gave to bestow the Spirit on man, just as life is given through the laws God has given to transmit and perpetuate life. The life we enjoy is the same life given to Adam that has been transmitted to us through the laws given to perpetuate that life to his descendants. The manner of bestowing it differs.

### **HOLY SPIRIT—HIS OFFICE.**

Are the Holy Ghost and the Holy Spirit the same, and what part does he take in the conversion of a sinner?

The **Holy Ghost** and the **Holy Spirit** are one and the same.

**Holy Spirit** is the better expression, as a ghost is the disembodied spirit of a dead person, so understood generally. But the Holy Spirit is not the ghost of a dead or departed being; he is a living Spirit, a Person of the Godhead. Hence, it is not well to call him a **ghost**, even a **Holy Ghost**.

The Spirit performed the same office in the material world that he performs in the spiritual world. In the material world God the Father provided all things; Jesus, the Word, created all things. (John **1:1-3**; Heb. 1:2; Col. 1: 16.) Then when all things had been created, the Spirit moved upon the face of the waters and organized and put in working order that which had been created by the Word. (Gen. 1: 2.) So all the six days' work recorded in Gen. 1 was performed by the Spirit, who organized and gave laws to this matter, and in and through these laws guides matter forward in the work it was created to accomplish. "By his Spirit the heavens are garnished." (Job 26: 13.) "Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the ground." (Ps. 104: 30.) This refers to the putting forth of vegetation in the spring season of the year. Again: "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, because the breath of Jehovah bloweth upon it." (Isa. 40: 7.) These seem to teach that the Spirit of God organized matter, gave it laws to govern its operations, and he dwells in and through these laws and directs matter forward to the end for which it was created.

So in the spiritual world. God the Father provided, Jesus the Son came and created, the matter and beginning of the spiritual world, and the Holy Spirit, on the day of Pentecost, came to that new creation, organized it, gave it laws, and took up his abode in these laws and is guiding it forward to the accomplishment of the work it was created to accomplish.

On the day of Pentecost (Acts 2) the Holy Spirit came down from heaven; he took up his abode in the new creation, and, through the apostles, the Holy Spirit taught the sinners that they must believe that Jesus the Christ is the Lord, must repent of their sins and be baptized unto the remission of their sins. This was the miraculous beginning; but the work of the Holy Spirit is clearly manifested. He, through the disciples, preached Christ to the sinners; told them to believe, repent, and be baptized, that their sins might be forgiven, and they should then receive the Holy Spirit as the abiding guest to dwell with them. But as Adam and Eve were miracu-

lously created, and after them no life has been imparted directly and no child has come into existence, save through the laws given by the Spirit for procreation, so no one since the first age of the church has received the Spirit miraculously or directly from God, but through the laws the Spirit gave to impart and develop spiritual life.

When the Holy Spirit came on Pentecost, he, through the apostles, told the people what to do; they did it. In doing what the Spirit commanded them, they were led by the Spirit unto the remission of their sins and into the church of God. The Spirit led them through the words he spoke. Every one who received those words into the heart and obeyed them was led by the Spirit into the church of God. These words were not only spoken, but they were written down and perpetuated for all people for all time. The Holy Spirit does not come down directly from heaven as he did then and put words into the minds of disciples to teach others. The words spoken then and written down and perpetuated are as much the direction of the Spirit now as they were then. If one hears those words, believes them, and obeys them, he as much follows the directions of the Spirit as did those people on Pentecost.

Again, the Spirit preached the gospel to the world through the disciples. He still does this. When the disciples hear the words spoken by the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, receive them into their hearts, mold their lives according to these words, and teach these same things to sinners, the Spirit of God is teaching sinners through the disciples as much as he did on Pentecost, because the words written are as much the words of the Spirit as the same words spoken are. So spiritual life is transmitted and perpetuated through the laws the Spirit gave in the spiritual world just as it is in the material world. The Spirit takes up his abode in the laws of the spiritual world just as he did in the laws of the material world. "It is the spirit that giveth life; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life." (John 6: 63.) The Spirit gives life, and the words are spiritual and life-giving, are the points that correspond and are explanatory of each other. To receive spiritual life, the words that are spirit and living must be received into the heart. To this agrees the parable of the sower: "The seed is the word of God." (Luke 8: 11.) In the seed dwells the principle that

is to be quickened into life. Many other passages teach the same thing.

The Spirit, when he came direct from heaven, took up his abode in the hearts of Christians and through them spoke to, pierced the hearts, and taught sinners the way of life. The Spirit of God dwells in that word, and through that word received into the heart molds the feelings of the heart, directs the lives, and makes their characters like to the character of the Son of God.

Every word of the Scriptures was written by the Holy Spirit. The things taught in the Scriptures are the teaching of the Holy Spirit. The Bible is the teaching of the Holy Spirit to the world. There is not a spiritual truth or thought among men that is not revealed and does not come through the Bible. The Bible is the teaching of the Spirit to the world; it is the only teaching the Spirit has ever given the world. The office of the Spirit was to give the Bible to the world, then in and through that Bible to guide the world and to fit all who will receive that word into the heart for heaven. Without the word of God no one would know there is a Holy Spirit or a Christ, the Savior of the world; nor would any one know God as he is.

### **HOLY SPIRIT, WHAT IS THE GIFT OF THE?**

What is meant by "the gift of the Holy Spirit" in Acts 2: 38?

The gift of the Spirit promised in Acts 2: 38 was the Spirit itself. The gift of the Spirit itself was in two forms. First, it was bestowed in its miraculous manifestation as the apostles themselves received it on the day of Pentecost, fully inspiring them and enduing them with miraculous powers. The Spirit was so given in the first establishment of the church—to guide and teach the infant church. "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy. . . . And I will show wonders in the heavens and in the earth," etc. This pertained to called-and-sent apostles to proclaim and confirm the gospel to the world, and was peculiar to that age. When the inspired men had been led into all truth—that is, when the perfect will of God was revealed to them—this miraculous manifestation of the Spirit ceased, and the Spirit in his regular manifestations through the laws remained. Secondly, there is a presence of the Spirit with and

in all Christians. They are said to "drink into this Spirit." They receive it gradually as they receive the word of God into the heart as the seed of the kingdom, and as it permeates, guides, and directs the thoughts, feelings, and desires of the person. By receiving and cherishing the word in the heart, the Spirit enters and abounds more and more in the person, making him like Jesus in his thoughts, feelings, works. I feel sure this is the manifestation of the Spirit promised to those who would repent and be baptized. If they would repent and be baptized, receiving and cherishing the word of God in their hearts, this Holy Spirit as the indwelling guest of the church and the Christian would be their portion. This Spirit enters the heart with and through the word of God, and spreads and strengthens as the word of God, the seed of the kingdom, more and more is understood and cherished in the heart. The presence of the Spirit is manifest in causing us to walk by the Spirit that was in Christ, to do the will of God as he did it, and to be willing to deny ourselves and save others, as Jesus died to save us.

### **HONOR PARENTS.**

Please give your exegesis of Eph. 6: 1, 2. Dwell on the words **children** and **honor**. Is a child a child when he is fifty years old and has a family? Is Deut. 27: 16 in force?

The relation of child and parents exists so long as the child and the parents live. It is the duty of the child to honor the parents so long as he and they live. What constitutes honor changes somewhat as the conditions of the parties to the relation change. While the child is young and immature, to honor the parents is to obey them, do their will, and be obedient in all things; to dishonor them is to disobey them. An example of dishonoring the parents is given by Moses: "If a man have a stubborn and rebellions son, that will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and, though they chasten him, will not hearken unto them: then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city, and unto the gate of his place; and they shall say unto the elders of his city, This our son is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton, and a drunkard. And all the men of his city shall stone him to death with stones: so shalt them put away the evil from the midst of thee; and all Israel shall hear, and fear." (Deut.



21: 18-21.) This was a son in his minority. This disobedience is elsewhere called "cursing father or mother." "He that speaketh evil of father or mother, let him die the death." (Matt. 15: 4.) These words were spoken primarily of the child in his minority; but when the parent grows old and infirm in body and mind and the child has reached the strength and wisdom of manhood, honor then demands support and help, but always deference, kindness, and respect. The principle's that regulated the relation in the Old Testament have been transferred to the New Testament. The only change would be that the manner of punishing the child that dishonors, or curses, the parent would not be the same now as was then prescribed. To curse means to violate the relations and obligations due; to curse God means to set aside and reject the relations and obligations due him. To treat the parents with discourtesy and neglect is to curse them.

### **HOUSE SWEEPED AND GARNISHED.**

Please explain Luke 11: 24-26. What state was the man in from the time the unclean spirit left him until it returned to find the "house swept and garnished?" Give us a full explanation of these three verses.

The man was a Jew, became wicked, and an evil spirit made a home in his heart. The spirit was cast out, but the man failed to fill it with a good spirit, until the evil one, with his more wicked companions, returned and made a home in his heart. This has its counterpart to-day in this: A man's heart is wicked; he leads a wicked life; he hears the truth, and the evil disposition in him is for the time cast out; but he fails to go forward under the good impulses in righteous life, the evil disposition comes back with stronger force, and he becomes a worse man than he was before. He is worse because he has resisted the influences for good. This may occur to a man either in or out of the church.

### **HUMAN INSTITUTIONS, WORK THROUGH, OR DO NOTHING?**

Which is better, to work through human institutions to convert the world or to do nothing?

There is nothing better, or even good, in either alternative. Both are evil, and very evil, and there is not the least neces-

sity for any Christian's adopting either alternative. The Scriptures never require men to take a choice of evils in serving God. His service is such that no Christian is dependent upon others for ability to do the will of God. He can do God's will without reference to the course of others, and God will hold him accountable if he does not do it. Each man and woman can do what they are able, in God's appointed way, in preaching the gospel to the lost and helping the needy, regardless of the course of others. While there are different classes and degrees of sin—that is, some sins are more offensive to God than others—it is always hurtful to say that one had better do this wrong than that. It is hurtful because it encourages the wrong that is regarded the less; and to do the less sin in this spirit of indifference is to commit the greater. That is presumptuous sin, adding to the appointments of God, legislating for his people, setting aside his laws, and is a greater sin than a sin of omission arising out of human weakness. But when one deliberately commits the sin of omission, it becomes the presumptuous sin. Then man does not look at these sins as God does. Man regards the presumptuous sins as light, the sins of passion and lust as heinous. I have often referred to the sins of Saul and David. Saul, in an excess of religious zeal, forced himself and made offerings to the Lord, in the absence of Samuel, then changed the command of God to slay all Amalekites and their animals because he thought it would bring greater honor to God to carry the fat ones into Judea and there sacrifice them to the Lord. For this repeated presumption, arising from overzeal toward God, no forgiveness could be granted. David was guilty of adultery and murder, and, while he was punished, found forgiveness. But to excuse a sin or to neglect it, to speak lightly of it, is to make the sin of weakness a presumptuous sin.

### **IDLE WORDS.**

Please explain Matt. 12: 36. What is meant by idle words?

**Idle** means useless, unprofitable, pernicious, and hurtful; it means what is idle, useless, and hurtful in the sight of God. The same kind of words or speech is referred to by Paul: "Let no corrupt speech proceed out of your mouth, but such as is good for edifying as the need may be, that it may give grace to them that hear." (Eph. 4:29.) Here the corrupting

speech that excites sinful lusts and desires is contrasted with that which is good, and administers good to the hearers, and edifies them, and fits them for receiving the blessing or favor of God. The idleness or hurtfulness is such in the sight of God, not in the sight of man. Many things that God would consider idle and hurtful man would not, and what man calls "idle" is not always such in the sight of God. God considers all conversation that would lead away from God to an undue devotion to the things of the world as idle, pernicious, hurtful. Man does not so consider. Light, pleasant words that bring joy and happiness to ourselves or others and lead none into evil, man is apt to consider idle and profitless, but God does not so consider them. All words of a hurtful, vicious tendency that excite evil thoughts and sinful desires are what God would call idle, useless, pernicious; and for the use of such words men will be held to account by God. "Evil communications corrupt good manners." (1 Cor. 15: 33.) Again: "Let your speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt, that ye may know how ye ought to answer each man." (Col. 4: 6.) Evil, vicious conversation that excites the lusts, passions, evil desires, often does more harm than many sinful deeds, and God forewarns that for all this men will be held to a strict account.

### **IMMORTAL, IS MAN BORN?**

Is man an immortal being when born into this world? If so, when does he lose his immortality? And is there a passage of scripture that teaches beyond a doubt that all people will be resurrected in the last day?

**Immortal** means **not mortal**. **Immortality** means more than eternal existence; it means freedom from pain, suffering, decay, or corruption. In this, the true sense, man is not immortal. He will render "to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life." (Rom. 2:7.)

The devil and the spirits of the lost have eternal existence, but not immortality, because they suffer. They do not possess what is called **eternal life**, in contrast with eternal death, a constant suffering. "Who [God] only hath immortality, dwelling in light unapproachable." (1 Tim. 6: 16.) Only that which is free from corruption or suffering is immortal, in the true meaning of the word. "Marvel not at this: for

the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs 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 judgment." (John 5: 28, 29.) If that does not teach it, I would not know how to frame a sentence that would. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all the nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as the shepherd separateth the sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left." (Matt. 25: 31-33.) A man who is not satisfied that these scriptures teach a universal resurrection and judgment is too much wedded to some hobby of his own that blinds him.

### **INFANT BAPTISM.**

(1) Where is adult baptism expressly commanded?

Neither adult nor infant baptism is taught in the scriptures. Believers—persons who understand, believe, and repent—are the scriptural subjects of baptism. An unbelieving adult and an unbelieving infant are equally disqualified for baptism.

(2) Where is infant baptism forbidden?

Infant baptism, meaning the baptism of infants incapable of understanding or believing, is forbidden in every passage in which intelligent hearing, thinking, or acting is indicated as prerequisite to baptism. No infant is capable of any of these things; hence, in restricting the command to be baptized to persons with these capacities, it is forbidden to infants, or they are exempted from the obligations of the command. No scripture is found requiring one person to have another baptized. Each is commanded himself to be baptized. No person incapable of this is a subject of the command.

(3) Where is any command which expressly specifies the subjects of baptism?

If there be no command that specifies the subjects of baptism, then who can obey a command not given specifically to any one or any character? "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare for the battle?" Every passage of scripture commanding baptism or imply-

ing its obligation, taken in its proper connection, clearly indicates the characteristics of the proper subject of baptism, beginning with John's baptism. "In those days cometh John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, saying, Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. . . . Then went out unto him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about the Jordan; and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins." (Matt. 3: 1-6.) Here clearly they were persons capable of hearing, understanding, repenting, and confessing their sins. They were responsible persons with capacity to act. Any one of these acts precludes incapable infants. The requirements indicate clearly that the subjects believed and repented. The corresponding passages clearly express the same truth. (Mark 1: 1-8; Luke 3: 3-10.)

The commission given by the Savior, "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 28: 19), declares these nations were to be taught as preliminary to, and a condition of, their baptism. If there be any doubt of this, the same commission as given by Mark places it beyond a doubt: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." (Mark 16: 15, 16.) Preaching "the gospel to the whole creation" explains exactly what is meant by teaching all nations. But baptism is clearly restricted to those who believe or are taught as Matthew records it.

Not only does this fully explain that baptism is commanded only to those who are discipled, who believe; but in the preaching of the gospel, these apostles, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, explain fully who of the whole creation are the subjects of baptism. Peter was made to exclaim, at the house of Cornelius: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him." (Acts 10: 34, 35.) Paul says: "Through whom we received grace and apostleship, unto obedience of faith among all the nations, for his name's sake." (Rom. 1: 5.) Again: "But now is manifested, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the eternal God, is made known unto all the nations unto obedience of faith." (Rom. 16: 26.) These

scriptures plainly declare that the preaching of the gospel to all nations would result in the obedience to the faith, or that the purpose for which the gospel was to be preached was to bring them to obedience through faith. If it was to bring to the obedience of faith, those without faith, whether by incapacity or indisposition, could not come to the obedience. Hence, infants are not embraced as a part of all nations that were to be baptized.

Not only do these explanations show who of "the whole creation" were to be baptized, but the Holy Spirit came from heaven to call all things commanded by Jesus to the minds of the apostles and to guide them into all truth. Under this guidance of the Holy Spirit the apostles, in carrying out this commission, became the infallible interpreters of its meaning. On the day of Pentecost the Holy Spirit came fresh from the Father to guide these apostles in carrying out this commission. After presenting the gospel of the Son of God and the testimonies needed to produce faith, he exhorted: "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified. Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Brethren, what shall we do? And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins. . . . They then that received his word were baptized; and there were added unto them in that day about three thousand souls." (Acts 2: 36-41.) Here only those who could "know assuredly," or believe with the fullness of the heart, who repented, who received his words, were baptized. There could have been no infants" among these. The conditions prescribed exclude them.

"And Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and proclaimed unto them the Christ. And the multitudes gave heed with one accord unto the things that were spoken by Philip, when they heard, and saw the signs which he did. . . . But when they believed Philip preaching good tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." (Acts 8: 5-12.) Here the baptizing is specifically confined to the men and women who heard, understood, and believed. "And Philip opened his mouth, and beginning from this scripture, preached

unto him Jesus. And as they went on the way, they came unto a certain water; and the eunuch saith Behold, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him." (Acts 8: 35-38.) Here the demand to be baptized is positive evidence that he believed that which was preached; then no infant incapable of believing can ever be a fit subject for baptism.

Saul is the next recorded convert. He was first required to believe; he repented in sorrow and anguish for three days before baptism. (See Acts 9: 1-22.) Cornelius and his household were the next converts. To them the angel said: "Send to Joppa, and fetch Simon, whose surname is Peter; who shall speak unto thee words, whereby thou shalt be saved, thou and all thy house." (Acts 11: 13, 14.) When he came, he said to them, "That saying ye yourselves know, which was published" (Acts 10: 37)—as he explains, embodying the gospel of Christ. "They heard them [Cornelius' household] speak with tongues, and magnify God." (Verse 46.) No one incapable of hearing and being affected by words, of knowing the gospel, and of speaking and magnifying God, were among these converts. "And on the Sabbath day we went forth without the gate by a riverside, where we supposed there was a place of prayer; and we sat down, and spake unto the women that were come together. And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, one that worshiped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened to give heed unto the things which were spoken by Paul. And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there. And she constrained us." (Acts 16: 13-15.) Here there were women met to worship away from their native city. He preached to them. The preached word was the means of bringing them to baptism; they believed.

The jailer said: "Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house. And they spake the word of the Lord unto him, with all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, immediately. And he brought them up into his house, and set food before them, and rejoiced

greatly, with all his house, having believed in God." (Acts 16: 30-34.) Here he spake the word of the Lord to all in his house; all believed, all rejoiced. None but believers were here baptized. "And Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, believed in the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized." (Acts 18: 8.)

Paul, finding certain disciples at Ephesus, asked: "Did ye receive the Holy Spirit when ye believed? . . . And when they heard this, they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. . . . And they were in all about twelve men." (Acts 19: 2-7.) These are all the cases in which people are said to have been baptized; and each one of them indicates clearly that faith was an essential prerequisite to baptism. There are other accounts of persons being converted—turning to the Lord, entering into Christ—in which baptism is not specifically mentioned; but in every case it is clearly implied that faith in Christ is set forth as the essential prerequisite to baptism.

Coming to the letters to the churches, it is clear that these churches were composed of believers only.

Without specially examining these letters, I will affirm that every letter to the churches and every allusion to them recognizes clearly that the churches were composed of understanding, believing, accountable persons, and that there is not an allusion to an infant incapable of believing in them. Children are addressed in some of the letters—commanded to obey their parents. They were children capable of hearing, understanding, obeying—children that had reached the age of accountability.

This accords fully with the prophecy: "Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith Jehovah. But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith Jehovah: I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people and they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know Jehovah; for they shall all know me, from the least of them



unto the greatest of them, saith Jehovah: for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more." (Jer. 31: 31-34.)

They had entered the old fleshly covenant by an involuntary birth of the flesh, totally ignorant both of God and of the laws of the covenant; hence, needed to be taught to know God, and they must learn his laws after becoming members. But in the new covenant they must know him before entering into this covenant, must voluntarily from a hearty love of him and his law accept of his service; hence, there would be no necessity for teaching these members to know the Lord, as they all knew him before entering into him. This is the distinction the Savior made to Nicodemus. A birth of the flesh brought you into the fleshly kingdom of Judaism; a birth of the Spirit, of the water and the Spirit, is necessary to enter the spiritual kingdom. This is the distinction between the Jewish and the Christian covenants. In the one, the fleshly man was born by a birth of the flesh into the fleshly kingdom; in the other, every one must be born by a birth, a renewal of the spirit, which produced faith; then he is brought forth into the kingdom of the water. Most emphatically are those who believe and repent, and they alone, specified and declared, at divers times and in sundry places, by John the Baptist, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, to be the only subjects of baptism.

(4) Is there any other command in all the New Testament which expressly specifies who are to be baptized than the great apostolic commission in Matt. 28: 19, 20?

The commission by Matthew and Mark and the teaching connected with every case of conversion under that commission clearly define that the believers, the taught only, are to be baptized.

(5) Does that commission specify either infant or adult by name? Does it exclude either?

Neither that commission nor any other scripture specifies either adults or infants, but believers, as the proper subjects of baptism. It excludes, as already shown, unbelievers, both adult and infant, from baptism.

(6) What command, therefore, is there, or what "Thus saith the Lord," for adult baptism that is not also for infant baptism?

There is no command for either adult or infant baptism, but

for believers' baptism—"he that believeth and is baptized." "Hearing believed, and were baptized." Those who cannot or do not believe are not fit subjects for baptism. Every reference to baptism in the Bible proclaims that the man must hear, understand, believe, as a prerequisite to baptism. Infants cannot do this, hence are clearly excluded.

(7) Is any instance mentioned in Scripture of the head of a household receiving baptism without the household also receiving it at the same time?

There were doubtless thousands of heads of families among the converts at Jerusalem and other places, but they were not specified as such because their families were not converted, hence their names were not mentioned. No one in the Scripture is mentioned in connection with baptism as the head of a household, save for the purpose of telling that his household heard, believed, and were baptized, and rejoiced in Christ with the head. This being true, in every case the household is mentioned as having been baptized with the head.

(8) How came the apostles to baptize the household of a believing parent at the same time the parent was baptized if they did not "believe in infant baptism?"

The apostles baptized the household without believing in infant baptism, because the households baptized believed, and did not include infants incapable of believing and repenting. The occurrences at the house of Cornelius convinced Peter that in every nation "he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him." (Acts 10: 35.) Again, Peter said to them: "The word which he sent unto the children of Israel, preaching good tidings of peace by Jesus Christ (he is Lord of all)—that saying ye yourselves know, which was published throughout all Judea." (Verses 36, 37.) The words preached were: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "They heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God." "He commanded them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. Then prayed they him to tarry certain days." They were to hear words whereby they were to be saved, which shows that those baptized could and would fear God and keep his commandments, did know the word of God, did believe, did speak with tongues, did hear and understand, and were saved by the words spoken to them, any one of which qualifications precludes the idea of infants being among them.

Or like Lydia's household, composed of women, hundreds of miles from home, engaged in selling the dyes for which their native city was celebrated, who assembled on the river bank for prayer, and could hear and understand what Paul spoke to them. (Acts 16: 13.) Or like those of the jailer's house, of whom it is said: "They spake the word of the Lord unto him, with all that were in his house. And he ... rejoiced greatly, with all his house, having believed in God." (Acts 16: 33, 34.) Or like "Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue," who "believed in the Lord with all his house." (Acts 18: 8.)

No infants were among the baptized of these households. All were believers. Then the apostles baptized, in every case mentioned in the Bible, the household with the head, because all the household believed with the head.

(9) Does the Bible anywhere teach that baptism is to be administered solely upon condition of faith and repentance? If so, where?

The commission, the only authority for baptism, says: "Make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them [the disciples] into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." (Matt. 28: 19.) "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." (Mark 16: 16.) "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified. . . . Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins. . . . They then that received his word were baptized." (Acts 2: 36-41.) According to the terms laid down in the New Testament, baptism was to be administered solely to those who had faith and had repented.

(10) Did Lydia's children understand what was being done when they were baptized?

Among the Jews the married woman was never recognized as the head of the household, but always the husband. Hence, Lydia was not a married woman, but an old maid, with women servants or helpers, skilled in the art of dyeing. They were over a hundred miles from home, and as unmarried women in the East were shy of mixed assemblies, they met out of the city by the riverside to worship, with no man present. She was a virtuous old maid and had no children, but her household was composed of women capable of hearing the

word spoken, of understanding and obeying it. This is a much more reasonable supposition than to **guess** she had infants, and **guess** that these infants, contrary to all the teachings of scripture, were baptized, and on this guess build a practice contrary to all the teaching of the Bible on the subject of baptism.

The facts in every other case of baptism mentioned in the Scriptures render infant baptism absolutely impossible. Interpreted in the light of the only commission under which any one was ever authorized to baptize, and in the light of any or every other baptism mentioned in the Scriptures, including other household baptisms, it is absolutely certain that no unbelieving infants were included in the baptism of Lydia's household. Yet pedobaptists insist on considering this case unexplained by the commission, which alone authorizes baptism, separated from every other case of baptism recorded in the Scriptures. They build a theory that annuls and makes void the commission, and that is out of harmony with the plain facts in every other example of baptism in the Scriptures, and totally destructive of the only baptism commanded by the Savior, approved by the Spirit, or practiced by the inspired apostles—that is, believers' baptism; for if infant baptism should become universal, believers' baptism would be totally supplanted and abolished. Is it wise to build a practice so contrary to God's teaching and so destructive of his institution?

(11) Did the Philippian jailer's children understand?

Yes, beyond a doubt. "They spake the word of the Lord unto them, with all that were in his house. And he ... set food before them, and rejoiced greatly, with all his house, having believed in God." (Acts 16: 32-36.) His children certainly did understand and believe.

(12) Does God never bestow any spiritual blessing upon those who do not and cannot understand what it means at the time?

God never bestows spiritual blessings that he prepared for those who understand, believe, and repent, and that he has conditioned on the doing of these things, upon those not doing them or those not capable of doing them. Baptism is not a spiritual blessing, but a condition on which the believer may receive a blessing.

(13) Did the little infants brought by their mothers to Jesus **understand** what that act meant? And yet was not the blessing bestowed, nevertheless?

They did not understand, neither were they baptized. The question is: Who is a proper subject for baptism? A blessing was doubtless bestowed; but baptism is not a blessing, but the condition, when properly submitted to, of receiving a blessing. These infants did not receive the blessing conditioned on baptism—the forgiveness of sins—for they were not sinners, so needed no forgiveness.

(14) Did their being brought to Jesus, therefore, **do no good**? Cannot the parent understand, and does not God understand, what baptism means?

It doubtless secured a blessing to the child, but it did not fit for baptism nor secure the forgiveness of sins, conditioned to the believer on baptism, nor any of the blessings that come through faith and obedience. A man cannot believe for his child, cannot repent for his child, cannot be baptized for his child, nor impart to his child his own righteousness. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die: the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." (Ezek. 18: 20.) All that the parent can do is to bring up his child in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, so that he will remember his Creator in the days of his youth, and so that the seed received into a good and honest heart may bring forth fruit unto everlasting life. God understands what man desires, and because he does understand he demands that a man should believe, repent, and be baptized. God's order cannot be changed.

(15) Does it, therefore, do no good merely because the infant cannot understand what it means?

Inasmuch as baptism is commanded only to them that believe and repent; inasmuch as no man is ever commanded to baptize or have baptized his own or the infant of another; inasmuch as none can enter the kingdom of heaven (the church) except those who believe, baptism can do no good to the unbelieving infant. It may do him great harm by preventing the voluntary obedience of faith when he comes to years of maturity; it may be a great harm to the parent for him to

set aside the baptism ordained by God and substitute for it an invention of man.

(16) If the same command for baptism which includes the adult includes the infant also; if the apostles administered baptism to the household at the same time that it was administered to the believing head of the household; and if the Scriptures nowhere teach that baptism is to be administered solely upon condition of repentance and faith, or that it is to be confined solely to those who are able to understand what it means, then by what right is baptism denied to the infant of believing parents?

All the conditions of this question having been shown to be wrong, the infant of the believing parent is not entitled to baptism, because baptism is never commanded to the infant, but always to the believer. The trouble is that infant baptism grew out of the dogma of infant guilt and infant damnation. These dogmas now having been given up as groundless, the practices growing out of or based on them should likewise be surrendered. Neither the idea of infant guilt, infant damnation, nor the authority or example for infant baptism can be found in the Scriptures. Those who reverence and honor God and are willing to be led by the direction of his Spirit as revealed in his holy word should surrender the practice and maintain the only baptism authorized by God—the baptism of penitent believers.

### **INHERITED WEAKNESSES.**

Do children inherit the habits of lying and stealing? Please give a scriptural answer.

Children inherit weaknesses of character that render them liable to yield to temptations to do these things. The proof is: "God said, Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind." (Gen. 1: 24.) All living creatures, including men, would bring forth children like the parents. Again, God visits the iniquities of the fathers upon the children and the children's children to the third and fourth generations.

### **INSPIRATION.**

What does the Bible mean when it uses such terms as "the inspiration of the Bible," or has it failed to use them? What is the difference in the working of the providence of God and his work in inspiration? To get the point which I wish you to bring out more clearly before you, I will say that I am very confident you will say inspiration is a miraculous process and its products are the fruits of miraculous force; while the providences of God overlook, control, and

guide both law and miracle to attain an object. If inspiration is not a miraculous process and its product a miraculous thing, then what is it? If this is true, then were all the writers of the Bible miraculously endowed with a knowledge of all the things they have given us in the Bible? It appears to me that the Bible clearly teaches that God is as infallible and certain in his providence over law and men as he is in miracles, and that he only used the miraculous as a creative and generative power in both the formation of the Bible as well as in his works in nature, and that the miraculous is not used for the general propagation and preservation of the things created. A clear denning of distinctions along this line by the word of God will give great light to many.

We do not usually use the word **inspiration** in a very definite or exact sense. We generally mean that the thing is revealed or guaranteed as true by God, regardless of how it is made known or assured to man. **Inspire** means "to draw in." **Inspiration** definitely means to draw the Holy Spirit into the soul, so that he will direct the thoughts and words of the individual. It is not surprising that persons gave different answers, because there are different methods of making known God's will to his servants. There are two methods—revelation and inspiration. **Revelation** was made by dreams or by speaking in an audible voice and telling what he wished them to know; **inspiration** is the entrance of the Holy Spirit into the heart so as to mold and direct the spirit of the person. Both methods of making God's will known to men were used by God. He spoke by dreams to Jacob and Joseph; he spoke in words they heard to Abraham, Moses, and Saul on the way to Damascus. In other instances the Holy Spirit entered into, abode with, and directed the minds and words as one's own spirit does. This is properly inspiration. Peter says: "For no prophecy ever came by the will of man: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit." (2 Pet. 1: 21.) The will of the man did not control this, but the Holy Spirit in him moved him to speak the words of the Spirit. The prophets did not always know the meaning of what the Spirit spoke through them. "Concerning which salvation the prophets sought and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glories that should follow them." (1 Pet. 1: 10, 11.) They understood that blessings were promised, but not what, when, or where they should be bestowed; were anxious to know, but did not understand. The apostles received the same kind of inspiration on the day of Pentecost. They

spoke as the Spirit gave them utterance. Peter prophesied that all that were afar off, as many as the Lord God should call, would receive the Holy Spirit; but he did not understand that this referred to the Gentiles. There were degrees in this kind of inspiration, graduated from those endowed, with the teaching gifts up to the apostles, who were fully endowed and whom the Spirit would guide into all truth and call to their remembrance all things that Jesus had said to them. The apostles possessed this highest degree of inspiration, so their teachings must be accepted as the teachings of God and infallibly true.

There seems to be no doubt that on Pentecost the Spirit gave the very words that were spoken—that is, the Spirit used the mouths of the apostles to speak the words he dictated. But that degree of inspiration was not needed in all the narratives made or teachings clone, and the degree of inspiration seems to have been graded to the requirements of the occasion. The promise of Jesus was that the Holy Spirit would guide them into all truth. All the truth of God needed for their works would be made known to them, and they would know to reject all error. I am sure all these forms and degrees of revelation and inspiration were used by God in making known his will to men. The apostles would be guided into all truth, and whatever degree of inspiration was needed to make known the truth was supplied.

All making known the will of God to man, whether by revelation or inspiration, was miraculous, and pertained to the preparatory and creative age of God's work. The Jewish age was preparatory to the permanent and perfect kingdom. When the people were obedient to the law of Moses, the prophets did not appear. Blessings came through obedience to the laws of God. Now the blessing for obedience is just as sure and as much to be depended on as if bestowed through miracle, but the kingdom was established and the law given by miracle to attest that they were from God. Man was created by miracle. His life is perpetuated and transmitted through the laws God gave to regulate this procreation of the species. The same order prevails in the spiritual world. "Providence," as we use the term, can lead into truth, but cannot reveal it. See **Baptism in the Holy Spirit**



**INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN WORSHIP.**

(1) The preacher who has preached for us two years is a strong advocate of instrumental music in the worship, and quotes Eph. 5: 19 and Col. 3: 16 as authority for using it. He claims there is as much authority for using it as we have for immersion for baptism. Please tell us what these scriptures teach.

These very points have been frequently discussed, but we do it again, and ask all to note them. The passages referred to are: "Be not drunken with wine, wherein is riot, but be filled with the Spirit; speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord." (Eph. 5: 18, 19.) "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly; in all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto God." (Col. 3: 16.) These passages mean exactly the same. To be filled with the Spirit and to have the word of God dwelling in the heart richly are one and the same thing; to sing and make melody in the heart to the Lord and to sing with grace in the heart to the Lord are one and the same thing, and mean to bring the thoughts and feelings of the heart into harmony with the sentiment sung. It is the sentiment that is sung that constitutes the worship; there is no acceptable worship in music distinct from the sentiment sung. The music of the song is only a means of impressing the sentiment sung more deeply on the hearts of both singer and hearer. What is sung must be the outgrowth of the word of God dwelling richly in the heart. It is to be done by speaking that word of God in song. The purpose is to praise God and teach and admonish one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in the heart to the Lord. No performance of an instrument can possibly grow out of the word of God in the heart; an instrument cannot speak that word either to praise God or to teach and admonish one another. The sound of the instrument drowns the words sung and hinders the teaching and admonition.

The use of the instrument hinders and destroys the essential purpose of the worship in song. It works an entire change in the song service; it sooner or later changes it from a service of praise to God and of teaching and admonishing one another .. in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs into a musical and artistic entertainment that pleases and cultivates the fleshly

and sensuous nature. A more hurtful change could not be made in the worship than this change in its spirit and purpose. The contention is this: The psalms carry the idea of singing with an instrumental accompaniment. But if the word carries that idea, it makes it necessary to use the instrument. To fail to use it is to disobey God, for he commanded just what the word means. No church could neglect the instrument without disobeying the law of God. Is any one prepared for that? If to teach and admonish in psalms means to use the instrument with the song, the Greek Church, which to this day speaks the language in which these letters were written, has never found it out. It not only does not use, but prohibits all instrumental music in its services. Not only is this true, but the very churches to which these exhortations were given did not understand it, for they never used them; and no church claiming to worship Christ for six hundred years ever used an instrument in its service. No intelligent and truthful man will deny this. McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia says: "The Greeks as well as the Jews were wont to use instruments as accompaniments in their sacred songs. The converts to Christianity accordingly must have been familiar with this mode of singing; yet it is generally thought that the primitive Christians failed to adopt the use of instrumental music in their religious worship. The word **psallein**, which the apostle uses in Eph. 5: 19, has been taken by some critics to indicate that they sang with such accompaniments. . . . But if this be the correct inference, it is strange indeed that neither Ambrose, nor Basil, nor Chrysostom, in the noble encomiums which they severally pronounce upon music, makes any mention of instrumental music. Basil, indeed, expressly condemns it as ministering only to the depraved passions of men, and must have been led to this condemnation because some had gone astray and borrowed this practice from the heathens. Thus it is reported that at Alexandria it was the custom to accompany the singing with the flute, which practice was expressly forbidden by Clement of Alexandria, in A.D. 190 as too worldly, but he then instituted in its stead the use of the harp. . . . The general introduction of instrumental music can certainly not be assigned to a date earlier than the fifth and six centuries; even Gregory the Great, who, toward the end of the sixth century added greatly to the existing church music, absolutely prohibited the use of instruments.

. . . The first organ is believed to have been used in church service in the thirteenth century. Organs were, however, in use before this in the theaters. They were never regarded with favor in the Eastern church, and were vehemently opposed in the Western churches." (" Music," Volume VI., page 759.)

Then these churches speaking the language in which the letters were written did not understand that they carried the idea of instrumental accompaniment, nor did any church or people so understand from six hundred to thirteen hundred years after. Not only the churches and people to whom the letter was written did not so understand it, but the writer (Paul) did not so understand it, for he did not use the instruments. Paul was faithful to observe the requirements of God—would do it at all hazards and under all difficulties. Nothing could deter him. Neither he nor any other apostle, nor the Lord Jesus, nor any of the disciples for five hundred years, used instruments. This, too, in the face of the fact that the Jews had used instruments in the days of their prosperity and that the Greeks and heathen nations all used them in their worship. They were dropped out with such emphasis that they were not taken up till the middle of the Dark Ages, and came in as part of the order of the Roman Catholic Church. Not only did none of these understand that it carried the idea of instrumental accompaniment, but the same encyclopedia further says: "In the English convocation held A.D. 1562, in Queen Elizabeth's time, for settling the liturgy, the retaining of organs was carried only by a casting vote." (Ibid., page 760.) Again: "The early reformers, when they came out of Rome, removed them as the monuments of idolatry. Luther called the organ an 'ensign of Baal;' Calvin said that instrumental music was not fitter to be adopted into the Christian church than the incense and candlestick; Knox called the organ a 'kist [chest] of whistles.' The Church of England revived them, against a very strong protest, and the English dissenters would not touch them." (Ibid., page 762.) John Wesley and Adam Clarke strongly opposed them, and Alexander Campbell refused to speak when one was used. They have come into use as Christians have lost their zeal and devotion and fidelity to the appointments of God, as parties do as they grow numerous, and have sought to be popular and fashionable and have catered to the fleshly and sensu-

ous tastes and feelings of the world. It cannot be otherwise than sinful to use them, as they constitute no part of the worship of God.

It seems there cannot be a doubt but that the use of instrumental music in connection with the worship of God, whether used as a part of the worship or as an attractive accompaniment, is unauthorized by God and violates the oft-repeated prohibition to add nothing to, take nothing from, the commandments of the Lord. It destroys the difference between the clean and the unclean, the holy and the unholy, counts the blood of the Son of God unclean, and tramples under foot **the** authority of the Son of God. They have not been authorized by God or sanctified with the blood of his Son. A Christian loyal and true to the Lord Jesus Christ cannot use them, nor in any way countenance the setting aside the order of God by adding to or taking from his appointments, even in **the** smallest matters, as washing of hands. While forbearance and love should be exercised in showing the sinfulness of their use, when the church determines to introduce a service not required by God, he who believes it wrong is compelled to refuse in any way to countenance or affiliate with the wrong. To do so is to sin against God and his own conscience and to encourage by example others to violate their consciences and the law of God; it is to lower the standard of regard for the authority of God.

(2) Is it, or is it not, a great sin to divide a congregation over so small a matter as instrumental music?

Those who claim this force others to fellowship the use of instruments against their conscience or disrupt the church, while acknowledging that they are not required by God. God plainly requires his children to withdraw from such. (Rom. 16: 17.) The test of a church of Christ is: It recognizes God as the only Lawgiver. "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." (Matt. 3: 10.) When it consciously changes the smallest appointment of God, it dethrones God as the only Lawmaker and ceases to be a church of God. The test of personal discipleship to God is: That in all matters in which God has given order we will do what God commands, adding nothing thereto, taking nothing therefrom, and we will forsake any thing or person that leads us to violate this rule. To add as simple and harmless a thing

as the washing the hands before eating, as religious service, destroys discipleship to Christ. (Matt. 15: 5-15.)

"Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. 5: 19.) "He that is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much: and he that is unrighteous in a very little is unrighteous also in much." (Luke 16: 10.) Our fidelity to God is tested as easily in little things as in great ones; rather, nothing is little where God's authority is at stake. Witness the sin of our first parents and the fearful results. Paul kept a good conscience in all things; so God honored him and chose him to be the great apostle to the Gentiles.

(3) A large part of our congregation wants the organ, and would it not be better for me to yield than create division?

A church that requires disobedience to God to maintain peace in it is already an apostate church; it has rejected God as its only Ruler. For one to go with a church in a wrong is to encourage them in apostasy. It injures both the church and the person going with the church in the wrong. While forbearance and love should be exercised in seeking to show them the right and persuading them to do it, it is sinful to so affiliate with them as to encourage and build up a church that is going wrong. It is a greater sin for those who know it is wrong to go with those in the wrong than for those who think it right, because those who know it is wrong sin against light and knowledge. The greater sinners in every congregation that departs from God's order in these things are those who know the wrongs, yet remain with and build up the congregations in the practice of the wrongs. "That servant, who knew his lord's will, and made not ready, nor did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he that knew not, and did things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes." (Luke 12: 47, 48.) There can be no doubt that those who cling to the church and build it up, knowing that it is maintaining practices contrary to the word of God, are worse sinners before God than those who introduce them believing they are right. Sometimes persons think that as the Lord tolerated these sins in Israel he will tolerate them under Christ. This would be to subvert the purpose of his exam-

ples so as to make what he gave as a warning to be avoided an example to be followed. It would nullify the purpose of the Jewish law. (See 1 Cor. 10: 1-10.)

(4) My lifelong friends and associates are in a church that uses an organ, and so also are my children and grandchildren. Shall I leave them or remain with them?

To leave them is to bear earnest testimony to them for the truth and to warn them that there is danger and ruin in departing from the law of God; to go with them is to affiliate with and build up the wrong and to encourage them in the way that leads to ruin. To depart from the order of God to go with them is to love friends, father, mother, brothers, and sisters more than God. "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me." (Matt. 10: 37.) "If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." (Luke 14: 26.) These mean that a man must separate from and give up all these to be true to Christ. True love to these friends and ourselves demands the same course. There is no real kindness in going with them in wrong courses and encouraging them in setting aside the law of God; it may gratify the fleshly feelings, but it only helps them and ourselves forward to ruin. Love "is the fulfillment of the law." True love to every creature in the universe is perfected and manifested in doing the will of God. That is love to God, and love to God is the only true love to every being in the universe of God; and be sure God is not pleased when his children violate his law to preserve standing in and harmony with a church setting aside his order. It will be no alleviation of the torments of hell to us or them to think we encouraged our children and friends in the course of rebellion by going with them. God especially warns: "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil; neither shalt thou speak in a cause to turn aside after a multitude to wrest justice." (Ex. 23: 2.)

(5) I am opposed to the use of instrumental music in the worship and protest against it. Will God hold me responsible if I worship where an instrument is used?

Pilate protested against the crucifixion of Jesus, yet went with the party that crucified him. Was he guiltless? The

protest is the proof of conscious guilt in participating in the wrong.

Then my faith is that it is the duty of those who believe a church sets aside the order of God to strive to correct that wrong, to be patient and forbearing in it; and if they fail in this, to withdraw and at once go actively to work to form a true church and observe the true service of God. If they quit work because others have gone wrong, they will die and the cause of truth will perish in their midst. Go to work to maintain the truth of God and to induce others to accept it, and God will bless you. "I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that I have set before thee life and death, the blessing and the curse: therefore choose life, that thou mayest live, thou and thy seed; to love Jehovah thy God, to obey his voice, and to cleave unto him; for he is thy life." (Deut. 30: 19,20.)

### **INVENTIONS OF MEN, CORRUPT AND BRING EVIL.**

Can man devise an institution that will bring honor to God and bless man? Has he ever done it? Has man ever founded an institution that is good?

Man is evil. He is fleshly, mortal. "Jehovah saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." (Gen. 6: 5; see also 8: 21.) If man is so evil and all the imaginations and thoughts of his heart are evil, and that continually, could he without God do good? "They are all gone aside; they are together become filthy; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." (Ps. 14: 3.) How can such evil and sinful beings bring forth good institutions or do that which will bring good to man? "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit." God cannot establish an institution that brings evil. An evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit.

Man, wicked and corrupt, with a continued tendency to evil, cannot bring forth or establish an institution that will bring good to man. "God made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions." (Eccles. 7: 29.) God created man innocent, upright, with capacity for understanding and following that which is good, yet, in his evil surroundings, prone to follow that which is evil. Man's only hope of attaining to God is by hearkening to and following the directions of God. To rely on and follow the directions of God, to walk in his

institutions, is to walk in the light of God's wisdom. To do what God commands us to do, and work in and through his appointments, is to have God to work in and through us "to will and to work, for his good pleasure." (Phil. 2: 13.) This is to do the works of God and is to seek good in accordance with the good pleasure of God. When man turns from the appointments of God and relies on his own wisdom and inventions, his own institutions, he rejects the wisdom of God and walks by his own wisdom; he is relying on his own works, not on the works of God, to bring good to himself and the world. Man cannot serve in both institutions nor the two masters. He will "hate the one, and love the other;" he will "hold to one, and despise the other." (Matt. 6: 24.) He cannot dovetail or graft the one into the other.

The inventions of man cannot be brought into the church of God without defiling and corrupting that church and its service, without defiling the service and worship of God with the precepts of men, which render the service offered vain worship. "In vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men." (Matt. 15: 9.) Man's own institutions are evil and corrupting. They bring evil and not good to man. To add the inventions of man to the order of God in his service, worship, or work must defile it, must bring evil and not good.

Every evil that has ever been brought into this world has come through man's seeking good in his own inventions and ways instead of in God's. This disposition has brought evil continually. It never has brought good to man. It cannot bring good to man until man gets wiser than God. This is true of earthly kingdoms.

There has never been a human addition to the church or worship of God that did not bring evil and not good. This grows out of the fact that man is evil, is weak and sinful. God is wise and good. The conflict from the beginning of the world has been whether man will follow his own wisdom or do the will of God. That brought death and ruin into the world. They will continue to reign in the world and among men until men learn that God's appointments are better than man's, that God is wiser than man. Which shall we follow, God or man?



**ISRAEL, WHO DISTURBS?**

One R. P. Meeks is holding a meeting for the "digressives" at this place. I met him on the street and asked him if he was preaching the same doctrine he preached before those innovations came up in the church. He said he was. He said that the Gospel Advocate was the cause of all the trouble and division in the church to-day; that it was opposing brethren's voting and belonging to secret orders, mission work, and boards for that purpose. He further said that brethren would not accept such extreme ideas. I have been reading the Advocate a long time. I am sure it has always been on the side of peace among the brethren, and has contended for the only true ground of union. He told me that I read only one side of the question, which I admitted to be so; and that is the Lord's side, revealed to us in his holy word. I told him I had read the "digressives" side some; and the more I read it, the more I was convinced of their errors. I believe fully the Advocate's grounds the only true grounds that will "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

It is natural that Meeks should lay the evil growing" out of his own departures from the truth upon others. This is human nature. I remember to have seen a letter written by him, in which he said if he had it in his power he would chop every organ in the world into splinters; but now he thinks those who oppose the use of the organ in the worship bad fellows.

Ahab, king of Israel, carried the people generally into the worship of Baal. Elijah was left alone of the prophets of God. He kept alive the worship of the true God in Israel. Ahab sought him in every nation to slay him. Finally, Elijah met King Ahab. "And Ahab said unto him, Is it thou, thou troubler of Israel? And he answered, I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of Jehovah, and thou hast followed the Baalim." (1 Kings 18: 17, 18.) Had Elijah gone with the rest, they would have had a unanimous thing for Baal. So if all Christians had set aside the commandments of God and gone off with those who set aside the order of God, they would have a unanimous thing for this modern order. But it is true now, as in the days of Elijah, that those who depart from the law of God, no matter how many they may be, are the guilty disturbers of Israel. God cannot condemn those who remain true and faithful to his order. He must condemn those who depart from his order.

A similar lesson is taught us in 1 Kings 22. Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, made alliance with this same Ahab, king of Israel and worshiper of Baal, to recover Ramoth-gilead from Syria. "Jehoshaphat said unto the king of Israel, Inquire

first, I pray thee, for the word of Jehovah. Then the king of Israel gathered the prophets [of Baal] together, about four hundred men, and said unto them, Shall I go against Ramoth-gilead to battle, or shall I forbear? And they said, Go up; for the Lord will deliver it into the hand of the king. But Jehoshaphat said, Is there not here a prophet of Jehovah besides, that we may inquire of him? And the king of Israel said unto Jehoshaphat, There is yet one man by whom we may inquire of Jehovah, Micaiah the son of Imlah: but I hate him; for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil. And Jehoshaphat said, Let not the king say so." (Verses 5-8.) They sent for Micaiah and called him before the two kings. "The messenger that went to call Micaiah spake unto him, saying, Behold now, the words of the prophets declare good unto the king with one mouth: let thy word, I pray thee, be like the word of one of them, and speak thou good." (Verse 13.) What an appeal for union! What a wretch not to yield to the appeal! "Micaiah said, As Jehovah liveth, what Jehovah saith unto me, that will I speak." (Verse 14.) Yet he answered as did the others, but in a tone that showed he did not mean it. "And the king said unto him, How many times shall I adjure thee that thou speak unto me nothing but the truth in the name of Jehovah? And he said, I saw all Israel scattered upon the mountains, as sheep that have no shepherd: and Jehovah said, These have no master; let them return every man to his house in peace. And the king of Israel said to Jehoshaphat, Did I not tell thee that he would not prophesy good concerning me, but evil?" (Verses 16-18.) Now was not Micaiah a harsh-spirited, contentious wretch, to refuse such overtures for harmony and sweet-spirited appeals for peace and union?

The present plea for union and harmony is in the same spirit and on the same grounds as that made to Micaiah. We are under the same obligations to be true to the Lord and his word that Micaiah was. There would have no good come of a union gained by Elijah or Micaiah surrendering the truth to bring about this union. It would have rested under the curse of God. A union now not based on a strict observance of the law of God can bring no good to any being. A union brought about by departing from his order or in compromises of the truths of God must rest under the curse of God. The wrath of God cannot rest upon those who through faith in

Christ cling firmly to his law. His condemnation must rest upon those who set aside God's order and change his appointments. If these propositions are not true, the Bible is not true.

But the efforts to unite by setting aside the order of God never bring union. Some one sent me a clipping of McGarvey's from the Christian Standard, insisting that the line be drawn to sever the more advanced from the more conservative. Where shall such a line be drawn, and who shall draw it? God alone has the right to draw the line. When we neglect his line, other lines are vain. McGarvey meant by this that quite a number of preachers and some churches had gone so far in setting aside the order of God, and substituting in its place the ways and authority of men, that it is wrong to recognize them as Christians, and a line should be drawn cutting them off from those more faithful to God. But who shall draw the line, and where shall it be drawn? Who has the right to draw a line denning the bounds of the church of the living God? Surely no human being or set of human beings has the right to draw such a line. Only God himself has the right to draw a line denning the limits and bounds of the church of God. For men to do this is to assume the authority and power of God. God has drawn that line. Jesus drew it when he said: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven." (Matt. 7: 21.) Again: "In vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men." (Matt. 15: 9.) "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." (1 John 5: 3.) The line has been drawn by God, marked by the blood of the Son of God. All that the child of God is required to do is to stand faithful to the requirements of God, and the line will show itself. Those who forsake the law of God will depart and lay the blame on the faithful ones.

### **JACOB AND ESAU.**

Was the way that Esau was treated by Jacob and his mother, and the treatment that Joseph received of his brothers, contrary to the will of God?

The treatment of Esau and Joseph was sinful. It was done in a wrong spirit and for a wicked purpose. Jacob and the brethren of Joseph all suffered intensely for the wrongs they

did. Jacob suffered in the exile from his family and the fear and dread of meeting Esau, and the similar things he endured from Laban and his sons. The brothers of Joseph suffered terribly for their sins, as may be seen in the account of his being made known to them in Egypt. It would be difficult to conceive of a greater punishment than they endured. While they sinned, God overruled their sins to work out his own purposes and ends. He brought both Jacob and the brothers of Joseph to repentance, and in their repentance they found a blessing. Both Esau and Joseph were disciplined by the wrong they endured. Joseph accepting it in a proper spirit, it brought good to him. He was without doubt unduly puffed up with his importance, and God, through his discipline, took it out of him and made him a true and humble servant of God, anxious to return good for the evil his brothers had done him. So Jacob received his blessing in spite of his wrong, and Joseph, through the wrong of his brothers, was schooled for his work.

### **JEWELRY AS AN ORNAMENT.**

Please tell me if it is scriptural to wear rings, watches, locketts, bracelets, and gold-rim spectacles.

Paul says: "In like manner, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with braided hair, and gold or pearls or costly raiment; but (which becometh women professing godliness) through good works." (1 Tim. 2: 9, 10.) Peter says: "Whose adorning let it not be the outward adorning of braiding the hair, and of wearing jewels of gold, or of putting on apparel; but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in the incorruptible apparel of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price." (1 Pet. 3: 3, 4.) I do not see how any one can fail to see that wearing gold as an ornament is forbidden. I do not know how, nor do I have any desire to explain the prohibition away. I think it a mark of reckless folly for any one to disregard the command of God for the little gratification of pride found in the wearing of a little gold. There are doubtless uses for which gold serves a better purpose than anything else. But when used as an ornament, it is a sin, because it violates the law of God.

**JOB AND HIS AFFLICTIONS.**

Tell us how long Job was afflicted with the sores.

I know of no data for determining, with any definiteness, this question, nor did I ever see an opinion on the subject. In thinking of it, I would say that it lasted him for a season—a few months. First, it was common among the patriarchs to come up yearly with offerings to the Lord, as it became the law among the Jews. It is thought that the day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord referred to this yearly gathering. On one of these gatherings God gave permission to Satan to strip Job of his property—children and all that he had. This was done. Job remained faithful. On the next annual gathering before the Lord, God delivered him to Satan to afflict his person. This was done with sores and boils very soon. He was afflicted long enough for his friends, of Teman, Shuah, and Naama, to hear of it and come to mourn with and comfort him. Life was long and people did not hurry then. They doubtless camped in tents, as most of the men of the East did, both at home and especially in traveling. They remained seven days before they approached him, and then through the period of his affliction. While it is not so said, the facts indicate that they remained until his recovery, and he made offerings for them. It is possible that this did not occur during their stay, but the facts strongly point to it. I would then say that it all occurred within the dry season of the year—three or four months.

We know nothing of the age in which he lived, save what we gather from his surroundings. His herds in different places and the marauding bands of thieves would favor an early age. He was old enough when introduced to us to have seven sons and three daughters. The eldest brother has a home and house of his own, and the other nine are all at his house feasting and drinking wine. This would show that they were all probably well grown. The children were killed; the affliction of boils came upon him. He must have been what would now be called a man well advanced in age. He was healed, seven sons and three daughters were again born to him, and he lived after he was healed one hundred and forty years, and gained riches and enjoyed prosperity greater than before.

I think the circumstances would indicate that the affliction

and healing occurred within one season of the year—the dry season—within from three to six months. This is the best I can do for it.

