



EUGÈNE W. HERNDON.

The
FOUNDATION
OF
CHRISTIAN HOPE

BY
EUGENE W. HERNDON

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE
MCQUIDDY PRINTING COMPANY

1904

INTRODUCTION.

No subject can be of more lasting importance to all classes and conditions of men than that of Christianity. In this age of enlightenment and letters there ought to be found no place for either atheism or infidelity. Every one should study to know, and should really know, the foundation upon which the authenticity of the Scriptures rests. Upon their truth the hope of the Christian is founded.

In the following pages will be found a concise and satisfactory statement in reference to this subject. Eugene W. Herndon, the author, has spared no pains in his investigations in settling, in the most logical and authoritative way, the question at issue between the infidel and the Christian. His treatment of other questions, from the clearness of his definitions and the exactness of his reasoning, cannot fail to give the reader a fuller and better understanding of them than he otherwise might have. It is to be regretted that Brother Herndon should have died before he could complete the work upon which he had set his heart and to which he had put his hand. The work is thorough and complete as far as it goes, save the last study, which was brought to a sudden end by his sudden death. It is given to the public as the last work of his vigorous intellect

and his facile pen by his beloved wife, Anna H. Herndon, in the hope that much good may be accomplished by it in the world; that infidelity may be made more harmless and the hope of the Christian may be strengthened.

JAMES E. SCOBAY.

STUDY I.

THE HISTORY AND AUTHENTICITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

If it can be shown that the New Testament Scriptures are what they purport to be, we have unquestionable authority for believing in the divinity of Jesus of Nazareth, and for urging men and women to become obedient to that belief. If we are to believe what is recorded therein, we must be able to show that the several writings composing the New Testament canon were written by their reputed authors, and about the time of the happening of the events that they record. To do this is the purpose of this study.

“Testament” means “covenant;” in our present speech, “contract.” In all contracts there must be at least *two* parties. Before a contract is effective it must be accepted by all the parties. In the Old Testament Scriptures we have accounts of several contracts made by God and accepted by men. In those Scriptures we find this statement: “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.” (Jer. 31: 31.) If the Old Testament Scriptures are true, the world was warranted in expecting a new covenant and in accepting it if its credentials are sufficient.

It is well to know at the beginning of any investigation what is known and admitted, so that we may know what is *not* required of us as well as what *is* required.

It is admitted that in the year A. D. 1, and for a long time previous thereto, there was a peculiar people—called "Jews," "Israelites," "Hebrews"—who worshiped only one God, who were prohibited from intermarrying with any other people, who circumcised their male children when eight days old, who observed certain religious feasts, who had a written code of laws and a collection of devotional and prophetic writings, and whose prophets had foretold of a coming Deliverer. These people built the city of Jerusalem, and in this city they built a temple magnificent in its architecture and appointments.

It is admitted that in the twenty-ninth year of the Christian era an obscure Jew suddenly appeared proclaiming in the open country the immediate coming of the long-expected Deliverer, and that very soon another obscure Jew did appear and claimed to be this Deliverer.

It is admitted that many of the Jews accepted him as the promised Deliverer, and that out of the number of his followers he selected twelve who accompanied him all the time, and to whom he gave special instructions.

It is admitted that this Jew claimed to be divine—to be equal to God, to be God manifest in the flesh.

It is admitted that this Jew was put to death because

he claimed to be divine; that he declared that at the end of three days of burial he would come to life; that the Jews who did not accept him as the Deliverer knew of this statement, and put a watch of Roman soldiers at his grave, and sealed it with the Roman king's seal, to keep, as they said, his disciples from stealing his body so as to claim that he had come to life.

It is admitted that on the morning of the third day his body was gone. His disciples said that he had come back to life; his enemies said that his disciples had stolen his body, notwithstanding the guard of Roman soldiers and the king's seal. No arrests were made, although his disciples were in the city publicly proclaiming his resurrection from the dead.

It is admitted that certain Jews—named "Matthew," "Mark," "Luke," "John," "Paul," "James," and "Peter"—lived at that time, were the disciples of this Jesus, acted as his ambassadors, and were punished for so doing.

From these admissions we find that the character who is the hero of the New Testament Scriptures is an actual person; that he lived and acted at the time, and place, and taught just as these writings say that he did; and that such characters as the reputed authors of these writings lived at that time and taught as the writings of these books teach. We see from these admitted facts that it is not unreasonable to claim that these men did write these books.

“From the close of the second century the history

of the canon is simple, and its proof is clear. It is allowed even by those who have reduced the genuine apostolic works to the narrowest limits, that from the time of Irenaeus the New Testament was composed essentially of the same books which we receive at present, and that they were regarded with the same reverence as is now shown to them." (Westcott.) It is true that with these books at that time and for a number of years later, we find other writings which were subsequently declared to be uncanonical and which have not for a long time been found in our *New Testament*. They were then allowed to have an ecclesiastical use, but not a canonical authority. They were considered profitable for instruction, for elementary teaching, but not for the proof of doctrine. "They ought to be read, though they cannot be regarded as apostolic or prophetic." (Muratorian Canon.) The early disciples exercised a vigilant watch to prevent unauthorized writings from exercising undue influence. In the time of Diocletian (A. D. 303), when the disciples were called upon to abjure their belief and to surrender their sacred writings, and when it thus became necessary to determine what superfluous books might be yielded to the Roman inquisitor without being guilty of apostasy, the uncanonical books were given up, and the canon was freed of all that were not universally received.

MARCION was born at Sinope, in Pontus, in the first half of the second century and came to Rome between A. D. 140 and A. D. 150. At first he was very friendly

with the congregation of Christians, and his severe asceticism made a deep impression upon the disciples; but a change came over him, and he severed his connection with them and built up a party of his own. The reasons for this change are not positively known. Some suppose that he was disappointed in his ambition to be made bishop, while others attribute the change to his association with the Syrian Gnostic, *Cerdo*, whose doctrine he adopted and further developed. Marcion, in his writings in support of his doctrine and in opposition to Christianity, mentioned, quoted from—accepting some and rejecting others—a number of books; and this list embraces nearly all the books now found in our New Testament, which shows that these books were in existence, and well known before A. D. 150. He used only Luke's Gospel, although he was acquainted with the others. Paul only, according to him, was a true apostle, and Paul's writings alone were accepted by him. The importance of the writings of Marcion is that they show that the writings of our New Testament were in existence, in general use, before A. D. 150.

IRENÆUS was born, probably, in Asia Minor, about A. D. 115, and died about A. D. 190, or the usual date— A. D. 202.

TERTULLIAN was born at Carthage about A. D. 150 or A. D. 160, and died at the same place between A. D. 220 and A. D. 240. In the congregation at Carthage he was made a bishop.

CLEMENS, *Titus Flavius*, was one of the most cele-

brated teachers of the congregation in Alexandria. The date of his birth is unknown; but when in the prime of life, about A. I). 192 to A. D. 202, he began on his principal work.

These three Christian writers represent three geographic centers of thought. They inherited, in common with their fellow-disciples, the doctrines which it was their task to arrange. They made no claims to any discoveries in Christianity, but appealed to the testimony of the church. From Lyons, from Carthage, and from Alexandria one voice proceeds in reference to the books of the New Testament, and it is in substantial agreement *with* our list.

The *third* Council of Carthage was held in A. D. 397; and it is the first council that certainly gave us a list of the books of the New Testament, in these words: "It was also determined that, besides the Canonical Scriptures, nothing be read in the church under the title 'Divine Scriptures.' The Canonical Scriptures are these [giving the list of the Old Testament]; of the New Testament: four books of the Gospels, one book of the Acts of the Apostles, thirteen Epistles of the apostle Paul, one Epistle of the same to the Hebrews, two Epistles of the apostle Peter, three Epistles of John, one Epistle of James, one Epistle of Jude, one book of the Apocalypse of John."

The Council of Hippo, held in A. D. 419, gives the same list in the same words, except that it says "fourteen Epistles of the apostle Paul" instead of "thir-

teen Epistles of the apostle Paul, one Epistle of the same to the Hebrews"—which is but saying "fourteen," except to specially indorse the Epistle to the Hebrews.

ATHANASIUS, a well-known historic character of the congregation of Alexandria, in a letter written in A. D. 367, gives a list of the canonical books of the New Testament exactly agreeing with our present canon.

These references show clearly and indisputably that our present canon of the New Testament was accepted and recognized by the disciples as early as A. D. 150, or possibly A. D. 175, and that we find the same canon confirmed by councils in A. D. 397 and A. D. 419 and on down continuously.

We now desire to call attention to the successive versions of the New Testament.

The year A. D. 1881 gave us a new version, the latest and best that we have ever had. It was not only a revision of the Greek text, but also a revision of the King James Version in accordance with the revised Greek text, virtually making it a new version. This version had its origin in action taken by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury in February, 1870. Two English companies of revisers and two American companies were appointed to do this work.

Immediately preceding this, in A. D. 1611, was made what is known as the *Authorized Version*—the *King James Version*, or the *Common Version*. It is the version now in common use by English-speaking Prot-

estant peoples. It was undertaken by a large number of the clergymen of the Church of England under the direction of King James I.

Immediately preceding this was the *Douay (or Rheims) Version*, in A. D. 1604, made by Roman Catholic exiles at Rheims. This is the version used by English-speaking Roman Catholics.

Next preceding this we find the *Bishops' Bible*, a revision of a previous translation,, published under the direction of Archbishop Parker in A. D. 1568.

Shortly before this we have, in A. D. 1557, the celebrated *Geneva* translation, made by English exiles and printed with notes favoring the views of Calvin and Beza.

Next older we find a revision of a former translation, made by *Cranmer* in A. D. 1539.

Next in priority, and having the distinction of being the first translation made from the Greek, we have, in A. D. 1526, the translation made by *Tyndale*.

Next older to this last one, in A. D. 1384, we have the first English translation of the Bible, which was made by *Wyclif*, who made his translation from the *Latin Vulgate*. There is a long gap between the translation made by Wyclif and the *Latin Vulgate*, a Latin translation made by Jerome while he was in a monastery at Bethlehem, in A. D. 387. Jerome's version claims to be both a translation and a revision of a previous Latin version, or possibly of several Latin versions. At the end of the second century there were

certainly several current Latin versions in use by the disciples in Spain, Gaul, and Africa, though where they may have arisen is a question that cannot be answered, though perhaps Africa has the best claim to the honor. Some writers have thought that there was one particular Latin version of which the others were copies and have named it the *Old Latin Version*, or *Versio Itala*, or *Vera Latina*.

Older than these Latin versions was a Syriac version which was called the *Peshito*. As early as A. D. 170, it is quoted by writers. The Aramaean, or Syriac, is an important branch of the great Semitic family of languages, and as early as Jacob's time existed distinct from the Hebrew. In the middle of the fifth century, the third and fourth general councils at Ephesus and Chalcedon proved the immediate occasions of dividing the Syrian Christians into three hostile parties, which parties still exist; yet the same translation of the Bible is read alike in the public meetings of the Nestorians among the fastnesses of Kurdistan, of the Monophysites scattered over the plains of Syria, of the Christians of St. Thomas along the coast of Malabar, and of the Maronites on the mountain terraces of Lebanon. Literary history cannot make out a better case than that of the identity of the *Peshito Version* with the version used by the Eastern Church long before these divisions. All of these versions closely agree with the present canon. The *Peshito* does not contain the

Second Epistle of Peter, the Second and Third Epistle? of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypse.

This line of investigation has taken us to within *sixty*, and possibly *fifty*, years of the time when it is claimed these books of our *New Testament* were written. How can this gap be bridged? If, as we have shown, there were *translations* of certain writings in common and general use within fifty or sixty years of the time when it is claimed the originals were written, it seems to us that no further proof would be required, when we consider that writings then were copied by hand, letter by letter; that the material upon which they were copied was costly; that learning was not so general as now; and that intercommunication between nations was slow and tedious. But this gap can be filled. The original manuscripts of these writings, so far as the world knows, are lost; they cannot be produced. We will, therefore, produce and quote from the statements of men who saw the original writings and whose statements have been preserved by very early writers.

Eusebius preserves these fragments from PAPIAS, who lived in the last half of the first century and the first half of the second century. PAPIAS wrote: "Matthew composed the oracles [*ta logia*] in the Hebrew dialect, and each one translated them as he was able." He also wrote: "This also the elder used to say. Mark-having become Peter's interpreter, wrote accurately all that he remembered, though he did not do so in order, that was either said or done by Christ; for hi-

neither heard the Lord nor followed him; but subsequently, as I said, Peter, who used to frame his teaching to meet the wants of his hearers, and not as making a connected narrative of the Lord's discourses. So Mark committed no error, as he wrote down some particulars just as he recalled them to mind; for he took heed to one thing—to omit none of the facts that he heard and to state nothing falsely in them." From some preserved fragments of the writings of Papias we learn that he was acquainted with the Gospel written by John and that he quoted an Epistle of John and of Peter and also maintained the divine inspiration of the Apocalypse.

IRENÆUS was born in A. D. 115, and died about A. D. 190. He was a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of the apostle John. He says: "Matthew put forth the writing of the gospel among the Hebrews in their dialect. Mark says in the end of his Gospel: 'And indeed the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken to them, was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God.' Luke, the companion of Paul, committed to writing the gospel preached by him. Afterwards John, the disciple of our Lord, the same that lay upon his bosom, also published the Gospel while he was yet at Ephesus, in Asia. All the elders testify who were conversant with John, the disciple of our Lord, in Asia, that John delivered these things.... John, the disciple of our Lord, announcing this faith, thus began.

in the discourse which is according to the Gospel: 'In the beginning was the Word.' "

TERTULLIAN, who was born at Carthage about A. D. 150 and died at the same place about A. D. 220, wrote: "The Gospel which Mark published is affirmed as Peter's, whose interpreter Mark was. In the outset Matthew himself, that most faithful reporter of the gospel, as companion of the Lord, for no other reason than that he might make us acquainted with the carnal origin of Christ, thus begins: 'The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.' Moreover, Luke was not an apostle, but an apostolic man; not a master, but a disciple—as it were, less than a master; and so much the latter, certainly, as he was the companion of the later apostle Paul, doubtless. Of the apostles, John and Matthew published the faith to us."

CLEMENS, *Titus Flavius*, was one of the most celebrated teachers of the church at Alexandria. Alexandria was not his birthplace; he was probably a native of Athens, Greece. His parents were of the upper class and were pagans. We do not know the date of his birth or death. He wrote about A. D. 192 to A. D. 202. In his writings that have been preserved to the present time he names and quotes from nearly all the books of the *New Testament*, the exceptions being Philemon, James, the Second Epistle of Peter, and the Third Epistle of John. Eusebius quotes from a book written by Clemens, now lost, called "Outlines:" "Clemens, in

his 'Outlines,' to speak generally, has given concise explanations of all the Canonical Scriptures, without omitting the disputed books—I mean the Epistle of Jude and the remaining Catholic Epistles, as well as the Epistles of Barnabas and the so-called 'Revelation of Peter;' and, moreover, he says that the Epistle to the Hebrews is Paul's, but that it was written to the Hebrews in the Hebrew dialect; that Luke, having carefully translated it, published it for the use of the Greeks; and that it is owing to the fact that he translated it that the complexion of this Epistle and that of the Acts are found to be the same." Clemens recognized as canonical all the books of the New Testament except the Epistle of James, the Second Epistle of Peter, and the Third Epistle of John; and his silence as to these proves only that he was unacquainted with them.

I introduce but one more witness, ORIGEN, who was born in Alexandria in A. D. 185, and died at Cesarea or Tyre, about A. D. 254. He was a pupil of Clemens, from whom I have just quoted. He wrote commentaries on both the Old Testament and the New Testament Scriptures. Of the commentaries on the New Testament there are preserved important fragments in Greek and Latin, on Matthew, John, and the whole of Romans. He also wrote the treatise against Celsus, in which he quotes largely from the New Testament books as we now have them. In describing the capture of Jericho, the walls of which fell down before the blasts

of the trumpets of the priests, he writes: "So, too, our Lord, whose advent was typified by the son of Nun, when he came, sent his apostles as priests bearing well-wrought trumpets. Matthew first sounded the priestly trumpet in his Gospel; also Mark, Luke, and John each gave forth a strain on their priestly trumpets; Peter, moreover, sounds loudly on the twofold trumpet of his Epistles; and so also James and Jude. Still, the number is incomplete; and John gives forth the trumpet sound in his Epistles and Apocalypse: and Luke, while describing the Acts of the Apostles. Lastly, however, came he who said, 'I think that God hath set forth us apostles last of all;' and, thundering on, the fourteen trumpets of his Epistles threw down even to the ground the walls of Jericho—that is to say, all the instruments of idolatry and the doctrines of philosophers." One other quotation from his writings: "The first Gospel is written according to Matthew, the same who was once a publican, but afterwards an apostle of Christ, who, having published it for the Jewish converts, wrote it in the Hebrew; the second Gospel is according to Mark, who composed it as Peter explained it to him, whom he also acknowledged as his son in his general Epistle; the third Gospel is according to Luke, the Gospel commended by Paul, which was written for the converts from the Gentiles. What shall we say of him who reclined on the breast of Jesus—I mean John, who has left one Gospel, in which he confesses that he could

write so many books that the whole world could not contain them? "

Let us now recapitulate. I have commenced with the New Testament in common use by English-speaking-people and have traced it back in an unbroken line of translations to the *Latin Vulgate* of the fourth century, which translation was confessedly undertaken for the purpose of improving a previous translation, or several translations, then in existence and which dated from the second century. I have also given extracts from the writings of men who lived and wrote from A. D. 90, to A. D. 254, whose concurrent testimony is that our present New Testament Scriptures were well known and accepted as authentic at and before the time of these writers. It seems to me that the authenticity of our present New Testament Scriptures is demonstrated beyond the possibility of doubt.

I have not referred to manuscripts. I have referred to only one heretical writer, to but two councils; I have deemed it unnecessary to refer to more. I could have quoted from a large number of heretical writers of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, some of whom mentioned all our New Testament books as authentic; some rejected some of them, others rejected others; but, taken all together. they show that all of our New Testament was known at that time.

I have not referred to the large number of translations made into other languages besides Latin and

English, which I could have done, and it would have shown their identity and common origin. To save space, time, and possible confusion I have confined myself to the English stream that has flowed down to us from the common fountain.

Although these conclusions seem to be unassailable, yet by some it might be considered an oversight if I failed to speak of the controversies of the sixteenth century, which are bearing some fruit even at the present time. From a very early period up to the sixteenth century, the enslavement of individual will to that of ecclesiastic authority had been steadily progressing, until at that time it had reached such arrogant rule that the reaction came, and, with it, a reckless throwing off of religious restraints. Men did not stop at merely inquiring of the "Church" by what authority she ruled, but of each scripture its authority. *Not* only was each particular book of the *New Testament* canon called upon to show its credentials, but Christianity itself was put on trial. There was a general reinvestigation of things spiritual, and a worse time for the trial of Christianity could not have been selected. Fourteen hundred years had elapsed since the questions to be investigated had agitated the world. Nations had come and gone, languages had been spoken and forgotten, the literature of Christianity had been locked up in monkish libraries and covered with the dust of centuries, but little progress had been made in intellectual culture, and men were thus illy qualified for this investigation.

Awaking to the freedom of individual study and opinion, a natural result was a variety of opinions. Opinions being formed, investigations were continued in order to find authority for those opinions; and hence the books of the New Testament were judged by the doctrine they taught, and men and parties rejected or received them as suited their opinions. While the canon of the New Testament was for a while disturbed by these doctrinal tests, it was never disturbed by historic investigations.

These canonical disturbances continued until men recovered from the intoxication of newly acquired freedom, when Reason again asserted her authority, and honest and impartial investigation was commenced. This investigation naturally fell into the historic method. The old libraries were searched, and every writing that bore any traces of antiquity was closely examined. These treasures have all been collected, examined, and tested by the most minute and laborious analysis; and the result has reaffirmed the canon of the first centuries, the canon we now have. It was a severe test through which our Scriptures had to pass; but they came forth so indorsed that should another era of intellectual darkness overshadow the world, future investigators need not go further back than the nineteenth century in their investigations.

STUDY II.

IS JESUS DIVINE?

In a previous study we have shown that the New Testament Scriptures are authentic—that *they* were written by their reputed authors, at the times and places claimed; that their authors were well known; that the principal person described did live, was put to death, was buried; that his body disappeared, and the Jews said it was stolen away by his disciples, and that his disciples said he came to life. The purpose of this study is to determine which statement is true: Was the body of Jesus stolen away and hidden by his disciples, or did he come back to life, talk with them, teach them, and bodily ascend into heaven? If the first is true, then, although the New Testament Scriptures are authentic, they are not true, but a romance. If the last is true, then the *New* Testament Scriptures are not only authentic, but true. If true, then Jesus is divine; and if divine, we must obey him or suffer the consequences of disobedience.

As in the previous study, so in this, we must determine the points of agreement first and then consider the items of disagreement.

UNDISPUTED ITEMS.

1. That there was such a person as the Jesus described in the New Testament Scriptures.

2. That he lived at the time and places stated.

3. That he claimed to be the Son of God.

4. That for this claim he was put to death.

5. That he was buried.

6. That he claimed that he would rise from the dead on the third day after his burial.

7. That his tomb was sealed with the king's seal and guarded by Roman soldiers to prevent his disciples from taking it away and concealing it so that they could claim that he had come to life.

8. That on the morning of the first day of the week, three days after his burial, the seal was broken, the tomb was open, and the body was gone.

9. That his disciples were in Jerusalem, where and when these things occurred; that they were not arrested or punished for breaking the king's seal; and that the Roman soldiers were not arrested or punished for permitting the body to be stolen.

DISPUTED ITEMS.

1. That the body was stolen.

2. That the dead body came to life.

Which is true? One or the other must be false. We have no account of the reasons given in support of the first position except those given in the New Testament by the disciples of Jesus, who hold to the second

position. "Now while they were going, behold, some of the guard came into the city, and told unto the chief priests all the things that were come to pass. And when they were assembled with the elders, and had taken counsel, they gave large money unto the soldiers, saying, Say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept. And if this come to the governor's ears, we will persuade him, and rid you of care. So they took the money, and did as they were taught: and this saying was spread abroad among the Jews, and continueth until this day." (Matt. 28: 11-15, B. V.) This is testimony from an interested party and counts for but little in a judicial investigation; but in the absence of an explanation from the other side, it should have some weight, although it is a flimsy and an absurd story. It would have been a difficult task to persuade Roman soldiers to confess that they had been asleep while on duty. It would have been a very dangerous confession to have made, as death was the penalty for such conduct, and Roman military discipline was very strict. If they were asleep, how could they know who stole the body? The Roman king could not afford to pass by in silence the breaking of his royal seal. But if Jesus did come to life, and the Jewish rulers wished to deny it, what other explanation could they give? Deceit is always hard pressed, and all falsehoods are clumsy when analyzed. In "Antiquities of the Jews," by *Josephus*, Book XVII., Chapter 3, Section 3, we have this language: "Now there was about

this time [A. D. 33] Jesus, a wise man—if it be lawful to call him a 'man;' for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. He was [the] Christ. When Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men among us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him; for he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him; and the tribe of 'Christians,' so named from him, are not extinct at this day." It is proper to state that some critics claim that this section of the writings of Josephus is spurious—an interpolation by some early Christian Jew copyist. Let that be as it may, the fact remains that Jewish tradition admits that there was a Jew named "Jesus" at that time, who claimed to be the Son of God, who was crucified, and that no history has come down to us, or tradition, concerning him further, but that his disciples have continued from that day to this in ever-increasing numbers.

After so long a time—nearly two thousand years— how are we to settle these two items of disagreement? They must be settled, for they are vital to Christianity. In support of the claim that the dead body of Jesus came to life in the grave, we have abundant proof in the New Testament Scriptures, which we have shown were written within a few years of the happening of

this event. In support of the proposition that Jesus did not come to life, we have barely a tradition that his body *was* stolen and secreted; no proof whatever is offered.

The witnesses who testify to his resurrection were his disciples. How much reliance can be placed in their testimony? What did it signify to be his disciple? At that time it was "a sect everywhere spoken against," and a Jew who became his disciple was socially and politically ostracized by his fellow-Jews. Sometimes they persecuted his disciples to the death. To be a disciple of "the Nazarene," as Jesus was in derision called, was to forfeit all worldly honors, social standing, and protection of life and property. Men, at that time, did not become Christians for temporal gain. Men do not become impostors from any other motives. They explicitly condemned lying. "And there shall in no wise enter into it [the holy city] anything unclean, or he that maketh an abomination and a lie." (Rev. 21: 27, R. V.) "Lie not one to another." (Col. 3: 9.) "Putting away falsehood, speak ye truth." (Eph. 4: 25, R. V.) These witnesses suffered death rather than admit that what they had written was a made-up story. Story-writers—romancers—do not act in that way.

There are *four* histories of the sayings and doings of Jesus, known to us *as* the "four Gospels." They were written by four men, all Jews, but differently educated and circumstanced. The peculiarity of thought

and diction of each is distinct and characteristic. The first writer was a business man and weighed everything by Jewish law and prophecy. He dwelt upon the fulfillment of prophecies in this man. He showed from the "Scriptures" that he was the *Messiah* of prophecy. He recorded such sayings and works as would produce conviction in a Jewishly constituted mind. The second Gospel was written by two men really—the one who did the writing largely influenced by the other, whose disposition was self-assertive; to whom authority, as manifested by material resources, signified much. He was a soldier, a fighter, by disposition. Force was his natural style of argument. He dwelt upon such utterances and works of Jesus as would impress such a character. He represented Jesus as one having authority. His narrative appealed to the Roman disposition. The third Gospel was by a scientist, as education was in those days. He was a physician, a close observer of events, and one who classified facts. He gave a logical life of Jesus, showing the sequence of events. The fourth Gospel was by a peculiarly spiritually-minded Jew. His discipleship was based upon love to the teacher. He and Jesus were drawn close to each other by the appreciation of each other's character. Love was the dominant element in each. He dwelt upon those events that brought out the individuality of the man—that inner man, which is the true man, and which was so manifest to his sympathetic eye. We have some examples of men cooperating in writing biographies and ro-

mances. In such modern biographies certain epochs are assigned to the one or the other, and a continuous narrative is written; but the persons whose lives were thus written were actual beings. We have lives innumerable of certain historic characters; and while they agree in most points, in some they differ radically. *Not* so in these four. They do not all record the same things, but they never differ in regard to any item in his history. Men cooperating in writing a romance are compelled to consult and agree upon the story they are to tell. Such could not have been the case in these biographies.

These four lives were written by men. contemporary with the events narrated, and their narratives were read by many who were often in the company of Jesus. If they stated falsehoods concerning his words or his miracles, they would have been detected at once. Public sentiment was against Jesus. Any biography of him written and read at that time, if not correct, would have eagerly been exposed. We have no account of any effort in that direction. His teaching and works were public. When one of his disciples was arrested for preaching the new worship, in his defense he said: "For the king knoweth of these things, unto whom also I speak freely: for I am persuaded that none of these things is hidden from him; for this hath not been done in a corner." (Acts 26: 26, R. V.) It is suggested that these men were enthusiasts and honestly mistaken. There is no example in human history of a dozen men

having the same delusions. These men said that they could, and did, perform miracles. They could not be mistaken about this. They knew whether they could perform miracles. If they could not, they knew themselves to be impostors, and were not honest, and could not have been enthusiasts, because a man to be an enthusiast must be honest. If they could perform miracles, they were supernaturally endowed. The people would know whether they performed miracles, and the people never denied the fact of their performing miracles. Men always act from motive. What motive could these men have had to testify as they did? It was unpopular. It required a renunciation of all earthly ambitions and a life of self-denial; it exposed them to arrest, imprisonment, punishment, and death. Jesus promised all these things to his first disciples; the reward was to come after death. If these men had not been honest, they would not have become his disciples.

The history of his worship and the influence that he has exerted on mankind prove conclusively that his origin was not human, but divine. It has steadily gained converts. Its books have been preserved; and today, nearly two thousand years since his worship was established, the percentage of his disciples is larger than at any previous time. The true worship has at some periods been almost, if not entirely, lost to the world; but the Bible has remained, and the true worship has been restored. No man has exerted such an influence upon

mankind. Were we to attempt to eliminate what he has caused to be done from our individual lives, from social and family circles, from business and political affairs, we would be surprised at the result. We may consider the lives of Brahma, Confucius, and Mohammed in comparison with his, and they shrink into insignificance. They are confined to two nations, the oldest and least progressive of all nations. Their influence is not felt outside of their own nationalities; the world has felt no influence from them. They are circumscribed and are dying out.

How can his claim to divinity be attacked? it cannot be denied that such a character existed and that he was put to death for making the claim that he was divine. They must deny that he arose from the dead. Have they any grounds for this denial? None—absolutely none. They can only say that it is *contrary* to nature—that dead people do not come to life. This is begging the question. If he was divine, he would not be bound by the laws of the natural world. The Jews never made this objection, because their scriptures contain accounts of dead persons' being restored to life. No one has authority for saying that anything that lies has not seen is contrary to nature. What would seem absolutely impossible to us from our experience might be an everyday experience with others. A few years ago had you been told that, with a small wire stretched between two cities a hundred miles apart, two persons—one in each city—supplied with proper appa-

ratus, could talk to each other and recognize each other's voices, you would have said, "It is impossible;" but it is to-day a practical fact. No one can *prove* that a dead body, before decomposition has commenced, cannot be restored to life. The proof must be that a certain person who died was not brought back to life. In some cases this is easy enough. A man may have been burned up, in the presence of many, in a crematory. He could not be restored to life. That proof would be sufficient. A man is hanged. The body is buried; it is never seen afterwards; the grave is opened, and the body is gone. Can you *prove* that the body had not been restored to life? Those who deny the resurrection of Jesus never saw the body after it was put into the sepulcher; it was opened, and the body was gone. Besides this, they have to prove that he was simply a man; for if he was more than a man. he would not be under natural laws.

It is claimed that Jesus should have shown himself to his enemies after his resurrection, and that the fact that his friends claim that he appeared to his disciples only is suspicious. If he had appeared to his enemies, what would have been the result? Some would have been convinced, and others would have mocked him and would have renewed the persecution. They would have claimed that it was some other man resembling him, or that his death was not actual, but simulated. The testimony of those who would have accepted him would have no more weight than that of those who had previously

become his disciples. The other class would have been summarily punished, because Jesus was no longer a man, to be mocked, insulted, and punished; but was now a conqueror, to be obeyed. This would have interfered with his plans, for he had determined that punishment for disbelief should come only in the future life. If he did rise from the dead, it was proper and the very thing to be expected—that he would show himself to his disciples in such ways that they could have no doubt about it. They had believed him for his works' sake before his death; he had told them that he would die, but would rise again. They saw him die; they were entitled to absolute proof of his resurrection, and he gave it to them.

What evidence of his resurrection did the apostles have? They had the empty tomb. They knew that his body had been taken from the cross and placed in the tomb and that the tomb was now empty. They knew that they had not taken it away. They knew that the Jews had not taken it away; and even if they had, they would have produced it just as soon as it was reported that he had risen from the dead.

They had the proof of his appearance to single individuals, to groups of individuals, to all of his apostles at once, and to large bodies of disciples. These appearances did not take place until after they were assured of the tomb's being empty. They did not come rapidly, so as to confuse, but with days and weeks between; so that time for deliberation was given.