### JOHN'S BAPTISM.

Do you think John's baptism was a Christian baptism? Were the people who were baptized by John still under the law? When were the old laws repealed? What does the word **unto** in Acts 19 mean? If these disciples were rebaptized, why was not Apollos?

The old law was authoritatively taken out of the way when Jesus was crucified; he fulfilled the law, taking it out of the way, nailing it to the cross. Yet it is sure there was a gradual relaxing of the claims of the law and the introduction of the reign of the Messiah before his death. "The law and the prophets were until John: from that time the Gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it." (Luke 16: 16.) Then some of the ordinances of the law were observed, after the death of Jesus, until the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem. The law gradually gave way; the rule of Christ gradually came in. So it was not an abrupt ending of one jutting up against a square beginning of the other. One was spliced upon the other. Pentecost, fifty days after the resurrection of the Lord, is regarded as the time when the kingdom was opened to men.

I do not think John's baptism was the same with Christ's baptism. One was intended to introduce the other, as the author of one introduced the author of the other. I do not believe that those baptized into John's baptism, while it was in force, were required to be baptized into Christ. They constituted his own, prepared for him at his coming. (John 1: 1-12.) They were in the transition state. If the apostles and others had been rebaptized when accepting Christ, it certainly would have been mentioned. If it was common to rebaptize all of John's disciples, then the baptism of John's disciples (Acts 19) would not have been told. It is told as a peculiar case. It is supposed that Apollos was baptized while John's baptism was in force—that is, before Pentecost; the others, after John's mission had ended.

### JONAH, REPENTED UNTO THE PREACHING OF.

Does **eis** ever mean **because of**? "They repented at the preaching of Jonah." (Luke 11: 32.) Did they repent **in order to** his preaching

or because of his preaching? I desire to know the truth along this line.

They repented unto the preaching of Jonah, or in order to practice the teaching of Jonah. While the preaching of Jonah may have been the occasion and ground of their repentance, the end or purpose of the repentance was that they might receive the blessings or promises contained in the preaching. Eis never points backward, but always forward.

### JUDAS ISCARIOT.

(1) Luke (22: 3) says: "And Satan entered into Judas who is called Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve." Was Judas a righteous man before this, or was he a devil from the beginning of his apostleship? (See John 6: 70.) From what did Judas fall? (Acts 2: 25.) These questions came up in our Bible lesson, and one brother took the position that Judas was a righteous man until Satan entered into him and he went to betray the Master.

I do not think Satan ever entered a man unless he was a welcome guest. I do not think he ever entered a good man's heart or a clean animal. He entered the swine; they were unclean. When the demon was cast out of a man, he returned only when he found his house "empty, swept, and garnished." (Matt. 12: 44.) Six days before the passover, when the devil is said to have entered into him, Jesus said: "He was a thief, and having the bag took away what was put therein." (John 12: 6.) Before this, "Jesus answered them, Did not I choose you the twelve, and one of you is a devil? Now he spake of Judas the son of Simon Iscariot, for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve." Judas was one who had the character that would admit the devil when he offered inducement enough.

(2) In answer to a query, you say: "Judas was pointed out as traitor, and left before the Lord's Supper was instituted." I have contended all the while that Judas was present when the Supper was instituted and that he partook of the bread and wine, and have been taking for proof Matt. 26: 17-23; Mark 14: 17-23; Luke 22: 14-23, especially Luke 22: 21, which reads thus: "But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table." Please answer, giving the proof that "Judas . . . left before the Lord's Supper was instituted," for the benefit of myself and others.

The only difficulty in the matter is that no one of the evangelists gives a full, connected account of the institution of the Supper. It was instituted at the close of the passover supper. Judas was present at the passover supper. During the supper

Jesus told them one of them would betray him, and pointed out Judas as the traitor. Matt. 26: 20-25 tells this. John (13: 20-30) tells that Jesus pointed Judas out, and he went out immediately and sought the mob that would take Jesus. After he was gone, Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper and gave to his disciples. John then tells that he spoke to them what is presented in Matt. 14-16 before they went to Gethsemane. Matthew tells after the Supper that they sung a hymn and went out. So many conclude that they did this without doing anything else. All the records should be studied together. They met for the passover supper. Jesus washed his disciples' feet. While eating the supper, he pointed out Judas as the traitor. Judas immediately left to get his band; the Lord's Supper was instituted; then, after the Supper, Jesus made the talk as given in John 14-16, closing with the prayer in John 17. They then went to Gethsemane, and he three times prayed that this cup pass "from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done." Then Judas appeared with his band and arrested him, carried him before the high priest, and the trial began. It all occurred the same night.

(3) In our Bible class we had the question: "Who filled the place of Judas Iscariot—Matthias or Paul?" We have some very fine Bible students that differ. Some think Matthias, others think Paul. So I come to you for information.

I cannot see why such questions are asked. The Bible as plainly says Matthias was to take the place of Judas as it is possible for it to say it. If it does not tell the truth when it tells this, I do not know whether it tells the truth anywhere or not. If the book tells what is not true in as simple a matter as this, it is not worthy of credit in anything. Peter not only said he took the place of Judas, but Luke wrote it forty years after the occurrence. Both of them bear false testimony if Matthias was not selected to take the place of Judas. On the other hand, it is not once hinted that Paul had any connection with Judas or his place. Judas was one of the apostles to the Jews, or the twelve tribes of the house of Israel; Paul and Barnabas were the apostles to the Gentiles. People get wise above "what is written" in another point that leads to their denial of "what is written"—that is, they conclude that there could be but twelve apostles. There is nothing in the Bible that indicates this is true. We first make a law that there could be but twelve apostles, then charge the Bible



with telling what is not true to prove it. This is lower criticism. Between the high and the low critics, the old Book gets many a buff and rebuff; but I think it will stand despite them all.

### JUDGING.

Please explain Matt. 7: 1; Rom. 2: 1. Harmonize them with 1 Cor. 5: 12; 1 Cor. 6: 2-5. I do not understand these scriptures. Under what consideration is one commanded to judge, and under what consideration is one commanded not to judge?

**Judge** is used in the sense of **condemn**. Be not too ready to condemn. Some persons are ready to put the worst construction on the actions of all and to condemn harshly and unjustly. People who so judge or condemn others will be judged in the same way. The Scriptures require us to put the best construction on the acts of our fellow-men, not to condemn them until forced to do so—that is, until no other construction can be put on their actions. It is the same thing as to condemn "evil surmising," "charity thinketh no evil," and like phrases. On the other hand, when the actions of persons will allow no other construction, one must apply the laws of God to them impartially. In dealing with those in the church, do it according to the law of God. I do not know in what sense Christians are to judge angels, but so it is.

### JUDICIAL OATHS.

One of the sisters here desires your explanation of Matt. 5: 33-37. Please pay especial attention to the custom of swearing in court, etc., for that is the point about which there is some trouble.

The subject of swearing is one on which there has been much difference of judgment. Many insist that this prohibition does not apply to judicial oaths, but that vows and obligations of a different character are here forbidden. The first statement, "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths," would seem to show that he was speaking of obligations, oaths, or vows made to the Lord. These were not uncommon in the days of Moses. "When a man voweth a vow unto Jehovah, or sweareth an oath to bind his soul with a bond, he shall not break his word; he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth." (Num. 30: 2.) Jephthah's vow was of this kind. "When thou shalt vow

a vow unto Jehovah thy God, thou shalt not be slack to pay it: for Jehovah thy God will surely require it of thee; and it would be sin in thee. But if thou shalt forbear to vow, it shall be no sin in thee." (Deut. 23: 21, 22.) These were vows made to the Lord to do certain things if he would bless, etc. This kind of vow is forbidden by Jesus Christ. The meaning is: Ask God to bless you; do the best you can without vows and oaths of any kind. While Jesus forbids the taking of these oaths and vows, he goes further and forbids all oaths. You cannot swear by heaven, or earth, or Jerusalem, or anything else. James repeats the same: "But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by the heaven, nor by the earth, nor by any other oath: but let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay; that ye fall not under judgment." (James 5: 12.) This seems to me to forbid all confirming of our statements by oaths or vows. An oath is an appeal to God to witness the truth of what is said, with an imprecation of his wrath if we tell not the truth. This seems to be more than letting your yea be yea or your nay be nay; and if so, it is prohibited. The courts of the country do allow person to affirm a thing as true without calling on the name of the Lord. Some think this as bad as the other. It may be; but, when in doubt, I always take the safer ground, and so, when called into court, ask to let me affirm without calling on the name of the Lord.

### JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

Will you please give us an article setting forth fully and completely the scriptural teachings of Rom. 5: 1—"Being therefore justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ"—for the benefit of some of us who want to be fully satisfied in regard to this much-disputed scripture?

Excepting that this passage has been mystified by a vicious theology, it would be difficult to make it clearer. **Therefore** shows this the conclusion of the foregoing facts and reasoning. The apostle has been contrasting the idea of justification and salvation through Christ and through the works of the Jewish law. Paul says: "Because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for through the law cometh the knowledge of sin. But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God

through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe." (Rom. 3: 20-22.) This is a plain declaration that God justifies not through the righteousness that comes by the law (the law of Moses is meant, for he says this law and the prophets witness of Christ), but by the righteousness that comes through faith, in Christ Jesus. If man becomes righteous, some one is entitled to the credit of it; and if man himself works this righteousness, it allows boasting. Paul asks: "Where then is the glorying? It is excluded. By what manner of law? of works? Nay: but by a law of faith." (Rom. 3: 27.) This shows that the righteousness which is of faith and which does **not** allow boasting comes through "a law of faith." The law of faith is the law to which faith leads a man to submit—the law given by him in whom we believe, Christ Jesus. Faith in Christ binds a man to walk according to the law of Christ. The law of Christ, then, is the law of faith. Justification comes by this law of Christ. But a law justifies none, save those who walk in it. Then faith justifies only those who walk in the law of faith.

In Rom. 4, Abraham is given to us as an example of justification by faith. The law of Moses was not given in Abraham's day. No general law to govern man was revealed, but he was required to believe in God and to walk according to the directions God gave.

In doing these things commanded by God, James says that he obeyed God, and in this obedience his faith was made perfect and was imputed unto him for righteousness. A faith made perfect by obedience to God alone justified Abraham. After Abraham's day the law was added. During the reign of the law the principle of justification was, "The man that doeth the righteousness which is of the law shall live thereby" (Rom. 10: 5), without any reference to his faith. "But the righteousness which is of faith saith thus, Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down:) or, Who shall descend into the abyss? (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead.) But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach: because if thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved: for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (Rom. 10: 6-10.)

Showing plainly that the word of faith must be received, Christ must be confessed with the mouth and in the life. "But they did not all hearken to the glad tidings. For Isaiah saith, Lord, who hath believed our report?" (Verse 16.) Showing plainly that obedience to the gospel and believing in Christ are the same, and that justification by faith involves obedience such as Abraham rendered, involves walking in his steps, involves obedience to the law of faith and obedience to the gospel.

Abraham was justified by faith through doing the will of God. The law was added and reigned from Moses to Christ. When the law was taken out of the way, the principle of justification by faith—by the law of faith, the words of the gospel—was restored. If any one will examine and see how Abraham's faith justified him, he can easily determine how our faith will justify us.

"Being therefore justified by faith" means exactly the same as the expression: "For ye are all the sons of God through faith." (Gal. 3: 26.) Those who are justified by faith are made sons of God through faith. Faith justifies a man at the same time and in the same way that faith makes him a son of God. The Spirit of God says: "Ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ." (Gal. 3: 26, 27.) Showing that faith makes a man a son of God by leading him to trust God—to distrust himself and his own works, to be buried out of self and to be raised in Christ Jesus. In the same way it justifies him. Some say that faith is used to indicate the whole plan of salvation, the leading principle of which is faith. This may be so. If so, it does not alter a single truth here stated. But it is not needed to so construe this to get clear of any imaginary difficulty thrown in the way by the vicious theology of past or present ages. God, in speaking of faith, always means an active, working, obedient faith, a faith that perfects itself by works; and a faith that does not lead to obedience he characterizes as a dead faith. He likens it to a body without spirit or life. Paul explains (Gal. 3: 26) how faith justifies or makes us sons of God. Whenever a man is spoken of as being a son of God through faith or of enjoying any of the benefits and blessings of a child of God by faith, the means by which faith makes us children of

God are necessarily implied as conditions of the attainment of the blessing.

### **KEYS OF THE KINGDOM.**

(1) Please explain what you understand Christ meant by "the keys of the kingdom." (Matt. 16: 19.) Does the last clause of the same verse give the apostles right to make laws for the church, or what does it mean?

The use of keys is to lock and unlock, to close and open the door. Peter was authorized to open the door of the kingdom to the world. He made known the terms on which men could enter and the terms that would bar their entrance into the kingdom, or church, of God. "He that believeth and is baptized" tells the conditions of entrance; "He that disbelieveth shall be condemned" (Mark 16: 16) gives the conditions that bar an entrance; "Repent ye, and be baptized" (Acts 2: 38), gives the conditions of entrance. To refuse this is the bar to the entrance. If it was intended to ask why keys are in the plural, I do not believe it has any significance. Keys is more euphonious and more easily pronounced than key; so the plural form was used. The clause, " whatsoever thou shalt bind [or loose] on earth shall be bound [or sanctioned] in heaven," only means to say that the Spirit shall guide in this work of declaring the conditions of entrance, and they will all be sanctioned in heaven. There is no legislative power for the church of God, save God himself. The apostles were only the agents through whom God made known his laws. A church that has other laws or introduces anything not ordained by God into its service so far rejects God as the Lawmaker, and ceases to be a church of God.

(2) Does any one on earth hold the keys of the kingdom? If so, who is it?

Jesus said (Matt. 16: 16-18) that he would build his church on the truth that Peter confessed—that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God." If any doubt that he meant this truth is the rock on which he would build, let him read the following: "For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. 3: 11.) The Holy Spirit said that no other foundation for the faith of the Christian or the foundation of the church could be laid than Jesus the Christ. Paul states the same thing. (Eph. 2: 20.)

Jesus then says to Peter: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." What Peter bound with the keys was forever bound in heaven; what he loosed with them on earth God forever loosed in heaven. In other words, Peter locked and unlocked the doors once, and no change, has been made of them since. He gave the terms of admission; God approved them, and they can never be changed. No one on earth has the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

#### **KILLING A HUMAN BEING.**

(1) If a man has a desire to kill a man, and that desire is so great that he would kill him if he had the chance, is he not just as guilty as though he had committed the deed—in God's sight, I mean?

I take it that the man, after the excitement was over, did not treasure the desire in his heart. If he did, while not as guilty as though he had killed the man, he is at heart a murderer. His sin is against himself and God, but no injury to the other.

This is the same old question under a different form. Is the will taken for the deed? If a man under strong religious excitement feels like he would obey the gospel if circumstances favored, but, as they do not, he fails to do it, the excitement passes away, and he does not obey, will the momentary purpose when the feelings were aroused afterwards be accepted for the service itself? No one will say that it would be. In this case the man became excited with feelings of animosity, so he would have killed the man had the circumstances favored. They did not favor it, his excitement cooled, and he now would not do it. Is he as guilty as though he had done it? Most certainly not. He sinned in letting his feelings get the mastery of him, but he committed no sin on the man. The providence of God hindered him. The feelings, the will, are nowhere taken for the deed. The sin was in his own heart, momentarily cherished, but no wrong was done to the other, to his family, to the public.

(2) Is life taking justifiable under any circumstances? I beg leave to state I am not seeking any one's life, but want information.

There is no example in the New Testament of a Christian taking the life of his fellow-man, and hence of God's treatment

of such a case under the New Testament law. This would indicate that it is not allowable for a Christian to shed blood. We know that it is contrary to the law and spirit of the Scriptures. Paul suffered much from the hands of men—the mob and the civil rulers. He appealed to the civil authorities sometimes to protect himself from their cruelty and to save his life from the mob that threatened it; but he never appealed to the authorities to punish those who persecuted or beat him contrary to the law. He appealed to the law to protect himself from lawless persecution, but never to punish or take vengeance on his persecutors; he left vengeance in the hands of the Lord. So it is wrong to premeditatedly shed blood. Thus it is wrong for a Christian to determine beforehand that he will shed blood or take the life of a fellow-man, to prepare for it or determine in any emergency that he will take life. It is his duty to pray God to deliver him from the temptation, keep him from the evil, and seek in every way to avoid the temptation to do it. While this is true, I think it possible that a Christian man might be placed in circumstances that, under strong temptation, he might kill a fellow-man and be excused in the sight of God. It is, on the other hand, highly probable that if a Christian striving constantly to live as God would have him live, seeks to avoid the temptation to sin, prays to be delivered daily from temptation, he will never be tempted to sin.

### **KING, IS CHRIST NOW?**

Is Christ a king? If so, when was he crowned? Can he be a king and a prince at the same time? How can he be a king and an advocate at the same time?

If Christ is not a King now, I cannot see when he ever will be. Paul said: "Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be abolished is death. . . . And when all things have been subjected unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subjected to him that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all." (1 Cor. 15: 24-28.) He reigns now, will reign till the last enemy is destroyed, then he (Christ) will be subject unto him (God) that put all things under him. He now possesses an authority that he will not

possess when he, having conquered the last enemy, will become subject to God, that God "may be all in all." Paul said to Timothy: "Who [Christ] is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords." (1 Tim. 6: 15.) Christ clearly has as much authority as he will ever have. In the exercise of that authority it takes time to overcome his enemies. When they are overcome, he will surrender the kingdom that he has rescued up to the Father and be subject to him. The word prince is often used in the sense of king. Webster defines it: "(1) The one of highest rank; a sovereign; a monarch. (2) The son of a king or emperor, or the issue of a royal family." Jesus Christ is the Son of the King or Emperor of the universe. He is in the exercise of kingly powers and prerogatives. He was given the kingly prerogative when all authority in heaven and earth was given into his hand. If we will follow him, we will find his power sufficient to save us. No truth can be elicited by trying to draw a distinction between him as Prince and King, and the effort to draw these unreal and speculative distinctions indicate a disposition to follow untaught and unprofitable questions.

### **KINGDOM, DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CHURCH AND.**

Does the kingdom and the church mean the same thing or not? Give your reasons for thinking them the same, if so.

Not exactly. The kingdom embraces the church, but is, I think, more extensive in its signification. The church embraces the disciples of Christ separated from the world by obedience to Christ. It has both a local and a general application. In its local application it refers to those in a community, separated from the world, meeting together to worship God in his appointments. In its general application, it embraces all the disciples in a country, nation, or the world, separated to the service of God. The kingdom of God embraces every thing and person in the universe over which God rules as King. The term kingdom is not only more extensive in its reach, but it is viewed from a different standpoint.

### **KINGDOM, HAS THE, BEEN ESTABLISHED?**

(1) What is meant by the following expressions in Dan. 2: 44? "In the days of these kings." Make these kings clear, for Adventists



tell us that there were no kings at the Pentecost period that fill this demand of prophecy.

The usual interpretation placed on this image that Nebuchadnezzar saw is that of the four kingdoms indicated by the metal forming the body of a man. The gold represented the first, or Babylonian, empire; this attained practically to universal dominion. There probably was never a time when some provinces or minor kingdoms were not in rebellion against the emperor, or king, of Babylon; but practically the Babylonish empire ruled and hectored over the known world. Still the language of Daniel was direct and specific: "Thou, O king, art king of kings, unto whom the God of heaven hath given the kingdom, the power, and the strength, and the glory; and wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the birds of the heavens hath he given into thy hand, and hath made thee to rule over them all: thou art the head of gold." (Dan. 2: 37, 38.) The application of this head of gold to the king or kingdom of Babylon is settled by the prophet himself. The image bearing the form of man, composed of these different metals, is accepted to mean that these kingdoms were of human origin in contrast with the kingdom of God represented by the little stone cut out of the mountain without hands, without human providing, wisdom, or skill. Only this one kingdom is clearly identified to Nebuchadnezzar at this time. This was to warn him that his kingdom must end. In connection with this is given here the truth that of these human kingdoms three others in succession, one after another, will rise and fall—come to an end; but the fifth kingdom, represented by the little stone cut out of the mountain without hands, that "cometh not with observation" or show of outward earthly power, as says Jesus in Luke 17: 20, or the "stone rejected in the beginning by the builders," became the head of the corner, would stand forever. He tells of the succeeding kingdoms, one after the other, absorbing the strength and possessions of the preceding, so that the riches, power, and strength of all are concentrated in the last. So in its destruction by the little stone cut out of the mountain without hands, it is truly said that it will break in pieces the gold, silver, brass, and iron, or the strength of all these concentrated in one. Adventists confound the first coming of the kingdom, when it was without observation, with the second coming of the Son of God, which is to be as the lightning that shineth

out of one part under the kingdom of heaven unto the other part under heaven. The point of the prophet here was to indicate to this ruler of the first kingdom the destruction of his kingdom by his own subjects, the absorption of it in these other kingdoms, and the destruction of all by this kingdom to be set up by the God of heaven, which must break in pieces and destroy all these kingdoms; and it should stand forever.

In Dan. 7 these four kingdoms are again set forth under the type of four ravenous beasts. The beasts that typify these three kingdoms are mentioned; that which typified the fourth is not named. In Dan. 8 Gabriel told him what should come to pass at the destruction of the kingdom of Babylon. Two kingdoms are presented—one typified by the ram with two horns, which he says was Media and Persia, followed by the he-goat, which represents Grecia. (Verses 20, 21.) This fixes the three kingdoms represented by the gold, silver, and brass on the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, and the Grecian. If it be asked why the fourth is not mentioned specifically as these, I can only say that I do not know; probably because the advent of the fourth kingdom was not at hand, would not be seen by any living, and these details of the working here given were given to test the truth of the prophecies and the claims of Daniel to be a prophet, speaking for God. The duration of the kingdoms of the Medes and Persians was short, that of Greece was longer, and none then living would see the advent of the fourth kingdom. The only question in the interpretation of the figure is: What constituted the fourth kingdom, and what was the kingdom of God?

The fourth kingdom was represented as of iron, stronger and more durable than all other metals. It was to follow, overcome, and absorb the Grecian kingdom. There can be no doubt as to what government or kingdom did this. All the circumstances point to the Roman Empire, or government. That government succeeded to the inheritances and powers of the three preceding ones; embodied the strength, riches, and power of all. There is no doubt of this. The expression, "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom," is commented on from different standpoints. One is, **these kings** refers to all the four kingdoms typified in the metallic body. If this were true, it would not materially alter the truth. The kingdom of heaven was in preparation from the days of Babylon. The Israelites in Babylon, especially

the prophets in the household of the ruler, were preparing for the kingdom of heaven. This was continued through the kingdoms of the Medes and Persians, of Greece, to the day of its establishment under the Roman Empire. Each of these empires was broken and destroyed to show them and the world that the mightiest of earthly kingdoms must be destroyed. They were destroyed because of their refusal to conform to the will of God; they were destroyed because they were founded by mortals, and, being mortal, must perish. It may be truthfully said that each of these kingdoms was broken in pieces by the kingdom of God, yet in its preparatory and elementary state.

But these kings must refer more directly to the kings embraced in the iron empire. Sometimes it is said that there was but one king reigning on the day of Pentecost. On that day the kingdom in its completed state was opened to the world. The work of establishing it was then completed; the purpose and preparation of establishing it existed from the days of Babylon. Jesus said: "The law and the prophets were until John: from that time the gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it." (Luke 16: 16.) The eight years of the Revolutionary War and many years preceding were devoted to the establishment of the government of the States, but it was completed only when their independence was acknowledged and the government was instituted. The work of establishing the kingdom was actual and drawing to completion from the days of John the Baptist. The birth and growth of Jesus were directly parts of the establishing of the kingdom. It was completed only on the day of Pentecost by the descent of the Holy Spirit and the planting of the first and mother church; but from the birth of Christ to the Pentecost on which the church was completed by the Holy Spirit descending and taking up his abode in it three or four kings sat upon the throne of the empire. **Kings** in the plural would necessarily be used in telling of these things.

Again, the term **king** is used to mean **ruler**. Many rulers of different degrees of power, as the Herods and Pilate, were called **kings**. The pretext that there were no kings at the time the kingdom of God was set up is the flimsiest pretext to avoid the force of truth.

2. "Shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom?" Again, Adventists affirm that there was nothing **set** up on the day of Pentecost.

To **set** up means to fix, place, establish, to cause to appear or exist. The first church of Christ did appear and exist on that day. The Holy Spirit on that day descended from heaven and bore testimony to it as he had descended upon Jesus at his baptism and bore testimony to him. The prophecy, "A stone was cut out of the mountain without hands" (Dan. 2: 45), shows that it originated with small beginnings, without the display of power usual in the establishment of kingdoms. The statement of Jesus, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation" (Luke 17: 20), means the same—not with those outward displays of power usual in the establishment of earthly kingdoms; yet he told them in the next verse: "The kingdom of God is within [or among] you." The kingdom, then, in all its elements, unorganized, was in their midst. These elements were brought together by the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost and put into harmonious and working order. Adventists fail to see that there are two periods, or stages, of the kingdom foretold by Daniel and confirmed by Jesus—(1) when it is represented by a little stone cut out of the mountain without hands; (2) when it became a great mountain, breaking in pieces and destroying all the kingdoms of the world. The Jews made the same mistake about Jesus. He was to manifest two apparently antagonistic characters—(1) a sacrificial lamb, led as a sheep to the slaughter, not opening his mouth; (2) a conquering hero, a King on whose shoulders the government rests. The Jews looked for him as the conquering King, and did not recognize the King in "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." Jesus said, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation" in its beginning. When he comes the second time: "As the lightning, when it lighteneth out of the one part under the heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall the Son of man be in his day." (Luke 17: 20, 24.) The church is as much the kingdom of God when it does not attract attention as when he comes in his power and glory. It is called "the kingdom of God" when a little stone, when it attracts no attention by outward displays of earthly power; it is called "the kingdom of God" when preached by John, when among the disciples in its elements during the life of Jesus; and all through the days of the apostles it was recognized as an estab-

lished kingdom, received by them, and preached as an existing kingdom. (Matt. 12: 28; Luke 10: 9-11; 11: 20; Matt. 21: 31, 43; Mark 9: 1; 15: 43; Luke 6: 20; 7: 28; 9: 27; 12: 32; 16: 16; 17: 21; 1 Thess. 2: 12; Heb. 12: 23; Rev. 1: 9.) All these passages speak of a kingdom existing on earth when they were written.

(3) "Which shall never be destroyed." Again, they tell us that if the church is the kingdom in any sense, it was destroyed during the "Dark Ages."

Adventists are noted as manufacturers of history to suit their demands. The first day of the week was observed by the disciples from the beginning as the day of worship. When Christians had multiplied in the empire and Constantine became favorable to the Christian religion, he set apart the first day of the week as a rest day, because the Christians already observed and honored it. The Adventists now say that Constantine first set apart the day. When it suits their purpose, they say that the Roman Catholic Church changed the day. The church existed before the Dark Ages and from the days of the apostles. If it was destroyed during the Dark Ages, when was it reestablished, and by whom? I never, with any degree of assurance, place interpretations on prophecies not clearly indicated by the Holy Spirit; but it has been usually agreed, and I think justly, that Daniel gives the history of that kingdom after it was set up. It was not a history of unbroken triumphs and victories. "I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom. Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be a fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all the kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces. And as for the ten horns, out of this kingdom shall ten kings arise: and another shall arise after them; and he shall be diverse from the former, and he shall put down three kings. And he shall speak words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High; and he shall think to change the times and the law; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and half a time. But the judgment shall be set, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end. And the kingdom and the dominion, and the

greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High: his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him. Here is the end of the matter. As for me, Daniel, my thoughts much troubled me, and my countenance was changed in me: but I kept the matter in my heart." (Dan. 7: 21-28.) Now, this seems to declare after the kingdom was set up, opposing powers and influences would prevail against it and bring it to the very verge of destruction, to the gates of death itself; but the judgment shall sit, and the rule and dominion of the whole earth would be given to the saints of the Most High, and the opposing powers would be destroyed. The end of all the strifes and conflicts of earth would be that the kingdom and dominion and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High. His kingdom (that was to be prevailed against for a time) is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him. "Here is the end of the matter." The strifes and conflicts of the kingdoms of earth will end in this final triumph of God's kingdom. If this does apply to a period of disaster and evil to the kingdom that it had been foretold God would set up, this prophecy concerning it was fulfilled in the Dark Ages, when church and State were united and used their power to destroy the true church of God. It was brought to the verge of destruction, yet lived and survived. That kingdom had to undergo that or a similar history, or the prophecy was false. Adventists make the fulfillment of the prophecy the reason for saying it was not the kingdom set up by God.

If the kingdom had to undergo that history and it is not yet set up, it will have to undergo a similar period of depression and destruction after Christ comes and sets it up, or the prophecy of Daniel will fail. The truth is that the church, or kingdom, set up by the God of heaven was during the Dark Ages, just when God said she should be, under the power of her enemies overcome, persecuted, cast down, yet never destroyed. Because she went through the trials God said she should pass through, it is denied that it was the kingdom God set up. The truth is that if the church, or kingdom, had not gone through that period, as foretold by the prophet, she would not be the true church, or kingdom, of God. The church was not destroyed during the Dark Ages. At all ages

since the kingdom was set up evidences can be found of people worshiping God according to the requirements of the Scriptures. The disadvantage is all with him who seeks to find these people, because the writings were few and those of the persecuted class were destroyed by their enemies, and we are greatly left to the accounts of their enemies for reports of their teaching. We know how little this can be relied on, even when we are at liberty to reply to and retain our writings. The very fact that the kingdom set up by the God of heaven did in its early history pass through the trials and was brought to the verge of destruction, as foretold in history, yet did not perish, is the strongest assurance that its future history of triumph and glory will be as foretold in the prophecies. But this cannot be until the citizens of his kingdom do his will on earth as it is in heaven. Do what he commands, adding nothing thereto, taking nothing from it.

### **KISS, HOLY.**

Why is it that the disciples of Christ do not heed the command given in Rom. 16: 16; 1 Cor. 16: 20; 2 Cor. 13: 12; 1 Thess. 5: 26; 1 Pet. 5: 14, as they do the one given in Heb. 10: 25?

They do not believe the scriptures quoted command to kiss; but when the kissing is common, as it was in those countries, the command was that the kiss should be a holy one, not a lustful one. This is mentioned only among the salutations and incidentals of their life. No ordinance of God is so treated. All the commands or ordinances of God are commanded by Jesus Christ, repeated by the apostles, and then embodied in the main teachings of the Holy Spirit; not left simply to the salutations and greetings at the close of the letters to the churches. Take baptism: it was introduced by John, approved by Jesus during his life, commanded in the commission given by Jesus and in the first sermon by the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, is constantly presented in Acts of Apostles, then through the letters to the churches. Or, take the Lord's Supper: it was solemnly instituted by Jesus in person, with the command to the disciples to observe it in memory of his death. Then the Holy Spirit presents it (Acts 2: 42); it was observed by the apostles (Acts 20: 7, with other clear allusions to it); then it was commanded in the main body of the Epistles, to be observed by the disciples. On the other hand, Jesus did not practice or command kissing, so far

as recorded. We have no example of the apostles practicing it. It is nowhere mentioned in the body of the letters, but is given at the close, among the incidentals and the salutations to the individuals.

Kissing was the salutation of the East, and the apostle cautioned that it should be a pure and holy kiss. He did not ordain kissing as a mode of salutation. He found it and cautioned that it should be pure and holy among Christians.

### **LAW, GOING TO.**

(1) Are there circumstances under which one Christian would be justified in going to law with another Christian? There is a contention that the apostle taught the Corinthian brethren that, where competent brethren can be found in the church, Christians do wrong to resort to law; but where the brethren are incompetent or refuse to bring about a settlement, one brother has a scriptural right to sue another. Is this true?

There are no conditions connected with going to law with brethren. It is placed in strong terms. I quote: "Dare any of you, having a matter against his neighbor, go to law before the unrighteous, and not before the saints? Or know ye not that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world is judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more, things that pertain to this life? If then ye have to judge things pertaining to this life, do ye set them to judge who are of no account in the church? I say this to move you to shame. What, cannot there be found among you one wise man who shall be able to decide between his brethren, but brother goeth to law with brother, and that before unbelievers? Nay, already it is altogether a defect in you, that ye have lawsuits one with another. Why not rather take wrong? why not rather be defrauded? Nay, but ye yourselves do wrong, and defraud, and that your brethren. Or know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God?" (1 Cor. 6: 1-9.)

Paul says that it is absurd that men cannot be found among Christians competent to judge in matters arising among them. Then he declares that they had better suffer wrong and be defrauded than to appeal to the courts of the unbelievers rather than to Christians to settle the difficulties. Then he intimates clearly that those who go to law before the courts



do it to wrong and defraud their brethren, and warns them that such shall have no inheritance in the kingdom of God.

The prohibition is strong and positive against going to law before the courts of the country. Sometimes business in fiduciary capacities has to be settled in the courts, and involves more or less of the formalities of the law; but in a matter between brethren the prohibition is clear and unmistakable. For a man to think that Christian men cannot be found competent to decide what is right is evidence that he desires more than is just.

Christians are sometimes inclined too readily to compromise matters of difference and not decide according to strict justice, but they need to have practice in the work to make them feel the responsibility that God has laid upon them. The reading shows that competent men are to be selected to settle the difficulties, and one disposed to honor God's law will be very slow to set aside these directions of the Holy Spirit. The spirit of the instruction is that men in the church competent to decide should be selected, and that they should be strictly just and impartial in the decision.

(2) When prominent members of a congregation resort to law to settle their financial differences, refuse to speak to or in any way recognize each other, and the elders for any cause fail to settle the matter, what is the duty of the congregation to its officers, the offended parties, and to itself, and what is the duty of a congregation that has one of the parties to the lawsuit employed as its pastor?

The law of God is just as clear and distinct in directing how difficulties between brethren must be settled as it is how a man shall put on Christ. Jesus lays down the law: "And if thy brother sin against thee, go, show him his fault between thee and him alone: if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or three every word may be established. And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church: and if he refuse to hear the church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican. Verily I say unto you, What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." (Matt. 18: 15-18.) The same authority is given to the church in this case that is given to Peter (Matt. 16) when he delivers the terms of entrance into the kingdom of God. It ought not to be neglected in any

case. Sometimes persons think that trouble has gone so far and has become so public that it is needless to attend to the first requirement, but this is a mistake. It is God's order, and should be observed. If there is any goodness or sincerity in men, if they will to themselves talk over and try to settle the difficulties between themselves, they will do it. Troubles and difficulties grow in magnitude and number because when they arise the parties get wrathful and refuse to talk them over quietly and try to understand each other and remove the difficulties. They can never go so far as to be beyond the reach of God's means, nor can a Christian afford to ignore the means provided by the Lord. I need not dwell upon the successive steps if this fails. They are plain and easily understood and obeyed. It is ordered that the offended party, the one that first feels himself wronged, shall take the lead in this. If he does not, it is the duty of the elders to see that he does it. This law of God should no more be neglected or set aside than any other appointment of God. It is the duty of the elders to insist on the one aggrieved doing this. If they do not, they fail of their duty and are accountable for the trouble in the church. When we do what God tells us to do, and trouble comes despite it, as it will sometimes, then we are not responsible; but if we do our duty, and evil comes, we are clear. I do not believe God approves of pastors separate from elders, nor do I believe God makes distinction as to the observance of his law between persons—that is, his law applies with equal force and authority to all the servants of God alike. If one of another congregation violates the law toward one of this congregation, it is none the less the duty of all to try to induce him to comply with the law of God, and, if he does not, to lay it before the congregation of which he is a member. To follow the law of God is the only way to secure his blessing and to carry out his work here on earth.

### **LAW OF MOSES AND LAW OF CHRIST.**

Can salvation be obtained now by keeping the law of Moses, which includes the observance of the seventh, or Sabbath, day? If not, when and by what authority did the law and the Ten Commandments pass away, and by what authority does salvation exist under the dispensation of Christ and the Lord's day, or first day of the week? Are any of the Ten Commandments binding on us under the law of Christ? If so, which, and how? Please set forth clearly the conditions of salvation under the law of Christ. Please make it plain. I am very much interested, as I have a friend who is an Adventist, who has never

heard the plea for New Testament Christianity, but who seems very conscientious.

Paul says: "Now to Abraham were the promises spoken, and to his seed. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. Now this I say: A covenant confirmed beforehand by God, the law, which came four hundred and thirty years after, doth not disannul, so as to make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance is of the law, it is no more of promise: but God hath granted it to Abraham by promise. What then is the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise hath been made; and it was ordained through angels by the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not a mediator of one; but God is one. Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could make alive, verily righteousness would have been of the law. But the scripture shut up all things under sin, that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept in ward under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. So that the law is become our tutor to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But now that faith is come, we are no longer under a tutor. For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus. And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise." (Gal. 3: 16-29.)

This passage shows that the law was given as a temporary arrangement to last till Christ should come. The promise was made to Abraham that in his seed (Christ) all the nations of the earth should be blessed. On account of transgression they were unfitted to receive the promise, and the law was introduced as a tutor to train and fit them to receive Christ. And this law was to remain until Christ came; then it was to be taken out of the way and give place to Christ and his rule. He says, too, that the inheritance could not come through the law, but through the promise made to Abraham—that is, through Christ.

That means not a soul was ever saved by the law of Moses,

because none ever obeyed it, save Christ Jesus; and he was not lost, to need salvation. Persons under the Jewish law were saved, but it was by and through Christ. Their sins, by the blood of animals, were rolled forward from year to year, until Christ came and took them away by the shedding of his own blood. "Because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for through the law cometh the knowledge of sin. But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe; for there is no distinction; for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the showing, I say, of his righteousness at this present season: that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus." (Rom. 3: 20-26.) "The righteousness of God" means God's provisions for justifying man. No man could be justified by the law, because all sinned and violated the law; and law condemns, and does not justify, or purge from sin. What the law could not do was done through Christ, the law and the prophets leading up to and bearing witness to Christ. All—Jew and Gentile—have sinned, or broken the law, so cannot be saved by the law. They are "justified freely by his grace through the redemption" provided in Christ Jesus. God set Jesus Christ forth to be a sacrifice and propitiation, through faith in his blood, for the remission of the sins committed under the law that had been passed over through the forbearance, or long-suffering, of God. God had foreborne to execute sentence on those under the Jewish law until Christ came, shed his blood, and took away their sins once and forever. None were saved by the "law of works, . . . but by the law of faith."

Of the same purport is: "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death. For what the law [of Moses] 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: that the ordinance of the law might be fulfilled in us, who

walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." (Rom. 8: 2-4.)

Read 2 Cor. 3: 6-11, where he calls the law of Moses written on stones "the ministration of condemnation," that which "passeth away;" and the law of Christ, "the ministration of life and glory." The one was the ministration of death, because it brought the knowledge of sin and death, but did not give life, because none kept its requirements; the other was the ministration of life, because it provided for pardon and life in Christ Jesus. The one was done away and swallowed up in the transcendent glory of the other.

To the Galatians he says: "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law: because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. . . . I do not make void the grace of God: for if righteousness [justification] is through the law, then Christ died for naught." (Gal. 2: 16-21.) If men could be justified by the law of Moses, there was no reason for the death of Christ.

Then the letter to the Hebrews is taken up chiefly with showing the old covenant was defective and taken out of the way, and gave place to the superior or new covenant in Christ Jesus. In chapters 1, 2, the superiority of Christ, who brought the one, over the angels, who brought the other, is presented. From chapter 3 to chapter 7 the superiority of Christ as the High Priest of the new covenant over the high priest of the Levitical order is argued at length. "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." (Heb. 7: 12.) He then shows the superiority of the priesthood of Christ over those of Levi: "For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore." (Verse 28; read chapters 7, 8.) The first covenant was a shadow. "But now hath he obtained a ministry the more excellent, by so much as he is also the mediator of a better covenant, which hath been enacted upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then would no place have been sought for a second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not according to the cove-

nant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them forth out of the land of Egypt; for they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and on their heart also will I write them: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his fellow-citizen, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest of them. For I will be merciful to their iniquities, and their sins will I remember no more. In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. But that which is becoming old and waxeth aged is nigh unto vanishing away." (Heb. 8: 6-13.) Chapter 9 is a contrast between the blood by which the two covenants are sealed. One, the pattern, was sealed by the typical blood of animals; the other, by the blood of the Son of God. One was called "the old covenant;" the other was called "the new covenant." In the offerings of the old covenant there was "a remembrance ... of sins year by year. For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins." (Heb. 10: 3, 4.) "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. . . . And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God. . . . For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." (Verses 9-14.)

No truth is more frequently or plainly taught than that no person was ever saved by the law of Moses, because no man ever kept that law, save Jesus Christ. That law was given as a training school to prepare them for the reception of Jesus Christ, the promised seed, in whom alone all the nations of the earth should be blessed. When Christ came, he fulfilled the law, obeyed it; but he was not a sinner, not lost, so could not be saved. Paul says: "Having blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us: and he hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross." (Col. 2: 14.) The Mosaic law condemned, but could not save, so "was contrary to us;" it was taken out of the way when Christ was nailed to the cross. From that day for-

ward the Jewish law, including the commandments written on stone, was done away with, and no part of it has been in force since that time; but the moral principles and the obligations to God embodied in the law of Moses have been intensified and made more sacred under the law of Christ, dedicated by his blood as part of the perfect and eternal law of God.

The Sabbath, or seventh, day, as a day of rest and worship, was taken out of the way by the taking" the law that contained it out of the way. Christ was raised on the first day of the week, and from that time forward his disciples have met on the first day to worship God.

It is a singular thing that after God had given the law of Moses and had tested it for fifteen hundred years and not a soul was saved by the law, and God had then taken it out of the way, bearing testimony that "it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins;" "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); "So that the law is become our tutor to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But now that faith is come, we are no longer under a tutor" (Gal. 3: 24, 25)—it is singular, I say, that any one should contend that it is in force. No truth is more clearly taught in the Scriptures than that no soul could be purified and justified by the law of Moses, and none more clearly and fully taught than that the law of Moses was taken out of the way by the death of Christ and man can only be justified by the blood of Christ. See **Forgiveness Under Jewish Law**.

**LAWLESS ONE.** See **Man of Sin, The**.

**LAY BY IN STORE.** See **Church Treasury**.

**LEAVE THY GIFT BEFORE ALTAR.** See **Altar**.

### **LETTERS OF COMMENDATION.**

Should persons be received into the fellowship of a local congregation without letters of commendation? Is it not scriptural to demand a letter? If there is any cause for exclusion of persons from the church that they hold membership with, should we take them before said cause is removed?

Letters of commendation were given to certify that those

who bore them were in good standing in the churches that gave the letters. They were given to those going among strangers, that they might be received and treated as brethren. The letters did not dismiss them from the church. If a Christian went from Rome to Corinth, the church gave a letter certifying that the bearer was a member of the church at Rome. Wherever he went this assurance gave him admission to the churches of Christ. It entitled him to all the privileges of the church wherever he went. It did not dismiss him from the church at Rome. A member at Rome is a member wherever he goes. His worshipping with the church at Corinth makes him a member there. If he is not in good standing at Rome, he is not anywhere. If there is any doubt of a man, he ought to be required to bring a letter from home, where he is well known, to show his standing. If he cannot bring that, he ought not to be received. Of course no man should be received into a church when there are grounds unremoved that hinder his being a member anywhere and everywhere, and specially where he is well known. See **Added to the Church, How?**

### **LITERATURE, SHOULD, BE USED IN TEACHING?**

Is it right to use literature in the Sunday school? We have a brother who objects to the use of literature.

Webster defines **literature** as **learning**. Anything learned is literature. It more especially refers to what is learned from books or things written. To spell and read is to use literature. Anything learned from the Bible is literature. We usually call that which is learned from the Bible "sacred" literature; that learned from other things, "secular," "common," or "profane" literature. The Bible is literature in the strictest sense. It is written. When one speaks or hears what is taught in the Bible or other books or things, he uses literature, just as much as he does who writes or reads what is taught. Every one who studies and teaches or hears the Bible uses literature. Every thought and word that God has given to the world was first spoken, then written by God's Spirit. God has just as much authorized us to teach and learn by reading as he has by hearing. A truth that goes into the heart through the eye will save just as surely as a truth that goes through the ear. All objection to literature by persons



who talk or hear, write or read, to teach or learn, is self-stultification. My observation has been that those who object to printed or written literature are those who think they are very wise and know everything themselves, and the use of the printed literature prevents their explaining their literature orally. In other words, it cuts them out of the opportunity of speechmaking. Their talking may be a good thing if they know what to say and how and when to say it. A thoughtful and studious teacher can often apply what he learns to the special condition of those he is teaching in a way that no writer or speaker to a general audience can do. On the other hand, to refuse all outside literature is to cut them off from much helpful teaching. The thing to do is to follow God's example. Use both speaking and writing as a means of teaching—that is, let the teacher study the lessons for himself and add all thoughts and suggestions he can, and apply the teaching to the conditions of the pupils. The great evil is that neither teacher nor pupils study the lessons. I think the old way of having the young especially memorize portions of scripture the better way. It will then stay with a child through life. Though he may not then understand it, it will often come up to him in life and cause him to think of it. It seems to me that it would not be a heavy task for the pupils to memorize and repeat the scripture lesson. Then use the literature, written and oral, in explaining it. How many will undertake to memorize the scripture lesson?

**LORD'S DAY.** See **First Day of the Week.**

### **LORD'S SUPPER, THE.**

(1) Some of our preaching brethren contend that to fail to meet on the first day of the week to break bread is to commit an unpardonable sin, giving as reference Heb. 10: 26: "There remaineth no more sacrifice for sins." I think it means if we fail to avail ourselves of the blood of Christ or come in contact with his blood by complying with his word, we need not expect any other sacrifice for sins.

A failure to attend the Lord's-day services is not the unpardonable sin; but if persisted in, in a spirit of indifference or defiance to the laws of God, it will become an unpardonable sin. When a man presumes in his heart that any appointment of God is not essential and deliberately sets it aside or fails to observe it, he is guilty of the presumptuous sin—that

is, he presumes to know better than God and substitutes his own will for the will of God. This is an unpardonable sin. It is probable that neglect to observe the Lord's Supper is more fatal and far-reaching than some other neglect of duty, since this act of worship is one intended to furnish food and strength to the spiritual nature, and without this food the whole spiritual being is weakened and broken down. A failure to take food weakens the body more than a misuse of the hand or the foot. The brother gives the correct meaning of the passage. If we fail to appropriate the blood of Christ, there is no more sacrifice for sin. His blood is the only sacrifice that takes away sin. But we can appropriate the cleansing power of the blood of Christ only by coming to his appointments, sealed by his blood. We first receive its efficacy in believing, repenting, and being baptized into his death. But we need its cleansing power all along the journey of life. We can reach it only by taking his laws, sealed by his blood, into our hearts and obeying them ourselves. The Lord's Supper is one of these blood-sealed appointments. When we neglect it, we cut ourselves off from the help of his blood; so, willfully persisted in, it easily becomes an unpardonable sin.

(2) Please give us some light on who should or should not officiate at the Lord's table.

I have never found a word in the Scriptures about officiating at the Lord's table or any service of God. The Lord's table is for his disciples. They are to give thanks and give one to another. All formality in it is without divine warrant. One, of course, leads in giving thanks. This is not officiating, for any disciple can do this. It does not pertain to any office. The elders, or those who preside, can call on any disciple to do this. He only expresses aloud and leads in what every disciple does. That one who stands up and hands the bread and wine to the others any more officiates in the sense of official duties than he who partakes is a priestcraft that does not pertain to the new institution. Every disciple is a priest to offer his own sacrifice or offering to God. Each should break of the loaf for himself as each sips of the cup for himself. He who stands up and gives thanks is not a whit above him who receives and partakes of it. I find not a thing taught concerning this, except all as brethren and equals are to participate in the service. One has as much right as another,

save the elders should direct and see that all things are done decently and in order.

(3) Is the Lord's Supper, of which we partake on the first day of the week, a duty which we owe to God, or is it a duty to man? We have a brother in our congregation who claims that it is a duty which we owe to man.

I am not able to draw nice distinctions like these. Just as well ask: Is eating our daily bread a duty we owe to God or our fellow-man? Partaking of the Lord's Supper and similar services stand related to our spiritual life as eating food does to our fleshly life. It is necessary to its existence. A Christian cannot indifferently neglect the Lord's Supper and the other acts of worship and devotion and remain a Christian. He will die spiritually, just as sure as he will die bodily if he refuses to eat food. A man is under obligation to himself, to his fellow-man, and to his Maker to eat to sustain the life God has given him for his own good and the good of others. A Christian is under obligation to himself, to his fellow-man, and to God to engage in the service God has ordained to perpetuate the spiritual life that God has given for his own good, the good of others, and the honor of God. A man ought to partake of the Supper because he is a poor, weak, helpless being, needing help and strength from God. This ought to swallow up all other thoughts and purposes. Coming in this spirit, he will grow strong, be enabled to help his fellow-man, and honor God. To come in any other spirit than that of a needy suppliant for divine help is to fail at the essential point. For people to persuade themselves that they do not need the help that comes through the service to God, but that they will attend to it to help others and confer honor and favor on God, is a specious manifestation of presumptuous pharisaism. Man should serve God because he is a lost sinner and needs God's help.

(4) We are divided on the time to break bread. One of our elders takes the position that it is wrong for us to break bread when we come together for preaching. We meet on each Lord's day in the evening, except on one Lord's day for preaching, and on that day we break bread just after preaching. But our elder will not partake, but generally gets up and leaves the house. He says we ought to come together for the sole purpose of breaking bread; and if we come together for preaching and break bread, our work is vain. We want you to give an article setting forth the scriptural time for coming together and as to whether it is right for us to break bread after preaching at the eleven-o'clock service.

I think your elder, if he is properly understood, has become wise above what is written; at least I have never found where the Scriptures say that breaking of bread was the sole object of the meeting when bread was broken. All the scriptures I know bearing on this subject show plainly that breaking bread was not the only purpose of coming together when bread was broken. Matthew (26: 30) says after partaking of the Supper, "when they had sung a hymn, they went out unto the mount of Olives." Singing, then, was attended after breaking bread. John (chapters 13-17) shows that the teaching contained in these chapters was given by the Savior after attending to the Supper, before they went out to the mount of Olives. Then, in Acts 2: 42, it is said: "They continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers." This is universally regarded as telling what was done at the worship on Lord's day. They had the apostolic teaching, they engaged in the fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and in prayers. These were all attended to at the meeting and should still be. The apostolic teaching is as much a part of the service as the breaking of bread; and if your preacher does not give apostolic teaching, he ought not to preach at that meeting or at any other; if his teaching is apostolic, then it is one of the objects of that meeting when bread is broken. So the objection to it is contrary to scripture. In Acts 20: 7 we have this: "Upon the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread, Paul discoursed with them, intending to depart on the morrow." In 1 Cor. 11: 17-34 is an account of their meeting to attend to the Lord's Supper. Evils that have crept in are corrected; and then the subject is continued in chapters 12-14, in which Paul defines the relative importance of the different gifts and how they were to be used in these meetings, showing that at these meetings all these gifts were used in teaching the congregation. So the preaching and teaching were done at this same meeting in which bread was broken in commemoration of the Lord's body. Every allusion to the Supper shows that teaching was connected with the service. The teaching then was not so formal sermonizing as we have now, but it was done at this meeting. They prophesied, spoke with tongues, interpreted, and engaged in all kinds of teaching that was proper at any other time. I think when a man comes to meeting only when there is preaching, and never comes to

partake of the Supper, but does it when he comes to preaching, that man's partaking of the Supper is hardly acceptable. But the teaching then is apostolic.

(5) Which is the worse sin—failing to meet on the first day of the week, when a man knows his duty, or to get drunk?

I know of no rule of grading sins, as one being greater than another, save this: The spirit that prompts a sin adds intensity to it. One man's neglecting the Lord's-day meeting may be worse than another, owing to the spirit that prompts the neglect. A spirit of self-sufficient indifference to the commands of God, feeling he does not need the help of God, that leads one to neglect the weekly meeting, is worse than the one who does it through weakness of the spirit under unfavorable surroundings. So, too, one man's getting drunk may be a greater sin than another, owing to the spirit that leads to it. One feels he can drink, and goes in the way of the temptation, and invites the sin; another, through weakness of the flesh, is tempted and overcome. The former sin is the worse. So neglecting the Lord's Supper may be worse than getting drunk, owing to the influence that led to it. There are two causes of sin—human weakness and human presumption. God is more forbearing with the former.

### **LOT, HOW DID CASTING THE, DECIDE?**

Please explain how the lot was cast in Esth. 3: 7; Matt. 27: 35; Acts 1: 26. Was it by vote or expression by word, or was it by chance, as drawing straws, or as our civil courts draw names from a hat in selecting their juries?

The **lot** was what man would call **chance**. It was not chance, but an appeal to God to direct; so the choice would be his, not man's. "They prayed, and said, Thou, Lord, who knowest the hearts of all men, show of these two the one thou hast chosen." (Acts 1: 24.) In the vote, those who vote choose; in the lot, God chose. When they prayed to God and cast the lot, he directed it as he chose; when wicked men cast lots, it was chance. "The lot is cast into the lap; but the whole disposing thereof is of Jehovah." (Prov. 16: 33.)

### **LOVE IS THE FULFILLING OF THE LAW.**

Paul says: "He that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the law." (Rom. 13: 8.) How is love the fulfilling of the law?

Here is a definition. Which is defined—love or the fulfilling of the law? The hidden, the more obscure, is defined by the clearer and better understood. Which of these is the clearer and more easily understood? A great many persons are ready to say that love is the clearer. Love is more easily understood. We are ready to say that everybody knows what love is. The apostle did not so regard it. He starts out to tell us what love is. Jesus, Paul, John, and Peter, all took up considerable space seeking to make the disciples of the Lord understand what love is. Jesus says: "If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments." (John 14: 15.) "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him." (Verse 21.) He then puts it in a different form, and says: "If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." (Verse 23.) Jesus is here trying to get the true idea of love into the minds of his disciples—what it is, what it does. Then, by way of contrast, he adds: "He that loveth me not keepeth not my words." (Verse 24.) Following up the idea as to what constitutes love, that they may know whether they love Christ or not, he tells his disciples: "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; so neither can ye, except ye abide in me." (John 15: 4.) "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and they gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned." (Verse 6.) "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love." (Verse 10.) Christ is teaching his disciples the absolute necessity of obedience in order to entering into and abiding in his love. While doing this he is telling them what love is—how we may gain it, how we may know we possess it, and how we may abide in love. The same principle that keeps love alive in our own hearts secures and retains for us the love of God. If we love God, we keep his commandments; if we continue to keep his commandments, we abide in his love and secure the perpetual presence of God with us. He that does not keep the commandments of God does not love God. God will not abide with him, and, as a withered branch, he will be cast forth to be gathered and burned. Christ, in these chap-

ters, is presenting the importance of love—what it is, and how it may be gained and retained. After showing the importance of love, John says: "Hereby we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and do his commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous." (1 John 5: 2, 3.) "And this is love, that we should walk after his commandments." (2 John 6.)

In all these scriptures keeping his commandments is taken as the clear and well-known term defining what love is. We have very crude and indefinite ideas of what love is. Confounded with love is a number of dissimilar and antagonistic feelings or emotions. Passion, or lust, is often confounded with it; yet they are the opposites. Passion is self-seeking, self-gratifying; love is self-denying, and seeks the good of the loved one. Love is frequently confounded with fleshly magnetism, and attracts two bodies as the magnet and the steel attract each other. Sympathetic emotions often pass for love. But James tells us: "If ye fulfill the royal law, according to the scriptures, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well." (James 2: 8.) "The royal law," as given by Christ, is, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them" (Matt. 7: 12); and to love the enemies is to bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you.

Love, then, beyond all doubt, is doing good to a person. When we do good to a person, we love him, it matters not whether the good we do pleases or displeases him. The question arises: How may I know what is for his good? Here we are in doubt, but the Lord Jesus and the Holy Spirit have abundantly decided that question. Do toward him what the divine law commands, and we do him good. It frequently will offend him. Be it so, love demands that we should help him, do him good, even if he persecutes us for it. That was the love of Christ to man. He loved him, although his love excited the wrath and enmity of man. He loved man in spite of man and did him good against his will. If God had waited until man would receive his offices of love with thanks, then man would never have been redeemed—would have gone on down to death without a Savior. Love is doing a man good, and the divine law tells us that it is the only way in which we

can do a man good; hence, "love is the fulfilling of the law." Love requires us to do unto a man whatever the law of God requires us to do to him. Unless we do this, we do not truly love. A mother loves her child only as she does to the child what the law of God says she must do to the child. She must bring it up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord—that is, she must train it from infancy to be guided by the Spirit, and to practice the precepts that God has given for his children to walk in. A mother that does not do this does not love her child. The great and all-wise God declares this. We shall all be judged by this law at last, and our eternal destiny depends on our fulfilling the law. A man loves his wife and the wife loves her husband only as each fulfills the law of God to the other; so the child loves the parent. A man loves his enemies when he obeys the law to do good to them, prays for them, and in all things manifests his desire to do them good.

Love may exist independent of emotions or the fleshly affections. A man sees that it is his duty to do good to his enemy—to return good for evil, blessing for cursing. All his fleshly emotions and feelings may demand that he should return evil for evil, cursing for cursing. With a resolute will he restrains these feelings, and, instead of these, he does him good, a kindness; he prays for him; he blesses him. It may be mechanical and outward, as we call it—that is, the fleshly feelings do not enter into it. Yet it is love, love of the highest type, love that springs wholly from the purposes and will of the spirit—the inner man. This is the battle between the flesh and the spirit within man. The flesh demands railing for railing, and cursing for cursing; the spirit, good for evil. If we are faithful to the purposes of the heart, it gradually brings all the impulses of the flesh into subjection to the will of the soul; and the finished and final work of love is to bring all the impulses of the flesh into subjection to the will and purposes of the soul, guided by the will of God; or, as Paul expresses it: "Bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ." (2 Cor. 10: 5.) Every thought and feeling may be gradually and finally brought into obedience to Christ. Then the emotions, feelings, and sentiments all will run in harmony with the higher purposes of the soul to honor and obey God.

It is looseness and indifference, not love, that makes man



look with allowance on a rejection of God's law, that makes him encourage his fellow-men in disobeying the law of God. To do this is neither love to God nor to man. It is a loose, indifferent regard to the honor of the one and the welfare of the other. He does not love his fellow-man most or best that goes with him in evil, that walks with him in rejecting God's law, or encourages him to set aside the appointments of God. Loyalty to God is the only true love to man. Such a course is enmity to both God and man, and God has fully warned us that he will so adjudge at the last day. We should be wise. Love is loyal to God.

### **LOVE OF GOD SHED ABROAD.**

What is meant by the statement in Rom. 5: 5 that "the love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Spirit?"

In this passage Paul tells what being justified by faith does for us. He says that it enables us "to rejoice in hope of the glory of God"—in hope that we shall share the glory that God has. Not only does it give us hope of sharing God's glory, but it enables us to glory in tribulations that we suffer for Christ's sake, knowing that the suffering of tribulation here gives the promise of the greater glory hereafter. "If we suffer [with Christ], we shall also reign with him." Tribulation works a patient spirit within us. This gives us experience, and experience arouses and strengthens hope, and hope of the future hinders our being ashamed in our present afflictions and evil state, "because the love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit which was given unto us." We think this sentence is greatly misunderstood. In the first place, it tells that the Holy Spirit has been given to us. It is given by God. It possibly refers here more especially to the miraculous gift bestowed upon the apostles in the beginning. But the same principles pertain to the Holy Spirit as received by all children of God.

This Holy Spirit was given by God. It was given to' impart the mind of God to the person to whom it was given. "But we received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is from God; that we might know the things that were freely given to us of God." (1 Cor. 2: 12.) In imparting to us the knowledge, he also imparts the mind or temper of God. He imparts to us the same feelings and disposition that God possesses and cherishes.

In this passage (Rom. 5:5) it is not intended to say that the Holy Spirit sheds abroad in our hearts a love for God; but the Spirit, coming from God into our hearts, imparts the same kind of love to our hearts that dwells in the heart of God. It causes us to love just as God loves—to love the same objects that God loves, and to love them in the same way that God loves them. The Holy Spirit in our hearts sheds abroad the same mind, temper, and disposition that dwells in the heart of God.

The next verses show what character of love dwelled in God, and, hence, what we should cherish in our hearts. Verse 6 says: "For while we were yet weak, in due season Christ died for the ungodly." This was the character of God's love to man. When man was weak and when the law could not save, then Christ died to save the ungodly. He shows in the seventh verse the difference between the highest type of the love of the best men and this love of God that led Jesus to die for his enemies. God commends this love which is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Spirit to man by the death of Jesus while we were yet sinners. We must cultivate the same spirit or feeling that will cause us to help those in need—to support, to lift up those who are enemies to God and enemies to us. We are, like God, to bless our enemies, do good to them that revile and persecute us, and to pray for them that spitefully use and abuse us. The same thought is here presented: "Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross. Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name." (Phil. 2: 5-9.)

Christ had the mind to humiliate himself, to take the human body and its infirmities, that he might lift man up to save his spiritual and immortal state and to partake of his glory. This was the mind that was in Christ, this was the kind of love God possessed. The Holy Spirit came to shed the same love, the same spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice, in the heart of man. This is the love of God that is shed abroad by the Holy Spirit. The man who has the Spirit of God in his heart will

find pleasure and joy in sacrificing all temporal favors and fleshly blessings to benefit and save men, as God through Christ Jesus did. Unless we have this Spirit of Christ, we are none of his. This Spirit within us is at first a feeble plant in an uncongenial soil. It needs to be nursed and cultivated. Noxious weeds spontaneously grow from the fleshly soil of our hearts. These need to be repressed and rooted out; but if we nurture the Spirit of Christ, if we cultivate the love of God in our hearts, it will respond freely to all culture. It will grow and bestow its fruits of "joy and peace in the Holy Spirit."

If a man begins the habit of self-denial to help those needing help, the Spirit will grow rapidly, and he will find the true joy that the Spirit of God alone can give.

If we repress the impulses to do good, our hearts will grow hard, cold, and selfish. There is no joy for a heart of this kind, neither for time nor eternity. A kind, tender, sympathetic heart and a generous hand bring happiness and peace here, joys pure and holy, then share in all the glories of God in the world to come. But we must nourish and cherish the love of God spread abroad by the Holy Spirit. We must let the same mind that was in Jesus dwell and rule within our hearts.

### **MAJORITY RULE.**

What do you understand to be the duty of members who do not favor church festivals in the church, where the majority overrules and brings them in?

A church in which majorities rule is not a church of Christ. In his church his law rules, and the elders see that it is enforced. While one violation of a law does not unchristianize a man or a church, if it is repented of, yet a persistent adoption of another law than the word of God does place the church or individual out of Christ. The thought of appealing to the flesh to raise money for the Lord is grossly violative of his law and insulting to God. He desires freewill gifts from faithful hearts.

### **MAN, IS THE BODY OR THE SPIRIT THE?**

If the spirit of the child is born of the spirit of the father and mother, as the fleshly part of the child is, by what right is the infant an heir of the kingdom of heaven until it has been regenerated by the

Spirit of God, seeing many children are born of unconverted parents, and must of necessity inherit unregenerate spirits, as you say "like begets its like?" What do you mean by the human spirit being made a new spirit, or soul? Is the human spirit mortal or immortal? Who gave it, God or man? If man imparts spirit to his own natural offspring, by what law of reproduction is mankind the offspring of God? You say: "Man is a spirit, and Adam was a living soul." Do you intend to convey the idea that all men living in the fleshly body are not living souls in the same sense that Adam was when God created him and pronounced him such?

The Bible says God created the herbs and trees each to bear fruit after his kind, and the living creatures each after his kind; and then "God created man in his own image. . . . And God blessed them: and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it." (Gen. 1: 27, 28.) This meant that he was to multiply beings like themselves; and whatever parts and faculties the parents have are transmitted to the child. If the parents have souls, or spirits, above that of beasts, the children are begotten with the same spirits, or souls. It would not be a multiplication of men and women if this were not so. The child is born, not with the faculties of the brute, the pig, or the cattle, but with those of its parents. The child inherits from its parents a mental and spiritual likeness, as well as a bodily likeness.

The souls, or spirits, of the first parents were not guilty or under condemnation until they sinned; neither are those of the children. The soul of the child, like those of the first parents, is overcome and brought in bondage of the flesh. I For the flesh . . . and the Spirit . . . are contrary the one to the other." So the spirit is overcome by the flesh, is in a body of death, from which it then must be delivered in order that it may be saved. "What the law [of Moses] 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 [or overcame] sin in the flesh." (Rom. 8: 3.) The belief of the gospel of the Son of God renews this spirit in man that has been denied by sin, and makes it a new heart and a new spirit. Ezekiel says: "I will put a new spirit within you" (Ezek. 11: 19; 36: 26); "And make you a new heart and a new spirit" (Ezek. 18: 31). Jesus says: "Except one be born anew, . . . be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3: 3-5.) The word of God, the seed of the kingdom, is received into the heart of man, and so strengthens it as to transform

it from a soul dominated by the flesh into a soul led by the Spirit of God. God gives the human spirit just as he gives the human life and the human body through the father and mother; he gives the divine Spirit through the word in which he dwells. So the heart that hears the word, and cherishes it, brings forth fruit, "some a hundredfold, some sixtyfold, some thirtyfold." So the human spirit comes from God through the parents. The Bible says Adam was the son of God. Perhaps he became such by God breathing into him the breath of life by which he became a living soul. He forfeited the "rights of sonship through sin. His children do the same. As Adam polluted his life and cut himself off from the blessing of immortality through sin, his children do like him. They are born sinless beings. As such they are entitled to all the privileges of spiritual life. They inherit mortal bodies from Adam. They forfeit spiritual life, as he did, through sin. All sin, and all who sin need the atoning blood of Jesus to save them. This blood is appropriated through walking "in the light, as he is in the light." (1 John 1: 7.) Eternal existence is not immortality. The devil will exist forever, but God only hath immortality. Man will exist forever, but he seeks for immortality by well-doing.

The Gospel Advocate, no doubt, errs sometimes; it claims no exemption from this; but sometimes the error is in the standpoint of the reader. Many confound eternal existence with immortality. Another error I was trying to correct and guard against is that they make the material body the man, and the spirit, or soul, an appurtenance or faculty of the body. The Bible clearly makes the spirit, or soul, the man, the part that lives and endures, while the body is but its temporary home in which the real man dwells. When the man dies, the body is buried and molds into dust; the man is carried to Abraham's bosom or is found in hell. To mistake the nature, the essential being of man, and to make him simply a material animal, is an error, surpassed only by mistaking who God is and what his character. God is a Spirit, and only spiritual beings who serve him in spirit and truth can dwell with him. As the outer man decays, the inner man is renewed day by day. The man which is seen is temporal; the man which is unseen is eternal. One of the old philosophers—Plato, I believe it was—trying to teach this truth to his pupils, took a hammer, struck a fragile piece of ware, and broke it in many

pieces. He asked: "Who did that?" The answer was: "You did it." "What office did the hammer serve?" The reply was: "It was the instrument you used in breaking it." He then took a piece of the same substance, struck it with his fist, and broke it. He asked: "Who did that?" The answer again was: "You did it." "What office did the fist perform?" Then the answer was: "Your fist was the instrument you used." This brought out the thought that there is an internal man that directs and uses the hand, the foot, the eye, the ear, and all the organs of the body as material instruments for the use of the man.

After a while the internal man shall have accomplished its work on earth, and, like the butterfly, it will lay aside the external shell which henceforward would be a hindrance, and not a help. The spirit, freed from its earthly incumbrances, enters a new and higher stage of existence. It is henceforth a spirit without flesh and blood or body.

### **MAN OF SIN, THE.**

I wish an explanation of 2 Thess. 2: 3-12. Is it the same he to be taken out of the way that "now letteth?" To what does the pronoun he refer? Also, who is "the man of sin" or "the mystery of iniquity?" If you will give an explanation of this passage, you will not only assist me in understanding it, but many others.

I think that he in the two places refers to the same person. The person who hinders will hinder until he (the person who hinders) is taken out of the way. My judgment is that Paul was the person who hindered or restrained the development of the man of sin, and he says he would continue to restrain so long as he lived. When he died, or was taken out of the way, then the mystery of iniquity without hindrance would do his work and develop himself. The Scriptures give no clear evidence of what the mystery of iniquity was, save that it was to become the man of sin, "the lawless one, who opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is ... worshiped, . . . sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God." But it is universally agreed that it means an apostasy in the church would take place before the day of the Lord, or the judgment of the world, should come. A power would arise in the church that would turn away from the law of God, that would exalt itself into the place of God. God's place is to make laws for his people. This power would take this author-

ity on itself and change and modify the laws of God. So it is said to sit in the temple of God, to exalt and oppose God as the only ruler and lawgiver, and set itself forth as the rival of God. Paul said that this power would come, according to the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceit of unrighteousness for those who refuse to receive the truth in the love of it. That power Jesus will destroy with the breath of his mouth and bring it to naught by the manifestation of his presence. God permits this delusion to come upon his people, that they might believe a lie and be damned, because they did not believe his truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness. The Holy Spirit says that this would come to pass. The question of difficulty is: When did it come to pass, and what are the manifestations of it? This power was to rise in the church, be of a religious character, set aside the law of God, and make laws to take the place of these laws of God. Almost all commentators of the Protestant churches apply this to the Roman Catholic Church, or to the papacy. Alexander Campbell, in his debate with Purcell, affirmed that this portrayed the Roman Catholic Church. I have been inclined to believe that it applies to a principle rather than a development of that principle. The principle was the claim to make laws for the church of God. To do this is to sit in his seat, to show by his acts that he is God, the lawmaker; that he is above the law, or is lawless. If it applies to a principle, the Romish Church, or papacy, is one development of this principle, the Greek Church is another, the Church of England is another, and every church or organization in religion that grows out of man's adding to, taking from, or changing the order of God is an outgrowth or development of the same principle. If either of these positions be correct, the disposition to use this power manifested itself while Paul yet lived. He held it in check during his life, but after his death, unchecked, it grew rapidly. If the papacy be a development of the principle, it is easy to trace it back and find its first development after Paul's death. Mosheim says: "During a great part of this [second] century all the churches continued to be, as at first, independent of each other, or were connected by no consociations or confederations. Each church was a kind of small independent republic, governing itself by its own laws, enacted or at least sanctioned by the people. But in process of time it became customary

for all the Christian churches within the same province to unite and form a sort of larger society or commonwealth, and, in the manner of confederated republics, to hold their conventions at stated times, and there deliberate for the common advantage of the whole confederation. The custom first arose among the Greeks, with whom a (political) confederation of cities and the consequent conventions of their several delegates had been long known; but afterwards, the utility of the thing being seen, the custom extended through all countries where there were Christian churches. Such conventions of delegates from several churches assembled for deliberation were called by the Greeks **Synods**, and by the Latins **Councils**; and the laws agreed upon in them were called **canons**—that is, **rules**. These councils, of which no vestige appears before the middle of this century, changed nearly the whole form of the church. For by them, in the first place, the ancient rights and privileges of the people were very much abridged; and, on the other hand, the influence and authority of the bishops were not a little augmented. At first the bishops did not deny that they were merely the representatives of their churches and that they acted in the name of the people; but by little and little they made higher pretensions, and maintained that power was given them by **Christ** himself to dictate rules of faith and conduct to the people. In the next place, the perfect equality and parity of all bishops, which existed in the early times, these councils gradually subverted. For it was necessary that one of the confederated bishops of a province should in those conventions be intrusted with some authority and power over the others, and hence originated the prerogatives of **Metropolitans**. And, lastly, when the custom of holding these councils had extended over the Christian world and the universal church had acquired the form of a vast republic composed of many lesser ones, certain head men were to be placed over it in different parts of the world as central points in their respective countries; hence, came the **Patriarchs**, and ultimately a **Prince of Patriarchs**, the Roman pontiff." ("Institutes of Ecclesiastical History," Century II., Chapter 2, Sections 2, 3, pages 116, 117.)

Paul died in the latter part of the first century. These meetings to deliberate and legislate concerning the good of all sprang up soon after his death, and they with regular steps grew into the papacy. The papacy is held as the most noted



and most objectionable outgrowth of this principle to us, because we have not come in contact with the Greek Church; but all dissatisfaction among Christians with the laws and appointments as God gave them is a manifestation of this spirit of lawlessness or rebellion against God, and all organizations growing out of this spirit of dissatisfaction are manifestations of the man of sin. Roman Catholicism, I do not doubt, is the highest manifestation of the spirit of the man of sin; but every effort to set aside God's order and to substitute human wisdom for it is a working of the principle, or a development of "the mystery of lawlessness." It applies to every effort to depart from God's order in work, worship, or living of the individual Christian. See **Branches, Who Are The? (2)**.

### **MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.**

(1) If a brother and sister marry and live together for a while and then separate without a Bible cause, and at the time of the separation the brother pleads with the sister to stay with him, makes all necessary acknowledgments, begs her pardon, and promises to do better in the future, but she will not hear him, has either party, under the circumstances, the right to marry again? If either party marries again, will that give the other one the right to marry also?

The Bible is very clear that nothing, save adultery on the part of one party, breaks the marriage bond. Paul says: The Lord gives charge "that the wife depart not from her husband (but should she depart, let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband); and that the husband leave not his wife." (1 Cor. 7: 10, 11.) This shows the possibility of their living separate, but they must remain unmarried. There is no ground given for either to marry, unless one be guilty of adultery. For either to marry is to be guilty of adultery; so if either marries, that one is guilty of adultery. This breaks the marriage bond, and the other is free to marry, I would say, though many deny the right of a person once married to marry again during the life of the other party. In a separation, the one who forces the other to leave does what causes that one to commit adultery; and if one, by a sinful course, forces another to commit adultery, that one is as guilty as the one that commits the sin. While I think the Lord allows the innocent party to marry again, I have never known a person to marry one divorced that did not, to some extent, lose his or her standing thereby. There is a public feeling that once marrying is enough while both partners still live;

and Christians cannot be too careful to avoid all doubtful courses.

(2) Miss A and Mr. B married. Later, B, having another wife, ran off and put A away. She then married Mr. C, and they spent a few years together and separated. She then obeyed the gospel, and in process of time she married Mr. D, who was not, nor is he yet, a Christian. Now the question is: Is she living an adulterous life or not? If not, why not? I read in Mark 10: 2-12 the Savior's decision of the matter. Now, Sister A has been withdrawn from on the charge of adultery, and she wants to be restored to fellowship; but, as I see the case, we cannot afford to take her in unless she quits the act. Now, I will say that Sister A got a writing of divorcement before she was married to Mr. D; but, as you well know, that was not intended from the beginning of creation.

No man or woman with a living wife or husband not guilty of adultery can marry another without adultery, and no lapse of time will purge the cohabitation of its sinfulness. The one who separates from the other tempts the other to commit adultery. This is plain; I cannot write more clearly than the Bible is on this subject.

The querist says that this woman obeyed the gospel while living separate from her husband. If the obedience was from the heart, she made an earnest effort to live with him. The Bible requires Christians to make an earnest and sincere effort to be reconciled to the unbelieving companion from whom separated. "Should she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband." (1 Cor. 7: 11.) A person in a state of sin cannot become a Christian without trying to correct that wrong. Repentance involves the confession of all our sins as occasion may demand, and of our undoing our wrongs as far as in pur power. A failure to make an effort to correct our wrongs shows a lack of faith from the heart and of genuine repentance toward God. Neither the woman nor the man with whom she cohabits can live the Christian life without ceasing their adulterous life.

(3) We have a case like this: A woman married A, and separated from him; she then married B, and separated from him. Then she obeyed the gospel and lived a consistent member for some years, when she married C, and was withdrawn from for living in adultery. Now she wants to come back to the church. What would be the proper steps to take in her case?

I am afraid she has done too much marrying and separating ever to be saved. God does not intend his institutions to be dishonored in any such way. The loose way of marrying and unmarrying here indicated is but little better than promiscu-

ous whoredom. The woman lawfully lived only with her first husband—rather, he is her only husband in the sight of God—and she could not have lived a consistent Christian life separated from him.

(4) In a recent issue of the Gospel Advocate a question was asked about a woman who separated from A and B, then obeyed the gospel and lived a consistent member several years, then married C, when she was withdrawn from for living in adultery, and now wants to come back to the church. He wants to know what steps to take. You say: "I am afraid she has done too much marrying and separating ever to be saved." You make the impression on my mind that she is past redemption. I am seventy-one years old, have preached over twenty-seven years, have read the Advocate about thirty years, have helped to settle several such troubles, and I cannot harmonize your position with the Scriptures. Do you believe that she is a greater sinner than Saul of Tarsus, who persecuted the Son of God and called himself "chief of sinners," and yet obtained mercy (1 Tim. 1: 13-16); or the Jews that crucified the Son of God, and were offered remission of their sins (Acts 2: 23, 36, 38)? John says: "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (1 John 1: 7.) If the blood of Jesus "cleanseth from all sin," the sin of the "chief of sinners" and murderers, will it not also cleanse from adultery? The questioner does not state what she separated from her first husband for; so how do we know but what she had the "one cause?" I lived in the sectarian world about forty-two years, and I found very few men but what their wives could have proven the "one cause," if they could have secured the right witnesses to testify. Is a sinner, a citizen of the devil's kingdom, subject to the law of Christ? My understanding of the Scriptures is that a citizen of the world is not under the law of Christ, but is under the law of our land; and if a woman gets a legal divorce from her husband, she has a right to marry again, and is not living in adultery, according to the laws of our land. If she then obeys the gospel, all of her past sins are blotted out, washed away, and will be remembered against her no more forever. If I do not misunderstand you, your position brings the sin she committed in separating from her first husband over into the church? How can a sin be blotted out, washed away, and still be held against her? This is a very important question.

This quitting one man or woman and taking up with another ought not to be called marriage. This was a more demoralizing plea than usual, so I publish and notice.

There are many worse sinners than was Paul or the crucifiers of the Son of God. Paul said he was "chief of sinners," but said that he obtained pardon because he "did it ignorantly in unbelief." (1 Tim. 1: 13.) He was chief of those who sinned ignorantly. There were sins for which there was no forgiveness. Those who committed these sins were worse sinners than Paul or the murderers of Christ, and the apostle declared that the rulers crucified him "in ignorance." (Acts 3: 17.) Then there are pretending Christians who "crucify

to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." (Heb. 6: 6.) It is impossible to renew that class to repentance. They are much worse than Paul or the murderers of God's Son. Those who betray and maltreat and corrupt the spiritual body of Christ are worse sinners and more hopeless than those who crucified his fleshly body. Those who knowingly and willfully change, add to, or take from the commands of God are more hopeless and worse sinners than Paul or the murderers of God's Son, who sinned ignorantly and repented.

Some sins were not even to be prayed for. The reckless repetition of a sin adds to its enormity. I know nothing of the case criticised, save that the woman, without scriptural ground, married and unmarried and remarried with such reckless disregard to the law of God or common virtue and decency as to destroy her sense of right, and there is no foundation on which to found a Christian life or to build a Christian character. A person is then in a hopeless condition. Only a good and honest heart can produce good fruit.

Whom does the blood of Christ cleanse from sin? Only those who obey his laws, only those who repent of their sins. This woman married a man, left him, took up with another, left him, and while separated obeyed the gospel, and the writer says that she lived a consistent life until another fellow came along who was willing, and she took up with him, and while with him now wants to come back to the church. It ought not to be called marrying. The case as stated is that the woman did the separating without scriptural ground. If so, I deny that the blood of Christ cleansed her from any of her sins. She did not repent. Had she repented, she would have sought to live with her scriptural husband. She was not only guilty of adultery herself, but was guilty of tempting her husband to adultery by refusing to be a wife to him. (Matt. 5: 32.) These things are true, not of that woman alone, but of every man and woman who refuses to discharge the marriage duties to the one to whom married. If they separate and one becomes a Christian, the first thing to do is to seek reconciliation and try to live with the unbeliever.

The idea that God takes no cognizance of the sinful lives and states they enter before becoming Christians, and they are all blotted out and forgotten when baptized, and the person may persist in the same course afterwards, is contrary

to the truth and most demoralizing. Read 1 Cor. 7 and see there that the marriage between sinners is recognized as sacred. The man is sanctified to the woman, the woman to the man, else your children are unclean. It seems to me that is on a par with saying that a man might steal a fortune before he obeys the gospel. God does not deal with him then, but the civil law. He then obeys the gospel, all his sins are washed away by the blood of Christ, and he is left in the possession of his ill-gotten gains. God forgives no sin until it is repented of and undone to the extent of the ability of the penitent person.

The writer of the above, in a private note, says that he knows a preacher who married a woman while his first wife was living. He now wishes to get rid of the second one to take up with a third one. He thinks he uses the position I advocate as an excuse for this. Paul could not prevent hypocrites from perverting most sacred truths for wicked purposes. Neither can I. But the man who could use a truth for an end so base is unfit to associate with penitentiary convicts. That people could retain a man who would so act in a church shows how low their estimate of Christianity is.

### **MARRIAGE, FORCED.**

In a certain community a young man made love to a girl. They both belonged to respectable families. The fathers of both parties and the young lady belong to the church of Christ; the young man does not belong to any church. The girl was young, and seemed to love the young man very devotedly. After they were engaged, as I gather the facts, he made improper propositions to her, and urged that, as they were engaged, there would be no harm. She finally yielded, and after this he seemed to lose interest in her and began to pay his respects to another young lady. Some time after this the injured girl moved to another county, and soon after this the young man moved to another State. The father of the girl knew nothing of her condition till a few hours before the baby was born. He then wrote to the young man, as I have been informed, saying nothing rough, but urging him to come and marry the girl. The young man at once came home. He said he did not want to marry her, as he loved another girl better; but if his folks said so, he would do it. The young man's father said it would be better to blight the life of one person than the lives of three; so he thought the proper plan would be to pay the injured girl money to satisfy her and let his son marry the other girl. He sent a man (a brother in Christ) to make the proposition, and it was rejected. Then the young man wrote the young woman that he did not intend to marry her. Her father then began to take steps to force him to do something, and he went and married her and then went back to his home; and I am told that he says he will never see her again, and is very anxious for her to give him a divorce. Now,

what I want to know is: Did the father of the young man commit sin in the course he took, and did the brother whom he sent to make the money proposition commit sin? What would have been the scriptural course for all parties concerned to have taken?

The community from which our brother writes is, in many respects, one of the best communities I know. It is composed of that class of industrious people, without extremes of wealth, fashion, and idleness, or extreme poverty, want, and degradation, that produce the best results morally and religiously; yet we hear of more complaint along the line here indicated in that community than from any other. The foundation cause of the prevalence of the sin, I believe, is in the free-and-easy handling of the girls by the boys that is tolerated by the fathers and mothers. It may be accepted as a maxim that a girl, a woman, who permits herself to be handled and caressed by a man, places herself at his mercy, commits her virtue to his keeping, and in doing this so excites and inflames his lusts that she tempts him to destroy that virtue. That is the evil of the dance. The contact, the handling, and the caressing invited in the dance inflame the lust and weaken the self-control and sense of virtue, so that ruin follows. For a young man to clutch a girl by the arm and hold it through a night walk of a mile or two, continually repeated, invites familiarity that so excites the lust and weakens the self-control that they would have to be more than human not to be led frequently into lewdness. For this the fathers and mothers who tolerate the lust-exciting freedom' are primarily guilty. Fathers and mothers sin against both their sons and their daughters when they tolerate customs that inflame the lusts and weaken the power of self-control.

When they have been both led into the wrong, the man ought to feel himself in honor bound to bear with the woman the guilt of that wrong; he ought to do it; for, let society view it as it may, he is as guilty as she is, and for him to shirk out of his share of the shame or refuse to shield her from shame is unmanly and dishonorable. But with the prevailing sentiment that the crime is the woman's, it is natural that he should desire to avoid marriage, lest she yield to the fascination of some other man. Women, more than men, are to blame for the different degrees of shame attached to the lewdness of men and women. They are more tolerant of the lewd man, more intolerant of their erring sister, than men are. This ought not to be so.

If the man refuses to take the girl as his wife, it is both folly and sin in her parents to try to force him to do it; it only complicates matters and brings additional trouble and shame upon all parties. Instead of forcing him to marry her, they ought to shield her from him as they would from a foul beast. The idea of forcing a woman on a man as his wife that he does not want is an outrage on the woman. The disposition to do this arises from the false idea that the woman is ruined who is guilty of this sin. This is a sad mistake. She is no more polluted in soul or in the sight of God than the man is, often not so much. She often throws herself away because the world frowns upon her so bitterly; but she ought, by prudence and virtue, to show that she is not lost, and she can command the respect of the world by fidelity. Society, her friends, all Christians, and especially her father, mother, brothers, and sisters, should tenderly encourage her and help her to retrieve her wrong step and live a useful and happy life. That a respectable girl would marry the polluted man any more readily than a respectable man would marry the polluted girl (they are equally polluted) shows how unjust society is. It would be folly for the man's father to insist on his taking the girl as his wife when he could not willingly do it. For him to offer a money consideration for the wrong done is probably the only compensation he can make for the wrong done, and it is something to his credit that he is willing to do this. He ought to do what he can to lighten the wrong done by his son, and he ought to charge it to his son, so as to make him pay the penalty for his wrong. There is nothing wrong that I can see in the man who conveyed his proposition; nor would there be wrong in the girl's father in receiving the money for her and the innocent offspring of the sins of its parents and society. To receive the money after the sin has been committed to help out of the difficulty is very different and should not be thought of as a sale of the woman's virtue or a justification of the man's wrong; it is the willingness of the father to do what he can to atone for the wrong done by his son. It leaves the man and the woman in their guilt. But society is largely responsible for the sins into which it leads the young.

### **MARRIAGE OF CHRISTIANS TO UNBELIEVERS.**

Please tell me whether a Christian would be justifiable in marrying a woman that was not a Christian. If so, where will I find the scripture for it?

The New Testament nowhere gives specific directions to a Christian man as to whom he should marry. The only direction given restricting marriage is that a widow "is free to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord." (1 Cor. 7: 39.) I know of no reason why a widow should be restricted in the matter more than maidens. Perhaps it might be considered better for a man to marry out of Christ than for a woman, since he is supposed not to be so much under her control as she is under his; but under the law of Moses the man was prohibited marrying out of the family of God, save when the woman would identify herself with the people of God. The reason given was, lest they draw them into idolatry. Solomon violated the law, and, despite his wisdom and power, his wives drew him into idolatry. Influence is frequently more potent for good or evil than authority or power. The sons of Elimelech and Naomi, when they went down into the land of Moab, married heathen wives—Ruth and Orpah—and it brought Ruth to the service of God. This marriage was when there were none others to marry. The law of Moses is an earthly type of the law of Christ. The inference would be that the children of God could not marry out of the family of God. "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers: for what fellowship have righteousness and iniquity? or what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what portion hath a believer with an unbeliever? And what agreement hath a temple of God with idols? for we are a temple of the living God; even as God said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come ye out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch no unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be to you a Father, and ye shall be to me sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." (2 Cor. 6: 14-18.)

To be unequally yoked would be to be so connected with the unbeliever that the Christian would be controlled by the unbeliever. I know no relation in which this would be more so than in the marriage relation. The whole drift and tenor of the Scriptures, both the Old and the New Testament, is that in the close and intimate relations of life the children of God should seek the companionship of servants of God, that they might help and encourage each other in the Christian life. When both are working together, man in his weakness



often becomes discouraged; it is greatly worse when the nearest and dearest one pulls us from Christ and duty. Then, too, when people marry, they ought to consider the probability of rearing children. It is the duty of Christian parents to rear their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. How can one do this when the other sets the example of unbelief and disobedience to God? The spirit and teaching of the Bible seem to me against it, and yet there is no direct and specific prohibition of it. God recognizes it as a necessity for some to marry in order to live virtuously. If such cannot marry Christian wives, they will marry those not Christians. Then it is their duty to try to convert them to Christ Jesus.

### **MARRIAGES, WHO HAS RIGHT TO OFFICIATE AT?**

I am a member of the church of Christ, and have been a preacher of the gospel for six years. During that time I have married many couples, and all these marriages have been duly recorded as provided by law, no complaint ever having been made as to my authority to perform such ceremony. Recently, however, I was the officiating minister at a marriage, one of the parties to which was the daughter of a Methodist preacher, who, being informed of the affair, forced the couple to marry again, saying that neither our church nor I have the right to marry people. The matter has created a sensation all over this country. What shall I do in regard to the matter?

I would not do anything. I would let him froth out his folly and shame without my help in any way. There is no law, human or divine, to prevent a man's showing his ignorance and bigotry when he is full of them. I would say nothing"; but if authorized by my church to perform such rites, I would marry others whenever they desire me. That preacher is mistaken; he did not make them marry over again. They cannot be married more than once without getting a divorce. The first ceremony is, in the law, the marriage; the second was a meaningless farce. Persons coming together as husband, and wife constitute marriage, in the sight of God without any ceremony; but God requires us to submit to the civil law, unless it demands of us something that violates the law of God. Performing a ceremony violates no law of God and is a proper requirement on the part of the civil government to protect the innocent people from the reckless and vicious. Then this ceremony must be observed; but the civil law makes a marriage performed by a Mormon elder or an idol worshiper as valid as when performed by the oldest and highest bishop of the Methodist Church. This may be humiliating to

some, but it is law none the less. This is not the first time such charges have been made. J. R. Graves once published it in his paper; but no one paid any attention to it, and its only effect was to lessen him in the esteem of all fair-minded people. The civil government, in permitting preachers, elders, and clerks authorized by churches to perform these ceremonies, agrees to take the services performed by the churches in lieu of their performance by its own officers on condition that the marriage is returned to its clerks and a record be kept of it.

### **MARRIED TO CHRIST.**

If we are not married to Christ when we become Christians, what right have we to wear his name? What right have we to call the church by his name unless she is married to him now? What right has she to bear fruit if not married to him? Please explain the latter part of Rom. 7: 4.

The passage in Rom. 7: 4 shows plainly that when they died to the law, they were married to Christ. They died to the law that they might be married to Christ, and that when married to Christ they might bring forth fruit to him. The church is represented as the wife and Jesus as the husband. (Eph. 5: 22.) Disciples are children of God and must have had a mother. Interpreting these relations as applying to the future is hurtful. It leads to much error, too, when a figure is used to illustrate one point of likeness, to try to make the things correspond in all points. Because the union with Christ is likened to a marriage in one point, to argue that it must be like it at all points is misleading. A marriage with Christ may represent the first union, and yet not represent the other relations. It might not imply that we must wear the name of Christ as a wife wears her husband's name; yet it is taught by other scriptures that we are to be baptized into his name, put on his name, and walk worthy of his name.

The church was married to Christ by each person entering into Christ, and so becoming a member of his body. Jesus frequently used an illustration to point out one particular quality or relation of the church or of our relations to God. To make the illustrations apply in other points is to do violence to the teaching of the Savior and lead into error. Because the acceptance of Christ in one point is likened to a marriage does not imply that the relations to Christ conform in all

points to the marriage relation. The same people that are said to be married to Christ or to constitute his wife are in other places called "the children of God," "the brethren of the Lord." If the relation of children must be conformed to in all points, they could not be called **brethren** nor be said to be married to him. We are sons of God; we are the brethren of the Lord; we are married to him and must bear children to him. These relations are all represented in our relations to Christ, and are present, not future.

### **MARRYING A CHRISTIAN TO AN UNBELIEVER.**

Suppose a bishop, or preacher, has taught to the best of his ability the people where he labors or teaches the will of God concerning whom disciples should marry, showing conclusively that under the old covenant, and also under the new, God wills for his people to be equal, and not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; that four classes of God's children are plainly told what kind of companions they should have—preachers', bishops', and deacons' wives must be "faithful in all things" (1 Tim. 3: 11), widows are to marry "only in the Lord" (1 Cor. 7: 39); and that God is no respecter of persons (Rom. 2: 11; Eph. 6: 9). Then a young lady who has been taught thus engages herself to a disobedient young man, and each of them, with the parents on both sides, earnestly desires and solicits said preacher to officiate in their marriage. The preacher then again takes the liberty to instruct the young lady of her duty and the impending danger of disobeying God, also instructing the young man of his duty and earnestly urging him to comply with the same, at the same time telling the couple it is against his will to perform the marriage ceremony for them; yet, after all this, they each, with tremulous voice and eyes blinded with tears, say: "You are our choice above all other men." What does duty demand of a true gospel preacher under such circumstances? Can a gospel preacher be consistent with truth divine and unite a disciple and an unbeliever in marriage? Or if he should teach them, as in this case, their duty, and fully believe that his refusal might be an offense and might drive one or both farther into disobedience, and, upon this conclusion, marry them, does the preacher do wrong?

It is the duty of preachers and elders to teach the young and the old what is right in choosing companions. When they have faithfully done this, they have done all they can do. People, young and old, when they catch the marrying fever, often seem to lose their regard for God and for common sense. Often the old men and women are more foolish than the younger ones. The teachings of the Bible are advisory rather than mandatory on marriage—that is, while the whole trend of the Bible is against marriages other than among the people of God, there is no specific command of God forbidding it, save to widows; and there is a command that when married to live together, with the hope that the faithful one will win the un-

believer. But the ceremony of marriage is not recognized in the Scriptures. It is a requirement of the civil government and is performed in obedience to its laws. It is not a religious service, save as it is right to obey the civil laws. Not long since a Christian girl, contrary to the earnest wishes of her parents, determined to marry out of Christ. The parents yielded to what they could not prevent, and wished the elder of their church and their lifelong preacher to perform the ceremony. He consulted me about it, and I felt that it would be harsh in him not to perform the ceremony, as the parents desired it. It was to accommodate them, not to encourage marriages out of Christ. I do not think he sinned in so doing. In these matters no explicit law is given, and, with the general principles laid down, each is left to act in each case as his judgment approves.

### **MERCY, GOD HAS, ON WHOM HE WILL.**

What is meant by the following? "I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy." (Rom. 9: 15, 16.)

The first of these verses is a quotation from what God said to Moses. In his dealings with Moses, God defined the classes to whom he would show mercy. When the people trusted and obeyed him, he had mercy on them; when they refused to trust and follow him, he refused to have mercy upon them and punished them. This was so universally understood to be the law of God that Solomon put it in a proverb (a proverb is the expression of a well-known and universal truth): "He that covereth his transgressions shall not prosper; but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall obtain mercy." (Prov. 28: 13.) The whole dealings of God with man under the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations illustrate and enforce this truth. When God, then, says, "I will have mercy on whom I will," he means that he will have mercy on those who confess and turn from their sins and transgressions; and nothing that others may do will turn him from it. In the preceding verses he has been speaking of his choosing Jacob and refusing Esau. He illustrates what he means by this case. Isaac willed that Esau should inherit the blessing, and Esau ran with haste to obtain the venison for his father, that he might inherit the blessing; but neither Isaac's will nor Esau's run-

ning could defeat the purpose of God to bless Jacob. If Esau had possessed the character approved by God, God would have willed to bless him; but as he did not possess the character approved by God, his father's preference or his anxiety for the blessing could not secure it.

He then uses Pharaoh as another example. Pharaoh was wicked. God did not make him wicked, but he determined to make an example for the world, to show his power and determination to punish the wicked and rebellious; so he raised the wicked Pharaoh up before the world to show that all the power of the Egyptian throne could not defeat his purpose. He raised Pharaoh, already wicked and depraved, to show his power. When Pharaoh was disposed to relent and turn back before the place of his punishment was reached, God hardened his heart to lead him on to the place where he would show his divine power to punish sin in the mightiest king of earth. Keep it in mind that God did not make Pharaoh wicked. Had he permitted the Israelites to defeat him, it would not have been clear to the world that God did it; as it was, all must see that God did it, and none could "stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?"

None of these examples affect the truth that God will have mercy upon those who confess and turn from their sins. When he says, "I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion," he affirms the truth that he will have mercy and compassion on the humble and contrite in heart, whether Jew or Gentile; and all the opposition or claims of the Jews will not hinder his purpose to save the believing Gentiles, because it was his will to save these. God's will, not man's, shall prevail. See **God's Foreknowledge.**

### **MESSENGERS, SENDING BY.**

(1) In talking to the society advocates in reference to doing mission work, they claim that their opposers depart themselves from an apostolic example by not selecting a messenger, as the church at Philippi did (Phil. 4: 18), and sending him direct to the preacher in the field. They claim that, as their opposers depart from this one example, they have the same right to go a few steps farther and organize the board. Will you give the reasons why the society advocates have not the same right to depart from an apostolic example, and send missionary money in a different way (through the board), as their opposers have to depart and send it through the mail instead of sending it direct to the preacher in the field?

The difference between the two is: One interferes with an ordained order of God, and the other does not; one is in the realm of divine ordinances, the other is in the class left to human expediency. There is no word of the Scriptures that shows that God ordained that personal or special messengers should be sent to carry help to the workers in the field, nor has he made any order about sending. They were sent as the only means they had of getting help to them, but it is nowhere spoken of or treated as an order of God. They had no banks, no system of exchange, no mails, no regular means of communication, save by sending messengers; so they adopted it just as they traveled on foot, on land, and by ship on water; they had no other way of travel. That was not ordaining that Christians could not travel by stage or steam car, or by boats, when they were available. God never ordained special messengers; the disciples used them without divine order, when there were no other means of sending help. They belong to the class of human expediences left by God to human wisdom. But God did ordain his churches and his disciples to carry forward his work of spreading the gospel. Societies to take the work out of their hands were just as feasible then as they are now. They did not use them because they could not do it without setting aside the God-ordained order. To do that is to exalt man above God, to make him sit in the seat of God, and displace God as the only Ruler and Lawgiver. Paul (2 Thess.) speaks of this tendency working in his day, and he calls it "the man of sin." The church and the individual Christian God has ordained to preach the gospel to the whole world. For man to organize other means to do this is to set aside the authority of God with his own wisdom. God has given no order as to how help shall be sent to the worker in the field. The apostles set the example of using what means were at command, and so left man to adopt just such means as he finds at hand; so we may follow their example in both cases.

(2) What would be your advice if a brother, in the congregation of which you are an elder, should object to the congregation sending missionary money in any way except by selecting a messenger and sending him direct to the missionary in the field?

I would show him God made no order on the subject, but used such means as were available; so had given us the example to follow. If we determine our course by results as

they appear to us, we set aside the law of God altogether; we substitute what appears to us good in place of his law.

**MIRACLES, WHEN DID, CEASE?** See **Baptism in the Holy Spirit.**

### **MORAL AND POSITIVE LAW.**

What is the difference between moral and positive law? I would like to hear from you to be enlightened. Is meeting together upon the first day of the week a positive command? If so, do we not sin willfully when we fail to comply with that command, if not providentially hindered?

There is no such distinction in the Bible as that between moral and positive law. There are differences between laws given in the Bible, and men have drawn distinctions between them as moral and positive law. There are certain laws given in the Bible that men have pronounced as moral and others as positive laws. The moral law is that from which the receiver of the law can see the good. A man may obey the law of God because he sees good in it, not as a test of his obedience to God. Obedience to the moral laws may show that man obeys them to obtain the good they present, regardless of the authority by which they are clothed.

"**Positive laws** are precepts which are not founded upon any reasons known to those to whom they are given. Thus, in the state of innocence, God gave the law of the Sabbath, of abstinence from the fruit of the tree of knowledge, etc. In childhood most of the parental commands are necessarily of this nature, owing to the incapacity of the child to understand the grounds of their inculcation." (McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia.) So positive law is given to test man's willingness to obey God. There is no moral character or influence connected with it separate from the command of the Author. Dr. R. B. C. Howell, a leading Baptist of the generation past, said in his work on "Communion" (page 37): "Those [duties] commanded by positive law are right for no other reason than because they are commanded. They are based solely upon the authority of the Lawgiver, and are designed to test our disposition to bow to his requirements. . . . The positive code is right because it is commanded." Positive commands test our loyalty to God. They are such as do not commend themselves to man's reason, are generally

repulsive to his sensuous or fleshly feelings, and require self-denial and humiliation to submit to them. There can be no motive to lead an holiest man to obey the positive ordinances, save the desire to obey and honor God. The positive ordinances test the willingness and the eagerness of the spirit to obey God, which overcomes the weakness and unwillingness of the flesh. Baptism is an ordinance, a positive ordinance of God—ordained to test and prove the earnestness of man's faith, the whole-heartedness of his repentance or desire to submit to him. There is no ordinance, no act of which man can conceive, more humiliating, more repulsive, to all the fleshly feelings of man than the giving himself up as one dead into the hands of another, to be buried out of himself as a lifeless and unclean thing. When man believes in Jesus and repents toward God with sufficient strength to lead him to submit to this test of his love, God promises to forgive his sins. As an example, in 2 Kings 5 there is an account of Naaman, the leper, going to Elisha to be healed of his leprosy. He came with all the pomp and splendor of the greatest captain of the mightiest Ration of earth. The prophet did not go out to see him, but sent the message: "Go and wash in the Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean." There was nothing in the water or the dipping that could heal. Naaman's reason was outraged at the proposed condition, and so he turned away in a rage. But at the protest of his servants he reconsidered the matter, laid aside his wrath, put away the objections of reason, denied the fleshly feelings, and submitted to the command of God; "and his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child, and he was clean." The water did not do the healing, the dipping did not do it. God healed him, and he did it only when he had submitted to his positive ordinance, or had complied with the condition on which God had suspended healing.

So God has ordained baptism as a positive ordinance with which to test the strength and sincerity of man's faith and repentance; and when he embodies them in this act of submission to God, God, who alone can forgive sin, promises to forgive his sins. Positive ordinances embody and express the faith and test the loyalty of man to God. In this sense, and in this only, is baptism for the remission of sins to the penitent believer. Baptism to him that believes in Christ and repents toward God is for the remission of sins. Jesus Christ



gave the condition, sealed it with his blood, the Holy Spirit through the apostles required all to submit to it, and all today who believe in Christ are required to prove their loyalty to God, their faith in Christ, and repentance toward God by complying with the command. The observance of the Lord's Supper also tests man's obedience to the will of God and his walk with God through life. It partakes more or less of the service of obedience to God from a moral standpoint, as all acts do as we become accustomed to their use. The probability is that all service comes in its beginning as a service to God because God commands it. It is as a little child receiving commands from a parent. The practice of the precepts begets a love for the service, and what one time was a positive law partakes more or less of the nature of a moral law. All laws in their beginnings partake more or less of the nature of positive laws and must be obeyed as matters of faith in God. See Sabbath Day, The (2).

### MORMON PRETENSIONS.

(1) Who sent you to preach and baptize, or did you fashion yourself a minister? (2 Cor. 11: 13-15.)

The question is not what affects me personally, but what the Scriptures teach. Unless Jesus has sent me to preach, I have no right to preach. Jesus said to the apostles: "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you." (John 20: 21.) "He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me." (John 13: 20.) What Jesus did, the Father did through him; what the apostles did, Jesus did through them. Jesus, in the great commission, commanded the apostles: "Go . . . make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them [those baptized] to observe [to **observe** is to do] all things whatsoever I commanded you." (Matt. 28: 19, 20.) Jesus told the apostles to teach all baptized persons to do what he had commanded them. He had commanded them to disciple all the nations, to "preach the gospel to the whole creation." So Christ commands every person taught and baptized by the apostles to teach and baptize others. This is the general and universal law, restricted as to persons and classes, times and places, by directions given by Jesus and to us through the

apostles, through whom he speaks to the world. By this great commission every one taught and baptized by the apostles is under the same obligation to teach and baptize others as the apostles themselves. All disciples, restricted as above by the direction of God, have the same authority and are under the same obligation to preach and teach what Jesus gave that the apostles had. Mormon pretenders, who claim to work miracles and to receive direct power from God, fill the following description: "For such men are false apostles, deceitful workers, fashioning themselves into apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for even Satan fashioneth himself into an angel of light. It is no great thing therefore if his ministers also fashion themselves as ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works." (2 Cor. 11: 13-15.) That scripture has never in the world's history been more completely fulfilled than in the claims and pretensions of Mormons to apostolic and miraculous gifts.

(2) Jesus appeared unto Paul to make him a minister. Who appeared unto you?

The man since the days of the apostles that claims that Jesus appeared to him as he did to Paul is a false apostle, a deceitful worker, fashioning himself into an apostle of Christ. I gave the authority by which I preach under (1).

(3) If Timothy was baptized just the same as Paul, give proof that he was made a minister in a different way from Paul.

The burden rests on you to show that he was sent as Paul, if it be true. But the evidence is so abundant against you that I give it. Paul says: "For I make known to you, brethren, as touching the gospel which was preached by me, that it is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ." (Gal. 1: 11, 12.) Paul, as all apostles, saw Jesus and received from him directly what he was to teach. An apostle was one sent directly by Christ to bear witness of what he heard and saw of him. Ananias said to Saul: "The God of our fathers hath appointed thee to know his will, and to see the Righteous One, and to hear a voice from his mouth. For thou shalt be a witness for him unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard." (Acts 22: 14, 15.) In verse 18 God spoke to him directly again; see also Acts 9: 15. "For

to this end have I appeared unto thee, to appoint thee a minister and a witness both of the things wherein thou hast seen me, and of the things wherein I will appear unto thee." (Acts 26: 16.) See also 2 Cor. 12, wherein God did appear unto him. "Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, by signs and wonders and mighty works." (Verse 12.) No true apostle ever demanded or expected people to believe that he was an apostle unless he gave them the evidence of his apostleship by these signs. Timothy was not so called of God to be an apostle. He had first been taught the Old Testament Scriptures by his mother and grandmother. (2 Tim. 1: 5.) He was Paul's "true child in faith" of the gospel (1 Tim. 1:2), which means that Paul taught him the gospel of Christ, or brought him to believe in Christ. Paul, after he had converted him, returned to his place and found him "well reported of by the brethren that were at Lystra and Iconium. Him would Paul have to go forth with him; and he took and circumcised him," etc. (Acts 16: 1-3.) So he was called by Paul to go with him, and whatever of spiritual gifts he had he received from the laying on of Paul's hands, and not direct from God. "For which cause I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee through the laying on of my hands." (2 Tim. 1: 6.) Paul received his teaching direct from God, and not of man; Timothy received what he knew from Paul and by reading and study of the Scriptures. "Hold the pattern of sound words which thou hast heard from me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus." (2 Tim. 1: 13.) "And the things which thou hast heard from me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." (2 Tim. 2: 2.) Again: "Abide thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; and that from a babe thou hast known the sacred writings which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." (2 Tim. 3: 14, 15.) He admonished Timothy to give attention to reading and study, and recognized that he in all things was dependent upon what he heard and learned of others. Paul says that he was not, nor was any apostle of Jesus Christ. It is true that Timothy had a spiritual gift that was bestowed on him by the hands of the apostles. These gifts were given to remain with and guide the church until the perfect will of

God should be made known; then these gifts, partial in their nature, were to give way to the more excellent and perfect way given in 1 Cor. 13. "Love [the better way] never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall be done away; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge [he is speaking of miraculous knowledge], it shall be done away. . . . When that which is perfect [the perfect will of God] is come, that which is in part shall be done away." He is speaking of the completion of the perfect will of God and the temporary spiritual gifts, which were partial and to pass away, as the context clearly shows. (See also Eph. 4: 12, 13.) It will be seen, too, that he tells Timothy that the truth is to be perpetuated by his committing it to faithful men able to teach others. This shows that the miraculous gifts were not to be perpetuated, but the word of God was to be taught from one to another. Timothy did not receive the same kind of a call that Paul did, nor was he inspired to the degree that Paul was. Paul declares that he was not a whit behind the chiefest apostle; and the test he gave by which all men's claims to be spiritual were to be true was that they acknowledged the things that he wrote (embracing the passing away of the miraculous gifts) were the commandments of God. (1 Cor. 14: 37.) Paul's call and Timothy's call were no more alike than the creation of Adam and that of his descendants. His was miraculous; others', by law.

(4) If Paul desired to "cut off occasion from them which desire occasion" by preaching "for naught," do you do as Paul?

I have never preached for money, and any man that does it is unworthy of Christ. Paul did receive help, but remained in poverty, so poor that he could not support one wife. The Mormon apostles have grown immensely rich and powerful in worldly affairs and can support many wives to gratify their pampered lusts. They are greatly unlike Paul in this.

(5) If those who hear the apostles hear Jesus, do you hear James (5: 14, 15) and John (Rev. 1: 3), just as well as Philip with the eunuch, going "down into the water" and "up out of the water?" As you are of those who call for "precept and example," do you anoint the sick when you pray for them?

I hear these and do them as commanded. I do not, as the Mormons, make a pretense of curing people, when they can-

not present a single case of real cure by laying on hands or anointing with oil in their whole existence. If to cure people by this process is a sign of approval by God, the Mormons are of all people most miserable. They have pretended that they had power to do this, and in all their history cannot present a single case of actual cure.

When you anoint the sick, do they get well? I saw a Mormon elder not long ago complaining greatly of suffering, and I suggested that he have hands laid on him and be anointed, and he was greatly offended. I pressed another, a few weeks ago, to give one single example, well authenticated, of any of them having worked a miracle of healing in all their history, and proposed that I would go five hundred miles to see one such. After much evasion he said that a blind woman was restored to sight last year in Warren County, Tenn. I pressed him for the name or neighborhood, but never could get either. I showed him that Christ and his apostles healed multitudes. "And Jesus went about in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness among the people. And the report of him went forth into all Syria: and they brought unto him all that were sick, holden with divers diseases and torments, possessed with demons, and epileptic, and palsied; and he healed them." (Matt. 4: 23, 24.) "And Jesus went about all the cities and the villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness." (Matt. 9: 35.) "And at even, when the sun did set, they brought unto him all that were sick, and them that were possessed with demons. And all the city was gathered together at the door. And he healed many that were sick with divers diseases, and cast out many demons; and he suffered not the demons to speak, because they knew him." (Mark 1: 32-34.) Here, as elsewhere, his miracles were numerous and in the presence of the whole city. Nothing did he speak or do in secret that he did not do openly. The apostles Peter and John healed the impotent man at the Beautiful gate of the temple, and "all the people saw him walking and praising God." (Acts 3: 9.)