What other proofs could have been given? The body was gone; he appeared alive to individuals, to several at once, to all together, to five hundred, at long and short intervals; he talked to them; he ate with them; he performed miracles; and, finally, he ascended into the clouds in their presence in the daytime, and was never seen again, but they had power to perform miracles in his name.

Is Jesus divine? In the light of the foregoing facts, can any honest, intelligent person doubt it?

STUDY III.

THE MISSION OF JESUS.

"Jesus answered, . . . To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should do as I have done to you." (John 13: 15, R. V.)

"And we have beheld and bear witness that the Father hath sent the Son to be the Savior of the world." (1 John 4: 14, R. V.)

"For hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, that ye should follow his steps." (1 Pet. 2: 21, R. V.)

"For I have given you an example, that ye also should do as I have done to you." (John 13: 15, R. V.)

Men can never determine what is abstract truth. We have no knowledge beyond, and independent of, our experiences. We judge of the "truth" of anything by comparing it with our standard, our experiences. We are offered a house to live in. Our experiences have taught us what arrangements a house should have to be desirable for a dwelling. In our own minds we have erected a standard made up of our experiences, and we judge the house by that. We are told that sickness follows imprudence in eating; our experience has taught us this, and we believe it. We are told that it is our duty to assist those who have assisted us, and

our experiences have shown us the wisdom of this command, and we say that it is correct teaching. But when we are told to do good to those who injure us. and to love those who hate us, we demur and decline to do it. The human race, of itself, could never have risen higher than its surrounding. When Jesus declared that we must love our enemies, we refused to do it. He had to demonstrate the wisdom of it, make it part of our experience, before we would accept it as truth. In some directions our faculties are limited and we cannot have experiences. In such cases another element of our natures is brought into use. We must accept a proposition as true without experience, when experience is impossible to us, on proof that is based upon experience. We cannot understand anything that is entirely spiritual, because we can have no experiences in that direction. Paul said that when he was caught up into heaven he saw things not "lawful" (possible) to tell—things that he could not put into human language. We have some idea of spiritual things, but always with the material element predominating, because such is the character of our natures. When matters purely spiritual are presented to us, we either put them aside or accept them because they were told to us by some one in whom we had confidence. Jesus came into the world's experience declaring that he was divine; that he came from God; that he was God manifest in human form, having human passions, yet being God. We could not understand this, because we had never had any such expe-

rience. He had to gain our confidence before we could accept his claim. His humanity—eating, sleeping, suffering, sympathizing; his form—brought him into fellowship with humanity. His life was pure, and the people were ready to believe him, if possible. He made it possible by the signs and wonders which he did. Their experience told them that no man could do the things that he did. He convinced them through their experience that he was more than a man. If he was more than a man, he must be divine; if divine, what he said must be true; and when he declared to them a future spiritual life, they accepted it—walked by confidence in him, not by the sight coming from experience. The first item of his mission was to enable the human mind to receive the truth. What he did and said was for all time and for all generations of men. Historians were divinely commissioned to record these things for all coining generations. One of them wrote: "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these 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: 30, 31.) We thus see that without an *Immanuel*—God in human form and with human attributes—men could never have received THE TRUTH; and without his miracles, men would never have accepted it. If the authenticity and truthfulness of the New Testament writings are estab-

lished, then, without doubt, men can receive and accept "the truth."

HE DIED FOR OUR SINS.

"Who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification." (Rom. 4: 25.) "For I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins." (1 Cor: 15: 3.)

God had decreed that without the shedding of blood there was no remission of sins. (Heb. 9: 22.) Under the *old covenant*—the shedding of the blood of animals in sin offerings—the sins of the individual and of the nation were not blotted out, but pushed forward. A man owes a debt; it is due at the end of one year. He pays the interest; he is given another year. That time expires; he pays the interest; the time is extended, and before that year is out he gets the money to pay the principal. A man is sentenced to death. The Governor respites him for a year; the year rolls by, and the Governor again respites him. Before that year is out, evidence is found freeing him from the crime; the Governor pardons him. Men violated God's laws. The penalty was spiritual death. The "fullness of time" had not come. God provided the death of animal sacrifices for extending the time; and these extensions, reprieves, continued until "the Lamb of God" came and was killed for the redemption of the sinner. If the Jew died before the reprieve expired, he was saved. Jesus came to be this complete payment of the debt;

he came to bring the price to pay principal and interest of the debt; he died that the innocence of the condemned might be established. "Himself took our infirmities, and bare our diseases; he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his hurts we were healed." (Isa. 53: 4, 5.)

Human philosophy cannot solve this problem, because it is beyond human experience; but it is part of "the truth," and we accept it. Under the old covenant unless a man did a certain thing to show that he appreciated the sacrifice it availed him nothing. "And the Lord called unto Moses, and spake unto him out of the tabernacle of the congregation, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, If any man of you bring an offering unto the Lord, ye shall bring your offering of the cattle, even of the herd, and of the flock. If his offering be a burnt sacrifice of the herd, let him offer a male without blemish: he shall offer it of his own voluntary will at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord. And he shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him." (Lev. 1: 1-4.) The putting of his hand on the head of the animal was absolutely necessary—just as necessary as the sacrifice itself. Christ died for our sins, but his death will not avail us anything unless we "put our hand upon the head of the sacrifice." The victim is ready, the priest is ready, the blood is shed that is to

“take away” the sins of the world; but has the world put its hand upon its head? “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” (Mark 16: 16.) He was a voluntary victim; he permitted himself to be slain; he became a perpetual sacrifice; he “died once for all;” and the command continues to men and women: “If you would have your sins washed away by the blood of the Lamb, put your hand on his head.” God does not force his mercies upon any one. He offers life to the human race; men and women must reach out their hands for it. “The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some count slackness; but is long-suffering to you-ward, not wishing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.” (2 Pet. 3: 9.) If we would enjoy the blessing, *we must come.*

HE LIVED FOR OUR EXAMPLE.

“For hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you a copy to imitate, that ye should tread in his footprints.” (1 Pet. 2: 21.) “Hereby know that we are in him: he that saith he abideth in him ought himself also to walk even as he walked.” (1 John 2: 6.) An old, but very true, saying is that “example is stronger than precept.” Any leader of men always in emergencies says, “Follow me;” but never: “Go.” We all are imitators, most generally unconsciously. It is related of a distinguished man that on one occasion, while walking in his yard deeply absorbed in his own thoughts, happening

to look behind himself, he was amused to see his little boy trying to step in the tracks that he had made. We are patterns for others without knowing it. No higher compliment can be paid any one than to try to imitate him. It shows that we have a very high appreciation of him. Precepts put into practice cannot be misunderstood. The philosopher was ready to quibble about the precept "to love one's neighbor as oneself;" but when it was vitalized into an action, there was no doubt about its meaning. The stranger who bound up the wounds of the traveler who had fallen among robbers, and who carried him to the inn and paid for his lodging, was recognized at once as a man who "loved his neighbor as himself."

If we walk in his steps, we cannot lose our way. "I am the way," he declared; and "if any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me." (Matt. 16: 24.)

In the *Gospels* we have the record of the teaching of Jesus; in *Acts of Apostles* we have that teaching put into practice. Should we have any doubt about any item of teaching, if we will turn to the record of its being put into practice, our difficulties will disappear. Should a question of correct conduct ever arise in our minds, it is solved at once by the question: "What would Jesus do if he were in my place?" It is the simplest rule of life, but it is infallible. There is no doubt about what Jesus would do. His life was so simple and so consistent that any one knows almost in-

stinctively what the page when turned will reveal. So should our lives be—honest, loving, tender, and true. The apostle Peter (2 Pet. 1: 3-8), fully realizing the pattern given to us in the Lord Jesus, tells us how to build our characters according to that pattern (I give a literal translation, which is not given in the *Common Version* or the *Revised Version*): "Seeing that his divine power hath given unto us all things which pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him who hath called us by means of his own glory and goodness, whereby he hath given unto us exceeding great and precious promises, that by these ye may become partakers of the divine nature, having escaped from the corruption that is in the world through impure desire. And for this reason, giving all diligence, mixing into your belief moral vigor, and into your moral vigor spiritual wisdom, and into your spiritual wisdom self-control, and into your self-control endurance, and into your endurance reverence to God, and into your reverence to God love of the brethren, and to your love of the brethren love to all men. For if these things are yours and abound, they make you to be neither idle nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ."

You will notice that instead of "and beside this," at the beginning of *verse 5*, I give "and for this reason," because it is correct, and by it the meaning is made plain. The reason is found in the preceding verses, especially in the statement: "Whereby he hath given unto us exceeding great and precious promises,

that by these ye may become [in the future you *may* become, if you will] partakers of the divine nature." In *verse 5* you will notice that instead of "add to," I say "mixing into." The Revised Version uses "supply." "Add to" and "supply" are both correct, but neither brings out the thought so plainly as "mixing into." The first two have the thought of keeping the items separate and distinct, as bricks in a wall all make the wall, but each is a distinct brick and preserves its individuality. The last has the idea more of a concrete wall. The sand, the cement, the gravel, and the water are all mixed together; and a homogeneous mass is the result. A man must mix together all these items, and the result is a *Christian*—a homogeneous character, with no single characteristic predominating. If these items are kept distinct, the man will not be as strong as if they were fused together. Temptations would possibly come in such a shape that he might be weak to resist a special temptation, while he would be strong to resist any other; but yielding to this one, his whole character is gone. The weakest link in a chain determines the strength of the chain.

HE ASCENDED TO APPEAR FOR US.

“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.)

"And if any one sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." (1 John 2: 1.)

"It is Christ Jesus that died, yea rather, that was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." (Rom. 8: 34.)

Religious teachers in many of the organizations have erroneous ideas concerning the mission of Jesus as an advocate with the Father, and consequently incorrect ideas concerning God's attitude toward men. It is taught by some that God must be reconciled to men—that he is angry and must be reconciled; that he will not always hear the cry of the distressed, but must be importuned; that Jesus stands as an advocate pleading their cause; and that even then God is not always reconciled. Paul had a different conception of the matter. 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.) It is man who is to be reconciled to God, not God to man. Then Jesus is not to plead with God to induce him to be reconciled to man.

This conception of the matter arises from a failure to consider the several relations that man holds toward God. He sustains two relations—an alien, a rebel, an enemy; and a child, sometimes disobedient. Man, as a rebel against God, must be brought to accept the terms of pardon. Subjects are in rebellion to the king. The king does not desire to kill his subjects; he had much rather for them to live and be law-abiding; for in

his subjects consists his strength. He, therefore, issues a proclamation, commanding all to cease all rebellious acts, promising those who will, and who will take an oath of allegiance, full pardon for all acts done, but declares that he will punish all who will not accept his terms. Does the king have to be reconciled? The world was in rebellion against God's authority. He issued his proclamation: "He that believes and is baptized shall be pardoned." Does God have to be reconciled? In this relation of man to God, Jesus was a sacrifice, not a mediator. God had decreed that without the shedding of blood there could be no remission, or pardon, of rebellion (Heb. 9: 22); and as the blood of animals had proved unavailing, Jesus volunteered to shed his blood, to be a perpetual sacrifice; and he was offered up once for all, so that there would be no more shedding of sacrificial blood and no more reprieving of men from year to year, but the granting of full pardon for all sins committed to all who would accept this sacrifice. The old covenant was found faulty. On that account it was abolished, and a new covenant was made. The *old* covenant was not altered; it was done away with. The *new* covenant was not the *old* covenant remodeled and amended, but a new and better one. "For if that first *covenant* had been faultless, then would no place have been sought for a second, for finding fault with it he saith unto them, 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....

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: 7-13; see Heb. 7: 11-18.)

To understand the law of pardon, the amnesty proclamation, we must never forget that the world is living under the *new covenant*, and not under the *old covenant*. To any one inquiring the terms of pardon we must not, therefore, refer him to the old proclamation. When we come to the *new*, we discover that it deals with men occupying two different relations to the King. The one class rebels; the other class, law-abiding citizens, sometimes violating some law of the kingdom, but not defying or denying the authority of the King. To those in rebellion the command is: "Receive my representative, and by a physical act, so that the world can see, declare your surrender and vow of allegiance." To those who are in the kingdom, but who have violated some law of the kingdom, the command is: "If any one [in the kingdom] sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." (1 John 2: 1.) "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us [Christians] *our* sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (1 John 1: 9.) The sinner in rebellion is to accept Jesus as divine and to be baptized in his name, in the name of the Father, and in the name of the Holy Spirit; the sinner in the kingdom is to confess his sins and in the name of Christ to ask God to forgive him. The sinner in rebellion is *not* to ask

God to forgive him, because God has said that if the sinner will do certain things he will forgive him. To ask God to forgive him without doing those things would be insulting God; and when those things are done, his sins are forgiven, and he would have no occasion to ask for pardon. But, still, some religious teachers continue to tell rebels to pray to God, to agonize with him, so that perchance he may grant them pardon. We find some confusion in the minds of some persons concerning Christ as an *advocate*. An advocate is one who appears for another before a court or a person who has power over that person to plead his cause and, if possible, to obtain the thing desired. This idea carried into this statement, "If any one sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous," we conclude that God is not cognizant of our condition and has to be informed of it or that he is not inclined to pardon us and Christ has to beg him to forgive us. Either assumption is contrary to divine revelation and is dishonoring to God. The Greek word here translated "advocate" comes from the verb that primarily means "to summon," "to call to one's side," hence "to call to one's aid;" and the noun would be "one who pleads another's cause before a judge, a pleader, counsel for the defense, an advocate." An advocate does not necessarily have to entreat; he may only present facts. Because a man is a judge he is not necessarily unfriendly or indifferent to the petitioner. Jesus is represented as a sacrifice and as a

high priest, as the high priest for Christians. In the new covenant sacrifice and priests were ordained. Jesus Christ is the sacrifice, every Christian is a priest, and Jesus is the high priest. "For such a high priest became us, holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, like those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the *sins* of the people: for this he did once for all, when he offered up himself. For the law appointed men high priests, having infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was after the law, *appointeth* a Son, perfected for evermore. Now to sum up what we are saying: We have such a high priest, who sat down on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, not man. For every high priest is appointed to offer both gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is necessary that this *high priest* also have somewhat to offer." (Heb. 7: 26 to 8: 3.) From this we conclude that in this case Jesus is our *helper* rather than *advocate*, and that he is our helper by being our high priest; and as the high priest must have an offering, he has with him the offering that he made upon the cross, the sacrifice for all who would accept of it. When Christians sin, they come with the offering God provided in his Son; the high priest, Jesus Christ, presents it to the Father; and the Christian is forgiven.

HE WILL COME AGAIN.

“Let not your heart be troubled: believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many dwellings; if it were not so, I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I come again, and will receive you unto myself; that where I am, ye may be also.” (John 14: 1-3.)

“For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we that are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord, shall in no wise precede them that are fallen asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trumpet of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.” (1 Thess. 4: 1. 5-17.)

From these scriptures we learn that Christ will come again; that this coming will be at the end of this world existence; and that as far as this earth on which we live and the human family, from Adam until that time, are concerned, this will be the end of their material existence. What will be the disposition of the other planets we know not; God has not revealed it to us. Another thing we learn is that the dead in Christ shall rise first; that they have not yet risen. We also learn that the good and the bad shall appear together before the judgment, and then their judgment shall be an-

nounced. The good shall be given eternal happiness; the bad, eternal misery. These two scriptures are given to us to comfort and sustain us in this life. The Christian life is a warfare, a race, a cross bearing, a pilgrimage, a life of sacrifice. The peace, the rest, the comfort, the joy, the home life do not come to us here. We see and hope for them only with the eye of faith. We fight "the good fight of faith;" and when we come to the end of the strife, when physical death begins to lay hold of us, we need something to comfort us, and this assurance is given to us as we enter upon our dreamless sleep of material decay as a glorious spiritual cordial to cheer us as we leave our earth life and all its associations. We are told that our Elder Brother will come to judge the world, to take unto the Father his chosen ones, and that we who are dying will not be forgotten, but that we who have died will be called first, then the living. With this assurance we contentedly fall asleep to await the coming of our King.