Again: "And by the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people; . . . insomuch that they even carried out the sick into the streets, and laid

them on beds and couches, that, as Peter came by, at the least his shadow might overshadow some one of them. And there also came together the multitude from the cities round about Jerusalem, bringing sick folk, and them that were vexed with unclean spirits: and they were healed every one." (Acts 5: 12-16.) Here the numbers seem to have been so great that the apostle could not go to each one of them personally; so they were laid along his pathway that they might be thus treated. A similar condition existed at Ephesus with Paul. "And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul: insomuch that unto the sick were carried away from his body handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out." (Acts 19: 11, 12.) These things were done openly before all the people in such numbers that none could be deceived. These are only given as specimens. I feel sure that we may safely say that no one suffering with disease ever applied to Jesus or an apostle for healing and failed to receive it. Had their claims to work miracles or to have the miraculous power of the Spirit been supported by no better or clearer testimony than the claims of the Latter-Day Saints, no sane man ever would have believed them. A more baseless and stupendous lie has never been perpetrated on the credulity of the ignorant than the claims of Mormonism to miraculous power. No miracle, no prophetic power, no ability to heal has ever been manifested among them, nor can be.

(6) Will you be kind enough to give a precept to pray for the sick without anointing with oil?

The question asked here meets no point of difference between Mormons and Christians. Many Christians believe that it is right to call for the elders, and that they should anoint with oil and pray for them, with no expectation that a miracle will be wrought to heal or that all will be healed. I am sure that if every one on whom the elders laid hands and anointed with oil had recovered, those Christians of early days would yet be alive; and if the Mormons could cure by laying on of hands and anointing with oil, none of them would die. The fact that Mormons die as much as other people proves the falsity of their claims to heal by laying on of hands and anointing with oil. All candid people recognize a difficulty in understanding this passage. Many claim that it refers exclusively to the miraculous age of the church; others,

that since the use of oil as a curative agent was common, it was an admonition to connect with the remedies used the prayers of the elders, and all who could be cured would be by this course. The Mormons claim that it was miraculous, and that they can cure by miracle now. This we insist is a blasphemous claim of divine power without a shadow of ground on which to base the claim. All the sick and diseased in all the country of Judea, Samaria, and Phenicia were brought to Jesus, and they were healed before all the people, before all the city. All that were brought to him were healed; no one was left in doubt. If Mormons have such power now, it was given to them, as it was to Christ and the apostles, that they might convince the world that they speak by the authority of God; and if they refuse to show this power, they betray the trust that God committed to them. All talk of unbelief as a reason for not exercising the power until they have given infallible proof of possessing it is false pretense. Neither Christ nor his apostles ever refused to exert their power, save after it had been shown, and then people refused to believe. But to the question. I cannot find where men were commanded to pray for the sick without anointing with oil, because this verse is the only command in the Scriptures to pray for the sick; but I can find quite a number of examples in which persons did pray for healing for themselves and others, and they were healed without the anointing. These as fully show God's approval as a command could. In the Old Testament Scriptures is the case of Hezekiah. (2 Kings 20: 1; Isa. 38: 1.) He was sick unto death, and he prayed the Lord, and he heard him and extended his life fifteen years. Then Isaiah applied a plaster of figs instead of anointing with oil. In the days of Jesus many besought him to heal them. He did it without the anointing with oil. (See Mark I: 40; 5: 35; Matt. 8:5; Luke 7: 3; 9:38; John 4: 47; 11: 1.) These, with many others, show that men did pray for healing and receive it without anointing with oil.

(7) As the gospel was preached by the apostles—those who did not "fashion" themselves ministers—to "every creature" in Paul's day (Col. 1: 23), "once for all delivered unto the saints" (Jude 3), how are we to know that you are not of those who have "crept in privily?"

The true Christian can easily determine that he has not "crept in privily" by his willingness to follow the law of God, without addition, change, or subtraction. "If ye keep my

commandments, ye shall abide in my love." (John 15: 10.) God says that all effort to add to, take from, or change his will is presumptuous sin before him. So the true child of God takes it as it was given by Jesus Christ and his holy apostles, without the Mormon additions. He knows that the Mormons are false apostles, because they do not accept the gospel as having been "once for all delivered unto the saints," and which had, in its fullness and completeness, been preached by Paul himself, and Christians had become complete in Christ as preached. (Col. 2: 10; 4: 12.) These claims of the completeness and perfection in "faith once for all" cut off all later revelations and brand all who claim them as false prophets. All true believers know that Mormons are not true apostles of Christ or servants of God, because they turn the grace of God into lasciviousness. Mormons fill the bill exactly of those of whom Paul warns: "For of these are they that creep into houses, and take captive silly women laden with sins, led away by divers lusts, ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." (2 Tim. 3: 6, 7.) That is Paul's picture of Mormonism. Christians know that Mormons are not true teachers of God, because they do not follow Christ. He came into this world and found polygamy existing, tolerated by God under the law of Moses on account of the hardness of their hearts, the ungovernableness of their lusts. Christ corrected this perverted order: "And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and the two shall become one flesh? So<sup>1</sup> that they are no more two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." (Matt. 19: 4-6.) Mormons found Christians trying to enforce this law of God and pretended to receive a command from God annulling God's law and substituting for it a command to take many wives unto themselves. They set aside that gospel "once for all delivered unto the saints" and preached another gospel which is no gospel, and God says let such be accursed. They show their utter antagonism to Christ and his apostles in another thing. When these were in the world, they found the laws of human government frequently contrary to the law of God. In all such cases they said, "It is better to obey God than man;" and when punished unto death often for disobey-



ing the human law in such cases, they counted it all joy to suffer for the name of Christ. Mormons claim to have received a revelation from God commanding them to practice polygamy. Mr. Roberts, before the congressional committee, testified that the revelation was mandatory, not permissive; yet when the government of the United States passed a law punishing polygamy, the Mormons, through their highest authorities, annulled it and ordered their members to disobey what they claimed to be the law of God. No true prophet or servant of God ever obeyed human law in preference to God's law. Either Mormons do not believe God commanded them to establish polygamy, or else, as a whole body, they have set at defiance the law God gave to them. This of itself brands them with treason against God.

(8) If the word of the Lord is now all written just as the Lord wanted it, and so plain that "a fool shall not err," how are we to know that he has left any place for your words, oral or written? (Ezek. 13.)

The words, oral or written, of no human being are to be accepted, save as he speaks according to the words of God. Nothing can be added to, nothing taken from. Hence we know that all added by Mormonism is false and to be condemned. Any one who adds a thing not commanded by God is guilty of presumptuous sin. No Christian is guilty of this. The whole Mormon establishment is added to the commandments of God.

(9) As the apostles baptized Jew and Gentile into one body, family, or fold nineteen hundred years ago, and as there is no wall in this field, world, or age, how do you know that the kingdoms of this age are not Christ's? (Rev. 11: 15.)

I know the nations are not the kingdoms of God, because they do not obey his laws; I know that the "nation" of Mormonism is not a kingdom of God, because they do not submit to his law, but set it aside with their own inventions, violate the spirit of his kingdom, which is one of gentleness, not force, warfare, and bloodshed, as they have shown their kingdom to be.

(10) if you are a valid teacher, can you "declare the whole counsel of God?" If so, is John's Revelation a part of the "counsel," and can you "declare" it?

I can, as I study and learn it. The "secret things belong unto Jehovah our God; but the things that are revealed be-

long unto us and to our children forever." (Deut. 29: 29.) There are many truths clearly and plainly revealed in the book of Revelation. These we may understand and teach. There are many things in the book of Revelation, and to a lesser extent in all the books of the Bible, that are not revealed. These should be left to God. The things that are revealed I teach. What the different figures—the beasts and the vials, etc.—mean is not revealed. No man can reveal them. Guessing at them is not revealing them; it is doing as the Mormons do—imposing their guesses on the ignorant as the revelations of God. I try to avoid this. While we do not understand what the different figures refer to, we can easily learn the practical lessons they teach and teach them to others.

(11) If it is wrong for a Mormon to have two or three women, and to feed, clothe, and educate his children, how about those ministers of yours and the Methodists who lead women into adultery and then leave them to practice infanticide or to live a life of deception or shame?"

To ask that question is to be guilty of slander. That there are Methodists and Christians that have been and are guilty of adultery and deception, no one doubts, but that they are in any sense justified or sustained in these sins by their churches is a slander. In all ages of the world men have been led into sin by their lusts. Sometimes good men are so led. Unless they repent of the sin, they will be lost. If they repent of it, confess it, and ask forgiveness, while suffering the penalty to a certain extent, they may be forgiven and saved at last. David is an example of this. He was a good man, but was led by his lust into sin. Trying to conceal his adultery, he committed murder. He repented, confessed his sin; and although the results of that sin clung to him and his family, he was forgiven and accepted of God. He was forgiven because he confessed it was a sin and that he sinned in the matter. But suppose David, when he was reproved by the prophet, had justified the sin, insisted that he would take care of the woman and child, and that God approved the sin. Do you think that he would have found any forgiveness in so doing? To cloak his sin with the name of God would have been an infinitely more heinous sin than the one he committed. For this there could have been no forgiveness. "The prophet, that shall speak a word presumptuously in my name, which I

have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, that same prophet shall die." (Deut. 18: 20.) To insist that God teaches a thing he does not teach is as great a sin as to speak in the name of or worship an idol. Death without mercy was the penalty under the law of Moses. If any Christian is guilty of lewdness or adultery, he commits a sin. If he claims that God approves his sin and cloaks his sin with the name of God, he so intensifies that sin that there is no forgiveness for it. To claim that God justifies or approves the sin is to refuse to repent of it and encourage others to commit the same sin—thus to make it a deliberate, presumptuous sin, for which there is no forgiveness in this world or in that to come. To cohabit with another woman when you have a wife is adultery. For a Mormon to do this is as vile as for any one else. The Mormon sins, and, instead of acknowledging his sin, justifies it, says that God approves it, encourages others to commit the same sin. He sets aside the teaching of Jesus, which plainly says, "The two shall be one flesh;" and cohabitation with another breaks, sunders, what God has joined. He then cloaks that sin with the name of religion and claims that God approves it. This is a much more heinous sin than the sin of adultery committed and owned as a sin. Jesus Christ came into the world and found the rulers of this earth practicing and upholding polygamy. He condemned them and it. The Mormons came and found the rulers of the earth practicing and insisting on one man having one wife, and they say that God commands them to take more than one. Either Jesus or the Mormons is wrong. One is an impostor. Which is it?

I have answered these questions according to the Scriptures. Every passage referred to by Mormons condemns them and their teaching plainly. Especially it was self-destruction for them to quote the passage that commands: "Contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." That means that it was delivered and finished, when the foundation of Mormonism is that it was not once and for all delivered, but that parts of it have been delivered in these latter days through Joseph Smith and others, who falsely claim to be prophets of God. By virtue of these later revelations they call themselves "Latter-Day Saints."

But the interpretation given to one passage or another really has but little to do with the truth or falsity of Mormonism.

The foundation stone of their fabric is that they have received revelations from God. If this is true, their interpretations of Scripture and teachings must be infallibly true. If it is not true, if their claims to receive revelations from God are not true, they, in pretending to do it and in presenting their own teachings as from God, are guilty of the highest crime possible for men to commit against God.

In the following passage we have the sinfulness of setting forth man's inventions as the commands of God: "Jehovah thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken. . . . But the prophet, that shall speak a word presumptuously in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, that same prophet shall die. And if thou say in thy heart, How shall we know the word which Jehovah hath not spoken? when a prophet speaketh in the name of Jehovah, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which Jehovah hath not spoken: the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously, thou shalt not be afraid of him." (Deut. 18: 15-22.) Tested by that rule, all the Mormon prophets would die. He always enabled his prophets to give ample evidence to both friend and foe of his presence with them. "But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema." (Gal. 1: 8.) That "gospel," in its fullness, had already been preached to them, and could not be added to. If Mormonism is true, the Bible is false; if the Bible is true, Mormonism is false.

### **MOTE HUNTERS AND HOBBY RIDERS.**

In my experience as a preacher I have found two classes who give much trouble and cause much confusion and contention among brethren. One is continually seeking and pointing out seeming contradictions in the Bible, while the other magnifies some truth unduly and thus overshadows other important truths. How should we treat such?

When men start to hunt difficulties and pick flaws in matters connected with the Bible, the best way is to let them alone. If you remove one, there are a thousand others for them to object to. God intends that every one who wishes to find motes and flaws and difficulties shall find them. When men wish to obey God, they will find ample ground for their faith in him and in the Bible, despite all the motes and diffi-

culties and inability to understand a thousand quibbles that may be raised. There are a number of things that I cannot see how they can be harmonized. What of that? Am I to reject the overwhelming evidence of the truth of the Bible because some mistake has crept into the records or because I am unable to understand some statements? There are a thousand things in nature that I do not understand. Some seem to me to interfere with and contradict others. But I do not reject the good and conclude that God is not the author of the natural world because one week the sun shines and brings out the buds and the flowers, the next week the north wind blows and frost and snow come and kill them. God gives evidence enough in his word to prove to every man willing to serve him that the Bible is his word. God does not wish those to serve him who do not wish to do it. So when a man desires to find excuses for not obeying him, God gives him many such. God sends a delusion on those who do not receive the truth in the love of it, that they, may believe a lie and be damned. (2 Thess, 2: 11.) Much more depends upon a man's having a good heart as to whether he believes and obeys God than on the amount of testimony he receives.

I am an old man now. I have been editing the Gospel Advocate since January 1, 1866. I have observed the workings of things carefully in some lines. A man who is hunting motes, spending his time over hobbies, criticising this ordinance of the Bible and that, never does anything in perfecting his own character or in saving his neighbors. When I get queries on this dark and difficult prophecy or another, running this hobby or another, I know without inquiry that that person is doing nothing to build up the church of God, to convert sinners or perfect saints. A man cannot serve two masters. He cannot ride two horses going in opposite directions. He cannot run side issues without losing interest in the main end of the religion of Christ—converting men to Christ and preparing them to live with God in heaven.

Any duty or secondary truth may be made a hurtful hobby. This is done when it is given undue prominence. When it is dwelled on to the exclusion of other truths equally important, evil comes out of it. Some commands of God are more important than others, because they define higher and more sacred relations. Jesus taught this when he said "the first and great commandment" is to love God; the second, to love our fellow-

man. That means that the first and highest duty is to obey God, do his will. Love keeps his commandments. The highest and most sacred motive that can move a man is the desire to do the will of God. When a person makes understanding what good he gets in baptism a higher duty than doing it to obey God, he makes a hobby of this minor truth, disarranges the order of God, and perverts the gospel. Faith is the great leading and underlying truth of the gospel, without which no service acceptable to God can be rendered; yet when faith alone, separate from its fruits of obedience, is exalted as the only condition of salvation, it is made a hurtful hobby and perverts the gospel. So any truth may be unduly exalted at the expense of other truths and become a hurtful hobby.

There is probably more danger in an error taken as a hobby than a truth. To hold error and magnify it, to the exclusion of truths of the Bible, is most hurtful. A person may hold a great error in a way that is not very hurtful to him or others. He holds that it is an opinion, and regards opinions as private property, not to be taught or imposed on others. But, usually, the more baseless an error, the more earnest its advocates are in proclaiming it and pushing it on others.

God plainly tells his children that they are to teach his word everywhere, in all the world, to every creature, at all times. He has set the example of doing it by mouth, by writing, by circulating the writings among Christians and those not Christians. Parents are especially charged to bring their children up in the instruction of the Lord. When we seek to provide schools in which, while the children are being educated for the duties of life, they will be taught the Bible, men passing as sane—and Christians, too—say it is wrong to have schools in which the Bible is taught. Others will say that it is right to require children to learn to spell and study books of man; it is wrong to require them to learn the word of God. Some say that it is right to teach them human learning in classes suited to their capacity, but that it is wrong to teach God's will to them. Some say that it is right to teach them in classes on Monday and Tuesday, but wrong to do it on Sunday. Some say that it is right to teach them orally on Sunday, but wrong to teach them through writings.

There is no end to such hobbies, nor do they ever get too absurd for some to advocate. The more absurd they are, the closer some stick to them. The more deformed the child, the

more the parent loves it. To yield to such persons is to sin against them, against God; and to sin against God is to sin against self and the whole world. To argue with the hobby rider infuriates him, as the raising of Lazarus did the priests and elders. The only way to treat them without treason to God and right is to bear patiently with them, but press forward in the work with redoubled vigor and put them to shame by good works, the good you do in converting the world, and leave them lonely with their hobby.

### **MOURNERS COMFORTED.**

Please explain Mark 10: 47; Matt. 5: 4. The Baptists, Methodists, and others say that these scriptures sustain their mourners'-bench system.

One who is familiar with the Bible ought to be able to show how mourners were comforted in the days of the Holy Spirit. On Pentecost three thousand heart-pierced mourners sought comfort, and found it by believing in Jesus as the Savior, repenting of their sins, and being baptized in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of sins. Saul was a distressed, believing, fasting, penitent mourner for three days, and the Spirit commanded: "Why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name." (Acts 22: 16.) The Philippian jailer was mourning, ready to kill himself. Paul and Silas stopped him. In his distress he asked: "What must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house. And they spake the word of the Lord unto him, with all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, immediately. And he brought them up into his house, and set food before them, and rejoiced greatly, with all his house, having believed in God." (Acts 16: 30-34.) That is God's way of comforting those that mourn, and there was no mourner's bench about it; the mourner's bench is man's way of comforting those that mourn. God's comfort is better than man's. The objection to the mourner's bench is that it gives comfort to men without their obedience to God. That is a false and deceptive comfort. The only sure comfort is that which comes through doing what God has required.

**MYSTERY OF INIQUITY.** See **Man of Sin, The.**

**NATURAL MAN, THE.**

In 1 Cor. 2: 14 we read: "Now the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged." In the Bible lesson on a recent Sunday it developed that, as to who the natural man is and who the spiritual man is, three theories are held—viz.: (1) The natural man is the unconverted man; the spiritual man is the Christian. (2) Man is a dual being; the natural man and the spiritual man are the same individual. (3) The natural man is the uninspired Christian; the spiritual man is the inspired man. I write these theories that you may understand fully our trouble.

The context seems to me plainly to teach that man by his natural faculties, without revelation, could not learn the will of God. One man cannot know what is in the mind of another man unless the latter tells it. So a man cannot by his natural faculties or reason know the mind or will of God unless God tells it. Then he shows how God tells or makes known his will or mind to men. The Spirit of God that knows the things of God was transferred to the apostles and made known to them God's will, and the apostles spoke it to the people. The natural man, then, would be the man who has never heard the will of God; he cannot know it, save by hearing it as spoken by the apostles, to whom God revealed it. It means about the same as 1 Cor. 1:21: "For seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God, it was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe." Man by his natural faculties or reason cannot know God or his will; he must learn it by hearing the things revealed to the apostles, or by preaching. The spiritual man was the man knowing the will of God. The natural man was without this knowledge; he could not know it, save by revelation. When revealed, it is addressed to the spiritual, not the merely animal, man. As in Rom. 7 and 8, it is presented that the animal, or fleshly, man of itself cannot be subject to the law of God, but the spiritual part in man must control.

**NATURE, DO BY, THE THINGS OF THE LAW.**

Please explain Rom. 2: 12: "For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law." Does **law** here mean the law of Moses or the law of Jesus Christ? If the **law** here means the gospel, does it mean that those who do not have the privilege of hearing the gospel will be lost?

There can be no doubt, I think, that the law of Moses is



meant. The reference to the Gentiles who have not the law shows that it was the law of Moses. The Gentiles who have sinned without law perished outside the law. Those who sinned under the law will be judged and condemned by the law. All who sin, whether within the law or without the law, perish. If any who are not under the law (the Gentiles) come to know the things that are in the law, and of their own choice do the things of the law, they become a law unto themselves, or adopt the law for themselves, and, doing the things contained in the law, of their own will show that the works required by the law are written in their hearts. They obey the law not because they are under the law, but because in their hearts they love the things contained in the law; so they will be saved by that law. All persons out of Christ are in a lost condition, and can be saved only by the redemption that is found in Christ. Those out of Christ were "alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of the promise, having no hope and without God in the world. But now in Christ Jesus ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ." (Eph. 2: 12, 13.) All were in a state of sin and condemnation, and Christ Jesus came to save the lost.

### **NEGROES, ARE THE, NEGLECTED?**

Do you think the social discrimination made against the negro race in the South is justifiable by the Scriptures? Do you think the churches are doing their duty by these people as much as they are the Japanese and others?

I do not know what is meant by social relations in the query. A few persons or a small portion of a community cannot control the social rules or relations of the community. A small number of people might choose to associate on terms of equality with the negroes, but they would of necessity cut themselves off from the whites. They cannot associate with both. When they cannot associate with both, with which shall they associate?

Race distinctions and antipathies are strong. They were recognized and to a goodly extent encouraged by God through the early ages of the world, until they were fixed and seemingly ineradicable. They exist among the different tribes and nations of the earth, even those of similar habits, color, and physical make, and intellectual and spiritual culture. The an-

tipathy becomes greater as the physical and intellectual differences increase. The antipathy was strong, in the days of the Savior's sojourn on earth, between the Jew and Gentile. Peter had that prejudice even toward other children of Shem and of Abraham, then the descendants of Jacob. When he went to the house of Cornelius, this feeling showed itself in his speech telling them how it is an unlawful thing for a Jew to eat with a Gentile. The strength of this feeling again manifested itself at Antioch when he refused to eat with his Gentile brethren; and Barnabas, who had been reared among Gentiles, was carried away by the same feeling. Paul reproved them for this. The natural antipathy is greater between the white and the negro races. I do not believe that it is possible to overcome it to such extent as to lead to social relations as among those of the same race. I think that an effort to bring this about would result in arousing more bitterness and produce a wider separation.

While this is true, I do not doubt that it is the duty of Christians to teach and instruct the negroes and in every way encourage them to lives of godliness and righteousness and purity. They need this instruction and help from the whites. The whites need the discipline and training they would obtain in this work to perfect their characters into the likeness of Christ. He went to the lowly and the outcast to' instruct them and to lift them up. We must do it, if we would be like him. While Jesus helped the Gentiles who appealed to him, there is no evidence that he so associated with them in such a way as to arouse Jewish prejudices.

I do not know that the negroes are more neglected than the Japanese or Chinese. The brethren through this country have contributed to the support of negroes to preach to the negroes. They have helped them to build houses, and some of the whites preach to them. When I was younger, I did it, as I know others did, as opportunity offered. Our earnestness for saving souls, white, yellow, and black, needs to be quickened and intensified, so that in our everyday life it will be a habit and constant aim to teach and save those with whom we come in contact.

The Bible never proposes to disrupt and change social and political relations suddenly. It plants truths in the heart, changes character and life, and, as these are modified, fits for changed social conditions; and these come gradually and al-

most imperceptibly. To force them is to destroy them. Let the negroes and the whites cultivate kindly and Christian relations toward each other, help each other as they can, and the social conditions will adjust themselves.

**NEW BIRTH, THE.** See **Born Again; Water, Born Of.**

**OATHS.** See **Judicial Oaths.**

**OBEDIENCE TO PARENTS.** See **Honor Parents.**

**OBEYING GOD, THE GREAT PURPOSE IN.**

A is immersed because of remission; B is sprinkled for remission. One has the right act for a false design; the other has an unscriptural act for the true design. Which is the more acceptable to God? They may both have a desire to obey God; and if one is acceptable, it seems that the other would be. If not, why not?

The only assumption on which that question can be based is that I maintain that the desire to obey God renders the service acceptable to him, even if we fail to do the thing commanded. To insinuate or represent me as in any manner holding this position is to misrepresent me. I have held and frequently maintained that when a man sincerely desires to know the will of God, promptly obeying it as he learns it, God will so lead him into the knowledge of the truth as to save him. Christ did not die to save men, and then leave one desirous to know and obey his will in such ignorance of that will as to be lost. "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from myself." (John 7: 17.)

If a man seeks to know all the reasons and wherefores of the obedience, or what blessings this service or that will bring, before he obeys God, I am not sure that he will receive the guidance into the truth that saves. God loves the soul that trusts and follows him without doubt or without questioning. "If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments." (John 14: 15.) "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him." (Verse 21.) "If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." (Verse 23.) He will keep God's words because he loves God; and God will

accept the obedience that comes from love, and will come unto him and abide with him. If God abides with and in him, he will come to know more fully the truth.

It is a mistaken conception of God and his character to think that he blesses only those who wait to know the good they will get out of the obedience before they render it. The great purpose is to obey God because he loves us and because we love him. We desire to enter into the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, that we may become members of his family, children of God, because we love him. An earthly father could not esteem so highly the service a son rendered that would not do his will until he knew what good he would receive for each act of service that he rendered, as he would that which was rendered through love of the father, whether the son received any reward or not. Yet the father might tell the wayward, the rebellious, or the discouraged son of the blessings he would bestow on him or the help he would give him to encourage him to make the effort to return to the bosom of the family and the joys of a son. This would be to increase and strengthen the love, that it might lead him to enter the family. But to make this good that he is to receive the chief or highest motive in returning is to dishonor the relation and lightly esteem the father. Jesus and the Holy Spirit represent the spiritual relations we bear to our Father in heaven by those we bear to our earthly parents. **For remission of sins**, or the good we are to get, is not the highest and holiest motive that leads us to enter Christ.

**OBSERVANCE OF DAYS.** See **Day, He that Regardeth The.**

**OFFENDERS, RULE FOR DEALING WITH.** See **Difficulties, Rules for Settling.**

### **ORDAINED TO ETERNAL LIFE.**

Please explain the following: "And as many as were ordained to eternal life believed." (Acts 13: 48.) Please explain, also, Rom. 8: 29, 30; Eph. 1: 4, 5; 1 Pet. 1: 2. These scriptures seem to teach that God has foreordained some to eternal life, and that only these believe and are saved.

There is no doubt but there is a certain foreordination taught in the Bible. In the scriptures referred to it is taught,

as well as in some others. "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and they shall become one flock, one shepherd." (John 10: 16.) Here he recognizes that he has a flock that were not then following him as the Shepherd. At Corinth God told Paul, while they were persecuting him, that he had much people in that city. (Acts 18: 10.) They had not yet believed, but God calls them his **people**. The meaning of both these is that there were a number of persons of that frame of mind and disposition of heart that when they heard the gospel they would believe and obey it. There were those of this class among the Gentiles, that Jesus speaks of, whom he calls his **sheep**, but **not of this fold**, and among the Corinthians were those who would receive the gospel when they heard and understood it. He speaks of them prospectively as his people. In Acts 13: 48 it means those who belonged to the class that would receive the gospel believed when it was preached. Rom. 8: 29, 30 clearly refers to those who had been called under the former dispensations. Those who had believed under these dispensations he had called and glorified by raising them from the dead when Christ arose, "that he might be the firstborn" from the grave "among many brethren." (See Matt. 27: 51-53.) Eph. 1: 4, 5 is a statement that certain classes described there were chosen to eternal life. This in no way intimates that God by any direct power made them holy and without blemish; but he has chosen that class as his beloved, and left it to man to make himself one of the class. In 1 Pet. 1: 2 it is said that they were elected according to the knowledge of God he had hitherto made known. They were elected by complying with his will. The word **foreknowledge** in the Bible means the knowledge of his will heretofore made known. It will be noted that Peter says that they were first elected to obedience. A man who does not first show his election by obeying God may be sure that he will never be elected to anything beyond obedience. So obedience is the prerequisite to all other and higher election. There is not a word in this to discourage a man from seeking to make his calling and election sure, nor to give him assurance of salvation, save through obedience to the word of God.

**ORDER OF WORSHIP.**

Is it wrong to take the Lord's Supper immediately after singing and prayer, then have our Bible lessons before singing the last song of the service? There is some contention over this matter among the brethren in our congregation. Some think that, on account of mothers who have restless babies, it is best to take the Supper immediately after singing and prayer; others think it wrong to have the Bible lessons between the Supper and singing the last song.

I do not think that Christ and the apostles have given any specific order to be followed in the worship. I read nothing that sounds like an order to be followed. "They continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers." (Acts 2: 42.) That does not sound like a specific order, but is a general statement of what was done at the meeting. When God gave a specific order to be followed, he did it so as to leave no doubt in the minds of any as to the order. Take Lev. 1: 14-17 or Lev. 4: 4-12. These are examples of how God gave directions when specific orders were to be followed. Look, also, at the order of healing leprosy. (Lev. 13.) These show how specific God was in giving an order when he intended them to follow a specific order. In Acts 2: 42 the terms are general. Each service embraces different acts. What is meant by apostolic teaching, singing, reading, praying, exhorting? Are all required in the Lord's-day service? Then what is embraced in fellowship? Is it confined alone to contributing to the treasury?

If one in need of counsel, advice, comfort, or encouragement is present, is no fellowship to be bestowed in these things? Is praying with and for one another fellowship? Fellowship is encouraging, helping, strengthening one another in every way that is possible. Then is there to be only one prayer offered? It says prayers. If a dozen different prayers were offered, would it not be in harmony with the teaching of the Bible? Must all the prayers come at once or together? Such effort at a formal order will drive all the spirit out of the services of God. Not a word is said about singing in Acts 2: 42. In Matt 26: 30 it is said: "When they had sung a hymn, they went out." (Matt. 26: 30.) Many think they must go out immediately after singing, but John tells that Jesus delivered the discourse beginning in chapter 13: 31, embracing chapters 14-16, and taking in the prayer in chapter 17. Then chapter 18: 1 says: "When Jesus had spoken these words, he went forth with his disciples over the brook Kid-

ron." So this teaching was after the singing before they went out. Matthew tells of the singing, but does not give this teaching and prayer; John gives the teaching and prayer, says nothing of the singing, neither has he told all that was done; and in Acts 2: 42 the things to be observed are mentioned only in general terms, some not at all. Certainly no specific order is given in this way.

The effort to make an order where God has not made one is as sinful as to neglect what he has ordered. I do not know a single commentator of any church that has held that Acts 2: 42 was intended to reveal a specific order. This ought to have weight. If among those of all churches who have studied the Bible sufficiently to write a commentary of sufficient merit to be published not one has seen this contained a specific order, it is pretty good evidence that no specific order is there revealed. To establish an order where God has established none is to assume to legislate for the church of God, and is sinful. The effort will be sure to bring greater divisions over untaught questions. The way to settle these questions is to let the elders, who ought to be discreet and wise men, inquire into the conditions of all who attend, and adopt the method that is best for the whole church, and all conform cheerfully to the order. It would be well to vary this order at times, too, to prevent its acquiring the sanctity of a divine law, as the tradition of the elders had done in the days of Jesus. This would be sin. But I do not think it good to make provisions for any leaving before the services are through. Babies have always been restless, but their mothers remained till service was over when we were babies.

### ORDINANCES.

Please give name and number of church ordinances.

The word **ordinance** of the church is indefinite. **Ordinance** is defined by the dictionary: "A rule established by authority; an established rite or ceremony." According to this definition, anything commanded by God to be observed in the church would be a church ordinance. Meeting together, reading the Scriptures, exhorting one another, singing, contributing as the Lord prospers, prayer, and the observance of the Lord's Supper are all ordinances of God to be observed by the church. A rite or ceremony would indicate a form of service to be

gone through. This has a good sense and a bad one. The good sense is that in obeying certain commands of God he bestows blessings upon those who obey him; the evil sense is that going through certain forms secures the blessing without reference to the spirit in which it is done. Every command of God is an ordinance in the good sense; in the other sense there are no ordinances of God. The popular idea is that ordinances are certain commands involving forms to be observed—such as baptism and the Lord's Supper; but I see no reason for saying they are ordinances, and that prayer, reading the Scriptures, and contributing are not. The Lord's-day meeting, including all the services connected with it, might be called an ordinance. But all commands of God for the obedience of men are ordinances of God in the true sense.

### **ORGANIZING A CONGREGATION.**

Should we attempt to organize a congregation unless we have persons that fill the qualifications given by the apostles?

Nothing is said in the Bible about organizing a church. I do not think the common idea of organizing a church is in the Bible. It is true that a church, with all its organs in full and active operation, is recognized in the Bible. It is compared to a body, a plant, a vine, a tree. But we never talk of organizing a human body, a tree, or a vine. The body is a growth. The seed is planted. The seed contains the germs and the embryo of the body, with all its organs and fruits. The seed is brought into favorable conditions; and it, with all its organs, grows until all becomes a full-grown body with all its organs. Just so it seems to me of the church. It in all its members and organs must grow and attain its growth and maturity. The church is a growth. The church grows by each member growing in its place and work. That is the way the body grows, and the church is the body of Christ. The body grows by taking the food needed for its growth and strength, then by taking the exercise needed to assimilate the food to the needs of the different members of the body. A Christian, a member of the body of Christ, takes food by engaging in the worship, by attending to the apostles' doctrine, the fellowship, breaking of bread, and prayers. The work they do in looking after the widows and the fatherless in their affliction and in keeping themselves unspotted from the world



assimilates this food; so they grow. How can a Christian grow into fitness for the work of the body of Christ without attending to the worship? How can the members become qualified to lead the congregation in the worship and work of the Lord without engaging in the work and worship of the Lord? It seems to me that God's order is plain. When two or three become Christians, they are to meet together and worship—study and teach one another the apostles' doctrine, remember the Savior's death for us in observing the Lord's Supper, help one another as they can, and pray one for another. Jesus has promised that where two or three meet together in his name, he will be with them. By this worship and service they will grow into active living members of the church of God. Baptize them and start them out to do nothing, and in the way a child is trained it will continue. Without meeting together and worshiping, they will become dead and lifeless from the beginning and continue so. When they meet together to study the word of God, exhort and strengthen and pray for one another, they will grow in the Lord and develop their fitness for work. Then as they develop fitness for work and the work is neglected, they can be appointed to the work. But no one can grow fitted to do a work by doing nothing. Put them to worshipping God if but two are there.

### **ORGANS IN THE HOME.**

Is it right for Christians to have organs in their houses?

I know of no reason why it is wrong to have an organ in the home any more than any other instrument of music. It is lawful and right to have and to do many things in our houses and family relations that it would be wrong to bring into the church and its services. The organ is more used in connection with the worship than other musical instruments; but others are used. The piano, the violin, the brass instruments are all used; and if the organ was out of the way, these others would take its place. There is no sin in the organ; its wrong use constitutes the sin. I think the general cultivation of instrumental music has hindered all learning to sing, and this creates the demand for the instrument in church services. Before instrumental music became common, the boys and girls all learned to sing; now the girls learn to perform on the instrument, and cannot sing without it, and the boys do not

learn to sing. So there is a demand for the instrument to carry the music in church. While these things are true, I cannot say that instruments at home, properly used, are sinful. The thing needed is that all should cultivate their ability to sing as a duty they owe to God; then there will be no demand for the instrument to carry the tune. Until the singing is done as a service we owe to God, it is not worship, but entertainment.

### **OWE NO MAN ANYTHING.**

Please answer the following question: "Owe no man anything, but to love one another." (Rom. 13: 8.) Does this embrace our business affairs or not?

I think it refers to business affairs and is a command not to go in debt. Owe him nothing, save what the obligations of love require at your hands. He is speaking of business affairs. Verse 7 says: "Render to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor." This relates to the dues to the government. He then adds: "Owe no man anything, save to love one another." After telling them to pay what is due the government and rulers, he adds: "Owe no man anything." It can mean nothing else. Under the Jewish dispensation, when a man became indebted to another and could not pay, the creditor could sell the children, the wife, and the man himself to pay the debts. (Ex. 21:2; Lev. 25: 39; Deut. 15: 12.) It has been displeasing to God for his children to be in debt and unable to pay, and under Christ he tells them not to go in debt. The creditors are required to be merciful to the debtors. See **Debt, Paying**.

PARENTS. See **Honor Parents**.

PAYING DEBTS. See **Debt, Paying**.

### **PEACE OBTAINED ON RIGHT PRINCIPLES.**

Suppose two elders of a congregation disagree in regard to their financial affairs and they are brought to the church about the matter; the house is brought to order, moderators sit and work begins; the plaintiff is allowed his plea; he tells the church in his speech that he does not think it proper to itemize anything of the past, neither accuse the other brother before the church of things concerning their trouble; but that he thinks it proper that they ask pardon of each other, drop the matter at once, and make friends in church; that the

church had rather know that peace is made between the two than know the cause of the trouble; and many other words on the same line. So the moderators tell the church that the brother has taken the right course to make peace, and has done all that is required at his hand. Then the other brother comes forth and begins to accuse the brother of all things he can think of, and keeps it up until he disturbs the whole church, and will not be reconciled to peace at all. The moderators adjourn with a great dissatisfaction all round. Now what course should be pursued under such circumstances?

The first and highest end of a church and of the Christian religion is to make men honest, truthful, just, and upright by obeying the Lord. Peace is not desirable unless it can be obtained on these grounds. Jesus came to make war and stir up strife until peace could be obtained on principles of honesty, uprightness, and truthfulness. The church is out of harmony with God or his will that seeks peace among the members at the expense of right doing.

If the foregoing means that the plaintiff and the elders wanted them to make peace without righting wrongs that had been done, they are wrong altogether. A peace not founded in justice and right is a false peace, and cannot be approved by God. The object of church discipline is to induce persons to do right. If a church member will not do right of himself, and cannot be brought to do it by him whom he has wronged, then the church disciplines him to induce him to do right; and doing right of itself brings peace. So peace is to be sought through doing right. The church ought to be the most upright and just tribunal in the world. It would be, if it lived up to its laws; but it does not. It almost universally tries to patch up compromises and cover up wrongs, and so peace is made, the church is satisfied, even if wrong is done. The greatest wrong a church can do a member is to let him live in peace while he is guilty of wrong. The wrongs a man does will condemn him at the last day. The wrong he suffers will never condemn him. It is the duty of the church to save a man. The only way she can do this is to save him from his sins, induce him to repent of his sins that he may be freed from them and be saved.

What would be thought of a civil court that would compromise and cover up wrongs instead of deciding controversies according to law and justice? Because the church does this, the world and the church members themselves cannot respect church decisions.

When one brother does a wrong against another, or both do wrong, and the matter comes before the church, the ques-

tion should be, "What wrong has been done by either or both parties?" and each should be required to right his wrongs. That is the only work of the church, and when the wrongs are righted peace will come of itself. The thing for the church to have done in the beginning was to have discreet and prudent brethren examine the charges made by each against the other, approve what is right and show which is wrong in each. This yet seems to me the proper thing to do.

### **PERFECT, CAN A CHILD OF GOD BECOME?**

Do the Scriptures teach that the children of God can become perfect while in the flesh—that is, reach a state of perfect love and a state in which they cease to sin? If so, please explain the following scriptures: "In that day ye shall ask in my name: and I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you." (John 16: 26.) "Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." (Heb. 7: 25.) "For Christ entered not into a holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us." (Heb. 9: 24.) "My little children, these things write I unto you that ye may sin not. And if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." (1 John 2: 1.) "And having a great high priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in fullness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience", and having our body washed with pure water." (Heb. 10: 21, 22.) If the Scriptures teach that we cannot reach such a state, please explain the following scriptures: "Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your Heavenly Father is perfect." (Matt. 5: 48.) "Whom we proclaim, admonishing every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ." (Col. 1: 28.) "Now the God of peace, who brought again from the dead the great shepherd of the sheep with the blood of an eternal covenant, even our Lord Jesus, make you perfect in every good thing to do his will, working in us that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be the glory forever and ever. Amen." (Heb. 13: 20, 21.) "And the God of all grace, who called you unto his eternal glory in Christ, after that ye have suffered a little while, shall himself perfect, establish, strengthen you." (1 Pet. 5: 10.) "Forasmuch then as Christ suffered in the flesh, arm ye yourselves also with the same mind; for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin; that ye no longer should live the rest of your time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God." (1 Pet. 4: 1, 2.)

Christ was not made perfect until he had suffered. "But we behold him who hath been made a little lower than the angels, even Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, that by the grace of God he should taste of death for every man. For it became him, for whom are all things, and through whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the author of their salvation

perfect through sufferings." (Heb. 2: 9, 10.) "Though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation." (Heb. 5: 8, 9.) If it required the sufferings of the cross that Jesus, the Son of God, might learn obedience and be made perfect, that he might become "unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation," it seems to me hardly possible that man, frail and sinful, should be made perfect without equal suffering. I do not believe that any human being equals Jesus in this. Peter says: "Forasmuch then as Christ suffered in the flesh, arm ye yourselves also with the same mind; for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin." (1 Pet. 4: 1.) Jesus possessed the sinful emotions within him until they were purged out by suffering. I do not believe that the emotion and temptation to sin can be purged out of any without suffering in the flesh unto death. I think that this explains the reason of much of the suffering that good people undergo. It explains why the infant suffers. I might say more along this line, but a person that claims that he is equal to or surpasses Jesus in the elements of his character that lead to freedom from sinful desires and impulses is hardly to be reasoned with. Yet there was a perfection that Jesus attained to and cherished during his life—that is, his heart was perfect toward God. He desired with a perfect heart to do the will of God. His will to do the will of his Father was sufficiently strong to hold in check the sinful emotions of the flesh, so that he committed no sin. Man may approximate this perfection of the heart. The heart may be brought to sincerely desire to do the will of God. Does it attain the degree of power over the flesh that the man never sins in thought, word, or deed; by commission or omission? I do not believe it does. To do this would be for man in his human nature to equal Jesus with his divine nature. The thought and claim of sinless perfection in human beings savors of presumption, the worst of all sins before God. The claim of persons who really know very little of what constitutes true Christianity being sinless is well calculated to bring the religion of Jesus into contempt with thinking men. While this is true, it is right for every Christian to keep before him the example of the sinless life of Jesus, and the perfection of the heart in its sincere and earnest desire to do the will of God, and strive to emulate them.

These latter scriptures quoted are exhortations to strive after this, or prayers and hopes that they may finally be made perfect in Christ Jesus, that they may be accepted of God. Every passage quoted recognizes man as in an imperfect state, and needing to go on to perfection, that he may strive after and approach that state. Some of the quotations give clear intimation that perfection can be attained only when freed from the fleshly impulses. Any one that will read these passages over with this thought in mind will see that this is true without my going over and applying it to each separately. A perfection of heart—that is, a sincere desire to do the will of God in all things—is to be cultivated and striven for. Its attainment is gradual, and I doubt if it can ever be said to be perfect while in the flesh. As the heart approximates this perfection, it seeks to bring the flesh in subjection, but the sinful emotions and desires are purged out only through the suffering and weakness that end in death. See **Sanctification and Holiness**.

### PHARAOH AND JUDAS.

I write you for a short comment on Judas, the betrayer of our Savior. Some say the case is similar to that of Pharaoh—raised up for that purpose; others say it is not; but it is evident that the scripture Was fulfilled by the deed. Hence our trouble over the passage.

God never raised up nor caused Pharaoh or Judas to do what he did, or any wickedness, in the sense of making him wicked. "But in very deed for this cause have I made thee to stand, to show thee my power, and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth." (Ex. 9: 16.) This does not say that God raised him up that Pharaoh should do anything, but that God might show his power in destroying one so wicked as was Pharaoh, and in destroying him he might give clear evidence that he will destroy every one who so sins against him; and in punishing in so clear and unmistakable a manner one so powerful for his sins against God's humble people, he caused his name to be declared throughout the whole earth as the avenger of his own people. God did not raise Pharaoh up for Pharaoh to do anything; but after Pharaoh, of his own will, had done evil, been wicked, committed high crimes against God and God's people, God made a public example of him", punished him in a public way, and raised him up before the world, so that the whole world could see the

punishment was inflicted by God and for Pharaoh's wickedness. Pharaoh made himself wicked; God punished just as he punishes every wicked man. He generally punishes in a quiet, natural way, letting each one eat the fruit of his own evil doing. But he lifted Pharaoh up before the world to make a public example and a public warning of him, and inflicted the punishment before the whole world. This was all the raising up that was ever done to Pharaoh by God. God did not make Judas wicked. Pie was a money-loving soul, with many good impulses. He followed Christ for a time, and was enabled to work miracles in common with the other apostles of the Lord. But when the Master's prospects grew gloomy, he lost heart; his love of money revived, the temptation was offered, and he betrayed the Master. God used him as an example, brought into contact with Christ, to show how corrupting is the love of money and how fatal its effect, how carefully its tendency and influence should be guarded against. The love of money was neither better nor worse in Judas, nor did it act differently, than in others. Men now for the love of money betray the truth and the church. They are just as guilty in the sight of God as was Judas. It happened that he came into contact with the truth in the person of Jesus in the fleshly body, and he betrayed it for money. We come in contact with it in the spiritual body. Men betray it for money; they do just what Judas did, showing that they would have acted just as he did had they been in his place. Their guilt and condemnation are the same. See **Judas Iscariot**.

**PHYSICAL CULTURE CLASS.** See **Decent, What is Healthful And?**

### **PILATE'S CHARACTER.**

Matthew (27: 24) says: "When Pilate saw that he prevailed nothing, but rather that a tumult was arising, he took water, and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this righteous man; see ye to it." What character does this language indicate? Is Pilate's condemnation just? What was his weakness?

This is as sad a statement as is found in the record of this shameful transaction. Here Pilate, the governor, whose office was to protect the right and to suppress wrong and injustice, with soldiers at his command to enforce his edicts, testifies that Jesus is a just man, that he finds no fault in him, and

goes through the farce of washing his hands before them all as a declaration that his hands are clean of his blood; yet with those hands he signs the warrant for the scourging of Jesus, then of his cruel, degrading death on the cross. Pilate has been popularly misjudged as to his character. He is usually regarded as cruel, bloodthirsty, and vindictive. The Bible record does not present such a character for him. It shows him kindly disposed, willing to see and approve right, but weak and cowardly, willing to sacrifice right for popularity, and unable to resist a current that he believes to be wrong. After he had signed the death warrant, the soldiers (John 19: 1-4) put a crown of thorns on Jesus' head, put on him a purple robe, saluted him, "Hail, King of the Jews!" and smote him with the palm of their hands. This excited the sympathy of Pilate the more, as he knew that he did wrong. "And Pilate saith unto them, Behold, the man ! When therefore the chief priests and the officers saw him, they cried out, saying, Crucify him, crucify him! Pilate saith unto them, Take him yourselves, and crucify him: for I find no crime in him. The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by that law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God. When Pilate therefore heard this saying, he was the more afraid. . . . Upon this Pilate sought to release him: but the Jews cried out, saying, If thou release this man, thou art not Caesar's friend: every one that maketh himself a king speaketh against Caesar. When Pilate therefore heard these words, he brought Jesus out. . . . And he saith unto the Jews, Behold, your King! They therefore cried out, Away with him, away with him, crucify him ! Pilate saith unto them, Shall I crucify your King? The chief priests answered, We have no king but Caesar. Then therefore he delivered him unto them to be crucified. They took Jesus therefore: and he went out, bearing the cross for himself." (John 19: 5-17.)

These priests were at any time willing to follow a revolt against Caesar that promised success. Now, to effect their end, they profess great loyalty. But we should study Pilate and his course carefully. God and the public sentiment of Christendom have condemned the course and character of Pilate as surpassed in infamy only by that of Judas Iscariot. That we may profit by this condemnation of God we should understand the elements of character condemned. God judges and condemns according to character. All who have the same



character share the same fate. Pilate gives in all this proceeding no sign of a cruel, bloodthirsty, vindictive, or persecuting spirit. He showed a disposition to favor Jesus—to be just, to regard truth and righteousness in him. He spoke and pleaded in his behalf with the Jews. But to please them he trampled under foot right and justice, and signed the death warrant of God's Son, and turned him over to his cruel enemies. For this cowardice and treason to right and truth God condemned him to infamy, and Christendom has reechoed the sentence. Now, we should understand this ground of condemnation, and should study our characters in the light of it, lest we fall under the same condemnation. We have not the fleshly Christ here to deal with. His spiritual body is dearer to him than the fleshly body ever was, for he sacrificed the fleshly body to build up the spiritual body. Then a wrong to the spiritual body—the true church of God—is more keenly felt by him than was a stab to the fleshly body. Treason to the spiritual body, or to the truth embodied in the spiritual body, is more offensive to God than was the treason to the fleshly body. When a man for the sake of money betrays the spiritual body, what does he differ from Judas? What differs his character from that of Judas? When a man for the sake of popularity, worldly honor, and ease, turns from the truth of God and leaves it to be abused by its enemies, what differs his course and character from that of Pontius Pilate? If his course and character are the same, his destiny must be the same. Often now are the same scenes re-enacted with reference to the spiritual, more sacred, body than were enacted with reference to the fleshly body by Judas and Pilate. It is often done unconsciously, because we do not see the elements of character that are condemned in them. We often, while condemning them, do the same things, and condemn ourselves.

### **POOR IN SPIRIT.**

Please tell us who are the poor in spirit spoken of in Matt. 5: 3. What is it to be poor in spirit?

When we say that a man is poor in purse, we mean that he has no money or money resources; when a man is poor in spirit, it must mean that he is without spiritual strength or power and has within himself no means of spiritual strength

or development. When one realizes that he is in a lost and helpless condition spiritually, that he is not able to save himself, that he has no powers within him that can safely guide him, that he is dependent on God for spiritual guidance and strength, he is poor in spirit. He is willing to listen to God and be guided by him; in other words, he is willing to accept spiritual help from God, and in his helpless condition he is willing to accept it on God's terms. A man who feels that he has strength and wisdom of his own cannot feel dependent upon or grateful to God for help.

In all ages of the world God has been pleased with those who look to him for help and guidance, because he is the source of all light, and no man can come to the light save by coming to him that is light. "In him was life; and the life was the light of men. . . . There was the true Light, even the light which lighteth every man, coming into the world." (John 1: 4-9.) All light comes from God. This is not only true of spiritual light, but of all true light and knowledge. Science, by many, is supposed to be the enemy of revelation; but where has science ever obtained a foothold in the world where the light of the revelation of God had not gone? Where has truth on any subject gained admission unless the light of God's truth opened the way? Look at the condition of the world in all ages where the light of God's revelation has not gone, and see what practical truth on any subject exists among the heathen nations.

There is affinity between truths. One truth begets or leads to other truths; truth on one subject opens the door to truth on other subjects. The great foundation truth, that opens the way to all other truths, is that there is one Lord God, the Creator and Ruler of the universe; that by him all things were made; and that he gives laws to, and regulates all the forces of, the universe. This is the seed truth, from which all other truth in the universe, spiritual or material, springs. Then it is true that all light comes from God in a sense higher than we are accustomed to consider.

If God is the fountain and source of all light, only he who looks to God can find true light. Man is prone to look to himself for light; but in man is no light, save as he receives it from God. Hence the importance of realizing that man is poor in spirit, has no light in himself, but must look to God, who is light. "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all."

(1 John 1: 5.) God is the fountain and source of all light and all truth, and all light and truth come from him. When man feels his poverty of spirit, that he has no truth, he will come to God for light, and light and life and strength all come from God; they dwell together. Man, without God, is in darkness. In this darkness he is helpless and hopeless. He learns his condition, he looks to God in his helplessness, and God delights to give light, and, in giving light, gives life and strength. Hence to know how poor in spirit we are is the beginning of light and life and strength to man. ' To this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and that trembleth at my word." (Isa. 66: 2.) God looks with favor to him who learns his own weakness and looks to God for light and strength. "I dwell in the high and holy place, with **him** also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones." (Isa. 57: 15.) High and exalted in his place in heaven, he dwells with the lowly, contrite heart, the heart that has learned its own darkness, weakness, and sinfulness, and feels sore and bruised with sin and seeks help and healing from God, the source of all light and strength. Man, in refusing to look to God, refuses the light, turns his eyes from the light, and gropes in darkness; and as he gropes in darkness he falls into the ditch of ruin. God gives the life that now is, as well as that which is to come. The true light of this life comes from God; it is found in the Bible. The Bible is the source of all true light and leads to the true light of both this world and of that which is to come. "There is no God else beside me; a just God and a Savior; there is none beside me. Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." Let us learn our weakness and nothingness and look to God for light and life and all help.

### POWERS THAT BE.

"Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power, withstandeth the ordinance of God: and they that withstand shall receive to themselves judgment." (Rom. 13: 1, 2.) Are we to conclude from this that God appoints the temporal government of the world? If so, in what sense is it to be

understood? If he appoints them in the sense often advocated, it appears to me that they would be more in harmony with his revealed word. Is there anything in the establishment and preservation of human governments above and beyond the capacity of man? But in their ever-changing, unjust course, without stability, always on the qui vive for something more, are they not peculiarly of men? When God appointed a government for the Jews, he did it in such a way as not to leave them in any doubt about it, and in it we see the wisdom of God. But may this passage not refer to the authorities of the church?

I answered the foregoing questions so frequently and fully a few years ago that I feel indisposed to answer them again, yet new readers make it necessary to repeat the truths on this subject as on every other. I hesitate the more to respond to them because I cannot answer them in as few words as I desire without being misunderstood. Many excellent brethren of sound and critical minds have been disposed to refer this scripture to the church authorities. After a full and, I think, thorough investigation of the subject, I am satisfied that it refers to the civil or political governments of the earth.

My first reason for thus believing is that God never ordained his own true and faithful children for the performance of such a work, but that he always ordained the wicked to do the work here assigned these ministers of God.

The object for which this minister is ordained is as an avenger "for wrath upon him that doeth evil." Now God never ordained one of his true, obedient, and spiritual children as an avenger to execute wrath, neither in this world nor in the world to come. In the world to come the devil is appointed to execute wrath on the evildoers. Christ and the holy angels are appointed to bless and render happy the well-doer. In the preceding chapter the apostle tells the Christian that he cannot take vengeance. "Avenge not yourself, beloved, but give place unto the wrath of God. ... If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him to<sup>1</sup> drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." (Rom. 12: 19-21.) Now God tells the Christian that he must not take vengeance, but must do good for evil. I will avenge the wicked; you cannot. Now the Christian was God's minister, ordained for doing good to men, of returning good for evil, and the minister of God for this work could not take vengeance.

But God says: "Vengeance belongeth unto me; I will rec-

ompense, saith the Lord." But he acts through ministers. The Christian is his minister to do good and to bless; he cannot take vengeance. But God has other ministers, the powers that be, that he so overrules in their wickedness and sin as to make them his ministers of wrath, his avengers "for wrath on him that doeth evil." (Rom. 13: 4.)

The idea is common that all of God's ministers are good. This is an error. His ministers are in character fitted for the work that he appoints for them to do.

Thus Judas Iscariot was a wicked man—a money-loving traitor at heart. In the providence of God, for the salvation of the world, it was necessary that Jesus the Christ should be betrayed and crucified. God wanted a minister to do this work. He did not chose the gentle and true-hearted John as his minister for this work. John was not in character fitted for it; John was in character fitted as a minister for another work. His gentle, kind, tender disposition made him a peculiarly well-fitted minister to care for an old, decrepit, heart-stricken, and bereaved mother in Israel, and because of this fitness Jesus made him his minister to care for his own bereaved mother. Peter might, in a moment of weakness and discouragement, deny his Master, but it took a different character to betray him. Hence, Peter was chosen or ordained as a minister, but not as a minister of wrath and treason. Because Judas possessed this money-loving, traitorous heart, God chose him as his minister to betray his Lord, and then damned him with endless infamy for his depraved and wicked character. "For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who it was that should betray him. . . . Did not I choose you the twelve, and one of you is a devil? Now he spoke of Judas the son of Simon Iscariot, for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve." (John 7: 64-71.)

Then Judas Iscariot was not made wicked or corrupt by God, but God, seeing his money-loving disposition and knowing that when once the love of money gets a firm hold on the heart of an individual that it prepares that heart for treason to every principle of honor and virtue, chose him on account of this character as his minister to betray his Son into the hands of his enemies.

God in his providential dealings with man used such characters as his servants or ministers for effecting works of

cruelty that were necessary to be performed as parts of his government over the human family. When a nation or people is wholly given to wickedness, when it refuses to obey God, his honor requires that that nation should be destroyed. When his servants and followers become disobedient, hard-hearted, and rebellious, his honor and their good require their chastisement, that they may be humbled and brought back to God. In such work God has always chosen the wicked and corrupt as his ministers or servants, and then, in the performance of this work, secured their own punishment.

The Jews disobeyed God—became fearfully rebellious. God determined to punish them. He chose a wicked nation, with wicked and bloodthirsty rulers, as his servants or ministers to do this work. "Therefore thus saith Jehovah of hosts: Because ye have not heard my words, behold, I will send and take all the families of the north, saith Jehovah, and I will send unto Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant, and will bring them against this land, and against the inhabitants thereof, and against all these nations round about; and I will utterly destroy them, and make them an astonishment, and a hissing, and perpetual desolations. Moreover I will take from them the voice of mirth and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, the sound of the millstones, and the light of the lamp. And this whole land shall be a desolation, and an astonishment; and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years. And it shall come to pass, when seventy years are accomplished, that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith Jehovah, for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans; and I will make it desolate forever. And I will bring upon that land all my words which I have pronounced against it, even all that is written in this book, which Jeremiah hath prophesied against all the nations. For many nations and great kings shall make bondmen of them, even of them; and I will recompense them according to their deeds, and according to the work of their hands." (Jer. 25: 8-14.)

This shows that the Jews were rebellious. God determined to punish them with desolation and captivity. Other nations around were hopelessly corrupt. He determined to destroy them. He chooses a servant in character and power fitted to the work of slaughter and desolation. The people of Babylon are strong, wicked, and depraved, and would glory in such

a work. God chooses them as his instruments to accomplish the work, and calls their king, Nebuchadnezzar, "my servant" to do this work. He does it from no love to God, no disposition to honor God, but from an ambitious and bloodthirsty spirit to gratify his love of power, conquest, and aggrandizement. He is unconscious that God is using him; he is wholly ignorant of the purpose of God. It is a case simply of God overruling human ignorance and human wickedness to accomplish his own purposes. It is a case in which the wrath of man is made to praise and glorify God. "Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee: the residue of wrath shalt thou gird upon thee." (Ps. 76: 10.)

But when God's purposes have been accomplished by the destruction of the nations and the captivity of Judah for seventy years, when Babylon has completed the service which God accomplished through it, he says: "It shall come to pass, when seventy years are accomplished, that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith Jehovah, for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans; and I will make it desolate forever." It is a plain case of God using one wicked nation to punish another, and then destroying the one that is used. God called the wicked king "my servant," and the wicked nation "my battle ax and weapons of war: and with thee will I break in pieces the nations." In Jer. 50, 51 may be found the account of the most fearful destruction of Babylon when her seventy years were accomplished. God sometimes used men not so wholly corrupt, but worldly, wicked men, and overruled their pride, liberality, ambition, and love of applause to serve him in a way less bloodthirsty and cruel, though still of a nature that his chosen servants could not perform. Cyrus was one of these. Isaiah says: "Thus saith Jehovah to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him. . . . For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel, my chosen, I have called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me." (Isa. 45: 1-4.) Here God uses Cyrus, an idolatrous prince, who knew not God, who was ambitious of power, place, and renown; makes use of him and overrules this spirit of love of renown for magnanimity to cause him to restore his people to their own land and to enable them to rebuild the temple of God—not because he desired to honor God, but because he desired the worldly honor of reestablishing the au-

cient and renowned temple of Jerusalem. God controls his ambition in this line to accomplish his purposes, and calls him his "anointed" servant to do this. Yet he was an idolatrous, wicked, pagan prince, ambitious only of fame and glory for himself.

Servant and minister mean precisely the same in the Bible. God always uses or ordains those to do a work who are in character fitted for its performance, and then always rewards the work performed according to the character suited to its performance. A bloody, cruel work demands a bloody, cruel character to perform it. A bloody, cruel destiny is God's reward. "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." (Matt. 26: 52.) A work of treason to holiness, to virtue, to purity, demands a treasonable heart, corrupted by the love of money. A work of love, gentleness, mercy, and good will demands a character pure and gentle, full of mercy, love, and affection for the distress of humanity. The rewards are those of joy, peace, and mercy from God. "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you." (Matt. 7:2.)

God, in the unseen world, ordained the wicked one, the enemy of truth and righteousness to execute wrath and vengeance on the finally impenitent. As his reward he is to share with them the woes of hell forever and ever. He ordained Jesus as the merciful High Priest of salvation, who was touched with a sense of our infirmities and bore the stripes of us all as his servant to minister salvation to the humble and true in the world to come. As his reward, he is to enjoy the most ineffable glories of the better land forever; he will occupy his throne at the right hand of the Father.

God ordains in this world his humble and true followers as his ministers to do works of love, mercy, long-suffering, and tender pity, and receive the reward of mercy and love in return here and hereafter.

The wicked, the corrupt, the rebellious, are his chosen ministers, "avengers for wrath to him who doeth evil," and in turn receive according to their works. The sharp sword of God's unquenchable wrath will repay. Then if man wishes a merciful reward, he must so act and form for himself a character suited for a minister of mercy and that will secure for him a merciful reward, not a wrathful one.

These civil powers were then God's ministers for executing



wrath; they were wicked, corrupt, and cruel. Nero, the prince of cruel, bloodthirsty demons, was the great ruler. The cruelty was so great that there was danger of Christians resisting, striving by violence to overturn the government. He commands them to submit to these authorities. God is using them as his ministers of vengeance to execute wrath on the evildoers. Of course they will reap the reward of wrath and vengeance from God. As they have done to others, so shall it be done to them.

But the difficulty is that they are said to be ministers of God to Christians for good, that Christians are told to do well and they shall have the praise of these rulers. This is true in more senses than one. Persecutions to the church have been for good to the Christians; and yet the gentle spirit of Christian forbearance has extracted praise, respect, and honor from the most cruel agents of persecution. "All things work together for good to them that love God, even to them that are called according to his purpose." God permits persecution to come only so far as is good for the Christian; the remainder of wrath God restraineth. So these powers work for the good of the Christian, even in their persecution of Christians, as well as in their suppression and destruction of the evildoer.

As God ordains ministers for wrath as well as for mercy, he ordains institutions of wrath as well as institutions of mercy. He ordains an institution of mercy—his church—and asks the world to enter, do mercy and receive mercy. Those who accept the invitation act and live in it; it is ordained for them. But for those who refuse to enter and become ministers of mercy he ordains institutions fitted for their rebellious character in which they work, while rejecting God's institution of mercy for his children. These institutions of wrath God ordains for wrath; they will be destroyed after serving their purpose here. People build them up unconscious that God is ordaining them for the destruction of the builders, of those refusing his government of mercy.

God ordains for people just such institutions as they deserve. If they are obedient and submissive, his merciful government is their heritage. If they refuse to obey God's government, he ordains that they shall be governed by the oppressive rule of man's own governments, of which the devil is the great head. Hence, God ordains these governments of

wrath for the children of wrath; they are not ordained for the purpose or the people for which God ordains his church.

But for the wicked, see how God ordained a kingdom for the Jews. (1 Sam. 8.) He ordains a government, not to bless, but to punish for their rebellion in refusing to submit to God's government that he had established for their good. So God ordains institutions to punish and destroy the wicked and rebellious; through these he brings persecutions upon his children to humble and purify them. "Shall the trumpet be blown in a city, and the people be not afraid? Shall evil befall a city, and Jehovah hath not done it?" (Amos 3: 6.) "I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil. I am Jehovah that doeth all these things." (Isa. 45: 7.) Evils of a physical nature are here spoken of, and it is a declaration that God in his providences brings war, famine, and ruin as a consequence of man's sins.

The idea is, then, that the powers referred to here are civil or political powers. They are ordained of God as instruments of wrath for the children of wrath, to be conducted and operated by the ministers of wrath, and their destiny will be a destruction of fierce wrath; that God's children must submit to them as such, not strive by violence to destroy them. When, in the providence of God, they are no longer needed, he will destroy them—cause them to destroy and eat up one another. No Christian, then, can become a partaker or participator or partisan of them, lest he partake of their woes. Quiet, passive submission that involves no violation of the laws of the spiritual kingdom is the measure and limit of their connection with them. God's kingdom of mercy—his church—is his institution in which his children of mercy must operate and in it receive the rewards of mercy.

### **PRAY, TEACHING CHILDREN TO.**

A sister says she is teaching her children to pray, and they are not church members. She wants to know whether she is doing right or not in teaching her children to pray, or if God will hear their prayers. The children are small and innocent.

A child cannot reverence and honor God without praying to him. Children ought to be taught to reverence, honor, and love God—trust him, look to him for good—and ought to be taught that they are weak and helpless and stand in need of God's help every day. When you teach them this, they will

pray. God pity the children whose parents do not teach them this. They are to be taught as older persons are—that is, that God will not hear their prayers unless they do his will. Hence, they should be taught that as they learn their duty they must do it, or God will not hear their prayers.

It is just as much right to teach them to pray as it is to teach them to tell the truth, to be honest, to give to the needy and relieve distress, because this is pleasing to God. These are all Christian duties; and if children are not to be taught to do things that are Christian duties, they cannot be brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

### **PRAYER AND PROVIDENCE.**

Does God do anything for his children because they ask him that he would not do, anyway, through the fixed laws of nature? If he does, how does he do it? If he does not, what benefit is there in prayer? Is prayer procurative or reflexive only? Does prayer, in other words, simply make us better in heart, or do we actually receive some blessing from without in consequence of it? Is God simply pleased with our prayers, or does he actually do something that he would not do if we did not ask him? I have put the question in several different forms to make it as plain as possible.

I believe that God answers prayer, that he bestows blessings in answer to prayer. I believe that he answers prayer in accordance with his own laws. I believe that God made provisions for saving men from spiritual death, that the means he provided are ample to save all fitted for salvation. And it indicates lack of faith in God to distrust the sufficiency of his provisions for saving men and to seek salvation in other than God's appointed ways. To pray to God to save outside of his provisions for saving betrays distrust of God.

I believe it equally true that God has made provisions for supplying the fleshly needs of his people, and that they are amply sufficient to effect the purpose for which he provided them. To doubt his ability to meet the needs of those he wishes to bless through these provisions and to ask him to go outside of these to relieve our physical wants betrays a lack of confidence in the wisdom and power of God. If God is willing to go outside of his laws to save and bless in answer to prayer, he would more readily do this to save a soul from hell than he would to save one from hunger or cold.

To turn the querist's question upon him, does he believe that the laws of God are more effective to save if obeyed with-

out prayer than they would be to save with prayer? When he answers that question, he answers his question to me. He prays for the salvation of the world. He does not expect God to go outside of the provisions of the gospel to save men; yet he thinks his prayer will avail to the salvation of the world, but only when the world is brought into harmony with the gospel, which is God's power to save. But how does he answer prayer to save, when he will not go out of his provisions or laws to save? You are in the pit that you digged for me; but I will try to help you out.

I do not believe that prayer is accepted by God as a substitute for compliance with his laws for obtaining good in either the spiritual or material world. All the prayers in the world will not save a soul, outside of God's established provisions for salvation; all the prayers in the world will not give a man food or raiment, outside of a compliance with the provisions that God has made to supply his fleshly needs. Prayer will no more be accepted as a substitute for planting and plowing than for believing in God and obeying the gospel. I apprehend that the trouble arises from two mistakes. The first is that prayer is something apart from the law of God. It enters into and is a part of the law of God for securing blessings in both the natural and spiritual world, and always works in harmony with and through these laws. It brings about its results through these laws, and never apart from them. The second mistake is in regarding God's provisions and laws in the material world as imperfect and inadequate to meet the emergencies and exigencies of life; so that when these provisions fail to bring good to his children, he must interfere directly and supplement the failures of his provisions for bringing good. This view is unconsciously held by many good Christians. The distinction between special and general providence is not found in the revelation of God, but originates in human reason from this misconception of God and the idea that his provisions and laws are inadequate to bring all good to any creature in every contingency in the whole universe. God is the great Architect and Guide of the universe; sees the end from the beginning; is everywhere present in the universe; inhabiteth eternity; dwells in an eternity past and one yet to come, as an ever-present now, without variability or shadow of turning. He dwells in the high and holy place, also in the hearts of the lowly and contrite ones. The prayers

and petitions of these enter into the workings of his laws and secure all spiritual and material blessings that they are capable of receiving. God is not absent that he needs to dodge in and out to supplement the failures and patch up the miscarriages of his provisions. The sunshine and the rain are God's provisions for bestowing his material blessings on the world. He has promised these alike to the just and the unjust. This means that God will give the benefits of both in this world to the just and unjust alike; and he, whether just or unjust, that most faithfully uses the means for obtaining these blessings will most abundantly receive them.

Where, then, the effect of prayer? The prayer must conform to the law of God. The prayer, then, must be that rain and sunshine will come alike on the just and unjust. The unjust must share the blessings bestowed on the just in this case. For a man to pray God to send rain or sunshine on the just, and not the unjust, would be to pray God to violate his own law. Such prayers will secure blessing neither to the just nor the unjust.

God honors his own laws in the material world, and he who most faithfully complies with those laws will obtain the most bountiful harvests. After the harvest is obtained, whether it proves a spiritual and eternal blessing or curse depends upon the spirit of the man who receives it. Other things might be said along these lines, but our knowledge of the operation of God's laws and of the forces that enter into them is so meager that, to us, it is true:

God moves in a mysterious way,  
His wonders to perform.

But he answers prayer, and he does not set aside or go out of his own laws and provisions to do it. In the creative and transition ages of both the material and spiritual world manifestations of power, to show that he is God, were given. But when that which is perfect was come, the gifts and manifestations were done away; and God's perfect provisions remain to work out all good to his faithful children, and faithful prayer is one of these provisions.

### **PRAYER, DOES GOD HEAR THE ALIEN SINNER'S?**

Will you please explain as to whether Cornelius was an alien sinner or not? If not, why not? Now, if he was an alien sinner and God heard his prayer, why will he not hear an alien sinner's prayer to-day?

I have, time and time again, said that God is just as unwilling to hear an inside sinner as he is to hear an outside sinner, or he is just as willing to hear the outside, or alien, sinner as he is to hear the sinner in the church. When the man born blind said, "God heareth not sinners" (John 9: 31), he was speaking of Jewish sinners, who were not aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, but members of the family of Abraham. The same is true of Job 27: 9; 35: 12; Ps. 66: 18; Prov. 1: 28; 15: 29; 28: 9; Isa. 1: 15; Jer. 11: 11; 14: 12; Ezek. 8: 18; Mic. 3:4; and Zech. 7: 13. All these passages, with quite a number of others, declare that God will not hear the prayers of persons on account of their sins. In all these passages he refers to sinners in covenant relation with God. They are the class most frequently addressed. God's laws are generally given to those who claim to obey him. To those who do not own him as God, he gives one leading command: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." (Matt. 4: 10.) Until he complies with this, he gives him no other command; until the man comes to recognize him as the only true and living God, he does not care to call on him.

There are many seeming contradictions in God's dealings with man. One is that God will not hear a sinner or one that "turneth away his ear from hearing the law." Yet we pray because we are sinners. One that willfully sins, and turns his ear from hearing the law, God will not hear. Yet because we realize that we are sinners, helpless and needy, we come to God in prayer. The more we realize that we are lost and helpless, the more we will pray, and the better God is pleased with the prayer. God does not hear the prayer of the self-righteous. When a man turns his ear from God, and refuses to hear and obey him, his prayer is an abomination to the Lord. God will not hear that kind of a sinner, whether he be an alien or a citizen. But when a man realizes that he is a sinner, that he needs divine mercy and divine help, and comes to God seeking his help to turn from sin, God is pleased with the prayers of that kind of a sinner, whether he be alien or citizen. When a man believes in God and realizes that he is lost, he cannot help praying. God hears such prayers. There is no sin in such prayers. The danger is in the man relying on such prayers and failing to obey God's commands in other things. This is the point to be guarded against. Cornelius

was an alien, anxious to know and do the will of God. The angel testified to him: "Thy prayers and thine alms are gone up for a memorial before God." (Acts 10: 4.) I do not think that God objects to the prayers of one out of Christ, if he prays in the right spirit and for the right thing. I do not think that a sinner can come to God, realizing that he is a lost sinner, without praying that he may see the way and believe and obey God. He will, in his sense of weakness, pray: "Help thou mine unbelief." (Mark 9: 24.) Jesus heard and granted the prayer of the centurion, whose servant was sick (Luke 7: 1-10), and the Syrophenician woman, whose daughter he healed. I think it running to an extreme to say that God will not hear one out of the church who is striving to learn and do the will of God. God will not hear one refusing to learn and do his will, whether in or out of the church. "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer is an abomination" (Prov. 28: 9), was spoken by Solomon as a universal truth applicable alike to those who do and those who do not claim to be servants of God. The same is true of the declaration: "We know that God heareth not sinners; but if any man be a worshiper of God, and do his will, him he heareth." (John 9: 31.) He must not only be a worshiper of God, but must strive to do his will, for God to hear him.

The objection to the mourner's bench is not that it is always sinful for one out of Christ to pray, but that the prayers and services are contrary to the will of God. When Ananias found Saul, a believing and mourning sinner, praying, he asked him: "Why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name." (Acts 22: 16.) God tells the believing mourner to be baptized, and in the washing of baptism God will forgive his sins. At the mourner's bench they are told to pray on until their sins are forgiven, while yet refusing to obey God. That is the sin of Baptists, Methodists, and others on this subject. The sin is in teaching them that they can be pardoned while refusing to be baptized. If they connect prayer with obedience, it is all right; but prayer as a substitute for obedience is sin.

**PRAYER, PUBLIC.**

Please give us a lesson on prayer. A brother refused to lead in prayer, saying that we had no authority for public prayer; that the Savior taught his disciples to pray in secret.

I do not know any law, human or divine, to prevent one displaying his ignorance and folly when he desires to; and most generally when one thinks that he is wiser and smarter than the rest of the world, he desires to do this. While it is true that Jesus teaches his disciples both by precept and example to pray in secret, one is very ignorant of the Bible that does not know that they are also taught to pray in the public assembly. The examples and admonitions are too numerous to mention, but a few may be given. Solomon stood upon his knees and prayed before the assembled nation of Israel at the dedication of the temple. (1 Kings 8: 22-54.) Elijah prayed in the presence of the king, people, and four hundred prophets of Baal; and God heard and answered his prayer. This was praying before pretty bad sinners, too. (1 Kings 18: 27-46.) From the beginning of the tabernacle service there were hours when all the people assembled for prayer at the temple. It was continued until the days of the apostles. When Zacharias, the father of John, was offering incense within the temple, "the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the hour of incense." (Luke 1: 10.) Jesus prayed frequently in the presence of his disciples and in the presence of the unbelieving Jews on several occasions, once at the raising of Lazarus (John 11: 41), then on the cross. The apostles and disciples engaged in public prayer when Matthias was chosen. (Acts 1: 24.) All the baptized on Pentecost continued steadfastly in prayers. (Acts 2: 42.) Peter and John went up to the temple at the hour of prayer. This was the hour in which the unbelieving Jews met to pray. They went to participate in this service. They prayed in the assembly, and the place was shaken. (Acts 4: 31.) When the seven were appointed, prayer was made in the whole assembly. Stephen stood on his knees and prayed in the presence of and for the wicked Jews that stoned him to death. (Acts 7: 60.)

In these and other specific cases of prayer other Christians and persons not Christians are mentioned as present. The frequent mention of the worship, of which prayer is an item, without specifying it, renders it certain that none were ex-



cluded from the worship who desired to be present, nor did any refuse to worship God because of the presence of any one.

### **PRAYER, SHOULD THE UNBAPTIZED BE ASKED TO LEAD?**

What right have I to call upon an unbaptized person to lead the prayer for the congregation—in other words, to ask such a one to pray? If it is right, I want to know it; if it is not right, I want to know it. Of all things, I want to be right in the religion of my Savior.

It is easy to say in general terms that it is wrong to encourage in any way persons who set aside the word of God; but when we come to apply this principle to the practical questions as they come up, we find difficulties. Another principle is: We ought not to drive off and excite the bitterness of people who are striving to know and do the will of God, even though they fall short of understanding the truth. How to so draw the line as to harmonize these two principles is the difficult question. As baptism is the act in which the believer declares his faith in God and God accepts him as his child, it seems reasonable that we would be safe in drawing the line there; but when persons who have been baptized into Christ turn from the commandments of the Lord, deliberately refuse to be governed by his laws, add to or take from his commandments, are they better than the unbaptized? Where no specific directions are given, some liberty of judgment must be allowed; and where this is allowed, some difference in action must be tolerated. I do not know whether a Methodist or Presbyterian is less a Christian than a Baptist, or even a disciple, who lets his love for his party, or for one practice or another not required by God, cause him to depart from the things taught in the Scriptures. It is true that baptism is the initial act of entrance into Christ, and, as such, stands as the dividing line between the children of God and those not children; but it is better not to have known the truth than, after having known it, to turn from it. I would like to be able to give a clear and definite answer to such questions if I could find it laid down in the Scriptures; but in the absence of it I can only say that we ought to be careful to do nothing that will encourage those not following the law of God to think they are on safe ground; and, under this, each will have to use his judgment in applying the rule. These invitations to lead the prayers are given, oftentimes, as mere matters of courtesy,

regardless of the real fitness of the one asked or the desire of the other that he should lead the prayers. This asking to take part in God's service as a courtesy to men, without regard to one's fitness, is all wrong, no matter who is invited, whether in. or out of the church. To ask a Methodist or Presbyterian or Baptist **to** lead the prayers of a congregation, when he is not in perfect sympathy with the work and purposes of the congregation, is to make mockery of prayer. The person who is most in sympathy with the objects of the meeting is the one to give expression to and lead in their prayers. If we look to these things, study the end and purpose of the meeting, see the object of prayer, and then lay aside all thought of courtesy and favor of men, we will not get far wrong.

### **PRAYER, WHY, NOT HEARD?**

A sister lost her fourteen-months-old babe last spring. In the beginning of the child's illness she was very despondent; but finally she resorted to prayer, importunate, constant; and she says she firmly believed the Lord would restore her child; but the child died, with three of our best physicians attending it, and it was pitiful to see the shock which death produced on the praying mother. Now she wants to know what was the matter with her prayers. She cannot be persuaded to see any kindness in the taking away of her child, and that in the face of the promise that whatsoever we ask, believing, it shall be given.

The trouble with that sister was that she dictated to the Lord instead of prayed to him. She made up her mind that she wanted a certain thing clone, whether it was the will of the Lord or not. All prayer must be made in submission to the will of God. When we determine that we must have **a** thing, whether the Lord wills or not, we direct or dictate to him, but do not pray to him. The Savior gave us the example of prayer. He prayed: "My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt." (Matt. 26: 39.) As if he feared that this did not sufficiently submit everything to the Lord, he went away the second time and prayed: "My Father, if this cannot pass away, except I drink it, thy will be done." It is not prayer, but dictation to the Lord, unless it is done with the earnest desire on our part that God's will be done; and it should be asked in deference to the divine will, and it should be as much a part of the prayer that we be able to submit to his will as that our wishes be granted.

The things that we ask we receive, if we ask in accordance

with his will. James says that we must not even say that we will do a thing next week or next year; but if the Lord will, we will do this or that. No Christian ought to desire that anything should be done contrary to the divine will. If we worship and honor him as God, if we have more confidence in him than we have in our own wisdom, we will desire that his will—the wiser will, not ours—shall be done. The doing of this will often causes us pain—may tear asunder the tenderest and strongest ties of the flesh, and may bring anguish of soul, as doing God's will brought this to the Savior—yet the full purpose and desire of the heart will be, while we suffer and bear this anguish and sorrow, that God's will shall be done. It is only when we come in humble, submissive prayer, asking and deserving that God's will shall be done, that God proposes to answer prayer.

### **PREACHERS AND THEIR SUPPORT.**

(1) Does the Bible teach that the only way to support a preacher is by the weekly contribution, and does it teach that it is the preacher's duty to spend his life preaching the gospel, trusting the Lord for a support, without a promise or an agreement from man?

The Scriptures say but little about the support of preachers, "Know ye not that they that minister about sacred things eat of the things of the temple, and they that wait upon the altar have their portion with the altar? Even so did the Lord ordain that they that proclaim the gospel should live of the gospel." (1 Cor. 9: 13, 14.) As the priests who ministered about holy things lived of the gifts made at the altar, so those who preach the gospel should live of the things contributed from the preaching of the gospel. The support of the priests is made the example for the support of those who preach the gospel. While they were ministering in the temple, they lived exclusively of the offerings of the altar; but the priests did not live exclusively from the offerings of the altar. Forty-eight cities were set apart for the use of the priests and Levites, in which they lived. "These cities were every one with their suburbs round about them." (Josh. 21: 42.) "And the cities shall they have to dwell in; and their suburbs shall be **for** their cattle, and for their substance, and for all their beasts." (Num. 35: 3.) They had these cities, pasture lands, cattle, and other beasts, and lived on these. They lived off of the things of the temple exclusively only when they were serving

in the temple. The tithes and offerings went to the support of all the service. We have nothing said of arrangements and contracts with others. The churches sent to Paul, and he sent messengers to them, who told of his affairs and how he did. Paul preached all in his power, worked for the support of himself and his company with his own hands when it was necessary, and did more preaching than any modern preacher. A preacher ought to preach all he can, whether he has to work or not. All Christians in their spheres are preachers. All should preach all they can. The support of preachers is a much larger question now than it was in the days of Paul, Luther, Wesley, Campbell. As a church grows cold and lukewarm, this question grows in importance. When the church is full of zeal and devotion, it settles this question itself. The preacher is so anxious to preach that he goes without waiting to settle the question, and the disciples are anxious to help all they can.

(2) Do the Scriptures teach that the preacher should wait for the church to call him, or do the Scriptures teach him to go and preach to every person? In other words, is it not a fact that our preachers are getting to be professional preachers—that they preach where they think that they will get the most money, and they **will** not go where they think that they are not likely to get much pay? My reason for asking this question is that I have written to preachers to try to get them to come and preach to the people in this part of the country, and they would write me to know who would support them in this work; and when I would write them that we were few in number and were not able to support a preacher, but would do all that we could, they would not come. So I have become discouraged, and have lost confidence, to a great extent, in our preachers, and have decided that it would be a sin to support any such preachers.

There are two sides to that question. Preachers ought to be willing to sacrifice to preach the gospel to others, yet they are under no more obligation to sacrifice than other Christians. Most preachers are poor and have families. Many of them have sad experiences on the question of support. Not many weeks ago I heard of a preacher, with a wife and several children, who was invited to preach for a church that has members owning property reaching from five thousand to a hundred thousand dollars each. He lost two or three days, and they gave him two dollars, over half of which went for railroad fare. I do not think there is any obligation on a preacher to visit such a place, save to teach them how lacking in a sense of justice and honor they are. Our brother lives

some distance from a preacher, and there are but two or three other Christians near him. He asks a preacher to visit them. It costs him several dollars to get there, several days in time. The loss of time and money to him is considerable. Now, are the brethren willing to make as much sacrifice as they expect of the preacher? They are under even greater obligations, since it is their neighbors that are to be taught. Then the sacrifice is made week after week by the preacher, only occasionally by the others. Now, until the private members sacrifice as much as they ask the preacher to, they ought not to complain at the preacher's making inquiry as to who will aid or what is the prospect of it. When all do their duty and there is perfect freedom of communication as to the needs of the preacher and his family, there will be no need of such inquiries. While the preacher ought not to preach for money, he is under the same obligation to care for his family that other men are. There is no more wrong in his looking to the prospect of a support than for the farmer to do it. It is a bad state of affairs when a preacher has to make the inquiry, but the preachers are not alone to blame for it.

(3) Would not a congregation be doing wrong to call a preacher who just waits for this church or that church to call him to hold a meeting? Is not this kind of a preacher as unscriptural as a Baptist preacher or a Methodist preacher?

A preacher would be regarded as presumptuous that would send an appointment to hold a series of meetings for a church without being invited. The places for a preacher to preach are where there are no churches; and when he is able to labor without pay, these are the places he should seek.

### PREDESTINATION.

In reading the first chapter of Paul's letter to the Ephesians, do you think it teaches that the twelve apostles were chosen or predestinated before the foundation of the world? If it teaches that, which it seems to do, do you think, then, that Judas was predestinated to betray Christ and to hang himself?

"The foreknowledge of God," as used in the Bible, means what God has before made known to man. "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God" (1 Pet. 1: 2) means elected according to the terms before made known to the world.

I doubt if there is what we call **fore** and **after** with God. All time is present. "A thousand years is as one day, and one

day as a thousand years." But what God has made known to man heretofore is called "foreknowledge." Before this he made it known to man. He says of Christ: "Who was fore-known indeed before the foundation of the world, but was manifested at the end of the times for your sake." (1 Pet. 1. 20.) In the beginning God provided that Jesus Christ should come to save men. Then he, as a lamb, was slain from the foundation of the world, but manifested in these last times for you who do believe in Christ. Christ was preordained as the means of salvation to all who should enter him. God did not choose or predestine which persons should enter Christ, but he chose or predestined that those who entered him should be saved. Then at any time when persons have entered Christ, they can say: We were chosen or predestined unto salvation in him before the foundation of the world. God chose or predestined Judas just as he does every man. He never made any man wicked or bad. "God made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions." (Eccles. 7: 29.) When they make themselves wicked, he appoints them to do evil work, and then to destruction for the evil done. I have no doubt that Jesus selected Judas because he knew his character and that he was fitted to do the work of treason. God did not make him bad; he chose him to do a wicked work because he found in him the character fitted to do it.

### **PROPHETS AND PRIESTS.**

What was the difference between prophets and priests and their relationship to God and the people?

The priest's special work was to teach the law that God had revealed and to approach the Lord for man. (Lev. 10: 9-11; Mal. 2: 7.) The priest was the representative of man to approach God. He was consecrated and set apart for the purpose of approaching God for man. He stood as man's representative to God. The priest was intended to be more sacred than the people. He was one of them sanctified, but he partook of their weaknesses and prejudices, and was generally led into their sins. The prophet was the representative of God to man. He was the mouthpiece of God. His mission was to speak for God, to deliver the word of God to the people to whom God sent him. The prophet represented God to the people as the priest represented the people to God. Moses

was the typical prophet; Aaron, the typical priest. God gave the law through Moses to Aaron. He stood as God to Aaron. God said to Moses: "And he shall be thy spokesman unto the people; and it shall come to pass, that he shall be to thee a mouth, and thou shalt be to him as God." (Ex. 4: 16.) Aaron was a prophet of Moses as Moses was a prophet of God. "I have made thee as God to Pharaoh; and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet." (Ex. 7: 1.) Again, God said to Moses: "Be thou for the people to Godward, and bring thou the causes unto God." (Ex. 18: 19.) Moses received the laws from God and gave them to the people. Aaron was the representative of the people to come to God with their offerings and sacrifices. Aaron was led into sin with the people. Moses in his teaching was always true to God. Through infirmity of the flesh he once failed to honor God as he should have done; but he was loyal to God, meek and humble before him under manifold temptations. Aaron was made priest to represent the people to God, was the representative of the people to God, and was often carried into sin and idolatry by the people. The priests generally were so carried away by the people that it became a proverb in Israel: "Like people, like priest." The priests seldom rose above the condition of the masses of the people. Often the two offices were embodied in the same person. Samuel was a prophet, yet he performed priestly functions; and Jeremiah was prophet and priest. Jesus was a Prophet to us on earth, and then became our great High Priest in heaven. Jeremiah wrote the two books of Kings. He was a highly favored prophet of God, and was faithful and true to God. He did all that he did with a view of honoring God. In these books he set forward the things that would promote the honor of God, lead to obedience to God, make the people humble and trustful, and that were well pleasing to him. The kingdom in Israel was never pleasing to God—was condemned by him in its beginning", and was destroyed when it had fulfilled its mission. God warned the people of its evil tendency and ruinous end, announced to them that in choosing it they rejected him, yet he told Samuel to grant them the king as they requested, and promised to choose their kings for them, the best and wisest of men, and to give them the counsel of his prophets and let them make a fair trial of the earthly kings.

Those kings built up the nation and made it strong among

the nations of the earth. God's Spirit was with them while they would hearken to God, and it guided them in that which was wisest for their greatness among the nations of the earth. God permitted the experiment to be tried as to man's ability to at once support and uphold human government while serving him. The experiment failed, and ought to be a lesson to all succeeding generations that people cannot serve both the divine and the earthly governments. "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." The earthly kingdom continually led the people into idolatry, which brought destruction from God upon them. The kingdom prospered for a time—brought earthly greatness among the nations. But in building up the earthly greatness it weaned the people from God, led them to idolatry, sowed the seeds of division and strife, and brought final ruin upon the kingdom and captivity to the people. The destruction of the earthly kingdom removed the causes that led to idolatry, caused them again to trust God, and from that time forward we find no more charges against them of running into idolatry. When they ceased from idolatry, they were made ready for the coming of the Messiah. Support of an earthly king was found incompatible with a readiness to receive and serve the Lord Jesus.

There were two ends to the work of the Jewish kingdom. One was to build up the earthly kingdom. God sent his Spirit to guide in this, that it might be done in the best way. The other end was to keep them loyal and faithful to God. The attempt was made to harmonize the two ends; it failed. The true prophets sought to hold them true to God. The priests greatly bent their energies to build up the earthly kingdom. The two books of Kings were written from the standpoint of the prophets, and in them the things that encouraged the teachings of God are presented.

The two books of Chronicles were written from the standpoint of the earthly kings. They were composed by Ezra, as generally supposed, when he was trying to reestablish the earthly kingdom after the return from captivity in Babylon. The matters are set forth in the books of Chronicles that would inspire a love of the earthly kingdom and a desire for its restoration. The same history in time and persons is gone over. Truthfulness is manifested in both accounts, reverence for God in both, yet the two ends in view cause quite a difference in the coloring of the two accounts.



Jeremiah in the two books of Kings gives no prominence to that which was intended to promote the earthly greatness of the kingdom. He lived at the time when the Jewish people reaped the fruits of their earthly greatness and consequent idolatry in the destruction of Jerusalem and the captivity of their people. He had no taste for the things that, under cover of earthly grandeur, brought about ruin so complete. Nothing is said in these books of Kings of the pompous temple worship, with its display and pride-inspiring influences. These books of Kings tell of the sins into which this pride led both rulers and people, God's condemnation, and the evil that comes of the course.

In Chronicles, chapter after chapter is given of the genealogies of the kings and the priests back to Abraham and Adam, of the great and pompous display of the temple, and the services of the thousands and thousands of priests and Levites in their parade and display in the temple service. This all gave them glory among the nations, but did not humble them before God. This display corrupted the service of God, destroyed the humility of the people and service, so that Jeremiah saw the destruction of the temple, the desecration of the altars of God, and he had no heart to mention even that service that had so defiled the altars of God and led to their ruin.

I would be glad if our readers would read the books of Kings and Chronicles, and note the sameness of the history and the difference in the things narrated in the light of these suggestions. It would correct many false notions and help to draw lessons that would profit. Wrong lessons are drawn from much of these teachings. We interpret examples that God gave for warning as encouragement, and are sadly misled into the same class of errors that brought ruin to the kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

### **PROVIDE FOR HIS OWN HOUSE.**

I want your opinion on 1 Tim. 5: 8: "But if any provideth not for his own, and specially his own household, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an unbeliever." Does this mean food and raiment, or God's word—food for the soul? It is very important to have this point settled here, for our preacher says it is temporal food.

It means temporal food, raiment, and comforts, and it refers to the widows properly dependent upon the persons, not one's wife or children. Read it in its connections. See that

he is telling how the widows shall be provided for. Those who have children or nephews (grandchildren) shall care for them. It tells what widows are to be supported by the church, and what not, and then says: "If any [referring back to the child and grandchild] provideth not for his own [widows, mother, or grandmother], ... he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an unbeliever." The next verse says, "Let none be enrolled as a widow [to be supported by the church] under threescore years old," and other qualifications. It is strange how any one could ever make the sentence apply to any save the widows. Of course it is right for a man to supply his wife and children with food and raiment, and spiritual instruction, too; but this passage does not refer to that matter.

### **PROVIDENCE, SPECIAL.**

I would like to see a pointed article on special providence. Of course there is a general providence God exercises over all his works, and he will at the last day judge the world by Christ Jesus in righteousness; but do men, as a special act direct from God, receive any punishment?

The Bible draws no distinction between special and<sup>1</sup> general providences, as these terms are usually understood. There is no such idea as that God changes or interferes with the operation of the laws that he has put in force to punish or bless a man in any special case. The general provision is that all the laws of God work to the end of blessing all that are in harmony with them and destroying those who violate them. The idea of a special providence outside of the general laws of God arises from a failure to see that God's laws are perfect in their operations, and meet all possible contingencies that arise, to punish and to bless, without the intervention of special laws or interferences. If there are special interferences and manifestations of power to bless or to punish, it must be because the general law fails to reach such cases. If cases arise which the general law fails to reach, it is because the law is imperfect and does not meet all the contingencies of life; it is because God failed to make his law perfect (as the Psalmist says he did): "The law of Jehovah is perfect, restoring the soul." (Ps. 19: 7.) If so, it meets all the contingencies possible to arise in life. It meets every special case that arises, and in its working reaches every case as fully as

God can reach it by special law or interference. God is always present in his laws. What is done through these laws, God does. Paul said: "God ... is the Savior of all men, specially of them that believe." (1 Tim. 4: 10.) That means that those who believe come more fully into harmony with his laws than those that believe not, and so they receive the blessing of God more fully than others do. The answer to prayer requires no departure from the principle. The blessings of God flow through his laws to those that are in the proper state and condition. Tap the channel through which they flow, and receive just such blessings as you are fitted to receive. God is personally present in all his laws, to bless those who comply with them in spirit and in truth, and to curse those who refuse to comply with them. God is all-wise and all-powerful. He sees the end from the beginning. Eternity, past and future, is an everlasting present to him, and he provides for all contingencies that arise in the onward march of his forces. Not a sparrow falls to the ground without a father's care, and the hairs of our head are numbered. Because we fail to see and understand how the laws of the spiritual and material world interlace and harmonize with others, all composing parts of one harmonious whole, we are not to conclude that they are not such. God is in all his works.

**QUALIFICATIONS OF ELDERS.** See **Elders, Qualifications Of.**

### **RACE COURSE, CHRISTIANS AT THE.**

Is it right for members of the church to attend races at a race course? Some members of the church attended the races at Cumberland Park recently. Is that in harmony with the Christian profession?

I cannot imagine a place more unfit for a Christian than the race course. The attraction at the race course is the running of the horses, enhanced by the excitement of betting and gambling. Under the plea that racing improves the stock of horses, the State government licenses the race course and the betting on the races. It is not claimed that the betting directly improves the efficiency of the horses. But the racing does, it is claimed; and interest in the raising, training, and running of horses cannot be kept up unless gambling is permitted to enhance this interest. This all proves that the interest of the occasion is in the betting on the racing. It is a

doubtful question whether breeding, training, and running horses really improves them for useful purposes; but let that go. To keep alive the interest in improving the stock by racing, the betting is licensed by the civil authorities. This shows that the chief interest in the racing is the betting and gambling attending it. Is it necessary to ask and answer the question: Should a Christian encourage, by his presence, places devoted to gambling? Men play cards. The chief interest in card playing and the gambling houses is the betting on playing cards. Is it right for a Christian to encourage, by his presence in a gambling saloon, the card playing and the attendant gambling? This is universally regarded one of the greatest evils of our age and country. The horse race is patronized by a wealthier—and, hence, more worldly respectable—class of people, and the temptations to the young to gamble are correspondingly greater and the race track more dangerous and hurtful to the young and the old. No more degrading and ruinous passion can be aroused in young or old than that for gambling. It brings more persons and families to ruin than any other passion.

The race course is worse, because more exciting and respectable than card gambling. A Christian had better attend and encourage others to attend, the gambling hell than the race course. A Christian had about as well bet on the cards or the race as attend, and encourage by his example others to attend, where the excitable and the young will be tempted to bet and so led to ruin. The guilt of gambling ourselves is no greater than to lead others into influences that tempt them to gamble. I cannot see how a Christian can find any pleasure in attending such places. He must forget all Christian feeling and desire to be able to see the excitement and fascinations that draw thousands of the young, the children, the excitable, into the influences that make gamblers and wrecks of so many souls. To enjoy these things, he must forget his responsibility to God, his obligation to his fellow-men, and be willing to encourage the wreck of virtue and honor. How can a Christian close his eyes and harden his heart for the time being to such influences and countenance what brings evil to so many souls, good to none?

Many have expressed mortification and sorrow that some of the daily papers that have so earnestly urged closing the gambling rooms in the city, as a temptation and injury to the

youth of the city and those attending the schools here, should encourage attendance at the race course, and that the city authorities and business men should in any way countenance the temptations to gamble by attendance at the races. It seems to me that every thoughtful citizen that regards the welfare of the young and the future morals of the city must regret the public or private countenance given to influences so pregnant with evil to the character of young and old.

There is great temptation to Christians to run in popular currents to wrong, but they cannot be too careful that they do not either run into sin themselves or lead others into sin. When we lead our weak brother into sin, we sin against Christ and against God.

### **RACE PREJUDICE IN RELIGION.**

Our congregation has been in some trouble since I last wrote to you. The cause of the trouble is, a colored member, who holds membership with the congregation, asked me to preach to the colored people, which I have been doing. When the other members learned that I was preaching to the colored people, a part of the congregation objected to it and said: "If you do not quit preaching to the colored people and withdraw from that one who holds fellowship with the congregation, we will not meet with the church." The colored brother has always been obedient to the word of God and the elders, and the whole eldership are in favor of fellowship with him, and I am still preaching to them. Please answer whether or not I am doing right. Since the trouble came up, a few of the members have walked disorderly, for which cause we have withdrawn from them. Have we done right?

The commission is: "Preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." God says: "Preach to the whole creation." The man that says you shall not preach to some creatures puts himself squarely against God, and fights against God as directly and serves the devil as faithfully as it is possible for a human being to, so it seems to me. The man who refuses to preach the gospel to any creature refuses to try to save that creature and aids in sending him to perdition. This is the work of the devil, not of a child of God. For a man to be actuated by such a spirit and still claim to be a child of God shows how we can seek "the livery of heaven in which to serve the devil." The spirit that forbids or refuses the gospel and any of its helps and privileges to a single child of mortality is of the earth, and is not of God. He who finds such a spirit in his heart ought to know at once that

he is not a child of God. God says, "Preach to the whole creation;" a poor, weak, selfish man says that you shall not. Christ came to break down the middle walls and separating lines and to make all who believe in him one in Christ Jesus. Man says that they shall not be one in Christ. What presumption, sin, and rebellion!

A preacher or a church that for one moment would listen to such a plea is no servant or church of God. If a Christian can reach a man with the gospel and refuses to do it, he is guilty of that man's damnation, and God will so hold him accountable. It is time that all this nursing the antichristian spirit in our hearts and in the church had ceased once and forever. Outside of Christianity, it is an exceedingly narrow and selfish ignorance that would withhold helps of advancement and improvement from any human being. Intelligent, fair-minded people seek the advancement of the whole human family; the advancement of each one promotes the elevation of the whole, and the degradation of one drags down the whole. An intelligent selfishness would seek the good, the elevation, of all.

I do not know a preacher of any religious body that would refuse to preach to the negro. I hope that such a one does not exist. I have preached to them whenever occasion offered, and have regretted constantly that I could not give more time to work with them. A man that would refuse to preach to the negroes or any other race is no true preacher of Christ, and is not fit to preach to any one. I had much rather belong to and meet with a church composed of humble and earnest negro worshipers than to a church that would refuse to preach to negroes.

I doubt if any of us are capable of discharging our duty to the negroes in the true spirit of Christ. But if we will cultivate the spirit of helping them all we can, we will grow better qualified for the work of God; but if we foster the spirit that refuses help to them, we grow more and more disqualified for any work of God. To the extent that a man in spirit grows disqualified for any work of God, to that extent he grows unfitted for receiving and enjoying the blessings of Christ. Our own good and our own salvation are just as much dependent upon our helping the negro as are the good and salvation of the negro. We cannot kick him down to hell and ourselves rise to heaven. As we treat him, God will treat

us; what we sow we shall reap. This spirit ought not to be tolerated for a moment. See **Negroes, Are the, Neglected?**

### **RAFFLE, IS IT RIGHT TO?**

Is it right or not, and would it be recognized as gambling, for a brother to raffle off his property or sell tickets and have it shot for? Does it not amount to this: Each man who buys a ticket or tickets bets the price of the ticket or tickets against the other number of tickets that he will win the property, whatever it may be?

All this raffling is gambling of the most flagrant kind. It amounts to a bet between those who buy the tickets as to who will win, and the man who sells the tickets does it to get more than the property is worth or would bring without the chances that are taken to win it. It is not honest to try to get more for the property than it is worth; especially it is not honest to get it through exciting the gambling spirit in others. To take chances in which some pay out something and get nothing and the other gets something for nothing is gambling, and all gambling is dishonesty. Making the gain or loss depend on skill in shooting differs nothing in principle to his making it depend on skill in playing cards.

### **RECONCILIATION WITH AN ENEMY BEFORE BAPTISM.**

If a man who is not on speaking terms with one of his acquaintance should hear the gospel, and, believing it to be his duty, should obey it without first becoming reconciled to his neighbor, would his repentance before baptism be valid?

If he went and sought reconciliation afterwards, it indicated that he had repented. A man cannot wait to correct all of his former wrongs before he obeys God. That would be making God last and frequently postpone obedience because he could not correct the wrongs that he had done his fellow-man. Then he might not be wholly to blame for getting into a childish fit of not speaking to some one else. That is a childish fit, no matter who indulges it. Repentance toward God means sorrow for all his sins against God, and a sin against a fellow-man is a sin against God. But it does not mean that he should wait to learn of all his wrongs and correct them before he is baptized. It does mean that he will change his whole life and correct all the wrongs that he is able to correct. When John told the sinners to bring forth "fruits meet for

repentance," he did not tell them to wait and do this before they were baptized; but after they had been baptized they were to live a course that proved that they had repented. Then the brother may not have been to blame wholly or in part for the bad feeling existing. He could only remove the cause so far as he had done wrong, and so encourage the other to do right. But a man's faith and repentance are not genuine unless they lead him to confess all of his wrongs to his fellow-man and seek to correct them. More stress should be laid on the practical results of repentance than is done in our teaching".

### REPENTANCE AND REFORMATION.

I write you to solicit your advice in regard to a sister who is in trouble about her spiritual condition. She had been thinking for several years of joining the church, but put it off from time to time, hoping her husband would go with her; but last year she was attacked with nervous trouble and with forebodings of evil, and, becoming alarmed, she confessed Christ and was baptized. She attended church several times, partaking of the Supper; but her nervousness continued, with doubts as to having acted right. Doubting her pardon and acceptance with God, she ceased to attend. Her health has improved, but she is not entirely well yet. She is still dissatisfied, and thinks that she should go now and confess and be baptized; and then she says she is certain to have a good, clear conscience. At present she thinks she did not have the faith she ought to have had, and that she did not repent as she ought, and has made herself miserable about it. I find I cannot reconcile her to her action.

This condition of mind is not uncommon among Christians of a certain temperament. They are liable to fall into a morbid state of mind, look on the dark side of things, and, forgetful to some extent of the earnestness of their faith, become distressed in conscience and feel that the work ought to be done over again from the beginning. While we may see the cause of the trouble **in** such cases, it is frequently difficult to deal with it.

As a rule, it arises from a failure to distinguish between repentance and reformation of life. **Repentance** is the determination of the soul to turn away from sin, to cease sin, and, with the help of God, to sin no more. Reformation of life grows out of this repentance, yet is distinct from it. Repentance is in the heart, the turning from the love of sin. **Reformation** is the correction of our evil ways. The first has a definite time and is a distinct act of the heart. The latter is a life work as we from day to day or from year to year see the



evil practices into which we have fallen and strive to turn from them and correct all wrongs. This explanation understood sometimes relieves the conscience of its torments. But sometimes it fails. While I do not believe that God forgives our sins for any work we have done, or as pay for obedience rendered, but as the mercy of God to penitent and trusting hearts., manifested by submission to his will, the object of baptism on the part of the subject is to satisfy the conscience toward God. If this cannot be effected on account of the distrust of the condition of the heart in the service rendered, I would always recommend an obedience that would satisfy the conscience. This seems to me the only possible solution of the trouble, if the conscience cannot be satisfied.

**RESTITUTION.** See **Altar, Leave Thy Gift Before The.**

#### **RESTORATION, TIMES OF.**

What are the **times of restoration** and the **all things** spoken of by the prophets in Acts 3: 20, 21? You can perhaps help me and others to better understand.

Jesus had been to earth and returned to heaven. Heaven must receive him until "the times of restoration of all things." Then "the times of restoration of all things" must be when Jesus returns again to earth—the restoration of all things to their original relation to God. The relation which the world originally sustained to God was broken and destroyed when man, the ruler, rebelled against God. That destruction of the world's relation to God was more far-reaching and destructive than we realize. The whole material creation shared in the evil. Briers, thistles, thorns grew in the material world, as in the spiritual. Sickness, death, mortality afflicted the material world. When man rebelled against his Maker, the under creation rebelled against man. The laws of the natural world were disordered. The germs of vegetation put forth ; biting frosts or burning heat destroys them. Disorder in the laws of the material world came as the result of man's sin against his Maker. When Jesus comes again, the will of God will be done on earth as it is in heaven, and all things in the world will be restored to harmonious relations with God, the Supreme Ruler of the universe.

**RESTORATION TO FELLOWSHIP.**

What is necessary to be done when a wanderer wants to be restored? Is it contrary to the Scriptures for a sister to make her own statement? Should special sins be mentioned?

"Confess therefore your sins one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The supplication of a righteous man availeth much in its working." (James 5:16.) "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (1 John 1: 9.) These are but general statements of the law of pardon for one who sinned in the Old and New Testaments. He was to confess his sins—not that he is sinful or has gone astray, but the specific sin or sins of which he has been guilty—and then those to whom he confesses it must pray with and for him, that his sins may be forgiven. But in all the statements of the case, I do not remember that the person to whom the confession shall be made is mentioned, save that when the wrong is done to a person, the confession is to be made to the person wronged and the wrong corrected so far as is possible. While a person must be willing to confess the wrong at all times and places proper and tell plainly the specific sin, there is no authority or sense in requiring a woman or man to tell salacious things to an audience of members or sinners. When both parties wish to do right, there is no trouble. One desires to confess the wrong. The other does not wish to require anything to humiliate or spite the other. When one person or many desire to do anything to spite and mortify the other, they need to repent and get on the confessional to confess their sins. Let the one not be shy about confessing the wrong and the others keep clear of a desire to humiliate or spite them, and all will work well. The Bible is not a book of forms and ceremonies.

**REVELATION, IS GOD'S, COMPLETE?**

There is a congregation of disciples near here that have been greatly disturbed by a preacher who affirms that certain apostolic epistles have been lost, and that we do not now have God's revelation complete as given for the instruction of the church, in this way raising the inference that, did we now have the lost epistles, there would be found authority for many things not mentioned in the New Testament of the present time. The wiseacre quotes Col. 4: 16 in support of this theory. Please give what light you can concerning the grounds of such a theory.

I suppose, then, that God failed to do what he intended to do for man. He intended to give full instructions to man as to his duty to God and to his fellow-man, and did send his Holy Spirit to the apostles, and have them to write all things needed; but then, by some slip in God's arrangement to care for them, they were lost, and now man can never be supplied with this needed but lost instruction. That was a wonderful oversight in God, after he had given his Son Jesus to die, and had sent his Holy Spirit to guide his apostles into all truth, to make no provision for the preservation of that truth. So the death of Jesus and the mission of the Holy Spirit were made vain by God's oversight! God as much preserved all things needful to life and godliness through his providence as he gave them through his Spirit. It is possible that there were epistles written that are not preserved; but, if so, there was nothing in them needful for man that is not found in the writings we have, else God failed to do what he sent his Son and Holy Spirit to do. But there is no evidence that there were other letters written than those we have. No ancient history tells of such. How do we explain Paul's reference to a letter written to the Laodiceans? A number of explanations are given. One that seems plausible is that different copies of the same letter were made. He tells these Colossians to see that the Laodiceans read the letter written to them. To do this they doubtless made copies of it and sent them to the Laodiceans, They hardly sent the original letter of Paul from Colosse to Laodicea. Biblical scholars think that the letter to the Ephesians was the same as that written to the Laodiceans. Some of the old copies have it marked, ' To the saints at Laodicea,' instead of "To the saints at Ephesus." Laodicea and Ephesus were neighboring towns. If a letter was written to the church at Laodicea, it was copied and sent to the church at Ephesus. This was much the larger church, and gave to it the name. It will be noted how similar are the letters to Ephesus and Colosse. But suppose we do not have all, who can supply the loss? The meaning of the contention is that God failed to do his duty in preserving the revelation, and that man is to supplement what God's mistake lost. It is to justify man in taking God's place.

**RICHERS, THE DANGER OF.**

What is meant by **the last days**? Who are the **rich** here referred to? "The coming of the Lord draweth nigh"—does this refer to what we call Christ's second coming? (James 5: 1-9.)

The **rich** were those bent on riches, who sacrificed right and truth to attain them. Jesus once speaks of them as those who trust in riches. These all sacrificed truth and justice to attain riches. They hoarded their riches; so the garments became moth-eaten and their gold and silver rusted from disuse, and that rust would be a witness against them and consume their own flesh. This is possibly figurative to some extent, and meant that the riches they hoarded would cause their own ruin. That class of persons oppress and defraud their laborers as well as fleece the public, and the cry of the wronged ones will be heard in heaven and avenged by God. It is thought "the coming of the Lord" refers to the destruction of Jerusalem primarily, as this occurred soon after the letter was written; but the destruction of Jerusalem was a type of the final judgment. Then the Scriptures recognize that death to each one is equal to him to the coming of the Lord, when he will be judged according to that he hath done, whether good or evil. The Holy Spirit knew that the tendency of riches and the love of riches is to oppress the laborers, the weak, the helpless. In that age the laborers were much more helpless in the hands of the rich and their employers than they are in our age and country; and wealth has a tendency to make its owners heartless toward the poor. "The love of money is a root of all kinds of evil." (1 Tim. 6: 10.) There is unjust and unfair oppression of labor in our day, when the capitalists grow rich, and the laborers, who make the wealth, remain poor and oppressed. This teaching condemns this in spirit. It is growing fashionable now for our wealthy men to make public gifts to exalt their names. This is better than hoarding it. But this scripture demands that the laborer should be dealt with justly. A library or a school built by money unjustly taken from the laborers is a monument of dishonor, not of honor. In all the walks of life men should be just and fair to the laborers.

**RIGHT HAND OF FELLOWSHIP.**

Please explain Gal. 2: 9, 10. What was given to Paul and Barnabas? Was it money, or was it something else? How were they to

remember the poor? Were they to give them of this world's goods, or were they to preach the gospel to them, or both? One of the best congregations in this county is divided over the right hand of fellowship. They have been practicing it. A brother from Alabama, recently located here, has called on them for chapter and verse, and they say they are going to practice it. Some of the members, among them an elder, have called for letters, because they cannot afford to practice something sinful. Did they do right, or should they have remained in the congregation?