Christ will come to judge the world. The wicked have flourished here; the rain has come upon the just and the unjust: the saint and the sinner have lived side by side, and clouds and sunshine have come to each alike. These thoughts were very real to David (Ps. 73) when he said: "But as for me, my feet were almost gone; my steps had well-nigh slipped, for I was envious at the foolish, when I saw the prosperity of the wicked Their eyes stand out with fatness; they have more than heart could wish When

I sought to understand this, it was too difficult for me, until I went into the sanctuary of God, then understood I their end." David could not understand how the godly and the ungodly received the same treatment in this world; how the godly man, sympathizing with his fellow-man, would share his sorrows and suffer, and the ungodly man, unsympathetic, caring only for himself, would escape all these troubles; and how the godly man, charitable and self-sacrificing, would deny himself many pleasures and gratifications to relieve and assist his fellow-man, and the ungodly man, using all for himself, making no sacrifices, would have more than heart could wish; but when God lifted the veil and he could see the end of both classes, then he understood it. The veil has been lifted for the Christian, and we can see Christ coming in power and glory—not as the humble Nazarene, without observation, but as the King, the Conqueror, coming to reward his soldiers and to punish his enemies. Then our "eyes will stand out with fatness" and we will "have more than heart could wish." Christ will come again, and we who have died will be the first to greet him. Blessed thought! We can welcome death as a friend, as a sleep undisturbed, as a rest from the cares of life, knowing the honor awaiting us.

We can no more doubt his second coming than we can doubt his coming the first time. We have accepted him as divine, as the Son of God, as Immanuel—God manifest in the flesh—and We cannot doubt his prom-

ise to come again. His first coming would be incomplete and fruitless without his second appearance. This promise lights up the grave and robs death of its sting. Up to this point Satan has never loosened his hold upon us; but now he has thrown his last dart—death— against us, and we are free from him for evermore. Our conflict is over. No more do cares harass us, sorrows afflict us, or temptations assail us. The battle is fought, and we lay our weapons down and sleep, with the full assurance that our Captain will call us from our bivouac on the field to homes in heaven.

HE WILL JUDGE THE WORLD.

“The times of ignorance therefore God overlooked; but now he commandeth men that they should all everywhere repent: inasmuch as he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom he hath ordained.” (Acts 17: 30, 31.)

"And he charged us to preach unto the people, and to testify that this is he which is ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead." (Acts 10: 42.)

“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.” (3 Cor. 5: 10.)

When Jesus was about ready to open his kingdom to the reception of citizens, he declared the terms of admission: "He that believes and is baptized shall be

saved; but he that does not believe shall be condemned." (Mark 16: 16.) *This* condition absolutely required a judgment. It had to be determined whether a person had complied with the terms. This judgment was known only to the judge; it was not made public. A man could profess belief when he did not believe; he could claim that he was baptized when he had not been baptized. God knew his heart and could judge him; but if a man was acting the hypocrite and deceiving his fellow-men,, he might change—become an honest man—and so God held his judgment in abeyance. "Then said Jesus unto his disciples, If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me." (Matt. 16: 24.) Here are conditions of citizenship prescribed for the citizen, and they are continuing. A man is judged in reference to these conditions when the term of trial is ended. These conditions are coequal with a man's life, and hence the judgment is final. A man is first judged as to whether he is in the kingdom. If he is recognized as a citizen, he is then judged by the conditions of citizenship. These judgments are absolutely essential. We cannot conceive of a government without the power of judging. God has appointed a day when he will hold his final judgment, and this judgment will be by his Son. This day is known to no man. The day of a man's death is, in fact, his day of judgment, although it may be thousands of years before the books are opened, because when a man dies, his record is closed; no changes,

no additions can be made to it. Christian living is until a man's death. It is not an enlistment for six months or for six years or for retirement from service at sixty years of age, but it is until death. The future is hidden from us for wise purposes concerning our temporal affairs; for equally wise purposes this day of final reckoning is kept secret from the world. The day, however, is fixed; the judgment is inevitable; and it will be the consummation of the earth life to every human being. The apostles were commanded to specifically *herald* to the world that Jesus is "the man" whom God had appointed to judge the world. He had declared that all authority in heaven and on earth had been given unto him. It was necessary that the world should know that he would judge it. The world had judged him; he must judge the world. It is a comforting knowledge that he who loved us enough to give his life for us is he who is to judge us. All the leniency that is consistent with justice will be shown us. It is a strengthening knowledge that we ourselves, each individual for himself, judges himself. We are to be judged according to the deeds done in the body. Is it not a strengthening and stimulating thought to know that each morning, as we awake to a new day, we can make a record that day that will be approved by the great Judge? God has given the eternal destiny of each man into his own keeping. God's mercy will find a boundless field in which to exercise itself in considering each man's environments. How will the child

of the gutter be judged? How will he be judged *who* grew up from infancy in a certain creed? How will those of a nation that has peculiar customs be judged? These are perplexing questions to us, but in the message heralded to the world that Jesus is the chosen Judge we find a solution of it: "He will judge the world in righteousness"

STUDY IV.

FAITH.

“But without faith it is impossible to please *God*.” (Heb. 11: 6.)

“For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus.” (Gal. 3: 26.)

If without faith it is impossible to please God, and if all men become sons of God through faith in Christ, we surely cannot exaggerate the importance of faith. Being so vital to our spiritual well-being, it is unfortunate that there should be so much misunderstanding of it by the religious world. This conflict of teaching is due, not to any defect in God's revelation, but to man's shortsighted policy in spiritual matters. It must be kept constantly in mind that the sacred writings were not given to the world in the English language, and that all of the translations of them are uninspired; it must also be remembered that ecclesiastical partyism had crystallized into dogmas, and that these dogmas were expressed in terms that had been invented for that special purpose long before the time when the translation of the Bible now used by English-speaking peoples was made. "Faith" is one of these ecclesiastical technical terms, and has no meaning to English ears except what has been given to it by religious teach-

ers. Of course the term "faith" is of no concern to us in studying God's revelation, and it would be much better for those desiring to serve God if it were blotted out and forgotten; but from an etymological standpoint a study of the word is interesting.

Faith is manufactured from an old French word, *fei*, with the suffix *th* added to make it analogous in form to *truth*, *wealth*, *health*. This French word was derived from the Latin. When first used, it was spelled *f-e-i-t-h* or *f-e-y-t-h*. The Latin word from which the French got their word was *fides*, and meant *constancy*, *trustworthy*, *honesty*, *loyalty*, *uprightness*. "Fundamentum justitiae est fides" (Cicero)—"*The foundation of justice is hone-sty, or uprightness.*" It signified an element of character, not a mental operation. By evolution the idea of element of character was superseded by the mental process that produced that particular character. A man was upright or honest because he believed that it was right and necessary. The mental operation led to the particular character, and into the word *fait* It was injected the idea of the mental operation; and to its derivatives only did the original conception cling, as *faithful*, *faithfulness*, *unfaithful*. In this transitory stage (A. D. 1611, when the *King James Version* was published) the term was introduced into our Bibles.

But in studying this question we have no use for such terms. We must learn what the Holy Spirit said, what word he used, and try to learn what English thought corresponded to the thought in that word. The

word used by the Holy Spirit is *pistis* (***pistij***). What does it mean to an English mind? "But without *pisteos* it is impossible to please God." What word shall we substitute for *pisteos* (the genitive of *pistis*)? Shall it be *constancy, honesty, loyalty, uprightness*? Of course without this element of character it is impossible to be well pleasing to God; but is that what the Holy Spirit is here speaking of? Let us have the whole sentence: "But without *pisteos* it is impossible to please God: for he that cometh to God must *pisteusai* that he is." It is first used in the noun form and then in the verb form. Whatever English thought is in the verb must be in the noun. Any one can understand this, and every one must admit it. What must the man do that comes to God? He must *believe* that he is *the* God and a rewarder of them that seek after him. There is no doubt about this; there can be none. Since the verb form means a mental action, *to believe*, then as we have just agreed, the noun form must also mean a mental action, *belief*. The Holy Spirit said to the English mind: "But without belief it is impossible to please God: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek him." This is plain to an English mind.

There are two rules of translation that are universally accepted:

1. The same word in the foreign tongue, wherever it is found, must in the translation be represented by the same word of the native tongue, unless the context ab-

solutely forbids, and then the context must determine the native word that will best give the modified thought. Examples: We take the word *aitia*. In Matt. 19: 3 it reads: "To put away his wife for every *cause* [*aitian*]." Verse 10 reads: "If the *case* [*aitia*] of the man is so with his wife." Matt. 27: 37 reads: "Over his head his *accusation* [*aitian*] written." John 18: 38 reads: "I find in him no *fault* [*aitian*]." Acts 25: 27 reads: "For it seemeth to me unreasonable to send a prisoner, and not withal to signify the *crimes* [*aitias*] laid against him." Here is a word used by the Holy Spirit represented by *five* English words. The word *aitia* has equivalent thought in the English word *cause*. In the first quotation it is properly translated; in the third quotation the context permits it, the literal statement being: "Over his head his cause [of condemnation] was written." *Cause of condemnation* is equivalent to *accusation*, and hence allowable for euphony. "I find in him no fault—no cause of complaint." This is allowable on the same grounds. It is the same in Acts 25: 27. In the second example the clause, "If the *case* of the man is so with his wife," presents a special difficulty. Here it is that we have an instance of putting the result for the cause. "If the condition [case] [produced by these causes] of the man with his wife be this way." The context in each of these quotations shows the English word that is best to use, and there is no difficulty in catching at once the thought of the writer.

2. If there are two native words equally equivalent to the foreign word, select the one that can be used in both noun and verb form if desired, so as to preserve uniformity. We have the word *pistis* to be translated into English. Suppose we find that it is equally equivalent to *faith* and *belief*. The first rule is to use the same word in every place, unless the context absolutely forbids. Let us apply this rule and try the word *faith*. Acts 17: 30, 31 reads: "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent: because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given [*pistin*] *faith* unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." If we give the primary and true meaning to the term *faith* (fidelity), we cannot use it in this place. We must give it one of its ecclesiastical meanings in order to use it; hence the translators have used another term. If the term *belief* had been chosen, there would have been no necessity of violating the rule. It would read: "Having caused all men to have belief in him, in that he hath raised him from the dead." Rom. 3: 26 reads: "So that he might be just, and the justifier of him that *pisteos* [believeth] in Jesus." Here the selected word could not be used. The literal translation would be: "In order that he might be just and justifying any one because of belief of Jesus." It would not sound well to say "because of *faith* of Jesus." 2 Thess. 2: 13 reads: "Because

God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and [belief] *pistei* of the truth." It would not sound well to say: "And *faith* of the truth." A literal rendering would be: "Because God chose you from the beginning unto salvation by the consecration *caused* by the Spirit and by belief of the truth." Tit. 2: 10 reads: "Not purloining, but showing all good fidelity [*pistin*]." Here *faith* might have been used in its original meaning (*fidelity, integrity, loyalty*) if some other term had to be substituted for *belief*. Did the context absolutely demand it? It reads: "And not stealing, but making manifest all upright belief." Some manuscripts leave out *pistin*, and the translator can add emotions or impulses. The *pistin* in this place is not limited to the gospel. Heb. 10: 39 reads: "But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition: but of them that *pisteos* [believe] to the saving of the soul." According to this translation, it is impossible to use *faith*, the term selected, because it is the verb form; but the translation is not correct, because *pisteos* is not a verb. The *Revised Version* reads: "But we are not of them that shrink back unto perdition; but of them that have faith unto the saving of the soul." The literal rendering would be: "And we are not of a drawing back to eternal ruin; but of a belief to a saving of the soul."

In every place where *pistis* is used, *belief* will correctly represent the thought; *faith* will not. According to the second rule, if two native words can be used

synonymously, if one can be used both in the verb and noun form and the other only in the noun or verb form, then the one that can be used in both forms must be chosen. *Pisteuoo*, the verb form, is used about *two hundred and fifty* times in the New Testament. *Faith* has no verb form in our language; *belief* has, and hence it is selected. The verb form having made the adoption of *believe* absolutely necessary, *belief* should be adopted for uniformity, if for no better reason; but *belief* is an English word from the beginning, and every child of English parentage knows its meaning as soon as it can talk. There is no good reason for the adoption of this foreign word *faith*, with a technical meaning given to it. Its use simply confuses, and no advantage is gained. I sincerely wish that some publishing house would print a Bible with *belief* substituted for *faith* wherever it occurs. It would be a great help to Bible students and would tend greatly to the breaking down of denominational barriers and the unification of those who sincerely desire to be God's people. Hereafter in this study we will use the term BELIEF.

Jesus, in his commission to his apostles, directed them to "go... 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.) "But without belief it is impossible to please God." (Heb. 11: 6.) "For ye are all sons of God, through belief in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3: 26.) From these scriptures it is ab-

solutely certain that we must believe in order to be saved, to please God, and to be sons of God. We must believe the gospel—that Jesus is divine, was put to death, rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, and established a kingdom on this earth and prescribed the terms of admission into it. One question in the religious world is: How does this belief come, or can men believe this proposition by the simple use of their reasoning faculties, as they would any other proposition, or must there be a divine influence operating upon them to enable them to believe it? Some have put the question a little differently, thus: A man can believe this proposition as he would any other proposition; but he is spiritually dead, and cannot, and will not, believe it until there is a divine influence to bring him to life spiritually; then he will listen to the proposition, weigh the evidence, and become a believer. In another form the same idea is presented: We see by the light that is around us. A man is in the light; but he is blind, and the light does him no good. An oculist restores him to sight; then the light enables him to see. A man is spiritually blind. The gospel light is round about him, but he cannot see; the divine healer gives him sight, and he sees. Of course these teachers quote scriptures in support of this position. One of these teachers has said: "Angels find the perfect gratification of their pure affections and the highest possible happiness in the contemplation of the works and perfections of God, in communion with him, and in his holy service. But

man is fearfully degraded. He worships and serves the creature and forgets the Creator; he loves the earth and its low and degrading pleasures; his affections are entwined around them; appeals to his gratitude and to his interest fail to withdraw them from earth and fix them on heaven.... Hence the necessity of a special divine influence in addition to, and distinct from, the Word. Motives are sufficient to secure the obedience of angels, for they are holy; they are disposed to do their whole duty. Motives will not secure the obedience of men, for they are sinful; they are disposed to rebel. Consequently if any of the human family love and serve God, it is because he 'worketh in them to will and to do, of his good pleasure. '... Such, briefly, are some of the effects of human depravity. It fills the mind with trifles, makes it averse to the truths of revelation and to the service of God, and thus closes it against the appeals of the gospel of Christ." (RICE, in "Campbell and Rice Debate," page 630.)