The grace of God given to Paul and Barnabas was: he committed to them the work of preaching to the Gentiles, as he had committed to Peter and the other apostles the work of preaching to the Jews. He had given to them the Holy Spirit to guide them in this work. James, Peter, and John gave to them the hand of fellowship to express their approval of the work in which they were engaged. They were to remember the poor by preaching the gospel to them and by teaching the brethren that it was their duty to help the poor. They remembered the poor when they taught the Gentiles to send help to the poor saints in Judea. I do not think that there is any wrong in the hand of fellowship when its proper purpose is taught. The hand of fellowship was given by the apostles to express hearty approval of what those who received it were doing. Paul says: "When they received the grace that was given unto me, James and Cephas and John, they who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision." (Gal. 1: 9.) That means that they wished to express an approval of what Paul and Barnabas were doing, and they gave the hand of fellowship to express this approval. If this means anything, it means that we may give the hand of fellowship to any one whose course we desire to approve. I think that we ought to give the hand of fellowship much oftener than we do. We fail to encourage and strengthen our brethren in doing right. If we did it more frequently than we do, it would encourage many a weak and fainting brother and help him to continue faithful or to persevere in a good work. That is what James and Peter and John did. The work of Paul and Barnabas among the Gentiles had been called in question, and they had been discouraged by many. These apostles, to encourage them, gave them the hand of fellowship. We are certainly on safe ground when we give the hand of fellowship to one whose course we wish to approve or to encourage him in any work which he

is doing. There is nothing in it establishing a ceremony or ordinance. There is no doubt that evil has grown out of wrong conceptions on the office of the hand of fellowship. It is often done as an act of receiving a man into the fellowship of the congregation. Evil frequently grows out of this. A man lives in and worships with a congregation for years, and does something wrong, then insists that he is not a member of that congregation because he never received the hand of fellowship. Such an idea is wrong and hurtful. A man who is a member of the church of God in one place is such wherever he goes, and is entitled to the fellowship of Christians and churches by virtue of his being a child of God. The fellowship of the church is shown in administering discipline as well as in bestowing approval and help. The thing, then, is to teach correctly on the subject, and then encourage all the expressions of approval and fellowship possible. Let us not make ordinances where God made none. I do not believe that a man ought to withdraw from a congregation so long as he thinks they are willing to hear and trying to obey God, even though they make mistakes.

### **SABBATH DAY, THE.**

(1) Very earnest efforts are being made by Seventh-Day Adventists and Seventh-Day Baptists to bring about Sabbath keeping. They claim that the Sabbath law was given at the creation of the world to all men, and that it was to be observed during all time. Their arguments are giving us much trouble, and we would like for you to answer a few questions on this subject. First, when and why did God give the Sabbath law?

The seven days as a division of time was doubtless adopted by Adam from the work of creation; but in the Bible there is no evidence that the seventh day was observed as a day of rest until after Moses led the children of Israel out of Egyptian bondage. There are allusions to the week in Genesis, where Laban said to Jacob concerning Leah: "Fulfill the week of this one, and we will give thee the other also." (Gen. 29: 27.) "And Jacob did so, and fulfilled her week." (Verse 28.) From the days of the creation the number seven became a rounded or complete number, as ten is to us. The division of time, we are told by those who investigate these questions, into the seven-day week, is common among all the old nations of the East.

In the law of the Ten Commandments, given through Moses

to the Jews, is: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath unto Jehovah thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore Jehovah blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." (Ex. 20: 8-11.) While God blessed and hallowed, or made holy, the Sabbath day, because he finished his work and rested from his labor on the seventh day, it has been a matter of doubt and uncertainty whether it was given as a command to be observed by men previous to the exodus. The Bible gives no intimation of either a command being given or of its observance by any of the patriarchs. If it had ever been given, the Jews had lost sight of it.

The Sabbath was first given as a day of rest from labor for man and beast. In Deut. 5: 14 the command is repeated very much as in Ex. 20: 8, save that he adds: "That thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou. And thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and Jehovah thy God brought thee out thence by a mighty hand and by an outstretched arm: therefore Jehovah thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." This seems to declare that the command to them to keep the Sabbath grew out of their servitude in Egypt, which was bitter and relentless, and remembrance of what they suffered is given as a special reason why God required that its benefits of rest should be granted to their servants. They had doubtless suffered from unremitted toil, without a day of rest. It was God interposing his authority to secure for their servants and beasts the benefits of a day of rest against the greed and rapacity of masters. The Sabbath, then, was hallowed as a day of rest sacred to God; and in thus ordaining honor to God, blessings to man and beast were secured.

(2) Was the Sabbath commandment a moral or positive law?

The observance of the Sabbath seems to have been regarded as more sacred than any other of the Ten Commandments. The first and greatest was to honor God. The keeping the Sabbath was a test of fealty to God. The desecration of the Sabbath was more frequently made the ground of condemna-

tion and punishment of the Jewish people than any other sin. Jeremiah (17: 21-27) says: "Thus saith Jehovah, Take heed to yourselves, and bear no burden on the Sabbath day, nor bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem; neither carry forth a burden out of your houses on the Sabbath day, neither do ye any work: but hallow ye the Sabbath day, as I commanded your fathers. But they hearkened not, neither inclined their ear, but made their neck stiff, that they might not hear, and might not receive instruction. And it shall come to pass, if ye diligently hearken unto me, saith Jehovah, to bring in no burden through the gates of this city on the Sabbath day, but to hallow the Sabbath day, to do no work therein; then shall there enter in by the gates of this city kings and princes sitting upon the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, they, and their princes, the men of Judah, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and this city shall remain forever.

. . . But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath day, and not to bear a burden and enter in at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched." (See also Isa. 1: 13; 56: 4; Lam. 1: 7; 2: 6; Ezek. 20: 12; 22: 8; Hos. 2: 11; Neh. 13: 15-22.)

Is there any reason why this command concerning the Sabbath should be more sacred or its violation be a greater sin than other commands? "And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, Speak them also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily ye shall keep my Sabbaths: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am Jehovah who sanctifieth you. Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto you: every one that profaneth it shall surely be put to death; for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people. . . . It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever: for in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed." (Ex. 31: 12-17.)

The Sabbath is here said to be a sign between God and the Jews—a sign, or test, that they own him as God—a pledge that he would own and bless them as his people. The observance of the Sabbath was made the test of their loyalty to God. God in all dispensations has had special tests of loyalty.



Those tests of loyalty are called "positive institutions." A positive institution is one that depends wholly upon the authority of the lawmaker for its observance. A moral institution is one the doing of which brings the good, the fitness of which can be perceived by human reason, and which men might be led to perform because they see it brings good. Such institutions can never be a clear test of loyalty to God, inasmuch as the man who performs them may be unable to determine in his own mind whether he observes them from the desire to obey God or because his own wisdom approves them. An ordinance which requires self-denial on his part, which runs counter to his fleshly feelings, and in which he can see no good, and which rests solely on the authority of God, makes a direct appeal to his loyalty, and tests his confidence in and willingness to obey God. The observance of such an institution is a sign that man is loyal to God, and on the manifestation of this loyalty God pledges blessing to man. The Sabbath day was of this nature; for, while it worked good to man, as all God's appointments do, it required the denial of his fleshly appetites, renunciation of the worldly desires, and in it man's wisdom could see no good. The Sabbath was the positive ordinance of the law of Moses, the test of man's fidelity under that law. Ezekiel (20: 12) says: "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am Jehovah that sanctifieth them." The Sabbath was a test of their loyalty, and in their loyalty were they to know that God was their God and blessed them. Ezekiel proceeds to say (verse 16): "Because they rejected mine ordinances, and walked not in my statutes, and profaned my Sabbaths: for their heart went after their idols." The polluting of the Sabbath was disloyalty to God equal to their heart going after their idols. They violated their oath of allegiance, they failed to stand the test of loyalty to God; so he says their hearts went after idols, followed their natural fleshly desires and served other gods that are no gods.

(3) Is the Sabbath law still in force, or has it been abolished?

It will be noted that it was a covenant between God and the children of Israel. "The children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations." "It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever." It was not given to others. That covenant was fulfilled by

and in Christ Jesus and then taken out of the way. Paul says: "If the ministration of death, written, and engraven on stones, came with glory, so that the children of Israel could not look steadfastly upon the face of Moses for the glory of his face; which glory was passing away." (2 Cor. 3: 7.) "For if that which passeth away was with glory, much more that which remaineth is in glory." (Verse 11; see also Gal. 4: 22-31.) The law written on stones, which was the Ten Commandments given by Moses, with all the laws and ordinances, was taken out of the way by Christ, and the new covenant in Christ was ordained. Are the Ten Commandments in force? The law of Moses, as a whole, became contrary to the good of man, and was fulfilled by Jesus and taken out of the way. Jesus took the old testament, or covenant, out of the way, and gave them the new testament, or covenant.

Jeremiah foretold: "Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah. . . . This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith Jehovah: I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." (Jer. 31: 31-33.) This means that the new covenant will take hold of the heart, and excite the love and enlist the feelings as the old did not. Paul says of the old covenant: "For when every commandment had been spoken by Moses unto all the people according to the law, he took the blood of the calves and the goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book itself and all the people." (Heb. 9: 19.) "It was necessary therefore that the copies of things in the heavens should be cleansed with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. . . . So Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many." (Verses 23-28.) The blood of Christ sealed the new covenant. "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus, by the way which he dedicated for us, a new and living way, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh." (Heb. 10: 19, 20.) Paul distinguishes the two covenants as the law and the faith of Christ: "We being Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, yet knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ,

and not by the works of the law: because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." (Gal. 2: 15, 16.) Paul keeps up the difference between the two covenants through chapter 3. He says: "So then they that are of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham. [Abraham was justified by faith, not by the law of Moses, which was not given for four hundred and thirty years after Abraham.] For as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse. . . . No man is justified by the law before God. . . . The law is not of faith. . . . Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law. . . . What then is the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise hath been made. . . . But before faith came, we were kept in ward under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. So that the law is become our tutor to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But now that faith is come, we are no longer under a tutor." (Gal. 3: 9-25.) Jesus came to fulfill the law—take it out of the way. "God sent forth his Son . . . to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Here it is expressly said that the law written on stones—the Ten Commandments—was done away, and superseded by the more glorious ministration of the Spirit.

The old was done away. All that was good for man in it was adopted into the new ministration. The Sabbath law was not adopted into the new testament. The old and the new testaments stood related to each other as an old constitution of a State after a new one has been adopted stands to the new. All that is of permanent good in the old is brought into the new. Then the new constitution is construed and applied in the light of the old. The Sabbath was never changed from the seventh to the first day of the week. The Sabbath law was repealed when the law written on stones was taken out of the way; and under the new covenant the first day of the week was instituted as the day of worship by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. There is not a command or admonition in **the** New Testament to observe the Sabbath.

All the Ten Commandments are re-enacted by Christ, save the one to keep the Sabbath. It is not. It was a positive law. It depended wholly upon the authority of God for its observance. When that authority was withdrawn, there was no authority for its observance. There is now no law for keeping

the Sabbath. The Sabbath was never changed from the seventh to the first day of the week. The Sabbath was abolished with the Jewish law. Christ Jesus, by his resurrection from the dead, ordained the first day of the week as the day of worship for his children. Smith's Bible Dictionary says: "The Epistles, it must be admitted, with the exception of one place (Heb. 4: 9), and perhaps another (Col. 2: 16, 17), are silent on the subject of the Sabbath. No rules for its observance are ever given by the apostles; its violation is never denounced by them. Sabbath breakers are never included in any list of offenders. Col. 2: 16, 17 seems a far stronger argument for the abolition of the Sabbath in the Christian dispensation than is furnished by Heb. 4: 9 for its continuance; and while the first day of the week is more than once referred to as one of religious observance, it is never identified with the Sabbath, nor are any **prohibitions** issued in connection with the former, while the omission of the Sabbath from the list of 'necessary things' to be observed by the Gentiles (Acts 15: 29) shows that they were regarded by the apostles as free from obligation in this matter." (Article on "Sabbath," Volume IV., page 2764.)

Christ observed the Sabbath, met with the people in the synagogues, taught them, healed them, taught that acts of mercy should be performed on this day, but from the beginning of his ministry asserted his authority over it, and clearly prepared the mind of his disciples for its being taken out of the way. Matthew says: "At that season Jesus went on the Sabbath day through the grainfields; and his disciples were hungry and began to pluck ears and to eat. But the Pharisees, when they saw it, said unto him, Behold, thy disciples do that which it is not lawful to do upon the Sabbath. But he said unto them, Have ye not read what David did when he was hungry and they that were with him; how he entered into the house of God, and ate the showbread, which it was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them that were with him, but only for the priests? Or have ye not read in the law, that on the Sabbath day the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are guiltless? But I say unto you, that one greater than the temple is here. But if ye had known what this meant, I desire mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless. For the Son of man is lord of the Sabbath." (Matt. 12: 1-8.) Many contend that Christ only cor-

rected the extremes into which the Jews had run in the observance of the Sabbath. An examination of the law as given and executed by Moses will not sustain this view. "And while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man gathering sticks upon the Sabbath day. And they that found him gathering sticks brought him unto Moses and Aaron, and unto all the congregation. And they put him in ward, because it had not been declared what should be done to him. And Jehovah said unto Moses, The man shall surely be put to death: all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp. And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him to death with stones; as Jehovah commanded Moses." (Num. 15: 32-36.) Surely this was a more rigid observance of it than Christ required. The Jews were not allowed to gather on the Sabbath day the manna that God sent from heaven; now Christ carries his disciples through the wheatfields, and they gather the heads, rub out the grains, and eat. He appeals to the fact that David set aside the law, and the priests by authority of God habitually cooked the showbread on the Sabbath. This shows that the Sabbath law could be set aside by divine authority. So he, as the Son of God, asserts that he is Lord of the Sabbath, and has power to set aside the laws concerning it. The Jews met on the Sabbath day in the synagogues. The apostles met with them, as they did at other assemblies, to teach them; but after the resurrection of Christ the apostles observed no day as the day of worship, save the first day of the week. See **Law of Moses and Law of Christ**.

### **SAMARITANS, WHO WERE THE?**

Were the Samaritans Jews or Gentiles? I understand that the world was divided into two classes—Jew and Gentile. Smith's Bible Dictionary says they were Babylonians. If so, they must have been Gentiles.

In the days of Rehoboam, son of Solomon, the ten tribes broke off from the house of David. "And Jeroboam said in his heart, Now will the kingdom return to the house of David: if this people go up to offer sacrifices in the house of Jehovah at Jerusalem, then will the heart of this people turn again unto their lord, even unto Rehoboam king of Judah ; and they will **kill** me, and return to Rehoboam king of Judah. Whereupon the king took counsel, and made two calves of gold; and he

said unto them, It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem; behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt. And he set the one in Bethel, and the other put he in Dan. And this thing became a sin; for the people went to worship before the one, even unto Dan." (1 Kings 12: 26-30.) He rejected the regular priests and made priests of the lowest of the people. These ten tribes were called "Israel" in contrast with Judah, the two tribes that remained loyal to the house of David. Israel went into apostasy earlier than Judah. They were carried into captivity. "So Israel was carried away out of their own land to Assyria unto this day. And the king of Assyria brought men from Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Avva, and from Hamath and Sepharvaim, and placed them in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel; and they possessed Samaria, and dwelt in the cities thereof." (2 Kings 17: 23, 24.) The strangers brought to Samaria were attacked by lions. "Then the king of Assyria commanded, saying, Carry thither one of the priests whom ye brought from thence; and let them go and dwell there, and let him teach them the law of the god of the land. So one of the priests whom they had carried away from Samaria came and dwelt in Bethel, and taught them how they should fear Jehovah. Howbeit every nation made gods of their own, and put them in the houses of the high places which the Samaritans had made, every nation in their cities wherein they dwelt. . . . So they feared Jehovah, and made unto them from among themselves priests of the high places, who sacrificed for them in the houses of the high places. They feared Jehovah, and served their own gods, after the manner of the nations from among whom they had been carried away." (2 Kings 17: 27-33.) No doubt many of the poorer classes of Israel were left in the land. Judah more and more rebelled against God. Some commingled themselves with Israel; so they became a mongrel race with a mixed worship. Their proximity to and association with the Jews kept alive a knowledge of the true God, though his worship was corrupted and his service mingled with the service of the gods of the nations whence they came.

At the return of the Jews from captivity and the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem the Samaritans sought to defeat the works of the Jews. Feelings of bitterness, fostered from the original separation, were intensified by these things. The city

of Samaria was the capital of the country ruled over by these people; so they were called **Samaritans**, and the land they inherited was called **Samaria**. The bounds of Samaria were regulated by the country they held. Originally all the northern section held by the ten tribes was embraced in Israel. In the days of the Savior the northern section was known as **Galilee**, and was largely inhabited by the Jews, while the middle portion (a small section) was held by the Samaritans; so that in passing from Judea to Galilee they must needs pass through Samaria. Jacob's well was there—a well on the land bought by Jacob of the sons of Hamor (Gen. 33: 19), on which was a well called **Jacob's well** because he had it dug.

### **SANCTIFICATION AND HOLINESS.**

We have a band of Holiness people here that rely mostly on Paul's letter to the Hebrews (12: 14-18; 6: 4-7) to prove their doctrine.

**Sanctified** means set apart to a specific purpose or end. All Christians are sanctified in that they are set apart to the service of God. All the vessels and implements used in the service of the temple were sanctified, set apart to the service of God, although they had no moral quality. The church at Corinth were all addressed as sanctified or saints, although they had among them quite a number of unworthy saints. Read the first verses of the letters to the Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, and *many* other verses in these different letters, and see the terms **saint** and **sanctified** are applied to all who claimed to be Christians, regardless of their degree of consecration or perfection of character.

There are degrees of sanctification, just as there are degrees in Christian knowledge and fidelity to Christ. The growth in sanctification and holiness is to be attained by a study of, and obedience to, the word of God. An increase in knowledge and fidelity is to be gained by a constant and persistent study of God's will and a daily effort on our part to bring ourselves in obedience to that will.

The idea that religion in any of its parts, in a first or second blessing, is to be obtained otherwise than through learning the word of God and striving faithfully to do the things commanded, is a sad mistake that results in the perversion of religion from a faithful, self-denying service to a spasmodic feeling or impulse of excitement to be gotten or felt. True re-

ligion is to be felt and appreciated, not as fleshly excitement or emotion, but as the result of right thinking and doing. It is the abiding consciousness of duty performed to the best of our ability. This feeling of joy and happiness that thus comes is permanent and enduring. All excitements of the fleshly emotions are deceptive and ephemeral.

The idea of holiness or sanctification that places people beyond the temptation to sin while yet in the flesh is unscriptural and deceptive. Jesus felt all the temptations to sin that men in the flesh feel. The difference is that he resisted the temptation and did not sin. No human being does this. He "hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." (Heb. 4: 15.) This temptation to sin continued in him until it was purged out through suffering. "For it became him, for whom are all things, and through whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the author of their salvation perfect through sufferings." (Heb. 2: 10.) The emotions of sin that dwelled in the body of Jesus, as in all fleshly bodies, were purged out only by the sufferings that he endured, that ended in his death. This is the meaning of Jesus' disavowing that he was good. When called good, he said: "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God." Which means that so long as the sinful impulses raged within him he refused to be called **good**. These impulses to sin were purged out through suffering that brought death; and when he was freed from this temptation to sin, "though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation." (Heb. 5: 8, 9.) Jesus did not claim that he was free from sinful impulses until he had suffered. For a human being to claim exemption from the disposition and temptation to sin is to claim superiority to Christ. It is to commit a gross sin of assumption, if not of presumption, and is akin to sacrilege in the sight of God. It is arrogant, self-righteous, presumptuous, and cannot be pleasing to God. God was pleased with the publican who stood afar off and cried: "God be merciful to me a sinner." The self-righteous have always been offensive to God; and Jesus says that he did not come to call such, but sinners, to repentance. The thought and pretense of sinlessness is itself a sin and an evidence of gross sin-



fulness. "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." (1 John 1: 8.)

Hebrews, as the contents clearly show, was written to the converted Jews, or Hebrews, to show the great superiority of the law of Christ to that of Moses, and the danger of turning back from the law of Christ to that of Moses. Both the passages mentioned are warnings against this, with the fearful dangers told. Instead of going back to the law of Moses, which could never make those who came to it perfect and could not free them from sin. they must go on to perfect themselves in the law of Christ. The Christian life is a regular and continued growth in Christ from a babe unto the stature of full-grown men and women in Christ. These passages warn that if they gave up Christ and went back to Judaism, there was no hope for salvation. They would receive the penalty of forsaking Christ. It is just as sinful to give up Christ and go back to other ways of sin as to go back to Judaism. See Perfect, Can a Child Become?

### **SANCTIONING UNSCRIPTURAL THINGS IN SECTARIAN REVIVALS.**

Will you do me the kindness to set me right as to my duty in reference to attending Methodist revivals here? When I attend, I am asked to "stand up" and in other ways to assent to and sanction many unscriptural "tests" and practices. Now, if I do not do as the preacher requests, he very angrily refers to certain "stumbling-blocks" that are present, etc. On the other hand, if I do not go to their meetings, they characterize my actions as full of prejudice toward them. I would be glad to hear from you as to the proper course to pursue.

The first thing a man should fix in his mind is that he will partake in no wrong and do nothing that will encourage others in wrong. If that demands that he should stay away from the Methodist or other revivals, he must do this. A Christian cannot do or encourage in religion what is contrary to the law of God. But I do not think it requires that we should stay away from their services. When I was younger, I attended their services oftener than I find time of late to do. I frequently met the difficulties our brother mentions. Once, in Maury County, Tenn., I held a meeting, preaching twice a day for ten days. A Baptist preacher attended every discourse and indorsed all I preached, he said. On Lord's day, when we attended to the Supper, he left the house. At the

close of the meeting he told me that the Baptists would hold a meeting soon, near by, and insisted that I attend. I promised him that I would, and the first time I went he called on every one present who wished a revival of religion to kneel down and unite with them in prayer for it. I declined to kneel, as I did not wish the kind of revival they were seeking to arouse. He reprov'd me publicly for it. So soon as the services closed, I went to him and said: "You attended our meeting, and we asked you to indorse nothing that you disapproved. When we attended to the Supper, you left, although you believe it is right to partake of the Lord's Supper; but no one complained. You asked me to attend your meeting, and you ask me to do something that you know I believe wrong. When I decline doing it, you reprove me." By the time I was through, he said: "I ask your pardon; I will not so treat you again." He did not, and I think he did not ask others to do it, because of my presence. I tell this to suggest that perfect frankness in letting all know your convictions, and that you cannot violate them, is the best and only way to avoid trouble. To let them know that you cannot approve things that are not required is the only true way out of all difficulties and is the only way to bear true witness for the truth.

### **SATAN.**

In Rev. 12: 7-9 we read: "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels going forth to war with the dragon; and the dragon warred and his angels; and they prevailed not, neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast down, the old serpent, he that is called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world; he was cast down to the earth, and his angels were cast down with him." Now, there was a question sprung by reading this chapter in our Lord's-day meeting that the devil once was an angel of God in heaven and by transgression was cast out. Is there any scripture to show or prove that he was an angel?

It is generally accepted that Satan was once an angel; it is inferential, rather than positive. Peter says: "For if God spared not angels when they sinned, but cast them down to hell, and committed them to pits of darkness to be reserved unto judgment," etc. (2 Pet. 2: 4.) Jude (6) says: "And angels that kept not their own principality, but left their proper habitation, he hath kept in everlasting bonds under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." John says: "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels going

forth to war with the dragon; and the dragon warred and his angels; and they prevailed not, neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast down, the old serpent, he that is called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world; he was cast down to the earth, and his angels were cast down with him." (Rev. 12: 7-9.) These, as now occur to me, constitute the scriptures which suggest the idea. Other passages would indicate that he was wicked when in heaven. John (8: 44) says: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and standeth not in the truth." (See 1 John 3: 8.) Putting these scriptures together, it seems to me that Satan was in heaven with a number of servants, or angels, who sinned, as it is now on earth, and the heaven underwent the same kind of purifying process that the earth is now undergoing. When sin is cast out of earth, it will be annexed to heaven as part of heaven. See **Angels, Fallen.**

### **SAUL, CONVERSION OF.**

Will you give a scriptural reason why the Lord did not tell Saul, on his way to Damascus, that his sins were forgiven, as he did to many others before his ascension, and before he had said to the apostle Peter that he would give to him the keys of the kingdom?

Jesus had said to his apostles just before his ascension: "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you." (Matt. 28: 19.) "Go ye therefore" means, Go by the authority that has been given to me—the authority that has been given to me, or given to you, to go and teach the nations the way of life, bring them into the church of Jesus Christ, and teach them to do all things as servants of God that I have commanded you that my servants should do. These apostles were the ambassadors of Christ to the world. Hence, Paul says: "But all things are of God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation ; to-wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation." (2 Cor. 5: 18, 19.) Here he tells plainly that "the ministry of reconciliation," "the word of reconciliation," had been com-

mitted to the apostles and disciples. If he had committed it to them, he could not administer it himself without discrediting them. The outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost and all the miraculous gifts bestowed on the apostles that enabled them to work miracles were to confirm them as his apostles and to enable them to show to the world that they had the right to proclaim the words of reconciliation to the world. As they were intrusted with the words of reconciliation to the world, all can see that Jesus honored himself and his words by confirming them, and not by discrediting them. Had Jesus himself ministered the words of reconciliation after he had sent the apostles into all the world to "preach the gospel to every creature," he would have discredited them and their mission. He would have said by such an act that he had not committed it to them, or that, although he had given them some power and authority, they were not competent to do the work, so that he must necessarily himself engage in it. "The gifts and callings of God are without repentance" means that gifts and calling to a work, once bestowed on persons, he does not take them from them. Once having given this work into the hands of the apostles, he would not take it into his own hands, but would confirm them in the work by sending persons to them to learn "the word of reconciliation."

Hence, in the next verse, he says: "We are ambassadors therefore on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating by us: we beseech you on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God." (2 Cor. 5: 20.) Jesus having sent them as his ambassadors to do this work, he could not do it himself without dishonoring them and his own provisions.

Inasmuch as he desired to make Saul an apostle, to commission him as a coambassador with the other apostles, he must appear unto him for this purpose to enable him to be an apostle. Apostles must have seen the Lord and be sent by him. He had not delegated that power to others; hence there can be no apostles since the days of Jesus Christ. Paul says: "I thank him that enabled me, even Christ Jesus our Lord, for that he counted me faithful, appointing me to his service." (1 Tim. 1: 12.) "Whereunto I was appointed a preacher and an apostle, . . . a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth." (1 Tim. 2: 7.) "And last of all, as to the child untimely born, he appeared to me also. For I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because

I persecuted the church of God." (1 Cor. 15: 8, 9.) Which means that the appearance to him after death was as to one "untimely born" to be an apostle. But he appeared to him to qualify him to be an apostle.

Paul, speaking of the appearance of Jesus to him, says: "But arise, and stand upon thy feet: for to this end have I appeared unto thee, to appoint thee a minister and a witness both of the things wherein thou hast seen me, and of the things wherein I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom I send thee." (Acts 26: 16, 17.) Jesus appeared to Saul to make an apostle of him, but did not take upon himself the work that he had committed to the apostles and prophets. So when Saul had seen Jesus in his glory and learned who he was, Jesus sent him to Damascus to learn from the chosen disciple what he should do to be saved.

Another reason why he did not tell him that he was saved was because he was not then saved. He must enter Christ. To enter Christ, he must be baptized. There was none with him to baptize him. Jesus did not personally baptize while on earth, much less would he do it after he had left the earth. So when Saul asked him, "What shall I do, Lord?" the Lord said unto him: "Arise, and go into Damascus ; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do." (Acts 22: 10.) "They led him by the hand, and brought him into Damascus. And he was three days without sight, and did neither eat nor drink." (Acts 9: 8, 9.) "And he hath seen a man named Ananias coming in, and laying his hand on him, that he might receive his sight. But Ananias answered, Lord, I have heard from many of this man, how much evil he did to thy saints at Jerusalem: and here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call upon thy name. But the Lord said unto him, Go thy way: for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles and kings, and the children of Israel: for I will shew him how many things he must suffer for my name's sake." (Acts 9: 12-16.)

Now Jesus, before he committed the ministry of reconciliation to the apostles when present, knowing the hearts of all men, could forgive sins as he saw fit. After he had done this, in the commission he gave the test by which men must be tried, and none could promise forgiveness without compliance with the test. That test of faith was baptism, and baptism

requires the services of another. So Jesus, honoring his own law and his own ministry, sent Saul to the man of God to learn the way and receive his services in complying with the conditions.

**SECRET ORDERS.** See **Fraternal Orders.**

### **SECTARIANS IN THE WORSHIP.**

Is it right or wrong to ask a sectarian to get up and read a chapter in the Bible where they take a part with us in the Sunday school, and should they offer prayer after reading?

I would say that it is wrong to encourage sectarianism in any way, if we can tell which are sectarians. But my observation is that it takes a sectarian to ferret out a sectarian, just as "it takes a rogue to catch a rogue." Unfortunately, all the sectarians are not in sectarian churches; and I hope that some in sectarian churches are not sectarians. Things get badly mixed in this world. Sometimes people who wish to obey God are born and reared in sectarian influences. A man who loves party more than he loves God is a sectarian. A man who divides the church of God for a theory or teaching not required by God is a sectarian. A person who pushes an idea or practice not required by God, to the disturbance of the peace of that church, or that exalts a human opinion or practice to an equality with the commands of God, is a sectarian and a heretic.

There are some in nonsectarian churches who are sectarians, who violate the laws of God in order to oppose sectarians. They are sectarians in their opposition to sectarians. There are some in sectarian churches who will obey God and follow him in spite of the sectarianism of the churches in which they find themselves. As examples, there are persons in the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian Churches who were baptized to obey God rather than to please the sects. In this they rise above the sectarian spirit, despite the parties in which they find themselves. They ought to get out of the sectarian churches, but they see so much sectarianism in the nonsectarian churches that they think they are all alike.

Peter and John, Paul and Barnabas, all met with the sectarian Jews at their times and places of worship and participated with them, that they might find an opportunity to speak a word for the truth. I do not think it hurts any man, secta-

rian or sinner, to read the Bible anywhere or at any time. I do not think it hurts any one to hear the Bible read by sectarian or sinner at any time or place. The great end is to be true and faithful to the truth and at the same time kind and sympathetic with those in error. The nearer we can do these two things, the more like Jesus we will be and the more sinners and sectarians we will save.

### **SECURITY, GOING.**

Give us some light on going security. A brother buys a piece of property and gives another brother for security on the note. Is it right for this security to pay this debt when he did not get the benefit of the property? If it is brought before the church, have not I, as elder, the right to ask this brother to release the security on the note?

It was wrong for the brother to go in debt; it was wrong for the brother to go his security. Both are clearly condemned in the Bible. "Owe no man anything, save to love one another." (Rom. 13: 8.) James says that we must not say that we will do this or that at a certain time, for we know not what a day may bring forth. The book of Proverbs is a compend of the wisdom that God gave to Solomon to guide him, and he gave it to the world for the benefit of the world. It is the wisdom of God applied to the affairs of the world. It is as true now as at any age of the world. He continually warns against suretyship. I sometimes think it a pity that every man who goes security does not have to pay it. They would all quit it then. A more senseless thing never was done. Why should I risk my property and character when I get no good of it?

But when A has a piece of property that B wishes to buy, but has not the money, and A is unwilling to trust B, C tells A: "If you will let B have that property, I will see it paid." He does this in giving security. C, as an honest man, is bound to see it paid, otherwise he has defrauded A out of his property. A trusts C, not B. Of course, if B is able to pay it, as an honest man, he is bound to do it to A first; but if C has paid it to A, then B is bound to pay it to C. But if I understand this case, C went security for B, and before it is paid he wants to get off of the note. Of course he could not get off without satisfying A, whom he had induced to sell the property. Is B bound to let him off? That depends on so many contingencies that it is difficult to answer. Possibly he

is not able to satisfy A and do it. Possibly C's going his security induced him to buy the property, and there is no one else that he could ask to go his security. It takes a goodly degree of cheek to ask a man to go security, to pay my debt if I fail to pay it—at least it would in me. If C was guilty of the folly of encouraging or helping G to go in debt by going his security, he ought to bear the results of his folly like a man and do the best he can with it.

I cannot see the justice of the elder of a church or any one else asking B to ask another man to involve himself to release C, when C has voluntarily involved himself, and by this helped B to get in debt. Possibly if C had not gone security, the debt would not have been made. Of course, if B misrepresented matters or has pursued an unjust course since C went his security, he should be dealt with for it. If he tries to evade the payment of the debt or shows indifference to it, he ought to be dealt with as a dishonest man. Any man that gets the property of another and is indifferent to paying for it, or of paying any just debt, is dishonest, and should be dealt with as such. Every Christian should keep out of debt, and ought to refuse to go security; but if he does either, he ought, in an honest, manly way, to meet the obligations. Otherwise he is not honest. The church needs to be educated up to a sterling honesty in its dealings; for God loves honesty, and to fail to be honest brings much reproach on Christ and his cause. See **Debt, Paying.**

### SEEING GOD.

Please harmonize John 1: 18 with Gen. 32: 30. Did Moses see God? Did not Adam see God?

God is Spirit, and no fleshly eye ever beheld a spirit. The fleshly eye can see only material things. God has made material manifestations of himself, and men have seen these and called this seeing God. Jesus said: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; how sayest thou, Show us the Father?" (John 14: 9.) When the Scriptures speak of men seeing God, they mean that they saw some material manifestation of his presence. When they say that no man hath or can see God they refer to his real spiritual being.



**SERMON ON THE MOUNT.**

Can you show that it is a Christian's duty to try to obey everything taught by Christ in the sermon recorded in Matt. 5-7 and in Luke 6? While the multitudes heard him speaking, can you show that it was expected that any but the twelve chosen disciples should obey everything taught in this sermon? Should not Christians in this age go to the Epistles, rather, for teaching as to their duty?

Jesus commanded the apostles to teach those who were baptized "to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matt. 28: 20.) This would include what was taught in the Sermon on the Mount, The Sermon on the Mount is the summing up, the announcement of the great principles that were to govern in his kingdom. The Epistles and all the teachings of the apostles are a reiteration of his teachings and the application of them to the affairs of life as they arose.

God gave the Ten Commandments, through Moses, as the constitution of the Mosaic economy; and then the books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy are the laws enacted under that constitution, and the judgments formed in the application of the laws to the cases as they arose in the administration of these laws. So the Sermon on the Mount is the presentation of the great fundamental principles of the Christian dispensation, and the Epistles are the application of these principles to the conditions of life by the Holy Spirit. Then there is not a single principle taught in the Sermon on the Mount but what is reiterated and applied in the Epistles. Had the apostles failed to teach a single principle that Jesus taught them in the Sermon on the Mount or at other times, they would have violated the command to teach them "all things whatsoever I have commanded you." The Epistles are the application by the Holy Spirit of the truths and principles taught by Jesus in this sermon and at any other time to the apostles. They were to teach others what he taught them. Then these teachings of Christ were to make men like God, that they might be fitted to dwell with him. Do not all Christians need to be trained into a fitness to dwell with God as much as the apostles did?

One can find the principles and the duties of life presented in the Epistles; he can find these principles much more concisely and connectedly set forth in the Sermon on the Mount. It is like a lawyer taking the laws, and then searching the decisions of the courts construing and applying the laws.

The Sermon on the Mount is a presentation of the principles that prevail in heaven. They are given that man may practice them here and by this fit himself to live in heaven.

### SHEEPFOLD, THE.

(1) Please explain John 10: 1-9. What is meant by **the sheepfold** in verse 1?

It refers to Jesus as the Shepherd coming to his fold. John the Baptist is the porter, who prepared the people for him, or opened the door and introduced him to the flock. He would not open to another coming in some other way. The basis of the illustration is said to be that in the Eastern countries flocks are gathered by the shepherds to a common fold at night and locked in, and one porter guards all. In the morning the shepherds come, to whom the porter opens the door, and they enter through the door, and each flock knows the voice of its shepherd and comes at his calling. One not coming in at the door is a thief and a robber. Any one coming who claimed to be Christ, but who did not come in the regular way, and to whom John, the porter, did not open, would be an impostor to be avoided.

(2) What do they go in and out of, and what is the pasture they find? (Verse 9.)

The sheep go out of the fold to get food, pasture, and water, and go in to find protection from beasts of prey and robbers. Because pasturage and protection are found by being led out and in, when calling his disciples his **sheep**, he calls the food and protection given them by the terms by which the sheep get these; just as he calls those who mislead his sheep for gain, **thieves** and **robbers**; just as he says our hearts are sprinkled from an evil conscience, because sprinkling the blood of purification was the method of purifying the Jews from fleshly uncleanness. The means are used to indicate the results. "Going in and out" is used to indicate the results that follow food and protection. So, giving food and protection to the children of God by Jesus is represented as leading them out and in, because that is the way sheep get food and protection.

**SIGNS SHALL FOLLOW THEM.**

What is meant by "these signs shall follow them that believe?" (Mark 16: 17, 18.) Does it apply to all who should believe on him for all time?

Jesus did not say that all who should believe on him would be able to perform these miracles. He said that these signs should follow those that believe. A good deed or a bad deed follows a man and his children by being told and repeated concerning him, and to the credit or shame of his family. That is what we mean by their deeds following them. The apostles, fathers, and founders of the church of God on earth performed these miracles, signs, and wonders, and did all things here enumerated. They follow as the heritage of the church of God through all ages, to strengthen it, vindicate its divine origin, and to show that the truths thus approved are sure and certain. This is all that is meant by signs following them. These miracles follow the church as the good deeds of a father follow the children, to give them honor or shame. "They shall cast out devils" refers to the apostles and prophets and inspired persons of early times. These do follow the church and give it character to-day. See **Spiritual Gifts**.

**SIN AGAINST THE HOLY SPIRIT.**

(1) Will you please explain for me what sinning against the Holy Spirit is? (Matt. 12: 31, 32.) Some of the brethren think it is a particular sin, and, if committed, cannot be forgiven in this world or the world to come.

There have long been differences on that subject. Many hold that those who charged Jesus with casting out devils by Beelzebub committed the sin against the Holy Spirit; the connection will bear that interpretation. Still, it will bear another construction. These persons sinned against Jesus in making this charge. He warns them: "You may sin now against me, and find opportunities to repent; but the Holy Spirit will come, and if you reject him as you now do me, there will be no forgiveness, neither here nor hereafter." The Holy Spirit was not the lawgiving and directing power at this time; it was not giving" the law, so could not be sinned against. After he came as the lawgiver and ruler, then to reject his teaching would be to sin against him. Until Jesus came as the ruler and representative of God, men could not sin against or blaspheme him. They knew nothing of him; so until the

Holy Spirit came as the guide and ruler and gave laws, none could sin against the Holy Spirit. Then, until the Holy Spirit came, none could sin against him. This is contrary to the generally received idea, but it is the only interpretation that I can harmonize with the other scriptures. Those who maligned, persecuted, and murdered Jesus did find forgiveness when brought by the Holy Spirit to repentance. The facts seem to be about this: Jesus came and performed his mission ; many rejected him. After he returned to his Father's throne, the Holy Spirit came to confirm the truth he taught and to add to his testimony; but when the Holy Spirit had performed his work, borne his testimony, there would be no further testimony or witness, and he who rejected his testimony then would be left to his own fate without further efforts to save. In other words, the Spirit would complete the testimony and would exhaust the provision that God had made for saving man. If man rejects these, there is nothing more to reach him. There would be no more sacrifice for sin or provisions for mercy. According to this, the rejection of the teaching of the Holy Spirit and the refusal to be led by these teachings is the sin against the Holy Spirit. It is true that, after stating it, he said: "Because they said, He hath an unclean spirit." (Mark 3: 30.) Many conclude that he meant charging him with having an unclean spirit was this sin against the Holy Spirit. I think this is not what is meant. They made this charge of acting by the power of the devil against him, and he warns them that they might do this now to him and find forgiveness; but if they so rejected and treated the Spirit when he came, there would be no forgiveness. The sin can be committed now, and it seems a persistent refusal to obey the laws of the Spirit constitutes this sin. Any disobedience persisted in will be a sin against the Spirit.

(2) What is blasphemy against the Holy Spirit? (Mark 3: 28-30.) Can any one that has never been baptized into the kingdom of Christ commit that sin?

**Blasphemy** means to speak evil of, to reject or refuse. I think that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is to rail upon, reject, refuse, misrepresent, and pervert the work of the Holy Spirit. To do this in the face of the clear manifestations of spiritual power in the times of the Savior seems to have been to blaspheme against the Holy Spirit.

**SIN AND EVIL.**

Please explain whether or not God created all things, both good and evil. If he did not create all things, give us the origin of sin and the devil. Please, also, state the difference between sin and evil.

The Bible says that God created all things. "I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil; I am Jehovah, that doeth all these things." (Isa. 45: 7.) Sin is the violation of God's law; evil is the punishment that comes on the violation of the law. God ordains that evil shall come upon the sinner; it is the penalty for violated law. James (1: 13-15) says that sin came into the world through lust. God created man with faculties and freedom to desire good and bad. He yielded to the evil desires and he violated the law of God. This is sin. Sin is not an independent entity, but is the quality of an action that sets aside the law of God. See **Evil, Does God Create?**

**SIN, PRESUMPTUOUS.**

The following statement from your pen is liable to be misunderstood. I think the sentiment it expresses has done, and is doing, much harm. The statement is as follows: "To substitute man's ways for God's was first instigated by Satan in Eden, and is a greater sin than neglect of duty. It is willful usurpation of God's place. The other is human weakness." The sin of neglect will be punished as severely as any sin we know anything about. "Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels." (Matt. 25: 41.) Why? Neglect of duty. Read what follows. (Verses 42-44.) Again: "For if the word spoken through angels proved steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great a salvation?" (Heb. 2: 2, 3.) Here the two sins of transgression, or going beyond, substituting man's ways for God's, and the sin of neglect are classed together as deserving the same degree of punishment. Note another passage: "Not forsaking our own assembling together, as the custom of some is, but exhorting one another; and so much the more, as ye see the day drawing nigh. For if we sin willfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful expectation of judgment, and a fierceness of fire which shall devour the adversaries." (Heb. 10: 25-27.) In this passage the sin of neglect seems to be as willful a sin as the sin of presumption, and it would be hard to find severer language than that regarding it. To call such sin only a "human weakness" eases the consciences of many down the road to ruin. Unless they repent and go to work, many will be spewed out of the Lord's mouth, though "loyal" against "innovations," for the negative sin of doing nothing.

Notwithstanding all that, God does say: "But the soul that doeth aught with a high hand, whether he be home-born or a

sojourner, the same blasphemeth Jehovah; and that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Because he hath despised the word of Jehovah, and hath broken his commandment, that soul shall utterly be cut off; his iniquity shall be upon him." (Num. 15: 30, 31.) For this presumptuous setting aside God's law there was no forgiveness. "And the man that doeth presumptuously, in not hearkening unto the priest that standeth to minister there before Jehovah thy God, or unto the judge, even that man shall die: and thou shalt put away the evil from Israel." (Deut. 17: 12.) "But the prophet, that shall speak a word presumptuously in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, that same prophet shall die." (Deut. 18: 20.) Setting aside God's law and substituting something else in its stead is a higher crime before God than a neglect of his will, and for this there is no forgiveness. The person who does this assumes the place of God himself.

Then, Jesus said: "Therefore I say unto you, Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven. And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come." (Matt. 12: 31, 32.) A sin against the Holy Spirit is a greater sin than neglect of duty. To set aside the teachings of the Holy Spirit and substitute something else in their stead is sin against the Holy Spirit. For this there is no forgiveness in this world or that to come. This is a greater sin than neglect of duty, even though the punishment in the end may be the same. One may be repented of and forgiven; the other cannot be.

A good example of this difference is found in the examples of King Saul and David. David committed, to human eyes, the greater sin in his adultery and murder of Uriah. Saul deliberately set aside the law of God and substituted a different service, with the view, too, that that would bring the greater honor to God. Both were sins that, unrepented of, would bring death and ruin. But the difference was: David's sin could be and was repented of and David saved. Saul's sin could not be forgiven; and though he sought forgiveness, he was not forgiven. If David had not repented, he may have incurred the same punishment. But it was not so great a sin

in its commission, and God granted repentance to him, but none to Saul.

A failure to perform a duty may arise from presumptuously concluding that we can do better, but that is the sin of presumption. There is danger in our judging of things as they affect us for good or evil, not as God commands them. The willful sin finds no forgiveness. This substituting what affects us and what seems good to us for the law of God savors of danger. David prayed, "Keep thy servant from presumptuous sin," because for this there is no forgiveness. All substitution of our ways for God's ways savors of presumption.

### SIN UNTO DEATH.

Please give your views on the following passage: "If any man see his brother sinning a sin not unto death, he shall ask, and God will give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: not concerning this do I say that he should make request. All unrighteousness is sin: and there is a sin not unto death." (1 John 5: 16, 17.) "If any man see his brother sinning a sin not unto death." How are we to know? "He shall ask, and God will give him life for them that sin not unto death." Give who life? If to the one that asks, how can it help the brother who sins?

We have never been able to reach a conclusion as to the meaning of the scripture. Most commentators refer it to the spiritually gifted; they connect it with James' direction to the elders to anoint the sick with oil, pray over them, and they shall be healed, and refer both to the age of miracles. It has always seemed to me unnatural and strained to take two or three verses out of scriptures directed to all Christians and for all ages and apply it to a specific class in one age. This gives great license for many evils. Macknight thinks that mortal diseases were brought upon people in that age for sin. The spiritually gifted could discern it. He says: "To encourage those to repent who by their sins had brought on themselves mortal diseases, there were in the first age persons who, being endowed with the gift of healing diseases miraculously (1 Cor. 12: 9), were moved by the Holy Ghost to heal the sick, who had repented of the sins which had brought on them the diseases under which they were laboring. We may, therefore, believe that when John directed **any one** who saw his brother sinning a sin not unto death to ask God to give him life, he did not mean any ordinary Christian, but any spiritual man who was endowed with the gift of healing diseases; and

that the brother for whom the spiritual man, was to ask life was not every brother who had sinned, but the brother only who had been punished for his sin with some mortal disease, but who, having repented of his sin, it was not a sin unto death; and that the life to be asked for such a brother was not eternal life, but a miraculous recovery from the mortal disease under which he was laboring." That explanation is not satisfactory to me, as I see no reason for confining this to the miraculously endowed and applying the remainder to all ages and people. To give men license to thus set aside scripture as inapplicable to us that does not seem clear and possible goes a long way toward setting aside the authority of scripture.

But I have no clear and definite idea as to the meaning of the scripture, or how we can tell which sin is unto death and which is not. Yet in that age there were clearer distinctions as to sins of this character than we have. Paul states that Christ was of none effect to those who went back to Judaism. "Ye are fallen away from grace." (Gal. 5: 4.) Again, for him that sinned willfully there was no more sacrifice for sin. These sins for which there was no forgiveness were better defined in the apostolic days than now. Our failure to keep a clear distinction comes somewhat from our altered surroundings and somewhat from loose habits of thought into which we have fallen. All sin persisted in, unrepented of, may become sin unto death. I think that the life and death referred to are spiritual, and not bodily. When he gives life to the prayer, it is the spiritual life of those who sin. They are forgiven, and are said to be given him who prayed for them, as they were forgiven in answer to his prayer.

### **SOCIETIES AND THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.**

Please point out the difference in principle between sending money for the societies and sending it to the Gospel Advocate for missionary purposes.

The Gospel Advocate acts only as a forwarding or shipping agent; it does not apply the money or direct the preachers. When one wishes to send money to a brother in Japan or elsewhere, and he does not know the post-office address or how to forward it, we offer to receive it and forward it to the person designated by the giver. The Advocate takes no control of the money or of the person to whom it is sent; it only for-



wards it as the sender wishes it sent. Sometimes when sending to foreign lands, the country postmasters or those in smaller towns do not know how to send it; at the larger offices they can always do this. So the Advocate has offered to take on itself the trouble of forwarding the money to the persons designated by the giver. The Advocate acts as a forwarding agent. It does not seek this work, but is willing to do it to help those who desire to send, but do not know how to send it. We think it better, when it can be done well, for the giver to send directly to the missionary and come into more direct communication and sympathy with him. A society collects the money from churches and Christians that its own board may employ preachers, direct their labors, their pay, and control them. It concentrates the authority and power and means of all the Christians and all the churches in a few persons, who constitute a board to employ, direct, and pay the preachers. This places all the money and all the preachers of all the churches and Christians in the hands and under the control of half a dozen men. Really, one or two men control all such boards, and it virtually puts the whole means and men of the churches in the hands of one or two men. Such men are not, as a rule, chosen for their piety, holiness, and devotion, but for their capacity to raise money. This opens temptations to money-loving men; it drives out self-sacrificing and self-devoted men. God's way is the best for conserving piety and devotion in the churches, as well as for spreading the gospel.

### SONG SERVICE.

Will you give scriptures authorizing the song service?

When the Lord's Supper was instituted, Mark says: "When they had sung a hymn, they went out unto the mount of Olives." (Mark 14: 26.) Christ and the apostles sung at the first institution and observance of the Supper. **They** sung, not **one** of them. Paul and Silas, in the Philippian jail, sung at midnight. This might not be called a public song **service**, but it was a part of the worship engaged in by these two disciples in the prison. Luke says: "But about midnight Paul and Silas were praying and singing hymns unto God, and the prisoners were listening to them." (Acts 16:25.) They both sung, and the prayer and singing are associated as equally

acceptable to God, each constituting an act of acceptable worship to God. Paul says: "Speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord." (Eph. 5: 19.) They were to speak to each other in the singing. It must have been when they were called together. Again: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly; in all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto God. And whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through him." (Col. 3: 16, 17.) This singing must be done when they were together, that each might be admonished by the singing done. This is clear and distinct authority for the song service. That it should be called in question is an indication as to what extremes people will go in trying to justify practices not required by God.

### SOUL AND SPIRIT.

I am a babe in Christ, and I want you to answer the following question: Are the soul and the spirit the same thing, or are they two different things?

You have a pretty tough and gristly piece of meat for a babe to masticate and digest if you undertake to define the difference between **soul** and **spirit**. **Soul** is defined "the internal spirit, but occasionally the animal life." That is its use in the Bible. So **soul** and **spirit** are sometimes used interchangeably in the Bible, sometimes they are used as distinct; which means that the soul and the spirit in part are identical, in some points they differ. The difference between the two is not set forth in the Bible; so I conclude that, however much it might gratify our curiosity, the knowledge of the difference is not needful or even helpful to our salvation, else the difference would have been plainly set forth in the Bible. It falls under the head of untaught and doubtful questions, which minister strife and create division rather than godly edifying in Christ Jesus. I suggest, then, that we postpone the study of these nonessential, impractical, and hurtful questions until we become skilled in the knowledge and practice of the questions that are taught, that are practical and helpful. If we do this, we will lose interest in the speculation as to the difference between the soul and the spirit and will let them go over

into the next world, where, it may be, they will be made plain and there will be nothing in them to argue over. I am satisfied that the best way is not to argue these untaught questions on the one side or the other, not to maintain whether the one position is true or not. They constitute no part of the gospel or the divine teaching, and so have no bearing on the salvation of the soul, save the discussion of them is calculated to turn men's minds from the truth that saves and so endanger their salvation.

### **SPIRIT, RECEIVING THE, THROUGH THE WORD.**

You ask the question, "What is meant by receiving the Spirit through the word?" and in a column or more you endeavor to give the answer. You will please pardon me when I say I have looked closely all through your answer, and utterly fail to find the question answered. Is it possible that there is a meaning in the expression, "receiving the Spirit through the word," that common minds like mine cannot grasp? In olden times persons received the Spirit **after** they received the word and had obeyed it (see Acts 8: 14-17; 19: 2, 4-6; Eph. 1: 13), not **while** hearing and obeying. Neither did they, save in a case of baptism of the Holy Spirit, receive it at all unless an apostle prayed for them and laid hands on them: "Who, when they were come down, prayed for them, **that they might** receive the Holy Spirit." (Acts 8: 15.) Where are **we** promised the Holy Spirit—i. e., gift of the Holy Spirit—to be received as an indwelling guest in fact? Is there any record of any one in apostolic times receiving the Holy Spirit other than in the personal presence of an apostle? Can a person receive the Holy Spirit and never know it? If you answer, "No," then I ask: At what particular moment of your life did you receive him? I **know** I received the word of God, and I **know** I obeyed it on August 12, 1878; but if I have ever yet received the Holy Spirit to personally abide in me, I do not know it Paul understood that persons would **know** it when they received the Holy Spirit, for he asked: "Did ye receive the Holy Spirit when ye believed?" And at the same time he thought these twelve persons were Christians; hence Paul supposed persons could be Christians without receiving the Holy Spirit.

Our brother alone has objected to our article. No doubt the common minds understand it; his is the uncommon mind. From his article we think that he objected to what he imagined was implied in it, rather than to what it taught. But I do not believe that a man can live a Christian without the presence and help of the Spirit of God. I do not believe that a man can become a Christian without the guidance of the Spirit. I do not believe that any man can live the Christian one day without the guidance and help of the Spirit of God.

Jesus said: "If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another

Comforter, that he may be with you forever, even the Spirit of truth: whom the world cannot receive; for it beholdeth him not, neither knoweth him: ye know him; for he abideth with you, and shall be in you." (John 14: 15-17.) This is the first direct and clear promise of the Spirit by Jesus. It is made directly to the apostles. But when he says, "whom the world cannot receive," here are two classes. One receives him, the other does not. The world, which does not see or know him, constitutes one class; all who see or know him, who receive him, constitute the other, and it shows the promise extends to all who are not **the world**, or who receive him. "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him. . . . If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." (Verses 21-23.)

While these were addressed to the apostles, a universal proposition is laid down. He, any one, or every man that loves Jesus will keep his words, and him will the Father love, "and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." How will the Father and the Son make their abode with any and every man that loveth him and keepeth his words? Paul says: "In whom [Christ] ye also are builded together for a habitation [dwelling place] of God in the Spirit." (Eph. 2: 22.) Since Jesus ascended, God dwells with man only in the person of his Spirit. All who are built into this temple as lively stones upon Jesus as the chief corner stone become recipients of the Holy Spirit by which God dwells in his habitation, by which Spirit they are enabled to offer up spiritual sacrifices unto the Lord. Peter says: "Unto whom coming, a living stone, rejected indeed of men, but with God elect, precious, ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." (1 Pet. 2: 4, 5.) How can they be a spiritual house unless the Spirit dwells in the house? How can they offer up spiritual sacrifices if they have not the Spirit? How can they be living stones unless the Spirit be in them? The Spirit gives life in nature and grace.

But going back to the promises and the fulfillment, Peter, on Pentecost, said: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of

you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For to you is the promise, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him." (Acts 2: 38, 39.) What promise but the gift of the Holy Spirit, as made in John 14: 16? He then tells that that promise was made "to you [Jews], . . . and to your children, and to all that are afar off [Gentiles], even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him." That means that every soul, Jew or Gentile, that accepts the call of God shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit; and this means the Holy Spirit as a gift, as you may see in Acts 10: 45-47, in which the gift of the Holy Spirit is explained to be the Holy Spirit himself. Acts 2: 39 shows that the gift of the Holy Spirit is to all, Jew and Gentile, who accept that call of God.