Angels are ready to obey God, because they love him; men will not obey God, because they hate him. Men's affections must be changed before they can love God. God made man as he is; God must remake him, so that instead of hating he will love God. This re-creation must be by a direct operation of the Holy Spirit, independent, separate, and apart from the Word. This is a concise statement of the position held by these teachers. It hinges on man's *hating* God. With what disposition did God create man? He created man in

his own image, after his own likeness, and blessed him, and saw everything that he made, and it was very good (Gen. 1: 26.) God placed man in the garden of Eden and told him: "If you obey me, I will supply all your wants; if you disobey my commandments, I will punish you and you must earn your own living." The devil persuaded man, and he disobeyed. The devil influenced man by words; God wins him back by words. The Bible speaks of man's disobedience, of his weakness, of his inclination to sin, of his hating God, and of God's hating man. We must not put the strongest meaning into this word *hate*. It is the same word in both connections. Man hates God in the sense of choosing to disobey him and to obey the devil. He has no spite, malice, or vindictiveness against God. Man has two elements in his character—selfishness and affection. Sometimes one, and sometimes the other, has the ascendancy. Appeals to the one or the other influence him if the appeal is strong enough. Paul said that in his personal experience there was a conflict between the two elements. "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh." (Gal. 5: 17.) "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." (Born. 7: 22, 23.) This same duality of disposition was after, as well as before, his becoming a Christian. If God by a direct operation of the Spirit had changed his moral nature

so that he would hate sin and love holiness, how is it that this same disposition remains? God did exert a special divine influence upon Saul—an influence that he could not resist—to make him believe; God did exert a special divine influence upon Lydia so that she could believe. In both cases they were devout worshippers of God from the Jewish standpoint, and their minds were so biased that they would not hear the truth. God had so trained the Jewish people that their minds were so firmly set upon their belief that nothing short of God's interposition could change them; and, therefore, God exerted this influence abundantly in signs and miracles, and in these two instances personally. After Christ's kingdom was established, God removed the former training and placed the record of these signs and wonders to counteract the lingering prejudices of the former training. Men's minds are not now prejudiced against Christ by any previous divine training in another worship; and, therefore, no special divine influence is necessary to free their minds of such prejudice. Men's hearts are now closed to Christ by unfortunate human training and the cultivation of the selfish element. An appeal to the other element, an arousal of it, and the presentation of the gospel are the only means that are now necessary to make men Christians.

But the special influence exerted in the cases of Saul and Lydia did not make them children of God, did not save them, did not bring them into Christ's kingdom.

In Saul's case he was told to "rise, and enter into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." A disciple, Ananias, was sent to him to tell him "what he must do;" and in concluding his directions to Saul, he said: "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." (Acts 9: 6; 22: 16.) He was not a child of God, not in the kingdom, while he was in his sins; and he was not free from them until he was baptized. The special influence of the Spirit was to remove his prejudice so that he could hear the gospel, the plan of salvation; the words spoken to him instructed him what to do; and the *doing* of what was commanded made him a child of God, a citizen of the kingdom—removed his past sins. In the case of Lydia (Acts 16: 11-15) we find a woman who is a devout Jewish worshiper. Her heart was closed, because it is said: "Whose heart the Lord opened." To what was it closed? Not to God, for she was worshiping him. Paul was speaking to her before her heart was opened; therefore we conclude that it was closed to him. The Lord opened her heart so that she gave heed, gave attention, to what Paul was saying. The opening of her heart did not make her a Christian, did not free her from her sins. When her heart was opened, when her prejudices were removed, then she gave attention to what Paul said, then she believed and was baptized; then her sins were removed, then she was a child of God. This statement concerning Lydia has given those who

oppose the theory of a direct operation of the Spirit in conversion considerable trouble, and likewise much comfort to those who hold to that theory. We will, therefore, give special attention to it. The statement is: *Sebomenee ton theon, eekown, ees o kurios dieenoizeni teen kardian prosechein tois laloumenois upo Paulon*. In the *Common Version* it reads: "Which worshiped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul." In the *Revised Version* it reads: "One that worshiped, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, to give heed unto the things which were spoken by Paul." It will be noticed that in the Greek there is no punctuation between *kardian* and *prosechein*, but in both of these versions a comma is inserted. It will also be noticed that in the *Common Version* *prosechein* is translated by "that she attended unto;" in the *Revised Version* it is "to give heed unto." *Prosechein* is *present infinitive*—"to give present heed to." Leaving out the comma (which is not in the Greek), the statement would be continuous: "The Lord opened her heart to give present heed to the things being spoken by Paul." The purpose of opening her heart was that she would give heed then to what Paul was saying.

Now we must consider the word *dieenoizen*. THAYER, in his "Lexicon of the New Testament," says: "Tropical: *teen kardian*,, to open one's soul—i. e., to rouse in one the faculty of understanding or the desire of learning. (Acts 16: 14.)" The same word is in Luke

24: 45, but in connection with *noun*—mind, intellect— and there means to open their intellect so as to understand the Scriptures. In the case of Lydia it is connected with the *heart*, the emotions, and means the removal of prejudices. The Lord removed her prejudices so that she would give heed to the things spoken by Paul.

Let us examine the word *prosechein*. THAYER says: "*Prosechoo ton noun*, to turn the mind to, attend to, be attentive: *tini*, to a person or thing. The simple *prosechein tini*, with *ton noun* omitted, is often used in the same sense from Xenophon down; so in the New Testament: Acts 8: 6; 16: 14; Heb. 2: 1; 2 Pet. 1: 19." This very good authority says, that in this passage that we are discussing, this word means *to turn the mind to, attend to, be attentive to the person speaking or the thing spoken*. With this investigation we have no difficulty in translating as follows: "Who was worshiping God, heard, the Lord removed her prejudices so as to be attentive to the things spoken by Paul."

One commentator, writing on this passage, says: "She heard the word as preached by Paul, and through that the Lord opened her heart to receive the teachings; so she 'attended,' or gave heed, to the things that she heard. There was nothing mysterious or singular about this. Men open one another's hearts by presenting to them the truth, enlightening their minds, and changing their affections from one person or thing to another. This God did for Lydia by the words spoken

by Paul." If her heart was opened by the words spoken by Paul—if that was the way God opened her heart— why is it said that her heart was opened to give heed to the things spoken, if she had already given enough heed to them for them to have opened her heart? The true explanation is that she heard Paul, but was so prejudiced that what she heard made no impression upon her mind. Then God performed a miracle by removing her prejudices; then she gave attention to what she heard, and the words spoken convinced her that Jesus was the Christ and that she must be baptized in order to have her sins forgiven and to become a child of God.

Another commentator writes: "Every Jew, and every Jewish proselyte, was at that time so wedded to the belief that the coming Christ would establish an earthly kingdom, as to have the heart very tightly closed against the conception of a crucified Christ, whose reign as a King is purely spiritual.... The statement, then, that the Lord 'opened her heart' means that he removed this mistaken conception which would have prevented her from receiving the Christ. The effect of the opening was precisely that which was aimed at: it led her 'to give heed to the things which were spoken by Paul.' The Greek verb here rendered 'to give heed' means, in some connections, to fix the mind upon a matter, and, in others, to put something in practice. Here it cannot mean the former; for Lydia had already fixed her mind upon the preaching, as is declared

in the words: 'A certain woman named Lydia... *heard* us.' She first heard, then the Lord opened her heart, and then she gave heed to the things which Paul had spoken. The meaning is that she put into practice the things spoken by Paul." Continuing, he says: "In this instance we are likely to jump to the conclusion that the Lord opened Lydia's heart by a direct operation of his Spirit, and thus to ignore a very different method clearly indicated by the context. In order to see this we must put ourselves in the place of our author, and inquire what led him to make a remark in regard to Lydia, which he has not made in regard to any other person whose conversion he has described. It cannot be because God did for Lydia something which he omitted in other cases, for in the case of every Jew and proselyte the same process was necessary. The difference is only in the phraseology employed." He explains that Paul and his company were very much perplexed by God's selection of their route, and in the midst of their perplexity they meet with these women and expected that a persistent effort would be required to convince them; and "they are surprised to find Lydia's heart immediately opened, and they see at once what the Lord has done and has been doing since they were first forbidden to go into Asia.... It was so strikingly the Lord's doing that Luke was moved to this mode of expressing it. The Lord opened Lydia's heart, as he did that of the eunuch, by bringing from

afar, at the proper juncture, the living preacher through whose word the end was accomplished.”

I have given so long an extract in order to not misrepresent the author. Detached sentences of this extract will make the author occupy both sides of this question; but taken altogether, it teaches that the opening of Lydia's heart was by the spoken word, although the statements are contradictory. He first says that every Jew was so prejudiced against Jesus that his heart was very tightly closed, and it was this that caused them to reject him; and if the Lord had not removed this prejudice from her heart, she would have been prevented from receiving Christ. Then the Lord removed this prejudice. The Jews had seen Jesus, and he had plead with them. He had not been able to open their hearts by words. The apostles had spoken to them, but their prejudice (from a misconception of his character) prevented them from receiving Christ; but the Lord opened her heart, and "the effect of the opening was precisely that which was aimed at: it led her 'to give heed to the things which were spoken by Paul.'” But he hastens to say that the Greek word here rendered "to give heed" means "to fix the mind upon a matter" in some connections, and in other connections it means "to put something into practice;" but in this case it cannot mean "to fix the mind upon a matter," because it was stated that Lydia had already "*heard* us." He differs from THAYER, but THAYER gives his proof from its connection with the word "mind "

understood, which forbids the idea "of putting something into practice," while our commentator gives no proofs, except that the first meaning does not agree with his theory! He says: "She first heard, then the Lord opened her heart, and then she gave heed," etc. According to this there were three separate items: she heard, the Lord opened her heart, she obeyed what she had heard. If the opening of the heart was the result of the hearing, it seems to me that it would not have been expressed in this way. He says that the Lord "removed this mistaken conception which would have prevented her from receiving Christ," but argues that the *hearing* signified her acceptance of Christ and the "giving heed" was doing what was commanded. Her prejudice would have prevented her from hearing (in the sense of accepting what was spoken); yet by the hearing her prejudice was removed! This word *hearing* must mean "accepting or understanding what was spoken," or "hearing without conviction or understanding." These two different meanings can be found in the two accounts of Paul's conversion—Acts 9: 7; 22: 9. If she had accepted or understood what had been spoken, her heart was already opened, the prejudice was already removed. But he says that this prejudice, or mistaken conception, would have prevented her from receiving the Christ or accepting what was spoken; therefore, *hearing* in this place must mean hearing the sound of the speaking, but not comprehending or accepting it: —she heard, but her prejudice made

it incomprehensible to her. She heard Paul preaching, but it made no impression upon her: —now the Lord steps in and removes this prejudice; now she hears desiring to understand; by this kind of hearing she becomes a believer, learns her duty, and is baptized.

He says: "The Greek verb here rendered 'to give heed' means, in some connections, to fix the mind upon a matter, and, in others, to put something into practice." It will be impossible, I think, for him to find any authority for this last definition. He cites three scriptures to show that the word is used in this sense—1 Tim. 3: 8; 4: 13; Heb. 7: 13. The first (1 Tim. 3: 8) reads: "Not given to much wine." This, of course, means that the deacons must not drink much wine; then why did Paul not use the word *pein*, as in Rom. 14: 21, "nor to drink wine?" Simply because he was speaking of the *inclination*, and not of the *act*. The second (1 Tim. 4: 13) reads: "Give heed to reading, to exhortation, to teaching." He says that this means that Timothy must not fail to put into practice reading, exhortation, and teaching. Of course Timothy must not fail to do these things; but Paul's advice was to *devote his attention* to reading, to exhortation, to teaching. The third (Heb. 7: 13) reads: "For he of whom these things are said belongeth to another tribe, from which no man hath given attendance at the altar." This "attendance" means more than merely doing the physical service of offering sacrifices; it included the giving up to this service of the mind and heart as well

as the hands. If the thought had been merely the routine service, *paredrenoo* would have been the word used. Our commentator says: "It cannot be because God did for Lydia something which he omitted in other cases, for in the case of every Jew and proselyte the same process was necessary." Did the Lord send a bright light and speak personally to every Jew that became a believer? He did to Saul. Did God send an angel to an evangelist and tell him to go to a certain place, and so bring him in contact with all Jews who became his disciples? He did to the eunuch. Did the Lord speak to every Jew that became his disciple and tell him to send for an apostle? He did to Cornelius. Did God send apostles speaking many languages, with tongues as of fire resting on their heads, to every Jew who became a believer? He did to a multitude of Jews at Jerusalem on a certain day of Pentecost. The Lord did what was necessary and best to be done in every case. Because he sent a bright light to Saul, an evangelist to the eunuch, a vision to Cornelius, an earthquake to the jailer, and "opened" Lydia's heart is no reason that we should expect such things now. These divine interpositions were necessary credentials of the divinity of Jesus. They need not to be repeated, because we have the record of them and over eighteen hundred years of human testimony to bear witness to them. The eunuch's heart was already opened; he was inquiring for the Messiah; Philip opened his understanding; but Lydia was not asking for more light.

We come back now directly to the question: How is a man made a believer? How does belief come? It seems that if we would let the New Testament answer this question we would have no difficulty about it. "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?... So then belief cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." (Rom. 10: 14-17.) This is a general statement. No exceptions are noted. The way belief comes is by hearing the word of God. Belief is an intellectual operation. What is necessary to belief? (1) A proposition; (2) the statement of that proposition in terms that we understand; (3) proofs concerning the proposition. We cannot believe unless there is something to understand; so, therefore, we must have a proposition. We cannot believe a proposition unless we understand it, because if we do not understand it, it is not a proposition to us. We cannot believe a proposition unless we have proofs of its correctness. This statement is accepted by all. In Christianity there is a proposition, there is a clear statement of that proposition, and there are abundant proofs of the truth of the proposition.

"Belief comes by hearing." "And those are they that were sown upon good ground; such as *hear* the word, and accept it, and bear fruit." (Mark 4: 20.) "And he said unto them, My mother and my brethren are these which *hear* the word of God, and do it."

(Luke 8: 21.) "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.) "Brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among you, that by my mouth the Gentiles should *hear* the word of the gospel, and believe." (Acts 15: 7.) "And how shall they *believe* in him whom they have not *heard*?" (Rom. 10: 14.) "Many of them that *heard the word believed*." (Acts 4: 4.) "In whom ye also, having *heard* the word of the truth, the gospel of your salvation, in whom, having also believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise." (Eph. 1: 13.) "And many of the Corinthians *hearing believed*, and were baptized." (Acts 18: 8.) "Belief cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." (Rom. 10: 17.) "Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name." (John 20: 30, 31.)

But, again, quoting from Mr. Rice as a true exponent of the doctrine of man's inability to believe God, to believe on him, or to believe in his Son, we find this language: "I will state an important fact—viz.: that all that is morally good in any man is by the Scriptures ascribed to a radical change of heart, of which God is the author. Does any one do good works? Paul ascribes it to a new creation. 'For we are his work-

manship, created in Christ Jesus into good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.' (Eph. 2: 10.) Does any one love God and his fellow-creatures? John says: 'He that loveth is *born of God.*' (1 John 4: 7.) Does any one believe that Jesus is the Christ? The same apostle says he 'is born of God.' (1 John 5: 1.) Since, then, all that is good in man is ascribed to a great change wrought in his heart by the Holy Spirit and all that is evil is ascribed to his nature, it follows inevitably that he is entirely corrupt. Such being the character of men, it is impossible, till their hearts are renewed, that they shall love God, his law, or his gospel or find pleasure in his service."

We have just quoted quite a number of passages from the New Testament stating positively and unequivocally that belief comes by hearing the gospel, and nothing is said anywhere about the absolute necessity of a radical change of disposition before the hearing of the gospel could produce belief, and yet Mr. Rice insists upon it, and quotes three statements from the New Testament in support of it. He says that it is impossible for a man to believe until his heart is renewed. His first quotation is Eph. 2: 10: "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God afore prepared that we should walk in them." Presuming that this is a fair translation of the passage, what does it say? First, that Christians are God's creation, or work, or things made by God. How are they

made by God? They are made in Christ Jesus, or with him as the instrument. For what purpose did God make Christians? To do good works. When did God prepare these good works? A long time ago. For what purpose? That Christians should do them—live that kind of lives. The only difficulty is how did God make Christians in Christ? By belief in him, by baptism. "For ye are all sons of God, through belief in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ." (Gal. 3: 26, 27.) His next scripture is 1 John 4: 7: "Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is begotten of God, and knoweth God." How are men "begotten" of God? In the *King James Version* "begotten" is "born;" in the *Revised Version* it is "begotten." I suppose Bible students are almost agreed now that *begotten* is the correct word in this place. The Bible will tell us how persons are begotten of God: "Seeing that ye have purified your souls in your obedience to the truth unto unfeigned love of the brethren, love one another from the heart fervently: having been begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the word of God, which liveth and abideth." (1 Pet. 1: 22, 23.) How is a man's heart purified? By a direct operation of the Spirit? No; but by *obedience to the truth*. Then a man purifies his heart by believing, and it is not purified so that he can believe. How is he begotten? By a direct operation of God's Spirit? No; but by the word of God,

which is the incorruptible seed. His next passage is 1 John 5: 1: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God." Mr. Rice applies this as if it read, "Whosoever is begotten of God believeth that Jesus is the Christ;" but it reads just the opposite, "Whosoever believeth is begotten"—the begetting being the result of believing, not the believing being the result of the begetting.