I know that some say that, as the apostles had received a miraculous manifestation of the Spirit, this promise must have meant a miraculous gift of the Spirit. But why should it so mean? Life was given to Adam by miracle. It was transmitted to his descendants by fixed means in accordance with law. So spiritual life was given to the apostles in the beginning by miracle, and has been transmitted by them to all others by law. All life is spirit. When the human spirit departs from the body, the body dies and crumbles into inorganic dust. When the divine spirit leaves the man, he dies as a child of God. Paul says: "But ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. But if any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ is in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, he that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall give life also to your mortal bodies through his Spirit that dwelleth in you." (Rom. 8: 9-11.) Now this means that there is no spiritual life in us, save as the Spirit of Christ dwells in us. Our work is to make our bodies temples fitted for the Spirit of God to dwell in. Again: "For we are a temple of the living God; even as God said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." (2 Cor. 6: 16.) How does God dwell in them as a temple, save through his Spirit? "Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man destroyeth the

temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, and such are ye." (1 Cor. 3: 16, 17.) "Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have from God? and ye are not your own." (1 Cor. 6: 19.)

The church is established, as was the tabernacle and temple, as the dwelling place of God among men. He dwells in them through the Spirit. "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control; against such there is no law. . . . If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk." (Gal. 5: 22-25.) How can the Spirit bear fruit in our heart, feeling, spirit, life, unless he dwell within us? (See also Gal. 5: 9.)

The word of God is the seed of the kingdom. (Luke 8: 11.) The seed is the material substance in which the germinal principal of life dwells. Then the word of God is the material seed in which the germinal principle, spiritual life, dwells. If the word of God is received into the heart, the Spirit of God must go with it, because the word of God is an incorruptible seed. It never can be separated from the Spirit dwelling in it. The Spirit becomes a living, working principle in the heart only as the word is believed and obeyed.

All the teachings, all the allusions, all the figures used in reference to the life of the Christian teach beyond a doubt that the Spirit of God dwells in the heart and works out into the life of men. The Spirit dwelt in all the New Testament Christians. If it does not, man is lost and ruined. Do I know when I received the Spirit? By my fleshly senses I never knew of a spirit, human or divine—my own or another's. The essence of spirit is that it is immaterial, intangible, cannot be cognized by any of the bodily senses. "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have," said Jesus. Spirit is not material ; it cannot be seen, heard, tasted, smelled, or felt.

I never saw, felt, heard, tasted, or smelled my own spirit. How do I know that I have a spirit? By the fruits it bears. "A tree shall be known by its fruits." No one who understands the nature of spirit ever claimed to know its presence by his fleshly sense. A man who claims this does not even know the character of spirit. I know that I have a spirit by the life and warmth and vigor it imparts to my body. I know that I have the Spirit of God by the fruits it bears in my life. If my life does not bear the fruits of the Spirit, it is because

the Spirit does not dwell in me. It affects my life by molding and directing my spirit; and without the Spirit of God molds and directs the spirit of man, it can never work through or bear spiritual fruit in the life.

There can be no spiritual fruit without a spiritual tree to bear the fruit; no spiritual tree without the spiritual seed, which is the word of God. The idea of a spiritual life for man, or of a spiritual man without the presence of God's Spirit in the man, would be fruit without a tree. There is one Spirit, but different manifestations; and because the same manifestation is not now presented as was in the beginning, we conclude that the Spirit is not present. But life was first imparted to Adam by miracle; it has since been transmitted through law without miracle. But it is the same life now received by the child through law that was given Adam by miracle. It is just so in the religious world. The same spiritual life that was given by miracle has since been perpetuated through law. "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ made me free from the law of sin and death." (Rom. 8: 2.) If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. It takes a very extraordinary mind to believe the Bible and not believe that the Spirit of God dwells in all the children of God.

### **SPIRITS IN PRISON.**

Did Christ go down into the graves and preach to those who were dead; or, otherwise, did Christ preach to the antediluvian world, that they might have the benefit of the death of Christ? Peter says: "For this end was the gospel preached even to the dead, that they might be judged indeed according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the Spirit." (1 Pet. 4: 6.)

In the understanding of this passage, several things are to be noted. First, Christ preached. Secondly, he did not do it in person, but by or through the Spirit which raised him from the dead. The Spirit which raised him from the dead was not his own personal spirit. "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, he that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall give life also to your mortal bodies through his Spirit that dwelleth in you." (Rom. 8: 11.) It is clear, then, that Christ did not preach in his own person, but through the agency of the Spirit. That Spirit was the Holy Spirit. He controlled or directed that Spirit. He says: "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Com-

forter, that he may be with you forever, even the Spirit of truth." (John 14: 16, 17.) "But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you." (Verse 26.) "For if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you." (John 16: 17.)

Christ could send the Holy Spirit, and work, act, or preach by and through him. Christ did act in the preexistent state previous to his incarnation or birth of Mary. He was present and the active agent in creating the world. "Through whom [Christ] also he made the worlds." (Heb. 1: 2.) "In him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, . . . and he is before all things, and in him all things consist." (Col. 1: 16, 17; see also John 1: 1-5.) He not only acted, but he acted through the Spirit. He preached or testified by the Spirit in the prophets. "Concerning which salvation the prophets sought and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glories that should follow them." (1 Pet. 1: 10, 11.) Here is the clear statement that Christ's Spirit was in the prophets before his incarnation to testify and prophesy. The manner of his preaching by the Spirit is plainly told. He sent his Spirit into the prophets, and through their mouths preached or testified to the people. Then Christ, before his birth, by his Spirit preached and testified to the world. He did it on the occasion here referred to through Noah, the preacher of righteousness. The Spirit of Christ was in Noah, the Spirit preached through Noah. Christ did, then, by his Spirit in Noah, preach to the antediluvians. The result of Christ's preaching by the Spirit was the salvation of eight souls in the ark by water, the like figure or antitype of which, baptism, doth now save us. The figure is, as Christ by the Spirit preached through Noah to the disobedient, and eight souls were saved by water in the ark, so now Christ by the Spirit is preached through Peter, and by water, in baptism, we are saved.

From whatever point we consider it, the preaching was done by the Spirit through Noah. The result of the preaching was the salvation of Noah, the destruction without excuse of the



disobedient. A fanciful idea sometimes drawn from it is that Christ in person went to the spirits in Hades, and while he was separated from the body his personal spirit preached in the unseen world to the guilty spirits there. But Christ did not go in person, but preached by the Spirit; he did this by his Spirit in the prophets. He did it so as to effect their salvation by water or their condemnation by it.

Had he gone to the unseen world and preached, he doubtless would have preached to other spirits than those disobedient in the days of Noah. The preaching would not have been limited to them. "But the spirits were in prison." Even if the account said that they were in prison when preached to, it would not be conclusive that they were in the unseen world. When the preaching of Noah was done, they were under the sentence of death from the Almighty. They were prisoners, as it were, in the hands of the Almighty awaiting the execution of sentence against them. True to his character, Christ interposes, puts his Spirit in Noah, and sends a message of mercy if they will repent and turn from their wicked ways.

But the passage does not say that they were in prison when preached to. The spirits, now in the prison house of Hades, were preached to when they were disobedient in the days of Noah—"when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." (1 Pet. 3: 20.) The passage is susceptible of either of these explanations, but does not bear the idea that preaching was done in the unseen world. Conclusively on this subject, each of the words **went** and **preached**, and the participle indicating the **disobedience** of the people, all indicate the same time of fulfillment of each action. A literal translation would be: "By which (Spirit) he having gone and preached to the spirits in bonds, being disobedient at the time, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water." The time when God waited in the days of Noah indicates the time of the going, preaching, disobedience, and the salvation of eight souls by water as the result of the preaching. The idea of preaching in the unseen world and giving an opportunity of repenting there plainly contradicts several passages and the whole tenor of scripture on this subject.

Solomon says: "If the clouds be full of rain, they empty themselves upon the earth; and if the tree fall toward

the south, or toward the north, in the place where the tree falleth, there shall it be." (Eccles. 11: 3.) This teaches that there shall be no change in the character or destiny after death. Again: "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in Sheol whither thou goest." (Eccles. 9: 10.) There can be no preaching or repentance in that state if this be true. Paul says: "For we must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ; that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad." (2 Cor. 5: 10.) They are to be judged according to that done in the body, not that done out of the body. Peter's statement, "For unto this end was the gospel preached even to the dead, that they might be judged indeed according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the Spirit," means that those now dead, while alive, had the gospel (in type, by the prophets) preached to them, that they might be judged as men living in the flesh are judged and might live as spiritual beings with God.

I know nothing of any preaching to the lost spirits in the next world. Jesus tells of one poor lost soul in hell, tormented in a flame, that begged most piteously for help and relief. He wanted water to cool his tongue. He would have gladly heard a preacher and become an easy convert. But Abraham told him: "Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, that they that would pass from hence to you may not be able, and that none may cross over from thence to us." (Luke 16: 26.) Jesus gives that as the true condition of the lost. How can there be preaching to them in that state? Better teach the people to hear the gospel in this world than delude them with the idea of having a chance to hear preaching and to turn in the world to come.

### **SPIRITUAL AND LITERAL MEANINGS.**

Are there **spiritual** and **literal** meanings to the Bible?

Words and sentences are to be understood in the Bible just as they are in any other book or writing. The meaning of the words and their context determine the meaning of the sentence. The Bible uses them in the commonest and simplest sense of the words as they were understood in the age and country in which the Bible words were given. The Bible was

intended to reveal God and his will to the common people, and used their language in the sense, too, in which it was commonly understood. As in all speech, sometimes it was used figuratively. A well-known fact was used to illustrate an unknown fact. This was done through parables and figures, as is done in all speaking and writing. The parable of the sower is an illustration. The words here mean exactly what they did in common affairs of life. Then he shows that these truths concerning material and well-known things illustrate and enforce certain truths concerning spiritual things. But there are not two meanings to the words. It is also true that one who enters into the spirit of the work understands the words and the statements much better than one who has not entered into the spirit of it, just as a man familiar with farming understands the terms used and the statements made on agriculture better than one not familiar with the operations of farming. But there is no common or literal meaning and then a distinct spiritual one that only people guided by the direct influence of the Spirit can understand.

### **SPIRITUAL GIFTS.**

"And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, then miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, divers kinds of tongues." (1 Cor. 12: 28.) Why are not the same in the church to-day? Paul said: "When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." (1 Cor. 13: 10.) Has that perfection come, or will it come with Christ at his second coming? It seems to me that it has not yet come, for Paul says: "Whether there be knowledge, it shall be done away." (Verse 8.) Now, we are bound by reason to admit that there is knowledge yet in the world. Now, if the word of God is "that which is perfect" which is spoken of, it seems that we have never reached it; or, if we have, it seems like our eminent theologians are all the time trying to make it imperfect by new revisions of the word. If the Holy Spirit was given by the laying on of hands by the apostle Paul (Acts 19: 6), why do we not receive it the same way now? The promise was to all, to as many as the Lord should call. Again, Christ said: "These signs shall accompany them that believe: in my name shall they cast out demons; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall in no wise hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." (Mark 16: 17, 18.) Are these signs following believers now, or did they stop with the apostles?

Spiritual gifts, faculties, or bestowments were given to the early church to guide and instruct it until the completed or perfected will of God was made known to the world. They were to serve a temporary purpose; then when their office

was fulfilled, they were to pass away and give place to the perfected will, or law, of God. Their purpose was to make known the will of God; when that purpose was completed, there was no further need for them.

That perfection was completed, so far as God's work of the revealing work of the Spirit is concerned, when the full will of God was revealed, or made known, and his provisions for saving man were set in operation. Churches and Christians come to that perfection as they learn and practice the full will of God. God's work in providing the full knowledge was finished when the revelation of God was completed. The work of an apostle was to bear witness of what he saw and heard of the work and teaching of Christ. "And ye are witnesses of these things." (Luke 24: 48.) "And ye also bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." (John 15: 27.) When one was chosen to take the place of Judas, he must be one that had been "with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto the day that he was received up from us, of these must one become a witness with us of his resurrection." (Acts 1: 21, 22.) So, too, Paul had to see Jesus after his resurrection and in his glorified state before he could be an apostle. Ananias said to Saul: "The God of our Fathers hath appointed thee to know his will, and to see the Righteous One, and to hear a voice from his mouth. For thou shalt be a witness for him unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard." (Acts 22: 14, 15.) "I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee." (Acts 26: 16.) No one could be an apostle unless he saw and heard Jesus. The work of an apostle was to bear witness of what he had heard and seen from him. For a man to claim to be an apostle at this day is to show that he either does not know what was the office of an apostle or he is a pretender.

Slight attention to the connection of 1 Cor. 13 shows that the apostle is speaking of spiritual gifts or miracle-working power, the gift of prophecy, the understanding mysteries and all knowledge, that were miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit. These gifts of healing, prophecy, understanding mysteries and miraculously acquired knowledge shall be done away when that which is perfect, the perfect will of God, is come. Then

knowledge is not to be sought through miracles, but by learning the perfect will of God. "And he gave some to be apostles ; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ: till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." (Eph. 4: 11-13.) This means the same thing. The gifts were to serve until the full knowledge was received to make them one in faith and to bring them to the fullness of the stature of men and women in Christ Jesus. That knowledge needed to bring men to the oneness of the faith and the fullness of the stature in Christ Jesus was given in the New Testament. If men do not measure up to this degree, it is because they will not learn this knowledge and live up to it. The knowledge revealed is sufficient. God has done his part. If man fails to receive the fullness of the blessing, it is because he will not. God never intended that knowledge should grow less, but it shall increase and spread through a study of the will of God.

There are two reasons why these gifts of the Spirit are not now imparted by the apostles. These gifts were miraculous powers. First, there are no apostles now to impart gifts. The apostles were inspired men; so they knew all truth through inspiration, and they had seen and heard Jesus. Secondly, they having revealed all truth needed to make men perfect and thoroughly furnish them to all good works, having put in operation all the provisions of God for instructing and blessing men, there is no further need for miraculous revelations. Man can now learn all truth needed for present and eternal well-being from his will revealed and recorded in the Bible, and it will lead him into all the blessings of God in this world and in that to come, if he will diligently study it to know and do the will of God. What man can learn himself, God will not work miracles to make known to him. Again, to all creations and orders of God there have been creative and procreative ages. The creative age is that in which new creatures and a new order of things are brought into being; the procreative age is that in which these beings are multiplied and developed and the order is continued. In the creative age, the age of miracles, things are miraculously formed and created,

afterwards they multiply and grow through the workings of law, without miracle. Life was imparted to Adam and Eve by miracle; life, the same life that was given to them, has been passed on to their children through all the generations from them to us, by law, without miracle. The same life bestowed on Adam and Eve has been transmitted and multiplied so that every human being to-day receives of the same life given to Adam, and it has been transmitted through law, without miracle. No miracle has been needed to impart physical life since Adam and Eve were made alive. A miracle giving physical life would be a violation of the order of God. The same is true in the spiritual world. In the beginning spiritual life was imparted miraculously. Men and women were endowed with all spiritual life and knowledge the first day they were created in the spiritual kingdom. The same spiritual life bestowed then has been perpetuated and multiplied until all Christians now enjoy that life without miracle. It was given by miracle; it is perpetuated by law.

The promises that certain miraculous powers should follow those that believe do not carry the idea that all who believe should be so endowed, nor that they should last for all time. These miraculous gifts were bestowed to prove that God was in and spoke through those who wrought the miracles and that the words spoken by them were God's words. These signs followed the believers in sufficient power and numbers to convince every good and honest heart of this truth, and they come down to us with equal assurance of their being from God. When this was done, then prophecies, tongues, miraculous knowledge—all gave way to that better way that embraces faith, hope, love—believing in and trusting God, hope for his blessings in time and eternity, and the love that leads to the fulfilling of all the duties we owe to God and man.

I do not see how<sup>1</sup> any one can read 1 Cor. 12, 13, and doubt the meaning of the apostle. Chapter 12 is taken up with the account of spiritual gifts—what they are, how they are given, how they stand related one to the other and to the body of Christ, and their several uses. It also tells them that while each ought to desire the best gifts, yet he would show them a more excellent way than these gifts. Chapter 13 tells how useless spiritual gifts are to save, unless associated with and ending in love. Speaking with tongues, without love, is "as sounding brass, or a clanging cymbal"—all sound, without

meaning to him who possesses them. Though he has the gift of prophecy that reveals all mysteries and all knowledge and has the miracle-working faith that would enable him to remove mountains (see Matt. 17: 20; Mark 11: 22; Luke 17: 6), and has not love, they add nothing to his salvation. This shows that power to work miracles or spiritual gifts were not given to save men; that what is here called "love" alone can save him.

The knowledge given through prophecy, mentioned in verse 2, is the knowledge that shall vanish away when prophecies cease, mentioned in verse 8. In verse 3 he shows that one may give all his goods to help the poor and his own body to be burned, and yet be without the love that saves. Verses 4-7 describe the qualities of love that saves. These qualities are such as lead to humble obedience to the will of God. "Love therefore is the fulfillment of the law." (Rom. 13: 10.) The perfection of love is to fulfill the law of God in all things toward God, toward our fellow-men, and toward ourselves. The passage means that to fulfill or come up to the law of God in all things is to love, is the highest possible good to every being in the universe and is eternal in its nature, while these temporary gifts that were to endure until the perfect or completed law of God was given would then pass away. Prophecies shall cease, speaking with tongues shall be done away, and the knowledge and mysteries coming through prophecy, as told in verse 2, shall vanish away.

In verse 11 he compares this time of partial gifts in the church to childhood; that when the perfect law is completed, to manhood. While the gifts last, he would use and speak by them as he spoke when a child. When the perfect law is come, he will put away these partial gifts bestowed as helps for the childhood of the church and use the perfect law given to guide its manhood. While in the state of a child, with only these partial gifts, he sees, as in a mirror, darkly; but when the perfect law is come, they will all, face to face, look into the perfect law of liberty. While having only the gifts to guide them, they knew only in part; but when the perfect law should come, they would know as they were known. While these miraculous gifts must pass away, faith, hope, and love would remain as the perpetual heritage of the church. Without these no one can be a child of God; with them and the perfect law of liberty, gifts are no longer needed. The

greatest of these is love; for it is the end, the aim, and the perfection of the others. The end and aim of faith and hope is to bring man into perfect harmony with the will of God. Complete harmony with the will of God is perfect love to every being in the universe. This love will only be perfected in the state of glory, when we shall see him as he is and be like him, and it will be eternal.

Chapter 14 continues the discussion of the relation of love to spiritual gifts, the relative importance of the different gifts, their dependence one upon the other, how and when each may be used, and the rule by which all gifts are to be tested. The passage, in its scope and connection, cannot possibly mean anything else than that the spiritual gifts were bestowed on the infant church to guide it until the perfect will of God is known, and that they revealed only parts of the will of God and must pass away when the whole will of God was given.

After we have received the better way contained in the perfect will of God, why should we go back to the partial and imperfect gifts that were bestowed to introduce the better way, the complete and perfect will of God? I do not know how God performs any of his works. I do not know how he causes the seed to germinate, grow, and bear fruit. I know that he does it, and that if we plant and cultivate, prune and water, the seed will bear fruit. I do not know how he answers prayer; but if we pray sincerely, we will work faithfully to attain the end, and in doing these we will receive the blessing.

### SPRINKLE CLEAN WATER.

(1) When, where, and upon whom was the **clean water** mentioned in Ezek. 36: 25 to be sprinkled?

In Num. 19: 1-10 we have an account of the preparation of the waters of separation, or **purification**, or **cleansing**, as it is called: "And Jehovah spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, saying, This is the statute of the law which Jehovah hath commanded, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring thee a red heifer without spot, wherein is no blemish, and upon which never came yoke. And ye shall give her unto Eleazar the priest, and he shall bring her forth without the camp, and one shall slay her before his face: and Eleazar the priest shall take of her blood with his finger, and sprinkle of



her blood toward the front of the tent of meeting seven times. And one shall burn the heifer in his sight; her skin, and her flesh, and her blood, with her dung, shall he burn: and the priest shall take cedar wood, and hyssop, and scarlet, and cast it into the midst of the burning of the heifer. Then the priest shall wash his clothes, and he shall bathe his flesh in water, and afterward he shall come into the camp, and the priest shall be unclean until the even. And he that burneth her shall wash his clothes in water, and bathe his flesh in water, and shall be unclean until the even. And a man that is clean shall gather up the ashes of the heifer, and lay them up without the camp in a clean place; and it shall be kept for the congregation of the children of Israel for a water for impurity: it is a sin offering. And he that gathereth the ashes of the heifer shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the even: and it shall be unto the children of Israel, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among them, for a statute forever." These ashes of the heifer and the cedar and hyssop were kept, and whenever a Jew or any vessel from any cause became unclean, he must take of water from a running stream, mix these ashes with it, and sprinkle himself or the vessel before he could be clean or come into the congregation of Israel. Verses 11-20 give an example of how it was used: "He that toucheth the dead body of any man shall be unclean seven days: the same shall purify himself therewith on the third day, and on the seventh day he shall be clean: but if he purify not himself the third day, then the seventh day he shall not be clean. Whosoever toucheth a dead person, the body of a man that hath died, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle of Jehovah; and that soul shall be cut off from Israel: because the water for impurity was not sprinkled upon him, he shall be unclean; his uncleanness is yet upon him. This is the law when a man dieth in a tent: every one that cometh into the tent, and every one that is in the tent, shall be unclean seven days. And every open vessel, which hath no covering bound upon it, is unclean. And whosoever in the open field toucheth one that is slain with a sword, or a dead body, or a bone of a man, or a grave, shall be unclean seven days. And for the unclean they shall take of the ashes of the burning of the sin offering; and running water shall be put thereto in a vessel: and a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it in the water, and sprinkle it upon the tent, and upon

all the vessels, and upon the persons that were there, and upon him that touched the bone, or the slain, or the dead, or the grave: and the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean on the third day, and on the seventh day: and on the seventh day he shall purify him; and he shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and shall be clean at even. But the man that shall be unclean, and shall not purify himself, that soul shall be cut off from the midst of the assembly, because he hath defiled the sanctuary of Jehovah: the water for impurity hath not been sprinkled upon him; he is unclean." This water was called **cleansing**, or **clean**, water; **purifying**, or **pure**, water. To speak of sprinkling pure water came to mean that the person or vessel was cleansed and purified, just as to bow before the Lord came to mean to pray to him, since men bowed or knelt to pray. So when it says that they were sprinkled with clean water, it meant that they had repented of their wicked ways and turned to the Lord and he had forgiven them. The Jews had gone into idolatry, had been carried into captivity, and were in a foreign land when Ezekiel told them: "And I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep mine ordinances, and do them. And ye shall dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers; and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God. And I will save you from all your uncleannesses: and I will call for the grain, and will multiply it, and lay no famine upon you." This means that when they repented he would cleanse them—he calls it sprinkling clean water upon them—so purify them and bring them back to their own land and bless them with abundance.

(2) Does this have any reference to baptism?

This all may have typified spiritual blessings to those who would be faithful in Christ, but could have had no reference to the ordinances of the New Testament or the conditions of Salvation in Christ. We must come to the New Testament when we wish to learn these arguments. There we are plainly commanded to be baptized, which means to be dipped, im-

mersed, overwhelmed, and nothing else. Neither **raino** nor any other word that means to sprinkle or pour is ever mentioned in connection with this service. God has not left any doubt as to what he commanded.

### **SPRINKLE MANY NATIONS.**

What is the meaning of sprinkle many nations in Isa. 52: 15?

Isaiah, if we accept it as a correct translation, would mean that when Christ came, not only the Jewish nation, but many nations, would repent, turn to the Lord, and be cleansed. In the margin of the American Revised Version it is *startle* instead of *sprinkle*. This is in accord with the context: "Like as many were astonished at thee, (his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men,) so shall be sprinkle [*startle*] many nations; kings shall shut their mouths at him: for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they understand." The whole context shows that wonderful afflictions of Jesus would astonish and *startle* the different nations of the earth. The Septuagint, the version in use among the Jews in the days of Jesus, and which he quoted, gives it: "Thus shall many nations wonder at him, and kings shall keep their mouths shut." This is the true meaning as now recognized by scholars.

### **SUNDAY, WORKING ON.**

What will become of those who work on Sunday? Can any one please God who does work on Sunday, such as picking cantaloupes or any other daily labor?

"I do not know what will become of them. God will decide that. But I am sure that it is contrary to his will in two points. First, it violates the civil law; and the Scriptures direct Christians to submit to "the powers that be," to obey those that are in authority. No one can disobey a law of the civil government, when that law does not violate the law of God, without disobeying God. In giving the Sabbath law, God said: "In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou." (Deut. 5:

14.) God gave as his reasons for the Sabbath that man and beast might have rest. Nothing has changed that need of rest. If the Sabbath is not kept, the rest ought to be secured on another day. Besides, I have never known a person to attend to his regular business on this day that did not come to neglect his religious duties. Cantaloupes will not be a blessing if they turn from the service of God.

### **SUPERSEDING GOD'S APPOINTMENTS.**

Did God ever accept human substitutes for divine appointments? If so, for what end? In the first place, did God's appointments ever fail? If so, when and what caused them to fail?

In answer to this question, it must be answered that God's appointments seem often to have failed of the purpose for which they were appointed. In the garden of Eden the provisions for man's life failed through the subtlety of the devil and the lack of faithfulness of Adam and Eve. A substitute order grew out of this failure. It was the result of man's rejection of God's order. This substitute order was the rejection of God's order for man to know not the distinction between good and evil, but to be immortal in ignorance of this, and the choice of man to know the good and evil, and in this knowledge to become mortal and die. God permitted the substitute of man to supersede the order of God. Did he do it to bless man? Read the curses pronounced against Adam and Eve and their posterity on account of the substitute, and answer. The substitute became a curse to those who accepted it and used it. That God provided a greater blessing for those who, out of the worse surroundings and conditions produced by the substitute, would still be guided by his wisdom does not militate against the truth that he permitted man to use his substitute for his own hurt and destruction.

A portion of the human family would be willing to reject all human substitutes and follow God's order despite the sinful surroundings. For these, God, through Christ Jesus, made provisions for richer blessings than could have been enjoyed in the original order in Eden. God permitted the choosing of the human order for the punishment of those who chose it. We can find illustrations of this all along the line of God's dealings with man. Abraham, notwithstanding his general fidelity, sometimes showed lack of faith in God, as when he went down into Egypt without direction of God. The re-

jection of God's direction and following his own substitutes brought sorrow upon himself and opened the pathway to affliction and slavery, temptation and sin, to his posterity.

A notable example of the consequences of the result of man's refusal of God's order is given us in Israel. God had instituted the order of judges to rule over Israel. The sons of Samuel "walked not in his ways, but turned aside after lucre, and took bribes, and perverted justice. Then all the elders of Israel gathered themselves together, and came to Samuel unto Ramah; and they said unto him, Behold, thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways: now make us a king to judge us like all the nations." (1 Sam. 8: 3-5.) Here God's order was perverted by those chosen to execute it, and the people desire a change, that a different order may be substituted for this order so perverted. God permits them to make the change, to supersede or swallow up his order with one of man's choosing. But was it done as a means of blessing them? Read the whole chapter. God testifies in superseding his order even when perverted with man's: "They have rejected me, that I should not be king over them." (Verse 7.) To supersede an order of God, even when abused and perverted with an order of man's, God testifies that it is to "reject me, that I should not be king over them." God does not bless men for or in rejecting him and turning from his order. He permitted the change as a means of cursing them for superseding or swallowing up God's order with man's. To do this was to reject God as their ruler.

Every substitution of a human order for a divine one, even when the divine one is perverted and made not only inefficient for good, but an instrument of evil, is a rejection of God, that he shall not rule over them. These substitutions work evil, wean man more and more from God, and become the means of cursing man more and more for his rebellion against God. A prophet said: "It is thy destruction, O Israel, that thou art against me, against thy help. Where now is thy king, that he may save thee in all thy cities? and thy judges, of whom thou saidst, Give me a king and princes? I have given thee a king in mine anger, and have taken him away in my wrath." (Hos. 13: 9-11.) Her king was given in anger to punish them for superseding God's order with that of man's. When the punishment failed to bring them back to God as their only king, he took away their earthly king and left them

without either an earthly or heavenly head. They were as sheep without a shepherd, the prey of the heathen nations around. That God made provisions to bless those who, even in the kingly order and in spite of the more adverse influences, were faithful to him with even higher blessings does not nullify the truth that the human order was granted them to punish them for rebellion against God, and it manifests his power and determination to bless those true to him, despite the most perverted surroundings.

### **TEMPTATION, CANNOT RESIST.**

We have some weak brethren in our congregation at this place. They claim that they want to live the Christian life, but cannot resist the great temptation to drink. We have admonished them as best we could. One of them returned, confessed his sin, and is holding out faithful; another one of them asks me to write this to you, asking what he must do.

"Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with men, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God." (1 Cor. 6: 9, 10.) A man that will not quit drink may read his eternal doom and destiny in that sentence. He is classed with the vilest of men and will share their destiny in the place prepared for the devil and his angels, "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." "And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever." There is no use for a man to deceive himself about the destiny he is making for himself by indulging the fleshly appetite for drink; nor need he deceive himself by saying that he cannot quit. The meaning is that he does not want to quit. He may sometimes feel like he would like to quit and be a decent man, but his desire for liquor is stronger than his desire to be a Christian and go to heaven. The strife in man is between the flesh and the spirit. The spirit seeks to lift him up ; the tendency of the flesh is to drag him down. When the flesh gains the mastery, he descends lower than the brute. No brute makes itself so low as the drunkard when he drowns all of his intellectual and spiritual powers, loses all pride and love for his family, and drags himself and family down to poverty, shame, and degradation here, and to everlasting ruin in the world to come. When a man says that he cannot quit drink, he means that he

prefers drunkenness and degradation here, and hell, with its horrors, in the world to come, to decency and manhood here and heaven hereafter. It is an awful and a sad thought for a man to make such a choice for himself; it is sadder still that he will drag his family, his children that he has brought into existence, down with him to the same ruin in time and eternity.

### **TEMPTATION, LEAD US NOT INTO.**

Was it not the Spirit of the Lord that led Jesus up into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil? Is it the Spirit of the Lord or the spirit of the devil that leads Christians into temptation now? Why were the disciples taught to pray, "Lead us not into temptation," if it is the spirit of Satan that leads into temptation?

It is the devil that tempts men to evil. "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God<sup>1</sup> cannot be tempted with evil, and he himself tempteth no man: but each man is tempted, when he is drawn away by his own lust, and enticed." (James 1: 13, 14.) Man is tempted by his own lusts. It is the devil that tempts him to do evil, not God. Yet it is a part of the providence of God that every one shall be tempted, tried, tested. It is a help to a man to be tempted when he resists it. It gives him strength. Hence, James says: "Count it all joy, my brethren, when ye fall into manifold temptations, knowing that the proving of your faith worketh patience [or perseverance]." (James 1: 2, 3.) The meaning of it is that while God tempts no man to sin, yet it is a part of his dealings with man that he shall be tempted and tried; if he resists the temptation, he will be strengthened by the temptation and made better. Christians, as quoted above, are told to count it all joy when they fall into many temptations, yet they are required to pray: "Bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one." (Matt. 6: 13.) Then they are to avoid temptation. The meaning of it is that God in his providence intends that we shall be tempted to try and prove and strengthen us; yet we are not to go in the way of temptation, but to seek to avoid it. Despite our efforts to avoid it, we will fall into enough temptations to try and strengthen us. Because we are strengthened by temptations that we resist, when we find ourselves passing through many temptations we are to count it a joy, knowing that if we resist them they will work good to us and for us in teaching us

patience and perseverance and in perfecting our characters. While temptations avoided and resisted work good to us, we are not to run into temptation nor to seek it, but to avoid it. When we seek to avoid it and resist it, God "will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation make also the way of escape, that ye may be able to endure it." (1 Cor. 10: 13.) If a man runs in the way of temptation, God will not provide a way of escape, but will let him eat the fruit of his own doings. But if he will strive to avoid temptation and pray God to deliver him from it, and strive to resist it when it does come, it will come, but God will provide a way of escape from it, and the temptation will prove a blessing instead of a curse. "And we know that to them that love God all things work together for good." (Rom. 8: 28.)

### **TEMPTING OTHERS TO SIN.**

I want some scriptural information. I will state the cause of my writing. Last summer two or three of our brethren united and made up a barbecue and bran dance. Now, some of them have confessed that they did wrong and are sorry for it; but one says he cannot see where he did any wrong, but says if any one can give him scripture, chapter and verse, where he has done wrong, he will then confess the wrong. He says he did not dance himself, but he fixed everything for others to dance in order to sell his barbecued meat for the money.

The man who fixes deliberately for others to dance and drink, or sin, and so encourages them, is more guilty than the young, excitable persons he leads to sin. An old man might dance or take a dram and not have his lusts and lascivious feelings and appetites aroused greatly, when young people cannot. So he had better dance or drink than to lead others to do so. Christ said: "It is impossible but that occasions of stumbling should come; but woe unto him, through whom they come! It were well for him if a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were thrown into the sea, rather than that he should cause one of these little ones to stumble." (Luke 17: 1, 2.) In both the Old and the New Testaments the man who tempts another to drink, to steal, to any wrong, is regarded more guilty than the one who is tempted. The man who made ready for a dance and led others to dance is more wicked than the young people he led into it. He deliberately tempted them to sin for the sake of money. He led others to sin for his own gain. That is just what the chief priests did



to Judas—with money tempted him to sin. They were as guilty as he. Hence, Jesus said to Pilate: "Those who delivered me to thee hath the greater sin." If those young people sinned in the dance, had their lascivious feelings aroused, the refinement of their feelings defiled, or their modesty shocked or destroyed, or were led into any sin, as all did, then he who tempted them to the course is the greater sinner. He did it deliberately and coolly, like the priests and Judas—for money. The man whose moral sense is so dull as to see no wrong in that needs very careful watching and nursing, that he may grow to appreciate the righteousness of God.

### **THANKS, GIVING.**

I would like for you to write something concerning the expression at our tables of our gratitude to God for his providential care.

Paul tells the Ephesians to give "thanks always for all things in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ to God, even the Father." (Eph. 5: 20.) In harmony with this admonition, we find that Jesus, before he ate, gave thanks. When he fed the thousands on seven loaves, "he took the seven loaves, and having given thanks" (Mark 8: 6), he "gave the loaves to the disciples, and the disciples to the multitude" (Matt. 14: 19; see also Mark 14: 23; John 6: 11, 23). Paul, when shipwrecked, after the long fast, having "taken bread, he gave thanks to God." (Acts 27: 35.) Then, in Rom. 14: 6, he speaks of those who eat meat giving thanks to God. It clearly was the custom among the early disciples, and probably among all the Jews, when about to partake of food, to give thanks to God for his mercy. We are required to recognize God as the Giver of all blessings and, as such, to thank him. When the disciples came *to* their regular meals, this was especially done.

A thankful heart should be cultivated. To do this, we must give expression to our feeling of thankfulness. Sometimes persons think that they can be just as thankful or prayerful without giving expression to their feelings. This is a mistake. To give expression to the feeling strengthens and fixes it as a part of our being. No thought or feeling enters into the formation of our characters or becomes permanent until it controls the action of our bodies and becomes part of our being. Faith itself is accepted by God only when it has molded the actions of the body and made the body subject to its control.

A feeling of the heart becomes a part of our being and enters into our character only when it prompts the body to action.

It is especially proper that thanks should be given when the family or a number of persons are about to partake together. It directs the feelings of all in the proper channel. It will have a happy effect in the family on children to direct their minds to the Giver of all good.

### **THEATER, IS IT WRONG TO WORSHIP IN A?**

We have sold our meetinghouse to a company which has made a town hall of it and uses it as a theater. In the meantime the church holds its Lord's-day meetings in it until a new house can be built. Some of the members (and good ones, too) will not meet with us because the house is used as a theater. Are we doing wrong to meet in it?

The trouble with these good brethren is that they are more anxious to follow their prejudices than to obey God. They are willing to set at naught a command of God and forsake the assembling together, neglect the holding in memory the blood and body of the Son of God, which are plainly commanded, to gratify a whim and prejudice for which they can find no Bible authority. It is a clear case of making of none effect the commandments of God by their traditions or prejudices. We are nowhere in the Bible told that we shall not meet where theaters are held, nor that we are to meet in houses held sacred. We have the example that they met in private houses and public halls. We are told that Paul was willing and did go into the theater to speak in defense of the Christian faith and so preach the gospel in it. I have no doubt that he would equally as readily have worshiped there in any service of God. These brethren forget that Jesus said: "The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father. . . . The true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth." (John 4: 21-23.) Wherever we can worship God in spirit and in truth, with our spirits guided by the truth, we can worship him acceptably. If I could get no other place, I would meet in a saloon to worship God; and I believe that if it was done in spirit and truth, it would be as acceptable as if done in the most sacred temple ever erected by human hands. We have not yet learned the force of the truth that God dwells not in temples made with human hands, but he dwells in the spiritual

temple composed of living stones—his people, his church—and wherever his disciples meet, there God is in and with them.

### **THIEF, THE, ON THE CROSS.**

In regard to Christ and the two thieves, Matthew (27: 44) says, "And the robbers also that were crucified with him cast upon him the same reproach;" Mark says about the same thing; but Luke (23: 42) says that one of them said: "Jesus, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." Considering the latter statement with the statements of Matthew and Mark, does it not appear to have been said in derision? Jesus said to him: "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Where is paradise? What is it? Is it the same place spoken of by Luke in Acts 22: 6? How did Christ conquer death, hell, and the grave? Did his soul go to hell and return? When Christ and the thief were together in paradise, were they in a place where the saved go after death? Do the saved and the wicked go to different places after death, or do both go to the same place, to await the judgment day? If the apostles did not understand the nature of Christ's kingdom at that time, how could the thief understand it? A preacher here said that a sinner (meaning an alien) could be saved in his dying hour, and to prove it he referred to the thief on the cross.

There are different theories given in explanation of the different statements made concerning the thieves. The common one is that both thieves ridiculed Jesus, but one repented and was forgiven. I think the Scriptures give no ground for this idea, since the writers give the same conversation; there is no reference to any repentance, and nothing at this time occurred to produce repentance.

The second theory is that Matthew and Mark tell what was done by the thieves, without specifying what one or both did, just as we say sometimes, "The boys did this," meaning that it was done by a company of boys, without specifying whether **all** engaged in it or not. This would be the reasonable conclusion had there been more than two. To attribute it to both, when only two were present and only one engaged in what was done, hardly comports with the style of the New Testament.

The third theory is that what Luke tells the second thief said was said in derision of Jesus' claim to be a King. One ridiculed his claim to be the Son of God, able to save people; the other was spoken in derision of his claim to be a King. The reproof the second one administered to the first one seems out of harmony with this idea, but not necessarily so.

**Paradise** literally means a quiet, pleasant garden, and was

used to refer to the garden of Eden. It then came to refer to the state of the dead—the happy state; and sometimes to heaven itself, as in 2 Cor. 12: 4. The meaning attached to this word determines the interpretation we make of the promise to the thief. Those who think that paradise is heaven adopt the first theory—that one thief repented and Christ promised that he should be with him that day in heaven. Against this, it is argued that Christ, after three days, after he had been raised, said, "I am not yet ascended to my Father," and that David foretold that his soul should not remain in Hades (the grave), which implies that it was in Hades during the stay of the body in the grave, but was raised. Those who claim that it was in ridicule of Jesus' claim to be a King give paradise the meaning of being at rest in the grave: "You and I will both be at rest in the grave this day." The first position is untenable. I have held to the third one much of the time, though I sometimes think the second one is the more probable. I would not say that a man cannot repent in his dying hour and be saved, if he had not neglected other opportunities ; but for a man to postpone obedience, trusting to repentance in a dying hour, there is no hope. This preaching of salvation from deathbed repentance has the tendency to encourage men to postpone, put off, these things during life, and it is without any warrant in the Scriptures. Man ought to be warned of the danger of hardening the heart and postponing acceptance of Christ. "To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." The man who hardens his heart against the warnings of God can find no place for repentance in a dying hour, even though he should seek it "carefully with tears."

### TITHING.

Which is the oldest, the law of tithing or the law of Moses? Was tithing a law? If so, when was it established? If it was a law, and in force before the law of Moses, did the giving of the law of Moses in any way change or affect the law of giving or tithing? Seeing Christ nailed Moses' law to the cross, did he nail the law of giving to the cross? When Christ gave Peter "the keys of the kingdom," saying, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven," did he condemn the law of tithing? If so, how much should we give now? Should we give less than they did? How are we to determine how much to give, if the law of tithing is ended, seeing that there is no amount stated in the New Testament, only "as we are prospered?"

Abraham paid tithes to Melchisedec long before the law was given, yet tithing in the Jewish age rested on the law of Moses for its authority. When God gave the law of Moses, he repealed all former laws. When he gave "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," he repealed all former laws. The different dispensations of God stand to each other as the different constitutions and laws of a State stand to each other. One in some of its features becomes unsuited to the conditions and needs of the people. A new one is adopted. The adoption of the new one repeals the old in all of its parts. What of the old is good to be perpetuated is brought into the new constitution. When the old patriarchal dispensation gave way to the law of Moses, all that was good of the old was brought into the new. When Christ took the law of Moses out of the way, he brought all of the good of it into the new covenant. Nothing is binding on Christians, save what is found in the new covenant. All that was good in former dispensations was brought into this. We may use the old dispensation and the decisions under it to see how to interpret the laws of the new covenant, just as the courts go back to laws and decisions under the old constitutions as examples to interpret under the new constitution. No specific amount is required under the new, because God only desires that which is willingly given from the heart. We may safely reason, as God required one-tenth under Moses, when he did so much more for us in Christ, he would expect more from us; but if we cannot do it willingly, he does not wish any of it. I know of no way of determining how much we must give, except for every one to study these examples and the gospel of the Son of God, and give what he can do cheerfully and gladly. This does not suit us sometimes, but it seems to have suited God, and we had best conform our views of what is best to his law and order.

### **TOBACCO GROWING AND USING.**

You claim that cigarette smoking is ruinous to body and soul. Now, I am a tobacco grower and user; and, of course, by both using and growing, I am guilty of injuring the youth of my country. I am in a strictly tobacco section; it is our money crop; yet you will not allow my boy in your school if he uses tobacco. If it is not right for men to use tobacco; if it is "ruinous to soul and body," I have no right to raise it. In fact, if the above be true, is it not a sin?

If the general use of tobacco is evil, it is wrong to raise, sell, or use it in a general way. I say "in a general way," because there may be uses of it that are not hurtful and in which it may serve useful purposes. In such cases the raising, sale, and use of it are not wrong. I believe that the general use of tobacco is hurtful and wrong. It does much harm and no good in a general way. I believe that the school does right to prohibit its use in school, because, if tolerated, it not only fastens an evil habit on those who use it, but the use of it in the school would encourage others to use it and make it a place for spreading evil habits among the young, and the school would be an influence for evil, not for good. Public sentiment recognizes the use of tobacco as an evil, so the legislatures prohibit the sale of it in the form most attractive to youth. Many railroads and manufacturers are refusing to employ those who use tobacco. They wish cool brains and steady nerves to direct and operate their machinery. Whatever affects the nerves weakens the brains. Many business houses are coming to refuse employees who use tobacco. The sentiment is growing. The school board of Davidson County, Tenn., has passed a resolution that no teacher or pupil be allowed to use tobacco on the school grounds. The next step will be to refuse to employ users of tobacco as teachers. These changes of sentiment grow rapidly. I can recollect when preachers ran distilleries and church members sold and bought whisky, and it was a rare thing to find a Christian man who did not keep his bottle and set it out for a neighbor that called to see him. Church members made, sold, bought, and used whisky as a beverage. The use of tobacco will go through the same experience. The young ought to be warned and guarded against becoming slaves of evil habits. To the extent that it is wrong to use it, it is wrong to raise, handle, or sell tobacco, or to encourage it in any way. These principles, I am sure, are true; and while the amount of money involved in the tobacco business has much bearing on public sentiment and on the action of legislatures, it should have no influence on the moral and religious principle involved.

Yet in the application of this principle discretion ought to be used. I mean this: It is a greater sin now to manufacture, sell, and use whisky than it was when I was a boy. The reason is that our sense of right has been cultivated along these lines and we see the evil more clearly, and our accountability

is correspondingly greater. It is true morally and spiritually, as it is in the material world, that as we rise higher our horizon is enlarged and our vision is clearer. So, as we see the right, we are under stronger and higher obligations to do it. This principle applies to individuals as well as to different generations. A man eighty years old told me only a few days ago that he had used tobacco for fifty years. He determined its use was wrong and he quit it; and in a few weeks he was feeling better, with no strong inclination to return to its use. It would be a sin to him to use it. But a good wife of a tobacco user, who persuaded him to quit, told me that after he had tried faithfully for some months she asked him to return to its use. It made him so cross and ill toward her, the children, the stock, when he seemed to be doing the best he could to control himself, that she thought it better for him to use the tobacco. I could not say that she was wrong. A Christian's influence should always be on the right side. He should enforce the abstract principle of right where it is possible. But we should forbear with human weakness and human infirmities and realize that man grows gradually to the stature of manhood morally and spiritually as well as bodily. If we do our duty to the young, fifty years hence the use, sale, and raising of tobacco will be regarded as an evil to be avoided by Christians.

### **TRANSGRESSION, DISOBEDIENCE, AND SIN.**

What is the difference between transgression, disobedience, and sin?

There is a very simple and plain distinction in the Bible between different sins that Christian men seem to ignore. One sin is transgression. The other is called disobedience in the New Testament; in the Old Testament, simply sin, in its milder form. The distinction is kept up between them all through the Bible. It represents God as "forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." (Ex. 34:7.) "Israel hath sinned; yea, they have even transgressed my covenant." (Josh. 7:11.) "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered." (Ps. 32:1; see Amos 4:4; Mic. 1:5; 6:7.)

Sin is a generic term that applies to all failure to please God, to walk in his law. But there is a distinction made in the Bible between the different kinds of sin. "For if the word spoken through angels proved steadfast, and every transgres-

sion and disobedience received a just recompense of reward." (Heb. 2: 2.) This shows the distinction. That which in the Old Testament is called **sin**, as distinguished from **transgression**, is here called **disobedience**. Webster defines as follows: "**Transgress**—(1) To pass over or beyond; to surpass. (2) Hence, to overpass, as any rule prescribed as the limit of duty; to break or violate, as a law, civil or moral." "**Transgression**—The act of transgressing, or of passing over or beyond any law or rule of moral duty." It is derived from two words—**trans**, across or beyond, and **grado**, to pass, which would mean "to pass across or beyond the law." Trans-Atlantic is across or beyond the Atlantic; transparent is to appear beyond the glass or intervening substance.

"**Disobedient**—Neglecting or refusing to obey;" not to obey; to transgress. While the words do not always retain these distinctions in the Bible, they generally do.

The Greek words carry the same distinction. In Greek, the words translated **disobedience** means "an erroneous or imperfect hearing; disobedience"—indicating that the disobedience comes from imperfect hearing, misunderstanding, or is not purposely done, or through neglect rather than wicked design.

Dr. Adam Clarke says, on this passage (Heb. 2: 2): "Infllicted punishment on every act of **transgression**, every case in which the **bounds** laid down by the law were **passed over**; and every act of **disobedience** in respect to **duties** enjoined." Dr. Macknight says: "**Transgression** is the leaping over the bounds which the law has set by doing the things it forbids. **Disobedience** is the refusing to do the things it enjoins." Everything not commanded is forbidden. (Deut. 12: 8-32; Matt. 7: 21, 22; 15: 3-9; Rev. 22: 18, 19.)

Jesus gives an example of transgression in Matt. 15: 3. The elders transgressed, set aside, passed over, the law of God to honor parents by giving a different rule in lieu of it. The same word in Greek is used in Rom. 2: 23: "Thou who gloriest in the law, through thy transgression of the law dishonorest thou God?" Jews, while boasting of the law, set it aside by their traditions. (Rom. 4: 15.)

To **transgress** is to pass over or beyond the law given by God, and to do something else in lieu of it, or to add to it as insufficient or so inferior that it may be amended or improved. To **transgress** is to consciously add to or set aside the ap-



pointments of the Lord for other ways. This is always based on the assumption of insufficiency or inferiority in the appointments of God that can be improved. Isaiah (24: 5) says: "The earth also is polluted under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, violated the statutes, broken the everlasting covenant." This shows that the transgression was to violate the statutes, and to change or add to this law is to break the everlasting covenant. The everlasting covenant is: You shall not add to nor take from the laws of God. Transgression—going beyond the law of God—is condemned in the Bible a hundred times, where the disobedience, or sin of neglect, is condemned once. It leads out in the direction of the presumptuous sin, for which there is no forgiveness. To transgress is to set aside, despise, reject, the law of God and to obey something that man regards as better. Paul, in arguing that the Jews were under the law, says, "Where there is no law, neither is there transgression," which is evident that where no law is given, there is no stepping outside of, going beyond, or setting aside the law. This means to say that if God had never given to man a law, then he could not transgress it; but as God had given him law, he did transgress the law, and in the transgression brought wrath upon himself. This passage is often misapplied. It is interpreted to mean that where God has not given a specific command prohibiting a thing, that thing may be done in religious service; that man is authorized to do anything or use anything in the service of God not specially prohibited in the Scriptures. This principle directly contradicts the whole teaching of the Bible. Moses says: "Ye shall not do after all the things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes; for ye are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance, which Jehovah thy God giveth thee." (Deut. 12: 8, 9.) Again he says: "What thing soever I command you, that shall ye observe to do: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." (Verse 32.) This illustrates, "Where there is no law, neither is there transgression." At this time the law was not in force. They were left very much to do whatsoever seemed right in their own eyes. Some general truths had been taught them, and they were left to show their love to God in their own way. But when the law should be given, then they could no longer be left to do what was right in their own eyes, but must conform to the will of God. To

go outside of it was to sin and to call down God's wrath upon them.

Jesus said: "In vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men." (Matt. 15: 9.) For men to go beyond the law of God to follow the precepts of men was to render their worship vain. The same truth is emphasized in Matt. 7: 21. Paul says: "If ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, do ye subject yourselves to ordinances, handle not, nor taste, nor touch (all which things are to perish with the using), after the precepts and doctrines of men?" (Col. 2: 20-22.) He warns them to touch not, taste not, handle not, the things which are after the doctrines and commandments of men. He tells them that these are all to perish with the using. They can bring no good to man. Indeed, the truth that man can serve God acceptably only in the appointments of God without human addition or subtraction is written more or less plainly on every page of revelation from God to man. If this be not true, then man is permitted to add in morals, in work, in worship, whatever is not prohibited directly in the Scriptures. He can gamble, for this is not specially prohibited, and the churches that act fully on this principle do gamble. The Roman Catholics notably do this. They can add meat to the Lord's Supper; it is not prohibited. According to the argument that to oppose things not specially prohibited is to violate the law of God and to add to it, those who add the meat do not add to the law of God, but those who oppose it do: It will be seen at once that this opens the flood gates for all errors and immoral practices, and must lead to the subversion of the whole order of God.

God now has a law of service, and this passage is not now applicable. Whoever oversteps, sets aside, adds to, or takes from the law of God transgresses that law and incurs the wrath of God. Sin is the transgression—overstepping, or going beyond the law of God. It is the great, the grievous, sin, David prayed: "Save me from the great transgression." Isaiah said: "The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof, because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant. Therefore hath the curse devoured the earth, and they that dwell therein are desolate." If this principle be true, that man is at liberty to add whatever is not specifically condemned, then man devises

the way of salvation, not God. The principle destroys the authority of the Bible and makes man's own wishes his supreme law. It dethrones God and enthrones man. Disobedience is sin, but to transgress is the sin of rebellion, and leads to danger. Let us not be led into transgression.

### **UNCLEAN SPIRIT, THE.**

Please explain Matt. 12: 43-45, especially the following: "But the unclean spirit, when he is gone out of the man, passeth through waterless places, seeking rest, and findeth it not."

It means that there were evil spirits in those days who took possession of men's hearts. When cast out, they were supposed to inhabit dry, desert places. One was cast out, and he "passeth through waterless places, seeking rest, and findeth it not." He said: "I will return into my house"—the heart whence he was cast out. He did so, found it empty, swept, fitted for the abode of a spirit, but none inhabiting it. When the evil spirit had been cast out, he did not take in a good spirit as he should have done. The evil spirit, finding it unoccupied by a good spirit, entered in and took with him seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and the last state of that man is worse than the first—all, too, because he did not fill his heart with good when the evil was cast out. Jesus said that it should be so with that evil generation. He had come and by his teaching checked the evil tendency; but as they failed to take him as their guiding spirit, it would end in evil. They would be the worse for having known and rejected Jesus. The principle applies to men now. If we know the truth and fail to practice and obey it, the heart is hardened. We are the worse for having known it. The gospel is a "savor of life unto life, or of death unto death."

### **UNCONDITIONAL SALVATION.**

I would be glad if you would tell us what the following scriptures teach (they were used in a debate by a Primitive Baptist as proof texts that salvation is unconditional): Jer. 13: 23; John 3: 27; 6: 37, 65; 8: 43, 47; 10: 26; 12: 39, 40.

Honesty in construing the writings of any author to determine what he teaches on a subject demands that all he says on that subject should be collated and compared and deductions be drawn from the whole. It is not fair or honest dealing with an author to take one class of his sentences that will

bear one construction and ignore another class that will not bear the construction he places on these. Fairness and honesty demand an effort to harmonize all scriptures, and the truth is where they harmonize. The ultra Calvinist seeks out passages of scripture that can be construed to favor his theory, parades these in proof of it, and ignores quite a number of scriptures that clearly contradict the construction he puts on these. This is not fair nor honest dealing, either with himself or the Scriptures.

There can be no doubt that there are many precepts and examples that show that spirits and men were once, in the favor of God by faith in him, that fell from fidelity to him and lost the favor of God. The devil was once an angel in heaven, and fell from his high estate because he did not abide or remain in the truth of God. (Rev. 12: 7-9.) A number of angels sinned and fell from their high estate. "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell." (2 Pet. 2: 4.) Adam was the son of God; was a part of the creation that God saw "was very good" (Gen. 1: 31) ; was a citizen of the paradise of God, with whom God walked and talked; yet he fell into sin and forfeited the favor of God. King Saul was chosen king of God's people when he was little in his own eyes. God's Spirit dwelt in and guided him; but he so sinned that God's Spirit forsook him and Samuel came no more to him, and he died forsaken of God. God loved Solomon in the days of his youth; but, as he grew older, he married strange women, who led him into idolatry, and he is never classed in his old age with the saints and faithful servants of God. "For as touching those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come, and then fell away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." (Heb. 6: 4-6.) Here Paul speaks of those who, after being partakers of the heavenly gift and the powers of the world to come, had fallen away; and he says that it was impossible to renew them to life again. "For if we sin willfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful expectation of judgment." (Heb. 10: 26.) "Of how much sorer punishment, think ye, shall he be judged worthy, who hath trodden under

foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?" (Verse 29.) This falling away was of those who had been sanctified and had the Spirit of grace, to which they had done despite. "For if, after they have escaped the defilements of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein and overcome, the last state is become worse with them than the first. For it were better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after knowing it, to turn back from the holy commandment delivered unto them." (2 Pet. 2: 20, 21.)

There are many such passages. Christ, in the parable of the sower, shows that the word of God, the seed of the kingdom, is received by many, but from various causes with many it brings forth no fruit. The plant that sprang up was the same, from the same seed; but owing to its treatment in many hearts it perished and brought forth no fruit. In the parable of the talents the talents were all from God, but the talent was taken from him who failed to use it. Paul had to watch himself, lest after he had preached the gospel to others he should be a castaway.

Now these are all Scripture truths, as well as those referred to by our brother. What do our Calvinistic friends do with these? As honest students of the Bible, they cannot ignore them. Will they make God contradict himself? All the scriptures of God, taken in their proper connection and rightly interpreted, agree perfectly. When we find this agreement, we come to the truth. These passages referred to do not contradict those that I have quoted. John the Baptist said: "A man can receive nothing, except it have been given him from heaven." (John 3: 27.) This is a general truth. In the material world all we receive is from God, or heaven, yet we receive it by complying with his laws for obtaining it. So all spiritual good comes from God, but it can be obtained only by complying with God's conditions for bestowing it. John is here especially speaking of his gifts and mission as distinct from that of Christ. He had no calling or gifts, save such as God bestowed on him. The same explanation applies to John 6: 65. "All that which the Father giveth me shall come unto me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." (John 6: 37.) This clearly means that the Father gave to him

those who desired to honor God. These are described: "As many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name." (John 1: 12.) Those he gives to Jesus are they who believe on his name, and Jesus says that he will not cast them out. The same truth is told: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16: 16.) "Ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ." (Gal. 3: 26, 27.) Jesus says that he will not cast off any of this class which the Father gives him. This does not say that such may not' depart from him, sin against him, and so cut themselves off from him. Beyond all doubt it is true that Jesus will not cast out those who believe in him.

"Why do ye not understand my speech? Even because ye cannot hear my word. Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do." (John 8: 43, 44.) The last sentence explains the first. The devil was their father because they desired to do his will; and while desiring to do his will, they could not understand the teachings of Jesus. No man can understand or serve God who desires to follow the devil. "He that is of God heareth the words of God: for this cause ye hear them not, because ye are not of God." This states the same truth in a different way. Those who desire to do the lusts of the devil are the children of the devil; those who desire to do God's will are God's people.

There is a certain election, or predestination, taught in the Bible. Jesus said: "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold." (John 10: 16.) This means that there were persons among the Gentiles that would receive Jesus when they learned of him. These he calls his sheep not of the Jewish fold. Then God said to Paul at Corinth, "I have much people in this city" (Acts 18: 10), before they believed. This means that God recognized those as his people who were of such mind as to receive him when they would hear the truth. That class of people God called his people, speaking prospectively. Then he says, "Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep"—ye are not of that class who are willing to receive the truth. He had tried them. (See John 12: 39, 40.) Read Matt. 13: 14, 15, where the same passage is quoted: "By hearing ye shall hear, and shall in no wise understand: and seeing ye shall see, and shall in no wise perceive: for this people's

heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest haply they should perceive with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should turn again, and I should heal them." He states that they had hardened their own hearts and closed their own eyes, did not wish to hear him. They had sinned away their day of grace, and God gave them over to hardness of heart, that they should believe a lie and be damned. That is taught often in the Bible, but is a wholly different thing from saying that God so predestined that they could not believe and turn if they desired. Jeremiah (13: 23) says: "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil." The latter clause explains the former. They had been so accustomed to do evil, had so given themselves over to do evil, had so sinned against the warnings of God, that their day of grace had ended; and then they could no more change than the Ethiopian could change his skin.

Texts taken out of their context can be made to mean almost anything; but if we will study them in their connections and take all the scriptures as true and harmonize them, we can reach the truth. One-sided and extreme views lead astray.

### UNITY OF THE SPIRIT.

Is the Savior's prayer (John 17), after nineteen centuries, yet unanswered? What is meant by **unity of the Spirit**? Do you teach that **all** Christians in the days of the apostles were **in** the unity of the Spirit? Were the Corinthians in the unity of the Spirit? They were taught to "be perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment." (1 Cor. 1: 10.) If not in the unity of the Spirit, in whose mind were they to be joined together? Peter wrote to scattered Christians, or sojourners of the dispersion, and taught them to be of one mind, likeminded. How could they, unless in the unity of the Spirit? And if they were, was not the **one mind** the mind of the Holy Spirit? If so, then the oneness or unity resulted from the expressed mind or teaching of the Holy Spirit. If unity of the Spirit is not possible except through the teaching of the Spirit, will not all who accept this teaching in good faith and in humbleness of mind obey the teaching be in the unity of the Spirit? When a person is brought into the unity of the Spirit, is not such person in the church of God? Can any one be in the church of God, in the body of Christ, and not be in the unity of the Spirit? The saints at Ephesus were taught "to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." (Eph. 4: 3.) They were not taught to seek it, but to keep it—keep the peace; and they were told (verses 4-6) what that unity of the Spirit was: the items as to man, and the wondrous unity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—meeting man in the "one body." They were in the

unity of the Spirit, in the church, and were taught to so live in the bond of peace that Christ "might present the church to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." (Eph. 5: 27.) "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all." (Eph. 4: 4-6.) Is unity of the Spirit possible with any one of these wanting? Are there any persons in the "one body" capable of exercising the "one faith," rejoicing in the "one hope," quickened by the "one Spirit," that have neglected the "one baptism?" I am not asking about final salvation—all things are possible with God. But are there any persons in the "one body," or kingdom of God, here upon the earth, that are capable of believing, repenting, and being immersed, and who, though believing and repenting, have not been immersed? Remission of sins and gift of the Holy Spirit are promised after repentance and baptism. (Acts 2: 38.) Can, then, the unity of the Spirit be enjoyed prior to baptism? If unity of the Spirit cannot be realized before baptism, and only immersion is baptism, then it is an impossible thing for the immersed to keep the peace with unimmersed persons of any and every creed. Did the Savior pray for any union or unity except that secured to all through faith, repentance, and baptism? If he did not, then all in the unity of the Spirit should endeavor to keep the peace in that unity and cease trying to bring about a different so-called "Christian union." This determination to keep the peace would lead all immersed persons to withdraw from all ecclesiastical and congregational relationship with the unimmersed on the ground that the unimmersed are not in the unity of the Spirit, and hence cannot keep the peace in a relationship into which they have not entered. Do not all persons born from above, born of water and of the Spirit, enter the kingdom of God, and thus enter into the unity of the Spirit? If in the kingdom of God, in the unity of the Spirit, in the "one body," in the church of Christ, can there possibly be any other union? Churches of Christ, then, must be in congregational relationship. But is not the subject of unity always taught with reference to individuals, and not churches? God is no respecter of persons; all born into his family must of necessity be born in the same way; and in their relationship to one another there can be but one question, and that is, how to live in peace and harmony in that family. Men cannot be united in the minds of other men. Unity and peace are possible only in the mind of the Holy Spirit. Where that is expressed, all can walk thereby; and where not revealed, man must be silent.

The idea presented in the questions is undoubtedly the correct one. Christ in various forms presented the necessity of oneness, or unity, in the body of Christ. He presented the necessity of it in the statement: "Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand." (Matt. 12: 25.) In his prayer Jesus said: "Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on me through their word; that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us: that the world may



believe that thou didst send me. And the glory which thou hast given me I have given unto them; that they may be one even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as thou lovedst me." (John 17: 20-23.)

The fatal, direful consequences, plainly told by the Savior as a warning to the disciples, is that his kingdom divided against itself cannot stand. It must fall and come to naught. As the Savior is true, unless his followers can be one, the kingdom cannot stand. Great efforts are now being made to convert the heathen nations. The weakness is the divisions and strifes among professed Christians at home. To avoid the baneful influence of the evil, an effort is made to divide the heathen land into sections, each having its own section, so that they will not come in direct contact, and the divisions will not be so apparent and so hurtful in influence. But this is only deceiving the heathen, and will finally result in making many of them infidels when the full truth is known. To cure the evil is the only help for the condition. To conceal it only postpones the result, and makes it even more hurtful. The only hopeful indication about apportioning the field among the different parties is that it shows that they begin to see and feel the evil and are becoming ashamed of it.

I remember when the different parties in religion were almost universally defended as good and right—a condition desirable in itself. This position is now seldom maintained by intelligent men and women. Now the plea is for union, federation, consolidation of different parties into one, regardless of their faith. The method proposed is for the compromise of principles and of scripture truths, ignoring the teaching of the Bible, to work together to build upon a foundation and along lines not laid down or marked out by God. A man cannot compromise his own convictions and adopt things that he believes to be wrong without loss of moral power and without dishonoring his own true spiritual manhood. A man cannot compromise and set aside what he believes to be a command of God without dishonoring God before the world, without destroying his own reverence for God and usefulness for his service. To set aside a law of God for the sake of union with others is to prefer union with them to union with God—is to hold their teaching above the word of God. If we

sacrifice God's word to please others, it is because we wish to please them rather than to please God. When we agree to set aside a command of God, we agree to separate from God.

Jesus Christ says: "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from myself. He that speaketh from himself seeketh his own glory: but he that seeketh the glory of him that sent him, the same is true, and no unrighteousness is in him." (John 7: 17, 18.) Here the declaration is clear that when a man speaks from himself—that is, his own convictions, ways, thoughts, and purposes—he seeks his own glory. When he seeks to know and do the will of God, he seeks God's honor; when he speaks from his own will, he seeks his own honor. Christ says, again: "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him." (John 14: 21.) God regards all willingness to set aside his words as a declaration that he does not love him. To set aside God's words for the words of another is to declare that we love and honor the other more than we love and honor God. God is a jealous God, and will not permit this. Christ also says: "But that the world may know that I love the Father, and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do." (Verse 31.) Christ could give no higher evidence of his love to God than to do his will. Let us be warned against setting aside the words or will of God to please any beings, few or many, in the universe. Unity in faith and life among the children of God is essential. But that unity among Christians can be maintained only by first obtaining and maintaining unity with God. "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (1 John 1: 7.) The unity of those cleansed and cemented by the blood of Christ can be obtained only by walking in the light as God gave that light, as Jesus walked in it by keeping the words of God. But Jesus prayed that those who believe in him "may be one, even as we are one." Christ says that he remained in the love of the Father by doing the words of the Father. We can be one with him only by keeping his words, which are the words of the Father. A unity with one another that does not grow out of a unity with God is not a helpful

unity. God will not bless it, and it brings no good, but only evil.

No union is acceptable to God unless it is effected by and based upon the word of God. Christ, in this prayer for the union of those who believe on him, prayed: "Sanctify them in thy truth: thy word is truth." (John 17: 17.) **Sanctify** means to **set apart**. The prayer was: Separate them, and set them apart (from the world) to God through the truth. Lest men should misapprehend what he regards as truth, he adds: "Thy word is truth." No one can be separated from the world, or sanctified to God by the truth, save as he makes that truth the rule of his life and is led away from all other paths into the path marked out by this truth. "And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth." (Verse 19.) The only way of sanctification is through the truth of God. The only union possible is in the truth as God has delivered it. He who turns from the truth of God—sets aside any of that truth for the sake of union with others—not only sets at naught the authority of God, but he places himself on ground upon which union is impossible. Union is not only undesirable, but impossible, save as men are sanctified by the word of God. A union in any other way, save as we are sanctified by and in the truth, would be a union out of and against God. If this were possible, it would only be the presage of swift and widespread destruction from God.

" I praised and honored him that liveth forever; for his dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom from generation to generation; and all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing; and he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?" (Dan. 4: 34, 35.) A union or combination of all the inhabitants of the earth into one body that did not grow out of and is not guided by faithful adherence to and love for the word of God would be the signal for the Lord's destroying them with a tornado of divine wrath. When the children of men sought a means of maintaining their own unity by building a tower, God wrote on it **Babel**—that is, **confusion**. "Come, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech. So Jehovah scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth."

(Gen. 11:7, 8.) This was typical. The religious world seeks a union of their own, not of God's. God confounds their language that they do not understand each other, and confusion and strife reign. God will tolerate union among his people only as they are sanctified by and through his truth. Hundreds of millions of souls, or all the world save one such, united on any other basis save fidelity to the word of God, are advocates of division, discord, and strife among the people of God. One soul standing alone, firm and true to the word of God, insisting that all should come to it, with the whole world besides against him, is the only advocate and promoter of union in the world.

The unity of the Spirit for which Christ prayed is illustrated by the union between him and his Father. "That they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us." (John 17: 21.) "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one." (Verse 23.) The oneness was a oneness in purpose and work, as it existed between Jesus and his Father. The oneness between Christ and his Father was effected by "the Father being in Christ, and Christ being in the Father." This union was maintained in this way: "For I am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." (John 6: 38.) "I seek not mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." (John 5: 30.) "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to accomplish his work." (John 4: 34.) Here is what God being in Christ and Christ being in God produced in Christ. Christ said: "He that sent me is with me; he hath not left me alone; for I do always the things that are pleasing to him." (John 8: 29.) The Father was in him, remained with him, because he always did the Father's will, not his own. The unity between the two was manifested in this way. He then adds: "If ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." (Verses 31, 32.) Freedom from sin is obtained only when we are in Christ and he is in us. This is gained by continuing in his word.

Again, Christ says: "As thou didst send me into the world, even so sent I them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth." (John 17: 18, 19.) He says to them: "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have

kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love." (John 15: 10.) There can be no doubt as to what the union was between Christ and his Father, and how it was maintained. I can see no possible doubt as to what was the unity of the Spirit between the children of God or as to how it can be maintained—a perfect unity in purpose, end, and aim among the disciples. It can be gained only by treating Christ as he treated his Father—have no will but his will. Let it be our meat and drink to do his will, as it was his meat and drink to do the will of his Father. Then, in doing his will, Christ will dwell in us, his Spirit will be with us, and we will be in Christ and he in us. But if we refuse to hear his words, if we have ends and ways of our own to accomplish, Christ will not abide with us, nor will his Spirit dwell in us. This union prayed for by Jesus could be attained and maintained only by their being sanctified by the truth.

The degree of their fidelity to the word of God is the measure of their attaining to the unity of the Spirit. If one man is faithful to God, he has attained to the unity of the Spirit in Christ Jesus. If every man in the universe save this one is united, but not on the words of the Bible, they are heretics and schismatics before God. The unity must first be with and in Christ, that he may be in us and we in him—that we may be one in him. Without him we can do nothing. He who turns from the words of God turns from Christ and God. Since the unity of the Spirit must be in Christ, and must be through the sanctification of the word of God, it can be found and formulated only by receiving the word in all things and by being guided by it. The only way to seek it is to seek a closer walk with God by a more hearty reception of his word and by a closer adherence to that word. "Sanctify them in thy truth; thy word is truth." To the extent that we turn from the plain, simple order of God to anything else, we turn from God and destroy the unity of the Spirit. The Spirit whose unity we must maintain is from God and dwells in the words that God has given. The unity of the Spirit did not exist in its purity and perfection in the days of Christ or the apostles. All who were fully governed by the word of God were in the unity of the Spirit. None others were. The prayer is answered now only in those who keep his word and are faithful to it, rejecting all else save the word of God. The man who accepts the word of God as the only rule and guide,

rejecting everything else, if alone (he is never alone; Jesus is with him), maintains the unity of the Spirit in Christ Jesus. The admonition is addressed to individuals composing the church. If the individuals keep the unity of the faith, the church will do it.

The letters to the churches reproving them for divisions and strife show that the true standard of unity was not attained by all the early Christians. A few may have attained it; the many did not. "Many are called, but few are chosen." Only a small proportion of church members at any time in the world's history have faithfully followed Christ. Divisions and strifes exist, because all are not satisfied to follow Christ and do his will, as he did the will of his Father. The admonition to unity is given in one form or another to all Christians in every congregation. The union is to be in Christ, in maintaining his truth, and the means to maintain it are always the same. "That ye all speak the same thing; . . . that ye be perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment." (1 Cor. 1: 10.) Always following the reproof for division comes the condemnation of human wisdom, called, in these latter days, **sanctified common sense**. All are warned against depending upon their own wisdom; all are admonished that God has laid the foundation, and we should take heed how we build thereon. Christ said: "Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on me through their word; that they may all be one." (John 17: 20, 21.) "Sanctify them in thy truth: thy word is truth."

The word of God is given to guide men in the pathway of God. It seems to me that nothing can be plainer than the way to union. It is by all taking the word of God, and each one being guided by it, adding nothing thereto, taking nothing therefrom. Men thus walking cannot avoid walking" together. When there is the slightest departure from the word of God, then division must begin; and were the whole world, save one man, to add a single institution or make the slightest change from the divine order, they would be dividers of the church and people of God. Were one man to stand firm for the divine order, he would be the true promoter of union and harmony. Any union that is not brought about by adherence to the word of God is sinful, and is rebellion against God. God stands pledged to curse and destroy such union. There is only one path to union: that is that every one accept

the order of God as he gives it. Follow it, and it will bring union among the people of God in Christ Jesus and in his Father. Instead of studying and formulating plans of union, the one thing to do is for all to seek the way that God has marked out, follow it, and union will come of itself.

"If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another." All that we have to do to have fellowship with Jesus Christ, with God, and with every other being in the universe that is in fellowship with God, is to walk in the light as Jesus Christ walked in it and shed it abroad in his teachings and life. The plan is too simple in its divine wisdom for man to walk in it.

### UNJUST, THE, STEWARD.

Please explain Luke 16: 1-12. What I want to know is: Why did the lord of the unjust steward commend his wrong dealing? How are the children of this world wiser than "the sons of the light?" Why should the disciples make to themselves "friends by means of the mammon [or riches] of unrighteousness?" Where have they an everlasting habitation into which they may receive them? To what do another and your own apply in this verse?

The lord of the unjust steward did not commend the injustice of the steward, but his wisdom, or shrewdness, in using present opportunities to secure future good. Money, property, is here called **the unrighteous mammon**. He condemns Christians because they do not act with the forethought that this unjust steward did. They do not use their means while opportunities present themselves for securing future good. Not the injustice, but the wise foresight in preparing for the future, is what the servant's master commended and what Jesus commends to his servants. In this the wisdom of the children of this world is seen to be superior to that of the children of light. He adds, as showing the principles on which God deals with men and the necessity of the faithful use of present opportunities, that we may enjoy higher privileges in the future: "He that is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much: and he that is unrighteous in a very little is unrighteous also in much. If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches? And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another's, who will give you that which is your own?" The **little** and the **much** here refer to the temporal good and opportunities and the spiritual and eternal. The

same is true of the unrighteous mammon and the true riches. Then the idea is presented that what we here have is not our own. The means and opportunities that we now have are not our own; they are loaned or intrusted to us by God to see whether he can bestow upon us eternal riches. Here we are using God's blessing as a loan intrusted to us, in the use of which our worthiness to use blessings will be proved. The future blessings or curses will be eternal and our own. If we fail to rightly use that loaned to us for a time, how can we expect God to give us higher and greater ones as our own for eternity?

### **USURY AND BANKING.**

Is it wrong for a Christian to be a stockholder in a banking institution which charges more than the legal rate of interest? Is it wrong for a Christian to be a bookkeeper or a cashier in a bank of this description? Is it wrong for a Christian to deposit money in a bank of this kind?

**Usury**, as we call it, is unlawful interest. As it is used in the Bible, it means any increase or pay for the use of anything. Hire for a horse or rent for land is as much usury as pay for the use of money. The law of Moses forbade the charging of any increase "to any of my people with thee that is poor." (Ex. 22: 25; see Lev. 25: 35.) It says not a word about charging usury to the well to do. They were not a trading, speculative people, and probably borrowed only for necessity. It forbade the taking of any increase from the poor. Nothing is said directly on the subject in the New Testament; but principles are laid down that would forbid taking increase from a poor brother in Christ. Nothing is said about lending to speculate on and make money. There is no more sin in taking increase for money than for the use of other property. The law of the land fixes a rate, and Christians must "be in subjection to the higher powers." The civil authorities are "the higher powers." The laws of Tennessee say that you shall not charge over six per cent per annum. To violate the law of the land is to violate the law of God and is sin, and any participation in or encouragement of this is sin. All business with a man or an institution that does wrong is not wrong. If so, you must go out of this world. In trading with them, it may profit them; but if it is not done to help it on, it is not necessarily sinful. If a man borrows money and pays



usurious interest to pay a debt he owes, I do not think he sins, although it may profit the usurious lender. So if a man deposits with a bank for his own good, although it may profit the bank, it is not necessarily a sin on his part. So I would say that it is sinful to violate the laws by charging more than lawful interest. His doing it through a company or corporation does not lessen the sin. It is sinful to any way so participate in it as to encourage and partake of the wrong. It is not wrong to deal with one who does wrong for our own good, even if it incidentally helps the usurious lender. I think these are correct principles, and each can apply it to himself and his course.

### VINEYARD, PARABLE OF THE.

In the parable of the vineyard (Matt. 20), what do **you** understand the Savior to teach by the expressions, **early in the morning** (verse 1); **the third hour** (verse 3); **the sixth and ninth hour** (verse 5); and **the eleventh hour** (verse 6)? This came up in one of our talks recently. One brother thinks the **eleventh-hour** people means the coming in of the Gentiles.

Early in the morning refers to the time to begin labor—six o'clock, or when they usually began labor; the third hour meant nine o'clock, the sixth hour meant twelve o'clock, the ninth hour meant three o'clock P.M., and the eleventh hour meant five o'clock P.M. They quit work at six o'clock; so these last have worked but one hour, while the first that began had borne the burden and heat of the day. I have heard these scriptures applied to represent the calling of the Gentiles, but the calling of the Gentiles had not come up then. If those who came at the eleventh hour meant the calling of the Gentiles, who was meant by those called at other hours? These referred to similar classes. It seems to me to represent a feature of God's dealings with man that may be applied to any and all conditions of life. A man who promptly responds when he hears the call of God will be blessed, no matter at what period of his life it be. There is no promise to those called at the third, sixth, or ninth hour that do not respond to the call when it is made. This was to encourage all to heed his call when made and to warn them against refusing the call when it is made. It teaches, too, that men do not earn the rewards bestowed; they are given as a matter of favor. And often those called late become better fitted to enjoy the

blessings than those called early. God's blessings are bestowed according to fitness to enjoy, and that fitness is according to the heartiness of the service rendered to God.

### WASHING OF REGENERATION.

Please explain Tit. 3: 5: "He saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit." What is **washing of regeneration**, and when was (or is) the Holy Spirit renewed?

The **washing of regeneration** is almost universally applied to baptism by commentators. Dr. Clarke, the well-known Methodist commentator, says: "Undoubtedly the apostle here means baptism." Macknight, the Presbyterian commentator, and Hovey, the Baptist commentator, so apply it. I do not know a commentator that does not. It is called **the washing of regeneration**. **Regeneration** is used but one other time in the New Testament. It means there the new kingdom. Here some think that it means the renewed state—the washing connected with the renewal, or the new kingdom, as we interpret it. The renewing of the spirit is frequently attributed to the begetting by the Spirit; but after one is baptized into Christ, if he does his duty as a Christian, times of renewal or refreshing from the presence of God will come to him. These are renewals, strengthening and building him up. He grows through these renewals of the Spirit from one degree of likeness to the Son of God to another. To these I think reference is made as the renewing of the Spirit after one is baptized into Christ.

This scripture settles two points: (1) Baptism is not a work of self-righteousness, righteousness by our own work. It is placed in contrast with it. It is a work of God's righteousness. The Savior's language to John, "Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness," settles that. Baptism is not our work; it is God's work. It is not a work we do; it is a work done on or to us by God, through the servant of God who baptizes us. (2) Being saved by "the washing of regeneration [or baptism] and renewing of the Holy Spirit," and being justified by the grace of God, are one and the same thing. "By grace have ye been saved, through faith" (Eph. 2:8), and being saved by "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit" are just the same. Baptism to the penitent believer for remission of sins and saved by grace through faith are one and the same thing.

**WATER, BORN OF.**

Please explain John 3: 5. Explain what the **water** and **Spirit** each mean. Please make this as plain as you can. I have heard several different meanings given the above passage. The Methodist preacher at this place says **water** means the natural birth. What was John Wesley's explanation?

Some things are so plain that it is difficult to explain them. It is difficult to explain water. We cannot put it in plainer terms. So of Spirit. A rule of interpretation is that words must be taken in their plain and literal meaning unless the context requires a figurative one to be used. There is nothing here that requires another than the literal meaning to be used; there is nothing that requires it to refer to childbirth; there is nothing about the birth of the child that is like this. No child is born of water at its birth. Whatever of water is connected with the birth of the child is itself brought forth from the womb, and is born with the child. The child is not born or brought forth from the water. There never was a more nonsensical, ridiculous, and hypocritical interpretation given to a passage than this; hypocritical because a mere pretext to avoid the truth. Jesus said that the fleshly child was born of the flesh. "That which is born of flesh is flesh." This could not be true if the child was born of water in its natural birth. The inspired interpreters and commentators apply this to baptism. Whenever one of them speaks of entrance into Christ or his kingdom, he requires them to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ with the whole heart and to be baptized into his name. The only safe commentators on the teachings of Jesus are the inspired men he sent. They say that we are baptized into Christ. "For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ." (Gal. 3: 26, 27.) Men who prefer the interpretations of foolish men to those of the inspired writers do not truly believe in Jesus. Wesley says: "Except he experience that great inward change by the Spirit and be baptized (wherever baptism can be had) as the outward sign and means of it." Wall, in his history, on infant baptism, says: "There is not one Christian writer of any antiquity in any language but what understands it of baptism; and, if it is not so understood, it is difficult to give an account how a person is born of water any more than born of wood." Every known commentator applies this to baptism.

Jesus, under the figure of a birth, tells how people enter into the kingdom of heaven: they are born into it. The elements of which they are born are water and Spirit. Led and guided by the Spirit, they are brought forth from the water. We certainly may learn what constituted that birth by seeing what Jesus and the Holy Spirit require to be done when they are led into the kingdom. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16: 16.) "Make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." (Matt. 28: 19.) "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified. . . . Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." In taking these steps that led them into the kingdom, they were born of water and the Spirit.

**WEAK IN THE FAITH.** See **Doubtful Disputation.**

### **WEDDING GARMENT.**

What is the **wedding garment** spoken of in Matt. 22: 11, and when is it put on?

The **wedding garment**, the lack of which caused the servant to be cast out of the wedding chamber, was the character gained by a righteous and holy life. It is put on by a faithful continuance in obeying the commands of God unto the end of life. A similar idea is found in Rev. 19: 8: "It was given unto her that she should array herself in fine linen, bright and pure: for the fine linen is the righteous acts of the saints."

**WICKED.** See **Annihilation; Future Punishment.**

### **WIFE'S, A, DUTY.**

How far should a wife be controlled by her husband when she believes it is her duty to do otherwise than as he demands she shall do? For instance, when a wife believes that it is her duty to meet with the saints on Lord's day and her husband will not allow her to do so, what is her duty under the circumstances? Suppose that such a husband will not give his wife money to spend in the good cause, but has his life heavily insured, and spends his money freely for worldly things, and thinks it a great hardship to go with his family to Lord's-day worship regularly, thus depriving the children of the benefits of scriptural teaching, etc. Do you think a wife should forsake husband and

children if she cannot stay with them and obey the Master or get them to do so?

I do not think that a Christian woman ought to separate from her husband, so long as it is possible for her to live with him. I know of nothing that exerts a more demoralizing and degrading influence on the country than the loose views of marriage and divorce that prevail among the people. While this is true, a Christian woman ought not to marry an unchristian man to start with. "But unto the married I give charge, yea not I, but the Lord, That the wife depart not from her husband (but should she depart, let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband) ; and that the husband leave not his wife. But to the rest say I, not the Lord: If any brother hath an unbelieving wife, and she is content to dwell with him, let him not leave her. And the woman that hath an unbelieving husband, and he is content to dwell with her, let her not leave her husband." (1 Cor. 7: 10-13.) But it is the wife's duty to obey God, and not permit her husband to hinder the performance of her duties to God. This can be done in almost all cases by a firm, but prudent and kind, course of life. The wife's object should be to win her husband to Christ. She can never do this when she permits him to hinder her obeying God. She can win him only by an earnest fidelity in obeying God. Kindly, firmly tell your husband that you must attend to your religious duties, Be doubly attentive to his comfort and wants and your duties as his wife, but do not neglect your duty to God. Be firm in the performance of these, and he will soon learn to respect and honor you for your Christian character, and will respect and honor your religion because you honor it. Very few men are so depraved that they will not respect the wife's religion, if she respects and honors it herself; but when she does not, they cannot.

The evil usually grows out of a wrong start. The wife begins by neglecting her Christian duties until the husband loses his respect for her religion, and things grow from bad to' worse until she realizes that she is giving up God and going to perdition ; then she undertakes to change things, but does not always start right. She ought to be frank and candid with her husband, tell him that she has been doing wrong, let him know her feelings, and show him that she is determined to change her course and for the future do her duty as a Chris-

tian. Do it all kindly, but be firm and earnest, and the chances are that he will help her.

I heard of a case, recently, in which a woman had married a man of a denominational church. They lived close to his church. She began yielding to him and never going to her own church. When she proposed to go, he would tell her that the horses were tired, and that he did not think it right to ride them off three or four miles on Sunday when they had worked hard all the week. It went on so for some years. She did not attend church. At last she felt that she was sinning against God and resolved to do her duty. So she told him that she wished to attend a meeting that was coming on, but he paid no attention to it until the time came to start. She prepared dinner for him and for all his comforts, and, with bonnet on, told him that she was going to church. He asked her how she would go. She asked him: "Have you provided a way for me?" He said: "No." She quietly and pleasantly said: "Then I will walk. I have been neglecting my duty too long." So she started off. He looked at her for a moment or two, went and caught a horse, overtook her, and accompanied her to the meeting. She never afterwards lacked opportunity to go. Firmness, a determination to serve God, with a kind, gentle, forbearing spirit toward those who hinder, is needed. With these God will remove the difficulties and provide a way of serving him.

The relation of husband and wife is sacred. Do not think of breaking it up, save under absolute necessity; but be firm in your obedience to God and kind to the husband. If he does not let you have money to use for God, God will not hold you responsible. Study the Bible, pray earnestly and faithfully, and the worst husband may be converted to an earnest and devoted Christian. "How knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband?" (1 Cor. 7: 16.) Set your heart to saving your husband and children. It is right to actually leave them only when they will not live with you on account of your being a Christian. Live the Christian, then leave results with them and with God.

### WILL FOR THE DEED, THE.

Did God ever in any age or at any time take **the will for the deed**? Sectarians often say this, and use the case of Abraham offering up Isaac to prove it. Did God accept the will of Abraham for the deed?

God requires both the will and the deed. He requires the will to express itself in the deed or the doing before he accepts it as pleasing to him. The will is first influenced. But God demands the will or the spiritual power in man to control the fleshly feelings and passions. Until it desires and is able to do this it does not effect or mold the character of man; the spirit is not able to control the flesh, which lusteth against the spirit. Until it shows its power to do this it does not meet the requirements of God. So he does not take the will for the deed as service to him. I do not know an example in the Scriptures of God blessing a person in response to faith until that faith manifested or declared itself in obedience or in outward act, showing that the feelings of the heart and the decisions of the will must cause the body to act before God accepts it as service. Abraham did exactly what God commanded him. He went to the appointed place, bound Isaac, laid him on the altar, took the knife to slay him, when God commanded him to stop, and not lay his hand upon the lad. There was no taking of the will for the deed, but he went forward when God commanded and stopped when God commanded. No case could be farther from taking the will for the deed than this.

### **WOMAN'S WORK.**

Can you not tell us just what work you think, according to the Bible, women may be permitted to do for the church as such? Once in a while you admit that there is work for women to do, but just what it is you never tell us. Of course we understand about home duties and rearing children, and all that, of which I, one of your "strong-minded women," certainly do my share. But what may we do for the church as such, besides?

The question as asked betrays one of the strongest, yet most common, widespread, and most difficult to be uprooted errors, concerning church work—to wit, that it is all done in public and by public speaking. There was very little set speaking and speeches in the days of Christ or the apostles. They talked to those they met—one or a hundred—concerning the things of the kingdom. A very small part of the work was done by public speaking.. Whatever is done by a Christian under divine direction is church work. Christ "is the head of the body, the church." "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." Christ dwells in the body and works through the members, as the soul dwells in the body

and works through the hands, feet, eyes, ears, etc. What the hand does, the body does ; so, too, of all the members.

Paul, after telling the men what they should do, says: "In like manner, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefastness and sobriety; not with braided hair, and gold or pearls or costly raiment; but (which becometh women professing godliness) through good works. Let a woman learn in quietness with all subjection. But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over a man, but to be in quietness. For Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not beguiled, but the woman being beguiled hath fallen into transgression: but she shall be saved through her childbearing, if they continue in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety." (1 Tim. 2: 9-15.) Following both these negative and positive requirements is church work, because the work of Christ, and must be observed by women if they be faithful members of the church.

Paul gives the works a widow must have done to entitle her to the support of the church: "Well reported of for good works; if she hath brought up children, if she hath used hospitality to strangers, if she hath washed the saints' feet, if she hath relieved the afflicted, if she hath diligently followed every good work. . . . I desire therefore that the younger widows marry, bear children, rule the household, give no occasion to the adversary for reviling." (1 Tim. 2: 10-14.) That is church work. The church has no more important work than bearing children and training them for service to God. Women must do that work.

Paul tells Titus to teach sound doctrine. That doctrine, as it refers to women, is: "That aged women likewise be reverent in demeanor, not slanderers nor enslaved to much wine, teachers of that which is good; that they may train the young women to love their husbands, to love their children, to be sober-minded, chaste, workers at home, kind, being in subjection to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed." (Tit. 2: 3-5.) That is church work—the old women to teach the young women good things; to be sober; to love their husbands, their children; to be discreet, chaste, good housekeepers, obedient to their husbands. A Christian woman is doing church work when she keeps house well—when she properly loves her husband, her children. The word of God is blasphemed when a woman does not keep house well,



when she fails to love and honor her husband, when she fails to love her children and guide the house.

Peter says: "In like manner, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, even if any obey not the word, they may without the word be gained by the behavior of their wives; beholding your chaste behavior coupled with fear." (1 Pet. 3: 1, 2.) He gives the adornment that they are to practice. All this is church work performed by women as members of the church, as members of the body of Christ. I am not quoting these passages because they admonish obedience to husbands, but all the passages on woman's work contain this caution. In these general admonitions that might be multiplied it is stated that women must guide the house and relieve the afflicted. This imposes on her the necessity of teaching her children the way of the Lord, of visiting the sick, and in these ministrations it is her duty to teach the word of God. Then women are to engage in all the prayers of the church; she is not to lead in prayer. Paul asks, "Is it seemly that a woman pray unto God unveiled?" showing plainly how she should appear before God when she prays, how she should approach God. It applies as much to her approach to God in the closet as in the public assembly. It has no bearing whatever on the question as to whether she should lead in prayer or not. Every Christian should bear a part in the public prayer, as well as the leader. There is no sense in any one bowing or making a pretense of prayer if only the leader prays.

In Rom. 16: 1, Paul commends unto them "Phoebe our sister, who is a servant of the church that is at Cenchrea." This shows that she devoted herself to the service of the church. This service was in looking after the needy and sick of their own members, then of the world. The theory now is that the public teachers should do this work. In the apostolic days it was said: "It is not fit that we should forsake the word of God to serve tables." Men who are teaching the word of God should not be hindered in this work to serve tables. Men were appointed to distribute to these families; but there is always work of looking after the sick and needy men, women, and children that women can do much better than men. Phoebe did this work. In doing this, she taught the word of God to all who came into contact with her. Verse 3 adds: "Salute Prisca and Aquila my fellow-workers in Christ

Jesus." One way they helped was when they found a young man mighty and eloquent in the Scriptures, knowing only a part of the counsel of God, and "they took him unto them, and expounded unto him the way of God more accurately." (Acts 18: 26.) Prisca and Aquila did this in taking him unto them and privately teaching him. They also helped Paul by giving him a home and employment when he needed it.

Paul says: "Help these women, for they labored with me in the gospel." (Phil, 4: 3.) This shows that women did work with Paul in spreading the gospel, and the record shows, I think, that his missionary company generally embraced a number of godly women who could reach their own sex and teach them the word of truth. At Cesarea, Paul and his companions found daughters of Philip, the evangelist, who were inspired and prophesied; but all was done modestly and in private. (Acts 21: 8, 9.) At Philippi they went out to where they "supposed there was a place of prayer," "and spake unto the women that were come together." (Acts 16: 13.)

As I take it, this teaches that women met together by themselves and instructed each other and worshiped together. Paul teaches that the same order in reference to women was continued under Christ that prevailed under the Mosaic law. Other scriptures and examples might be found, but these suffice to show that women must teach their own children; must visit the sick, the afflicted, the needy, and, in these quiet ministrations, teach them the word of truth. She may teach men in private; she may teach her sisters, one by one or together. The Scriptures give full authority to the Christian women to teach those misguided women who refuse to bear children. It can be more effectively done in private, by tender, personal admonition. She can teach her servants, employees, and others about her house. She can teach her neighbors in private—the most effective teaching ever done. She can gather her neighbors' children together, if they will come, and teach them. It is no violation of these restraints thrown around woman for her to take a class of children or old persons and quietly, in the Bible school, teach them. There is privacy in publicity. When all sing, there is no publicity attached to one singing. When one sings alone, there is publicity. So, for a woman to teach a class in a meetinghouse, when all others are teaching around, it is not publicity. It would be wrong for her to

get up as the only teacher of all who attend. This would be inviting publicity.

There is no trouble in finding labor. The field is wide enough. It is large enough to satisfy all demands, save "a prurient desire to assail Paul's teaching as narrow." I have known men—and women, too—who devoted their whole time to teaching the Bible from house to house that never made public speeches. They are successful laborers for God. There is ample room for the full home talent and energies of all the sisters without once violating Paul's order, and their services are greatly needed. There is not an ungodly home; there is not an ill-kept house, a badly cooked meal; there is not a discordant home, a family of children untrained in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; there is not a wayward girl threatened with ruin, or a boy that looks on the wine; there is not a negro hut nor a princely mansion, where the people are not religious, that is not an inviting field pleading for missionary labor on the part of the faithful Christian woman, where all of her gentle ministrations, her "tender, tearful, heartfelt talks," may not be freely made to the salvation of men and women and the honor and glory of God. The magnitude of the field, the multiplicity of the openings at our own doors that plead for her ministrations are oppressive, and without earnest trust in God would be discouraging. The field at your doors, my dear sister, is white for the harvest, but the laborers in this vineyard are few. Why is it?

### **WOMEN PREACHERS.**

Is there any scripture authorizing women to preach? Paul says that it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church. (1 Cor. 14: 34.) Please give all the light you can on the subject.

All the teaching of the Bible is against women speaking in public. Paul said: "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets; for God is not a God of confusion, but of peace. As in all the churches of the saints, let the women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but let them be in subjection, as also saith the law. And if they would learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home: for it is shameful for women to speak in the church. ... If any man thinketh himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him take knowledge of the things which I write unto you, that they are the commandment of the Lord."

(1 Cor. 14: 31-37.) If that passage of scripture can be reasoned away so as not to mean that women should not speak in the churches, I do not know what command of God may not be set aside. First, it is spoken of those spiritually endowed. Those possessed of spiritual powers are under discussion. They are told how to behave themselves in church. The **spirits of the prophets**, the spirits with which the prophets are endowed, are subject to the prophets. This was no doubt said in view of the claim frequently made that, as they were under the guidance of the Spirit, they could not restrain themselves, but produced a scene of disorder. Paul tells them that they can so restrain the Spirit as to one speak at a time, "for God is not a God of confusion, but of peace," or order, in "all the churches." Then he says: "Let the women keep silence in the churches." He is still speaking of the spiritually endowed. Hence he means: Let the women gifted with the Spirit "keep silence in the churches." What churches? "In all the churches of the saints." He is disapproving disorder and confusion, and says that God is the author of peace "in all the churches of the saints." As a means to this, let the women, although spiritually endowed, "keep silence in the churches." Why? "For it is not permitted unto them to speak; but let them be in subjection, as also saith the law." Here he shows that it had been the order of God under the law, and this order is brought over into the gospel reign so as to make it perpetual. "And if they would learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home: for it is shameful for a woman to speak in the church."

That is a general proposition. It could not be expressed in terms more general and universal in application. Here Paul speaks of **all the churches, the churches, and the church**, showing the universal application of the principle. It was spoken with reference to spiritually endowed women, too, for he says: "If any man thinketh himself **to** be a prophet, or spiritual, let him take knowledge" of the things which I write unto you, that they are the commandment of the Lord." Then, in verse 39: "Wherefore, my brethren, desire earnestly to prophesy, and forbid not to speak with tongues." The apostle could not have well used language that could make it more universal in application. There were spiritually endowed women; but their spiritual endowment did not authorize them to overstep the bounds of womanly modesty and publicly speak in the

churches. God not only respected womanly modesty wherever it existed, as he had inculcated it in the law; but he was careful to preserve and cultivate it "in all the churches of the saints."

The command to Timothy was given him to guide him in setting in order the churches of Christ. "Let a woman learn in quietness with all subjection. But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over a man, but to be in quietness. For Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not beguiled, but the woman being beguiled hath fallen into transgression." (1 Tim. 2: 11-14.) Here are two reasons given: (1) Adam was first created, and the precedence, the right to rule and lead, was given him; (2) the woman was deceived and led in the transgression. Both reasons are universal in their bearing, showing clearly that the rule is universal. I do not see how God could have made it clearer and more certain than he has done. The reasons given for this command apply to every woman in the world alike; the command must reach all alike. There is not the least difficulty in explaining all the passages in harmony with these, if we will recognize what is true—that God intended the great burden of prayer, teaching, exhortation, and admonition to be done in private, not in public. Woman has free access to this great field. "We have perverted this order; we do all of our preaching, teaching, exhortation, and, I fear, praying often, in public ; so interpret the Scriptures by our practices, and not by the will of God.

If these commands can be set aside, I do not see what command of the Bible may not be set aside. The great majority of those who set them aside openly adopt the infidel rule; they are not to be governed by Paul. Sam Jones said, "God has blessed women's preaching; and if God does this, who cares what Paul says?"—that is, he sees that women's speaking has stirred up a religious excitement. He takes that to be a sign that God has blessed their speaking, and on that judgment of his he denounces Paul as unworthy of credence. Paul, furthermore, in direct connection with this, says: "If any man thinketh himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him take knowledge of the things which I write unto you, that they are the commandment of the Lord." Paul not only insists that these are God's commandments, but for a person to refuse to acknowledge them as such is to show that they were not

spiritual. Many things arouse a temporary excitement in religion that produce evil results in the end. Faith is intended to make us trust God for the future, rather than judge by immediate results. That woman's speaking, preaching, and engaging in public affairs would degrade society, I have no doubt. It would destroy the domestic life of our people and lead to anything else than good results. The practice involves a rejection of the word of God. Professor Harper, late president of Chicago University, used this language: "A great denomination of the Christian church is to-day searching to know the mind of an apostle who, in the first century, made some suggestions concerning the women in public worship in one of the little churches of Christ planted at Corinth. Men are not going to perpetuate a foolish custom, even if an apostle himself advised it." On which the Journal and Messenger wisely comments: "The question is not one pertaining to the conduct of women in the churches, but concerning the methods of dealing with the word of God, the writings of men of common sense under the influence of the Holy Spirit." Then the Western Recorder says: "Of course Baptists in Chicago have a right to believe and teach what seems good in their own eyes; but Southern Baptists, to a man, deny that an apostle in his inspired, infallible writing could advise a foolish custom, and they propose to perpetuate to the least jot and tittle all that Paul advised in his letters."

The truth of the whole matter is that many of the churches are infected more or less with a spirit of rationalistic infidelity that does not hesitate to set aside any order of God that does not suit their ideas of things. Reason—or, as it is called now, **sanctified common sense**—is put on equality with the revelation of God, and sets aside the Scripture whenever it stands in the way of their fancies. The habit of women preaching originated in the same hotbed with easy divorce, free love, and the repugnance to childbearing.

The experience of the world shows the wisdom of God's orders. Where women most freely take part in public worship a much smaller portion of the people are religious than where they remain silent. There is a great complaint that the men are forsaking the church. One chief reason is that the church has been given up to the rule of the pastor and the women; and they run it in channels that drive men from it. We will never succeed in the church until we follow God's or-

der. Then "God will work in us to will and to do of his good pleasure." The time to check an evil is in its beginning, before it gathers strength and momentum. Let us be wise.

**WORDS.** See **Idle Words.**

### **YOKED WITH UNBELIEVERS.**

Please give a weak brother some light on 2 Cor. 6: 14-18. While verse 14 is generally understood and construed so as to apply in a matrimonial sense, does it not equally—and, in fact, more forcibly—apply to a partnership in any and all business dealings with an unbeliever? Please give your views, or what you understand the Scriptures to teach, on this chapter.

I believe the command covers all relations in which the Christian is controlled by the actions of those not Christians. That is what **yoked together** means—so connected that the actions and course of one not a Christian control the actions of the Christian. This general rule is laid down; then it is pointed out that a neglect of it leads, first, to destroy the distinction between righteousness and unrighteousness, then between light and darkness, then it leads into idolatry. The safe ground is to avoid the association that weans from Christ and leads to idolatry. As a precaution against that, the command is: "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers." We have no formal idolatry, but a great amount of informal idolatry—real idolatry without the forms of idol worship. Whatever a man esteems above service to God is idolatry. Covetousness is idolatry, because a covetous man is more eager to gain money than he is to honor God or to gain his favor. Whatever man holds above service to God is his idol. This scripture tells Christians to avoid the complications and alliances that lead into idolatry. All that wean man from God are embraced. He tells them to come out from among them, from this idol worship, and to withdraw as far as possible from the associations that lead to them. Some associations, like marriage, cannot be broken without violation of other laws of God; and 1 Cor. 7 gives the rules regulating those so circumstanced. See **Associating with Sinners in Business.**

## INDEX TO SCRIPTURES.

---

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Gen.	1:2-----204	Ps.	55: 11-----197
	1: 27, 28-----275		76: 10-----334
	2: 17-----6		104: 30-----204
	3: 22, 23-----177	Prov.	4: 23-----77
	4: 15-17-----71		13: 24-----57
	6: 2-----72		15: 8-----10
	11: 7, 8-----434		16: 33-----268
	15: 13-----64		21: 3-----10
	22: 18-----5		28: 9-----342
	32: 30-----383	Eccles.	7: 29-----349
Ex.	4: 16-----350		11: 3-----401
	7: 1-----350	Isa.	24: 5-----424
	9: 16-----325		40: 7-----204
	12: 40-----64		45: 1-4-----334
	18: 19-----350		45: 7-----163, 388
	20: 8-11-----366		52: 15-----410
	22: 25-----439		57: 15-----330
	31: 12-17-----367		66: 2-----330
Lev.	6: 2-5-----10	Jer.	13: 23-----430
	10: 9-11-----349		25: 8-14-----333
	25: 35-----439		31: 31-34-----216, 369
Num.	15: 32-36-----372, 389	Ezek.	20: 12-----368
Deut.	5: 14-----366		36: 25-----407
	6: 6,7-----57	Dan.	2: 44-----247
	12: 8, 9-----424		4: 34, 35-----434
	12: 32-----8		7: 21-28-----253
	17: 12-----389	Hos.	13: 9-11-----412
	18: 20-----306, 389	Mal.	2: 7-----349
	21: 18-21-----207	Matt.	3: 6-----30
Esth.	3: 7-----268		3: 11-----39, 40, 47
1 Sam.	8:3-5-----412		3: 12-----170
1 Kings	18: 17, 18-----232		3: 15-----52
	22: 5-8-----233		3: 16-----30
Job	26: 13-----204	S:	3-----328
Ps.	19: 7-----353	S:	4-----310
	32: 2-----197		5:23,24-----8
	34: 13-----197		S: 32-----283
	SI: 11-----203		S: 33-37-----240



	PAGE.		PAGE.		
Matt.	6: 13 -----	414	Luke	14: 28-----	107
	6: 24-----	131		16: 10-----	228, 438
	7: 1-----	240		16: 16-----	250
	7: 7-----	25		16: 26-----	401
	7: 12-----	194		17: 1, 2-----	26, 415
	7: 21, 22-----	132, 234		17: 6-----	165
	8: 29-----	12		17: 20-24-----	251
	12: 31, 32-----	386, 389		23: 3-----	238
	12: 36-----	209		23: 42-----	418
	12: 43-----	426	John	1: 4-9-----	329
	13: 14, 15-----	430		1: 11-----	201
	13: 24-30-----	15		1: 12-----	429
	15: 1-20-----	94, 117, 228, 231, 234, 425		1: 18-----	383
	16: 18-----	189		1: 47-----	197
	16: 19-----	244		3: 1-8-----	64
	18: 10-----	14		3: 5-----	32, 442
	18: 15-----	133, 256		3: 23-----	30
	19: 4-6-----	303		3: 27-----	42
	20: 1-6-----	440		5: 28, 29-----	17
	20: 22, 23-----	32		6: 37-----	428
	22: 11-----	443		6: 63-----	205
	23: 25,26-----	94		6: 65-----	428
	24: 24-----	22		6: 70-----	238
	24: 28-----	146		7: 17, 18-----	433
	25: 14-----	14		7: 64-71-----	332
	25: 41-46-----	17		8: 29-----	435
	26: 28-----	54		8: 43, 44-----	429
	26: 52-----	335		8: 47-----	426
	27: 24-----	326		9: 31-----	341
	27: 35-----	268		10: 1-9-----	385
	27: 44-----	418		10: 16-----	429
	28: 19,20-----	24		10: 26-----	426
				10: 28, 29-----	22
Mark	1: 5-----	30		12: 39, 40-----	426
	3: 30-----	387		13: 8-----	176
	10: 47-----	310		13: 14, 15-----	175
	16: 16-----	33		14: 9-----	383
	16: 17, 18-----	386		14: 15-17-----	395
Luke	3: 11-----	35		14: 21-----	433
	3: 16-----	35		14: 26-----	24
	3: 11-----	205, 397		14: 31-----	433
	10: 16-----	131		15: 1-6-----	69
	11: 24-26-----	208		17: 17-----	434
	11: 32-----	41, 237		17: 19-----	434
	12: 47, 48-----	228		17: 20-23-----	432, 435
	14: 26-----	138, 229	Acts	1: 5-----	37

INDEX TO SCRIPTURES.

457

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Acts	1:26-----268	Rom.	14: 16-----416
	2: 16-21 ----- 37		14: 23-----199
	2: 38-----206, 396		16: 1 -----448
	2: 42-----317		16: 16-----258
	2; 44-46----- 95		16: 17-----227
	2: 47----- 7	1 Cor.	1: 17----- 46
	3:20, 21 -----360		2: 14-----311
	5: 14----- 7		4: 15----- 65
	6: 2-----126		5: 9-12-----27, 181
	7: 38----- 84		6: 1-9-----255
	8: 36-39----- 31		7: 1 ----- 94
	10: 48----- 34		7: 2-5----- 75
	11: 15 ----- 38		7: 10, 11-----26, 280
	11: 24----- 7		7: 10-13-----444
	12: 15----- 14		7: 16-----445
	13: 48-----315		7: 39-----287
	15: 9 -----199		8: 7-----101
	16: 13-15 -----31, 449		9: 13, 14-----346
	16: 33, 34 ----- 31		9: 21 -----190
	18: 10-----429		10: 1, 2----- 29
	18: 26-----449		10: 12 ----- 44, 68
	20: 7 -----174		10: 13-----415
	22: 16----- 31		10: 27----- 11
	26: 16-----380		11: 4-15-----113
Rom.	2: 1 -----240		12: 13----- 48
	2: 12-----311		12: 28-----402
	3: 20-25-----179, 242, 259		13: 10-----402
	4: 15-----200		14: 30, 31-----94, 450
	5: 1 -----241		14: 32, 33----- 94
	5: 5 -----273		15: 29----- 49
	5: 13-----200		16: 1, 2 -----86, 88, 174
	6: 4----- 31		16: 20-----254
	7: 4-----289	2 Cor.	3:3 ----- 198
	7: 7-25 ----- 99		3: 6-11----- 260, 369
	8: 9-11-----396		5: 10-----401
	8: 29, 30-----316		5: 20-----379
	9: 15, 16-----291		6: 14-----287, 396, 454
	9: 18-21 -----192		10: 3-6 -----44, 271
	10: 10----- 96		11: 13-15-----296
	13: 1, 2 -----331		13: 12-----254
	13: 4----- 73, 332	Gal.	1: 9 -----364
	13: 8-----268, 320, 382		1: 11, 12-----297
	13: 10-----406		2: 9-11 -----364
	14: 1 ----- 87, 145		3: 16-29-----63, 243, 258
	14: 6-----123	Eph.	1: 4, 5 -----316
	14: 14-----100		2: 8-----190

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Eph.	4: 11-13-----404	Heb.	10: 1-----60
	4: 29-----209		10: 16-----198
	5: 19-----225		10: 25-----124, 173, 174
	S: 20-----416		10: 26-----264, 427
	6: 1, 2-----207		10: 28, 29----63, 133, 428
	6: 4-----57		12: 1, 2-----55
Phil.	2: 5-9-----273		12: 14-18-----374
	4: 3-----449		12: 22-24-----374
	4: 18-----292	James	1: 2, 3-----414
Col.	1: 12, 13-----7, 62		1: 13, 14-----414
	1: 23-----302		1: 18-----65
	2: 12-----32		2: 10, 11-----79
	2: 20-22-----425		2: 17-----199
	3: 16-----224		5: 1-9-----363
	4: 6-----210		5: 12-----241
1 Thess.	2:3-----197		5: 13-15-----143, 299
	4: 8-----132		5: 16-----98, 361
	5: 26-----254	1 Pet.	1: 2-----62, 316, 348
2 Thess.	1: 9, 10-----18, 186		1: 10, 11-----222
	2: 3-12-----277		1: 20-----349
1 Tim.	1: 2-----298		1: 21-----222
	1: 5-----101		1: 22-----199
	1: 13-----282		1: 23-----65
	2: 9, 10-----235, 447		2: 1-----197
	2: 11-14-----452		3: 1, 2-----448
	4: 10-----354		3: 3, 4-----235
	5: 3-10-----175, 352		3: 10-----197
2 Tim.	1:6-----298		4: 1-----324
	1: 13-----298		5: 1-3-----153
	2: 2-----298		5: 14-----254
	3: 14, 15-----298	2 Pet.	2:4-----12, 377, 427
Tit.	2: 3-5-----447	1 John	1:5-----330
	3: 5-----441		1: 7-----63, 433
Heb.	1: 14-----13		1: 9-----361
	2: 2-----423		2: 19-----22
	2: 9, 10-----324, 375		3: 9-----67
	4: 15-----375		3: 15-----138
	5: 8, 9-----324, 375		5: 16, 17-----390
	6: 1-6-----168, 283, 374, 427	Jude	3-----102, 302
	6: 2-----29		6-----12, 377
	8: 9-----108	Rev.	11: 15-----304
	8: 10-----198		12: 7-9-----377, 427
	9: 9, 10-----61, 180		14: 5-----197
	9: 13-15-----180		22: 19-----8
	9: 18-26-----61		