To sum up, this is the conclusion of the whole matter: We are intelligent creatures; we can weigh evidence. God loves the human race. He gave his only begotten Son a sacrifice for the sins of the world. God gave him all authority in heaven and on earth. Jesus established a kingdom and prescribed terms of admission into that kingdom. One of the terms was *belief* in his divinity. "Go, preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be condemned." *Faith is belief, and nothing else.* It is an intellection. The mind comprehends a proposition and accepts or rejects it on the proof presented. The person may be indifferent until self-interest or affection interests him in the proposition. A man's interest is aroused in this proposition by both a desire "to flee from the wrath to come" and love to God because "first he so loved us."

In the apostolic days, when race prejudice was so strong and when idolatry and Jewishism were so ingrained into men's natures, it was necessary to give supernatural proofs. The record of those proofs is

preserved for our instruction. Time has removed the prejudices, and the supernatural is no longer needed. In this age of the world the gospel is preached; men hear it and are convinced; by words of exhortation they become interested and take their places with the children of God; and then, as children, as disciples, as soldiers, as citizens, they work out their future and eternal salvation with fear and trembling, having at all times an advocate and a great high priest in the presence of the Father, who is ready and willing at all times to forgive us our trespasses when we ask him.

STUDY V.

REPENTANCE.

“Then opened he their mind, that they might understand the scriptures; and he said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem.” (Luke 24: 45-47.)

"And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." (Acts 2: 38.)

In commencing this study it is again necessary to remind our readers that the Holy Spirit did not use the English language in giving the New Testament to the world. He did not use the words *repentance* and *repent*. Uninspired men selected this term, and it is our task now to decide from all the information we can obtain whether they selected the word that to the English mind conveys the thought of the Holy Spirit. There can be no doubt about the meaning of the word *repentance*. It means *sorrow*, and has meant this from its first appearance in human speech. But did the Holy Spirit use the Greek word that means

sorrow when he used the word that has been translated *repentance*? Bible students have denied this for years, and have attempted to fix new meanings to the word so as to retain it. This is not honest or fair to the uneducated readers. Many men read the Bible who do not read the disquisitions of scholars, and they take the word at its true meaning and as it is commonly used by religious teachers. If the word used by the Holy Spirit does not mean *sorrow*, *repentance* should not be used, for it does mean *sorrow*. Our purpose will be to learn the English thought in the Greek word from lexicons and from the context in the inspired writings.

The Greek word is ***metanoew*** (*meta-noeoo*), the verb, and ***metanoia*** (*meta-noia*), the noun. It is compounded of *meta* and *noeoo*—"to know over again," "to change the mental conclusion;" and the noun would be "a change of mind." I suppose no Greek scholar will deny that this is an exact English rendering of the word. There is nothing in the word to indicate whether the change of mind was produced by, or resulted in, sorrow or joy. All that is in the word is a *change of mind*—that we had come to a certain conclusion, but from some cause we had changed that conclusion and now thought differently. This is absolutely all that is in the word.

We propose now to examine every place in the New Testament to see if it can be so rendered. In its two forms, verb and noun, it is found *fifty-eight times*. The verb is found in the following places: Matt. 3: 2;

4: 17; 11: 20, 21; 12: 41; Mark 1: 15; 6: 12; Luke 10: 13; 11: 32; 13: 3, 5; 15: 7, 10; 16: 30; 17: 3, 4; Acts 2: 38; 3: 19; 8: 22; 17: 30; 26: 20; 2 Cor. 12-21; Rev. 2: 5, 16, 21, 22; 3: 3, 19; 9: 20, 21; 16: 9, 11. Matt. 3: 2: "And saying, change your mind: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Mark 1: 15: "Change your mind, and believe the gospel." Luke 10: 13: "They had a great while ago changed their mind." Acts 2: 38: "Change your mind, and be baptized every one of you." 2 Cor. 12: 21: "And have not changed their minds concerning the uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness which they committed." Rev. 2: 5: "Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and change your mind, and do the first works." I have quoted the first citation from each book and have substituted the actual meaning of the word for the word *repent*, and find that in all of them an intelligent statement is made. The same is true of every other passage. It is necessary to say that Acts 2: 38 has been referred to as not permitting this change—*repent to change your mind*—without involving the Holy Spirit in the charge of inconsistency, in commanding men to do that which they had already done. With this single exception, I believe all will admit that the substitution of the true meaning of the word makes good sense, gives us good English, and contradicts no other scripture. If we can show that in this single exception no inconsistency of the Holy Spirit is

necessitated by the change, all of us should be willing to adopt the change.

In Acts 2 Luke is giving an account of the events that happened at Jerusalem on the first Pentecost after the crucifixion of Jesus; describes the miraculous manifestation of the Holy Spirit, the sound as of a mighty rushing wind, the cloven tongues as of fire, and the speaking in the various languages by the apostles; and a report of the speech of Peter, the conclusion of which is given as follows: "Let every 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, *Metanoesate*, 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.... And with many other words he testified, and exhorted them, saying, Save yourselves from this crooked generation. They then that received his word were baptized." It is claimed that the statement, "they were pricked in their heart," means that they had then changed their mind, were then believers; and to command them afterwards to change their mind would be commanding them to do what they had already done. If the expression, "pricked in their heart," does mean a change of mind, then this Greek word does not mean "change your mind" in this place. We freely admit

this. There are several -ways to settle this question. If the word does mean "change your mind," it must mean it here, unless there is some plain statement by the writer to show that he meant to use it in a different sense. Any other rule would render any interpretation valueless. There is no such statement, unless it be the phrase, "pricked in their heart," and assuredly it is not plain that it means "a change of mind." If "pricked in their heart" means anything like this, it means *sorrow*, the real meaning of *repent*; and then the Holy Spirit would be guilty of the very inconsistency with which we are charged!

Can we determine the meaning of this expression, "they were pricked in their heart"—or, rather, of the Greek original? We will try. **'Akouantej de katenughsan thn kardian**—"And hearing this they were greatly agitated." This is the only place where *katenugeesan* is found in the New Testament. It is formed of *kata* and *nussoo*, *kata* adding intensity to the thought. *Nussoo* is found only once in the New Testament—John 19: 3-1, where the soldier pierced Jesus with his spear. Of course in Acts 2: 37 it is used figuratively if we use the words *pierced in their hearts*, but literally if we use the word *agitated*. The literal meaning of the word, without the prefix, is to pierce by thrusting in an instrument of some kind. Whatever effect upon the body would be produced by the piercing with a spear would be the effect produced upon the emotions by figuratively thrusting a spear into

the seat of the emotions. The physical system, receiving a sudden severe wound, does not at first complain so much of pain as of the shock. The man is dazed; there is collapse; the body trembles; there are spasms of the muscles. Use the term in connection with the emotions, and we would have, not *sorrow*, but *agitation*.

The "seventy" used this word in translating the original of Gen. 34: 7 into Greek: "And the sons of Jacob came from the plain; and when they heard, the men were [*katenugeesan*] deeply agitated, and it was [*lupeeron sphodra*] very grievous to them." Here we find a different word for sorrow. In our *King James Version* it reads, "The men were *grieved* and *very wroth*;" but *lupeeron* never means *wroth*. They were compelled to use *wroth* to get to use *grieved* for *katenugeesan*, so as to get *sorrow* into Acts 2: 37. If in Acts 2: 37 these Jews were *grieved*, or sorry, then they must have *changed their minds* and become believers; and *repent* in Acts 2: 38 could not mean *change of mind*, and it could fit into other passages and read: "You have believed; now repent and be baptized," This eliminates the idea of *sorrow* from *repentance*, and the expression, "penitent believer," is altogether wrong. If we take *sorrow* out of *repentance*, the Romanist is deprived of one of his most cherished doctrines. But if we take *sorrow* out of *repentance* and will not have *change of mind*, what will we have?

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL (" The Christian System, "

page 53) say-: "Repentance is an effect of faith, for who that believes not that God exists can have 'repentance toward God?' Repentance is sorrow for sins committed. But it is more: it is a resolution to forsake them. But it is more: it is actual 'ceasing to do evil, and learning to do well.' This is 'repentance unto life,' or what is truly called *reformation*. Such is the force of the command: 'Repent, every one of you.' It is not merely, Be sorry for what you have done wrong; nor is it, Resolve to do better; nor even, Try to amend your ways; but it is actual amendment of life from the views and the motives which the gospel of Christ exhibits."

J. W. McGARVEY ("Commentary on Acts, Volume I., page 58) says: "In the command, 'Repent and turn again,' the word *turn* expresses something to be done subsequent to repentance and something different from repentance; for there would be no propriety in adding the command, 'Turn,' if its meaning had already been expressed in the command, 'Repent.' In order to a proper understanding of the conditions of forgiveness here [John 3: 19] prescribed we must determine the exact import of both these terms. The most prevalent conception of repentance is godly sorrow for sin; but, according to Paul, godly sorrow for sin stands related to repentance as cause to effect.... These remarks show that it is godly sorrow that brings men to repentance, and the last implies that there may be sorrow for sin without repentance. The same distinction is implied in commanding those on Pentecost who were

already 'pricked in the heart' to repent.... The fact thus made clear, that repentance is a result of godly sorrow for sin, has led some critics to suppose and to teach that repentance means reformation of life, seeing that this is a result of the sorrow in question. But while reformation does result from sorrow for sin, the Scriptures furnish clear evidence that it is distinguished from repentance. Confounding the two terms would make the passage before us a piece of tautology; for when Peter says, 'Repent and turn,' the idea of reformation is involved in the word *turn*; and if *repent* meant to *reform*, then the command would be nothing more than, 'Reform and reform. '... Again, when Peter required those on Pentecost to repent and be baptized, if by *repent* he had meant *reform*, he would have given them time to reform before baptizing them instead of baptizing them immediately.... Seeing, now, that repentance results from sorrow for sin and leads to reformation of life, we can have no further difficulty in ascertaining what it is; for the only result of sorrow for sin which leads to reformation is a change of the will in reference to sin. The primary meaning of the Greek word (*metanoia*) is a change of the mind. . . . Repentance, then, fully defined, is a change of will caused by sorrow for sin and leading to a reformation of life."

DAVID LIPSCOMB ("Commentary on Acts of Apostles," page 44) says: "When they heard and believed this truth [Acts 2: 37] given by the Holy Spirit, they

(not all, but many) were pierced to the heart, were cut to the heart, by the conviction that he was the Christ of God and that they had crucified the Son of God. Through faith that he was the Son of God they were pierced to the heart. They were made to feel that they were the guilty, bloody-handed murderers of the Son of God. As such, exposed to divine wrath, they ask, in tremor of soul, of Peter and his fellow-apostles: 'Brethren, what shall we do' to escape the wrath of God as the murderers of his Son? So the Holy Spirit responds to this question through Peter and tells them to repent, turn from their sins which led them to crucify Jesus. This turning was based on the change in their faith. Whereas they had believed him an impostor, now they believe him to be the Son. of God. The faith was incomplete, but it led to repentance; and every step, or degree, of repentance was based on faith." On Acts 3: 19 he comments: "' Repent,' produced by a godly sorrow, a sincere desire to serve and honor God, to change the purpose and course of life. 'A change in thought, feeling, and purpose.' (A. Hovey.)"

To sum up from these three commentators: Campbell translates ***metanoia*** by *reformation*. McGarvey shows that this is incorrect, and translates it: "A change of will caused by sorrow for sin and leading to a reformation of life." From this definition we can never tell whether a man has "repented" until his life shows that he has reformed; and as repentance must precede baptism, he must be denied baptism until he

shows reformation of life, and not the same hour in which he confessed his belief. He says that the primary meaning of the word is "a change of the mind," and then defines it as "a change of will," and explains by saying that if a change of mind leads to reformation of life, it must be a change of the will. That is true, but he is confounding the effect with the thing itself. If a change of mind leads to a change of will, a change of mind is not a change of will. Judas "repented." Now substitute McGarvey's definition: "Judas changed his will by sorrow for sin, and he was led to a reformation of life!" This will not do. A change of mind does not necessarily produce a change of will. In translating a word, a term or a phrase must be found that represents the thought in the word and that can be used in translating. The definition that he gives cannot be used in translation. I cannot see any difference between "a change of will" and "a turning," and men are commanded to repent and turn. Lipscomb is obscure. He makes "pierced to the heart" and "cut to the heart" synonymous. Two very different Greek words are represented by these two phrases. He gets "tremor of soul" out of the word. He makes *repent* and *turn* synonymous when he says: "And tells them to repent, turn from their sins." "This turning was based on the change in their faith." This statement seems to indicate that he believes that repentance is a change of mind or change of belief, which are equivalent, and that the turning was a result. He

seems to adopt Alvah Hovey's definition: "A change in thought, feeling, and purpose." His comments are obscure, and we might do him an injustice to try to state his understanding of the word.

PHILIP SCHAFF, in the "International Revision Commentary," writing on Matt. 3: 2, says: "*Repent*— not mere remorse, but conversion and reformation, or turning away from sin and unto God. The Greek word means a change of mind or heart." It does not mean "or heart;" it means a change of mind only. If it means a change of mind, as he says it does, why does he give it another meaning?

J. S. HOWSON and H. D. M. SPENCE, in the "International Revision Commentary," writing on Acts 2: 38, say: "The Greek word *metanoesate* does not signify merely sorrow for sin, but a change of mind. Alford well puts it: 'Here the change was to be from thinking Jesus an impostor and scorning him as one crucified to being baptized in his name and looking to him for the remission of sins and the gift of the Spirit.'" If it means "a change of mind," why not so translate? Alford states it emphatically—a change of mind. If in verse 37 they believed that he was the Messiah, how could the Holy Spirit command them to change their mind and look to him for remission of sins and the gift of the Spirit?

JOHN A. BROADUS (in "An American Commentary on the New Testament"), commenting on Matt. 3: 2, says: "*Repent.* —The Greek word here and commonly

used in the New Testament (*metanoein*) signifies to change the thought, and so to change the opinion or purpose. This inner change naturally leads to, and thus the expression may be said practically to include, a corresponding change of the outward life, which we usually describe by the word *reform*. A change of thought does not necessarily involve grief, and the word is sometimes used by Greek writers for a mere change of opinion or judgment where there was no occasion for regret.... Whenever this Greek word is employed in the New Testament (unless we except Heb. 12: 17) the reference is to changing the mind, purpose, from sin to holiness; and no one will do this who does not feel deep sorrow for the sin he has already committed. Sorrow is thus not expressed by the word itself, but in New Testament use is always suggested from the nature of the case, and thus becomes associated with the word. To repent, then, *as* a religious term of the New Testament, is to change the mind, thought, purpose, as regards sin and the service of God—a change naturally accompanied by deep sorrow for past sin and naturally leading to a change of the outward life." Dr. Broadus here freely admits that this Greek word simply means "to change the mind," *but* that the context most usually in the New Testament connects sorrow with it, and that a change of mind, accompanied with sorrow, usually leads to reformation of life; *therefore "repentance"* means a change of mind, accompanied by sorrow and leading to reformation. I

am not caring for what the context shows as an accompaniment or the result; I am trying to determine what Peter commanded the Jews to do when he told them to "repent."

WILLIAM JACOBSON, Bishop of Chester (in "The Bible Commentary"), on Acts 2: 38, says: "*Repent.* — The Greek word implies more than sorrow—a. change of mind, leading to amendment of life." As I said, I am considering, not the effect, but the thing commanded.

J. P. LANGB ("Critical Commentary"), on Acts 2: 38, says: "Peter demands that these persons should (1) change their minds (their whole moral state should undergo a change) and (2) be baptized in the name of Jesus," etc.

I could quote from commentators on my shelves almost indefinitely, but what I have given is a fair sample. The actual thought in the word is beyond question, but the accompanying condition of mind and expected effect are lugged in to support some theory of conversion. When men inquire what to do to be saved from their past sins and are told by the Holy Spirit, "*Metanoesate*" I earnestly desire to know what to tell them in English.

As we have shown, these Jews, when they cried out, had been "pricked in their heart;" had had the charge of murdering the long-looked-for Messiah abruptly thrust into their heart, surrounded as they were by supernatural, awe-inspiring events; and they were

startled, agitated, and cried out: "If this charge be true, what can we do? What can we do to repair the wrong? Our long-looked-for Deliverer—if we have killed him, what can we do?" A man, a stranger in a village, stops at night at the hotel. He retires at night, and is soon asleep. While soundly sleeping, the landlord rushes into his room and rudely arouses him, and as he awakes, he hears a tumult—angry voices, curses; and the landlord excitedly tells him that there is an angry mob breaking into the house to take him and hang him for an atrocious murder committed in that neighborhood. A Greek writer would say, "*Katenugeesee teen kardian*;" and we would say that he was greatly agitated and cried out to the landlord: "What must I do?" The man was innocent; he knew it; but the danger was just the same, innocent or guilty. These Jews did not believe that they had killed their Messiah; but the charge so bluntly made amid these wonderful conditions staggered them, dazed them, agitated them, and they asked: "What must we do?" If they believed, why is it said immediately that "with many other words he testified, and exhorted them?" And then the narrative says: "They that received [or "having received"] his word were baptized." It seems that none received his word before he continued his address, and not all who were pricked in the heart and asked what they must do believed or were baptized, only some of them. We lose the full force of the statement, "with many other words he testified, and exhorted

them," by not observing the comma after *testified*. "With many other words he testified"—argued, presenting proofs. He saw that his previous speech had not caused them to change their mind, and he told them that they must change their mind, and he commenced giving them reasons why they should; and seeing that they were hesitating, he changed from argument to exhortation, and finally induced a large number of them to believe; and those who did believe were baptized.

There is another Greek word used by the Holy Spirit in the New Testament (*metamelomai*) which I wish to consider. LIDDELL AND SCOTT define it: "To feel repentance, to rue, regret. Absolutely: to change one's purpose or line of conduct." This word is used five times in the New Testament—Matt. 21: 29, 32; 27: 3; 2 Cor. 7: 8; Heb. 7: 21—and in every place *regret* or *sorrow*, connected with the change of purpose, is the thought.

There is still another Greek word that I must consider: *lupeoo*—"to make sorrowful, to cause grief." 2 Cor. 7: 8 reads: "For though I made you sorry [*elupeesa*] with my epistle, I do not regret it [*metamelomai*], though I did regret [*metamelomai*]; for I see that that epistle made you sorry [*elupeesan*]. Now I rejoice, not that you were made sorry [*elupeetheete*], but that you were made sorry [*elupeetheete*] unto a change of mind [*metanoian*]: for you were made sorry [*elupeetheete*] after a godly sort, that you might suffer loss by us in nothing. For godly sorrow [*lupee*] work-

eth a change of mind [*metanoian*] unto salvation which brings no regret [*ametameleeton*]." Here the three words representing sorrow, regret, and a change of will and change of mind are used in the same sentence, and the distinction of their significance is clearly shown.

I will now examine the noun form of the word, ***metanoia***. It is used *twenty-four* times in the New Testament, and in every place it is translated by *repentance*. These places are: Matt. 3: 8, 11; 9: 13; Mark 1: 4; 2: 17; Luke 3: 3, 8; 5: 32; 15: 7; 24: 47; Acts 5: 31; 11: 18; 13: 24; 19: 4; 20: 21; 26: 20; Rom. 2: 4; 2 Cor. 7: 9, 10; 2 Tim. 2: 25; Heb. 6: 1, 6; 12: 17; 2 Pet. 3: 9. In all of these places *change of mind*, if substituted for *repentance*, gives an intelligent thought.

I now revert to the definition of *repentance* given by Professor McGarvey, "*Repentance*, then, fully defined, is a change of will caused by sorrow for sin and leading to a reformation of life" (which is exactly the definition of *metamelomai*), and see if it is correct. The passage from which he gets the suggestion of godly sorrow causing a change of will is 2 Cor. 7: 8, 9, and is addressed to persons in Christ who had been doing things that were wrong for Christians to do; and Paul so wrote as to make them sorry for what they had done, and this sorrow made them change their mind about the propriety of doing those things, and they quit doing them. The reference is doubtless to what is mentioned in 1 Cor. 5: 1, 2. Paul was writing to persons

who had already done what was necessary to be done to put them into Christ. In their case a godly sorrow did accompany their change of mind which was produced by Paul's letter, and it did lead to a reformation of life; but the godly sorrow and the reformation were not repentance—the change of mind. Christians can reform their lives. Alien sinners are begotten and born, and are new creatures. The old life is laid by, not reformed. When we are born new creatures, we then commence to work out our salvation. A man cannot beget himself. We are begotten by the Word, and born of water and Spirit, new creatures in Christ Jesus; and then we commence to grow. Did it ever occur to you that *reformation* occurs only *once* in the *King James Version* (Heb. 9: 10), and then refers to the times of the Messiah, when things will be made straight? To read this definition one would imagine that reformation was particularly enjoined as something an alien sinner was required to do in order to become a Christian; but, in fact, such a thought is not expressed anywhere by the Holy Spirit.

Again, sorrow is not suggested by the context in a single place where *repentance* is connected with an alien sinner in the New Testament. We have shown that the Greek word translated *repent* means *to change the mind*, and find that many commentators so state and none deny, and that *reformation* and *sorrow* are not by the context connected with it when used in connection with alien sinners.

I desire to approach this question from another standpoint. Jesus declared that all authority had been given unto him in heaven and on earth; and resting on this, he commanded his apostles to "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: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you" (Matt. 28: 19); and "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). These two quotations give in different words what has been called the *great commission*. The other two Gospel writers do not give it. Some writers claim that Luke (24: 45-47) gives it; but it is a mistake, as will readily be seen by reading it: "Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." This refers to some prophecy that has not been preserved. We see that it was literally fulfilled, but it was not a command or a commission to his apostles. They were commanded to go into all the world and preach the gospel—or, in different language, to go and disciple by teaching the whole creation—promising salvation to those who would believe and be baptized; and yet, most

unexpectedly, we find that they did not do it in the very first sermon that they preached. How can this be explained? By supposing that they willfully disobeyed him? No; for they were guided by the Holy Spirit that would lead them into all truth. By supposing that he gave them instructions not recorded, different from those recorded? No; for that would leave us in doubt about our duty. God, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit never contradict themselves or each other. By supposing that their preaching at Jerusalem was in some way in harmony with their instructions as recorded by Matthew and Mark, can we discover that harmony? The coin-mission was: "Believe and be baptized." Does any one doubt or deny that if a man believes that Jesus is the Son of God and is baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit for the remission of his sins, his sins will be remitted and he will be acknowledged as a child of God? We have the absolute and unconditional promise of Jesus that he will. Will any one dare say that he must do other things before his sins will be remitted? I hope not. Some say that a verbal confession of this belief should be made prior to baptism. Some of the early converts may have made such a confession, but it is doubtful. The statement (Horn. 10: 9, 10), "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," is quoted by some as the conditions of salvation; but Paul was evidently quoting from Matt. 10: 32, where Jesus was urging his acceptance upon the Jews, in order to show that love and deportment were necessary to insure future salvation, not remission of past sins. I do not believe that the New Testament teaches *four* steps, or *four* conditions, or *four* duties to be done in order to become a child of God. *Two*, and only *two*, were required by Jesus—belief in his divinity and baptism into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. How, then, must we understand the statement of Peter on the day of Pentecost at Jerusalem: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins?" If he had said "believe ye" instead of "repent ye," he would have done precisely what Jesus commanded him to do. Jesus directed them to remain at Jerusalem until they were endued with power from God and came under the control of the Holy Spirit, who would lead them into all truth; and they were assured, that in their ministry it would not be them who spoke, but the Holy Spirit speaking through them. Then Peter made no mistake when he said "repent" instead of "believe;" and as it was "repent and be baptized" instead of "believe and be baptized," it was not an additional item, but in some way *repent* and *believe* were equivalent. Peter was speaking to Jews who had put Jesus to death as an impostor and still believed him to be an impostor, but who now were excited, agitated,

by the wonderful surroundings and were ready to listen to proofs; and Peter—or, rather, the Holy Spirit—told them to "change your mind and be baptized." You are believing that Jesus is an impostor; change your mind and believe that he is the Messiah and has risen from the dead, and be baptized in his name. This instruction to them was in harmony with the commission, and was a striking fulfillment of the scripture quoted by Jesus in Luke 24: 47: "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." I do not say that **metanoia** is *belief* or that *change of mind* is *belief*, but that when men are disbelieving and change their minds, they become believers, and that when disbelievers are told to change the mind, it is *equivalent* to telling them to believe.

I wish to look at this question from still another standpoint. If repentance was an *additional* condition of salvation, why in all the reported cases of conversion or in all the writings of the New Testament do we never see the three conditions mentioned together or told to the same person seeking entrance into the kingdom? If never by the Holy Spirit were all three ever told to the same person, should we? It is said that in none of the cases of conversion was the person lacking in all three of these requirements, and each one was told to do only that in which he was lacking. If there were persons who were lacking in all three items, is it not strange that not a single case is mentioned? As no

such case is mentioned, can we not infer that there were either no such persons or that there were not *three* conditions for each person to observe? We find persons commanded, or instructed, to believe; persons commanded to believe and be baptized; persons commanded to repent and be baptized; and persons commanded to be baptized; but they are never commanded to believe and repent; nor believe, repent, and be baptized; nor repent and believe; nor repent and believe and be baptized.

In the light of this strange omission we will examine the cases of conversion.

The first case is Acts 2: 38. The people were all Jews who had made' up their minds that Jesus was an impostor. They were commanded to change their minds and be baptized. Proofs were submitted to them of the divinity of Jesus, and as many as accepted the proofs changed their minds and were baptized.

The next case is Acts 3: 19. The people spoken to were all Jews, believing Jesus to be an impostor. They were commanded to change their minds and turn. Many of them, when they heard the preaching, believed, which is equivalent to saying they "changed their minds." Here, in addition to being told to change their minds, they are told "to turn." Is this a *fourth* condition? And must we tell persons to believe, to repent, to turn, and to be baptized? I know of no one who so teaches. Turning is considered equivalent to being baptized. McGarvey well expresses this idea:

"The term denotes a change of conduct; but a change of conduct has a beginning, and a person is properly said to 'turn' when he does the first act of the better life. Now it so happens that one act was uniformly enjoined upon the penitent [?] believer as the first act of obedience to Christ—that is, to be baptized. This Peter's present hearers understood; for it had been proclaimed from Pentecost onward, and they had seen it observed every day [?]. When, therefore, they heard the command, 'Repent and turn again,' they could but understand that they were to turn by being baptized, thus entering upon a new and better life. Baptism was the turning act." (" Commentary on Acts," Volume I., page 61.)

The next is the case of the eunuch. (Acts 8.) He was a devout man of the Jewish belief, earnestly striving to know the will of the Lord. He was not a disbeliever concerning Jesus; his mind was not made up on this question. Philip, an evangelist, was sent to him by the Lord, and "preached unto him Jesus." While he was explaining the Scriptures and presenting proofs of the divinity of Jesus, they came to a certain water, and the eunuch said to Philip, "Behold, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" and Philip baptized him. Asking for baptism indicated that he believed and that Philip had told him the conditions of salvation—belief and baptism. (In the *King James Version* it reads: "And Philip said, If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said,

I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Some of the oldest manuscripts leave this out. It is now considered by the best critics an interpolation.) This man was waiting for proofs before deciding, before making up his mind. The proofs are presented, and he believes.

The next case is that of Saul. (Acts 9.) Saul is a Jew, and has fully made up his mind that Jesus is an impostor. By a supernatural power his mind is changed, and he is simply told to be baptized. Nothing is said about a confession of belief. His actions were a sufficient confession. He was not told to change his mind, simply because the Lord forced him to do it; he had no choice.

The next case is that of Cornelius. (Acts 10.) This man was a Roman soldier, a Gentile, but a worshiper of the true God. Peter was sent to him. He came and told him all about Jesus, and closed with the statement: "To him bear all the prophets witness, that through his name every one that believeth on him shall receive remission of sins." Cornelius was a devout man and ready to do anything God required of him. He was told to believe the divinity of Jesus. He was not told to change his mind, because he had not made up his mind against Jesus. When Peter had the evidence that he believed, he commanded him to be baptized. There is no record of Cornelius' making an oral confession of his belief.

The next case is that of Lydia. (Acts 16: 13-15.)

This woman was a Jewish worshiper, decided in her mind that the Messiah had not come, and was intensely prejudiced against Jesus. We say this because her heart was so tightly closed against what Paul was saying to her that the Lord had to open it. (We have discussed this in Study IV.) As soon as her prejudices were removed she paid attention to the gospel preached by Paul and was baptized. It is not recorded whether she was told to believe or to repent or to be baptized, and nothing is said about an oral confession. As she "gave heed to the things spoken by Paul" and was baptized, we are forced to believe that she became a believer and that Paul told her that she must be baptized.

The next and last case is that of the Philippian jailer. (Acts 16: 23-34.) Here the man is a Gentile who has not made up his mind about Jesus. A wonderful occurrence causes him to realize that there is something supernatural about Paul and Barnabas and that the "new religion" that they are preaching must be true. He 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." Then they preached the gospel to him and he was baptized. There is not a word about his changing his mind, because his mind had not been made up. He was told to believe; and in order that he might believe, the gospel was told him, and that included the commission, and he did believe and was baptized.

We learn from these instances that where men had made up their minds that Jesus was an impostor they were required to change their minds and, in so doing, become believers and be baptized. Where men had not considered the question and had come to no conclusion they were commanded to believe and be baptized; where persons were so prejudiced that they would not hear the facts, if God so chose, by a direct operation of God's power the prejudice was removed, and they believed either from facts already known to them or then told them, and were baptized. But not a single one was told to believe and repent and confess and be baptized. None of them did more than two things; some of them changed their minds and were baptized and some of them believed and were baptized.

We have stated that only where men have made up their minds adversely to Jesus are they commanded to repent—to change their minds—in order to the remission of their sins. In opposition to this, Acts 17: 30; 26: 19, 20; 11: 18; 20: 21 are cited. Let us examine them.

Acts 17: 30 reads: "The times of ignorance therefore God overlooked; but now he declareth to men that they should everywhere repent." This is Paul's speech to the Athenians. They had made up their minds to worship images; they are now commanded to change their minds and worship the only true God.

Acts 26: 19, 20: "Wherefore, O king Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision: but declared

both to them of Damascus first, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the country of Judea, and also to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, doing works worthy of repentance." In this Paul says that he told Gentiles that they should repent—change their minds. After the lapse of some years after the gospel had been first preached at Jerusalem, many Gentiles had decided against the claims of Jesus, and we can presume that it was this class of Gentiles that he directed to change their minds and turn and do works in harmony with the change in their minds.

Acts 11: 18 is the account given by Peter of the conversion of Cornelius. He says: "And when they [the Christianized Jews] heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then to the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life." As no one denies that ***metanoia*** means a change of mind, we must conclude that when a man is commanded to change his mind he has made it up in a particular direction. In this case it does not say how Cornelius stood on this question; but as he had not embraced Christianity, it is fair to presume that he had rejected Christ.

In Acts 20: 21 Paul is speaking to the elders of the congregation of Ephesus, and says: "Testifying both to Jews and to Greeks repentance [change of mind] toward God, and faith [belief] toward our Lord Jesus." These Greeks were either Jews living in a Grecian colony or proselyted Greeks, as the change of mind was toward God. This is the single place in the New Tes-

tament where repentance and faith are mentioned together, but here the repentance is toward God and the faith is toward the Lord Jesus. The persons were not to have repentance and faith toward the same person. They were to change their minds toward God and then to believe in the Lord Jesus. The preposition is *eis* in both places. "I urged upon them the necessity of change of mind as to God, and belief as to the Lord Jesus."

Some persons to whom I have endeavored to explain this matter have said: "Then you make *repentance* and *belief* mean the same thing?" No; I do not. *metanoia* and *pistis* have entirely different meanings. The one is to change your conclusion (or mind) concerning a proposition; the other is to accept as true a proposition. But if you have concluded and decided that a proposition is false and then by subsequent investigation you change your mind—you then accept it as true—you will be in precisely the same condition as if you had upon your first investigation accepted it as true. If I were trying to teach and persuade a man to do his duty toward God, if I knew that he were an infidel, I would tell him to change his mind and be baptized. If I knew that he had never made up his mind about the divinity of Jesus, I would tell him to believe it and be baptized.

The common idea about *repentance* has led to confusion about *faith*. Understanding that *repentance* means *mourning, sorrow, grief*, they divide *faith* into

two kinds. They know that a man must believe before he can be sorry, and they say that intellectual or historic faith precedes repentance, but after the mourning comes saving faith. They say that intellectual faith will not save a man, as "the devils believed" and were not saved, and that "many believed, but would not confess him for fear," and were not saved, and that as men are "saved by grace through faith," there must be some other kind of faith. The devils could not be baptized; the gospel was not for them. Those who believed, but for fear did not confess him and were not baptized, were not saved, because the promise was to those who "believed *and* were baptized." There is only one kind of faith—belief of a proposition—and it-is an intellection. This question should be settled forever in the minds of those who will read John 20: 30, 31: "Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name." Here the Holy Spirit says certain things are recorded that people reading about them might believe that Jesus is the Christ. Is not this historic, intellectual, head faith? Certainly. What was the effect of this faith? *That you might have life!* Is not that all you want? Can any other kind of faith give you anything more?

ALVAH HOVEY ("An American Commentary on the New Testament"), commenting upon this passage.

says that this was written to Christians whose faith was growing weak by the teachings of false teachers; that John recorded these things to strengthen their faith; that they already had the faith that saves. But John does not say so. In the preceding verses Thomas has said that he would not believe unless he could see and feel the wounds in the side and hands of Jesus. If he had not seen these wounds, would he have been saved? Then it was "saving" faith that he had lost and "saving" faith that he gained by seeing; but this "faith" that he did recover was "intellectual," "historic;" therefore "saving" faith and "historic" faith are one and the same. It is preached that men must believe, repent, and be baptized in order to become children of God, citizens of Christ's kingdom, and have remission of past sins. It is easy to tell the people what they must do to obey the command "to believe." It requires no long definitions and deductions, but it is simple; any one can understand it. It is equally as easy to tell them what has to be done to obey the command "to be baptized." But when it is asked, "What must be done to obey the command 'to repent?'" they are either told "to be sorry for your sins" or "to change your will and resolve to live a better life" or "to reform." Why not preach the terms of pardon just as Jesus commanded his heralds to proclaim them? He said: "Go,... preach the gospel.... He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Why not preach that way? All Greek scholars admit that

the meaning of this Greek word is "to change your mind," or "change of mind." Why not use this expression and govern ourselves by conditions, as did the apostles? When they found men who had made up their minds against Jesus, they said, "Change your mind and be baptized;" when they found men who had not made up their minds, they told them "to believe and be baptized." Why will we not do it? Early training and habit are too strong for many to overcome. Why will men who know better continue to talk and write about "*penitent* believers?" Why will they continue to defend in debate the proposition that "the proper subject for Christian baptism is a *penitent* believer?" Why should a man be sorry for sins committed when he has become convinced that Jesus is the Christ and has resolved to obey him and become his disciple and obey him in the future? It seems to me that that moment ought to be the happiest in any man's life: then a man should shout for gladness instead of mourning. The *penitent* sinner is the *disciple* who yields to temptation; then is the time for mourning. But, it is objected, Paul mourned after he believed until he was baptized. Paul was a persecutor. He was an unbeliever. A miracle made him change his mind. He now believes that Jesus is the promised Messiah, but he does not know what to do. He supposes that some sacrifice must be offered, that he must make some atonement; and he is left in the dark, physically and figuratively, and all the information that is given him is:

“Go into Damascus, and there it will be told you.” Until the messenger came he was in deep distress; but when the messenger came, darkness—physical and figurative—left him, and he rejoiced. He mourned only until the light came. The light comes to us with our belief, and we have no time to wait or to mourn. The eunuch is not spoken of as mourning, but he is said to have gone on his way rejoicing as soon as he believed and was baptized. If he mourned, it was for the briefest time; for as soon as he believed he was baptized. On the day of Pentecost, of the three thousand it is said: “They that received his word were baptized.” Nothing is said about their mourning, and not much time is given to them in which to mourn. The jailer, *I* am sure, did not mourn after he believed. Lydia did not. In the whole New Testament there is not a “penitent” believer *before* baptism, but many then and now *after* baptism.

There is less time for *reformation* than for sorrow. “Repentance, then, fully defined, is a change of will caused by sorrow for sin and leading to a reformation of life.” Sorrow for sin committed as a citizen of the kingdom causes a change of mind, but nowhere is it said that sorrow for sin causes a change of mind or a change of will before baptism. A man has the gospel preached to him; he believes; he demands baptism. What does that signify? Would a man ever demand baptism unless he had changed his will? If I tell a man to be baptized, is it not equivalent to telling him

to change his will? The only evidence a man can give of believing and of changing his will is to be baptized. A man having heard the gospel, if it includes "repentance," and he were to say, "See, here is water: what doth hinder me to be baptized?" would not the evangelist say unto him, "If you believe and have repented, you may?" and he would have answered: "I do believe, and I have repented." But such is not the record. Philip, when the eunuch requested baptism, asked no questions, the request being absolute evidence that the eunuch did believe and intended to try to live a Christian life. In Acts 8, if verse 37 is not an interpolation, Philip asked him if he believed with all his heart, but never said a word about whether he had changed his will. If belief and change of will must precede baptism and they are separable mental acts, why did he not inquire about the one as much as the other? There is no reformation of life required before baptism as a condition of salvation. This salvation is not a re-formed life, but a *new* life. We are born again—a new birth. We are new creatures in Christ Jesus. We bury the old man; a new man is resurrected. We rise to live a new life. The new man is spiritual, and he is dwelling in the fleshly body that has weaknesses. The devil tempts the new spiritual man through the weaknesses of the fleshly body. If he yields to temptation, he confesses and asks the Father for forgiveness in the name of the Son, and he is forgiven. Paul said the spirit was willing, but the flesh

was weak. If it were a change of will and had to lead to a reformation of life before baptism, then time—a long time, in some cases—would be required, and not a sinner, but a righteous man, would be buried. If Saul had to have that change of will that led to reformation of life *before* he was baptized, Ananias was mistaken when he told Saul, as soon as he restored his sight and told him what to do, to hasten immediately and be baptized and wash away his sins.

Let us take the Greek word at what all say it means and can mean in every place where used, and not give it a different meaning that it cannot have in several places.

"A word, at a given time, has one, and but one, *current* sense. This one current sense *must* be the one accepted as its meaning at the time it was used in the book or document under consideration, in all places in said document where it is found, unless the connection does not permit it. The meaning of a word in any given place is, *prima facie*, what its meaning is when alone. A word has a sense when it is unaffected by any other word or circumstance whatever—that is, as it stands alone on a page otherwise blank. This meaning is *the meaning of the word*. Often, in composition, it seems to appear in a modified sense, sometimes in a very modified sense. In *such cases* the meaning which a given word seems to have is not a meaning of the word itself so much as it is the sense of the whole connection.... In all cases where a word

is employed the presumption is that it has, in the place, its current meaning. If one denies this, the burden of proof is on him." (Wilkes' "Designs of Christian Baptism," page 89.)

“But it cannot be laid down too strongly that nothing should be offered as the interpretation of scripture except what can be legitimately shown to be the literal, historic, grammatical, and contextual meaning, together with such inferences as spring immediately and indisputably from that meaning. The books of scripture were written, as all books have always been written since the world began, with the object of being understood; and the starting point of all real exposition must always be the sense which the words would have borne among those to whom they were primarily addressed." (Canon Farrar's "History of Interpretation.')

STUDY VI.

BAPTISM.

"All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. 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: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. 28: 18-20.)

"And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." (Mark 16: 15, 16.)

To be baptized becomes a duty, to every one who would be saved, by the command of Jesus, to whom all authority in heaven and on earth has been given. It is, therefore, of vital importance for us to know exactly what we are commanded. The doctrinal condition of the religious world at the present time makes it necessary in this study to consider: (1) What is it that is commanded? (2) Who should obey this command? (3) For what motive should it be obeyed? (4) Who should be the administrator?

I. WHAT IS IT THAT IS COMMANDED? *Baptize* and *baptism*, the verb and noun forms of the same word,

are not English words, but Greek words anglicized. The Greek words are *baptizoo* (**baptizw**), the verb, and *baptisma* (**baptisma**), the noun. The verb changes the *omega*, the final letter, into *e*, and it becomes *baptize*; the noun drops the final letter, and it becomes *baptism*; and the student who is not something of a Greek scholar knows nothing about it. The English dictionaries define "*Baptism*; The act of baptizing; the application of water to a person, as a sacrament or religious ceremony, by which he is initiated into the visible church of Christ. This is performed by immersion, sprinkling, or pouring." "*Baptize*: To administer the sacrament of baptism." *Baptism* being an anglicized Greek word, the English lexicographer would give the meaning of it as understood by English-speaking people; consequently he defines it in contradictory terms, as being a *sacrament* and a *religious ceremony*, and being done by immersion, sprinkling, or pouring! So we learn nothing from the English dictionary, except that some religionists teach that it is a "sacrament;" some, "a religious ceremony;" and that some teach that it is to be performed by "immersing" the person in water; some, by *pouring* water upon the person; and some, by *sprinkling* water upon the person! If "baptism" is performed by "immersing a person in water," sprinkling or pouring water upon a person is not. What does the Greek word **baptizw** mean? It is not necessary to give much time to the lexicons in this study, as to do so would be to thrash straw that

has been thrashed hundreds of times. Any one who is not satisfied with the quotations and statements that I will make, can, for one dollar, buy a book containing the definitions from all the lexicons.

In 1887 JOSEPH HENRY THAYER, Bussey Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in the Divinity School of Harvard University, translated, revised, and enlarged the "Grimm's Wilkes' *Clavis Novi Testamenti*," and from that we quote: "**baptizw**. I. (1) Properly, *to dip repeatedly; to immerge, submerge*. (2) *To cleanse by dipping or submerging; to wash; to make clean with water*. (3) Metaphorically, *to overwhelm*. II. In the New Testament it is used particularly of the rite of sacred ablution, first instituted by John the Baptist, afterwards by Christ's command received by Christians and adjusted to the contents and nature of their religion (*see baptisma*, 3)—viz., an immersion in water, performed as a sign of the removal of sin and administered to those who, impelled by a desire for salvation, sought admission to the benefits of the Messiah's kingdom." **baptisma**, 3, to which he refers, reads: "Of Christian baptism: This, according to the view of the apostles, is a rite of sacred immersion, commanded by Christ, by which men, confessing their sins and professing their faith in Christ, are born again by the Holy Spirit unto a new life," etc. We learn from this that the word used by Jesus in commissioning his apostles means *to dip, immerge, submerge*, and that the noun form means *immersion*.

PROFESSOR SKEAT, of Cambridge University, England, in his "Etymological Dictionary of the English Language," says: "*Baptize*—to christen by dipping. A French word from the Greek. Old French *baptizer*; from Latin *baptizare*; from Greek *baptizein*; from *baptein*; to dip. Derivatives: *Baptist*, from Greek *baptistees*, a dipper; *baptism*, from Greek *baptisma*, a dipping." From this we learn that the word *baptize*, when first adopted as an English word, meant *to dip*. DR. SCHAFF, president of the American Revision Committee, a pedobaptist, says: "In the primitive church baptism was by immersion. The indications are clearly that the subjects were *immersed* by John." In his "International Revision Commentary," discussing Matt. 3: 6, he says: "The indications are clearly that the subjects were immersed by John, and commonly in a stream. Immersion (thrice repealed) is still the only mode in all the Oriental (and orthodox Russian) churches, and continued to prevail, as a rule, in the West down to the thirteenth century, though other modes, by affusion or sprinkling, were also used in the case of infants and sick persons. The Greek word for *baptize* is derived from a root that means *to dip, to immerse, to submerge*, either literally or figuratively. The traditional place of John's baptism, a few miles from Jericho, is still visited by thousands of Christian pilgrims on Easter Monday, who *plunge* into the sacred river as into a bath of regeneration."

JOHN PETER LANGE, when living, a Professor of The-

ology in the University of Bonn, Prussia, commenting on Matt. 3: 6, says: "*And were baptized*, immersed, in the Jordan, confessing their sins. Immersion was the usual mode of baptism and the symbol of repentance."

ADAM CLARKE, a Methodist, in his "Commentary," writing on Col. 2: 12, says: "*Buried with him in baptism*—alluding to the immersions practiced in the case of adults, wherein the person appeared to be buried under the water, as Christ was buried in the heart of the earth. His rising again the third day and their emerging from the water was an emblem of the resurrection of the body, and, in them, of a total change of life."

"The Bible Commentary," by the bishops and other clergy of the *Episcopal Church*, on Rom, 6: 4, edited by CANON F. C. COOK, says: "The expression, 'we were buried,' may have been suggested by the momentary burial beneath baptismal water."

ADOLPH HARNACK, of Giessen, Germany, says: "*Baptizein* undoubtedly signifies immersion. No proof can be found that it signifies anything else in the New Testament and in the most ancient Christian literature. The suggestion regarding a 'sacred sense' is out of the question. There is no passage in the New Testament which suggests the supposition that any New Testament author attached to the word *baptizein* any other sense than immersion."

ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, Dean of Westminster, England, Episcopalian, in an article on "Baptism," says: "What, then, was baptism in the apostolic age?"

In that early age the scene of the transaction was- either some deep wayside spring or well, as for the Ethiopian, or some rushing river, as the Jordan, or some vast reservoir, as at Jericho or Jerusalem, whither, as in the Baths of Caracalla, at Rome, the whole population resorted for swimming or washing. The water in those Eastern regions, so doubly significant of all that was pure and refreshing, closed over the heads of the converts, and they rose into the light of heaven, new and altered beings.... For the first thirteen centuries the almost universal practice of baptism was that of which we read in the New Testament and which is the very meaning of the word *baptize*—that those who were baptized were *plunged, submerged, immersed into the- wader.*”

“In a version of the Bible which the Baptist Church has compiled for its own use in America, where it excels in numbers all but the Methodists, it is thought necessary, and on philological grounds it is quite correct, to translate *John, the Baptist* by *John the Immerser.*”

“It [immersion] had, no doubt, the sanction of the apostles and of their Master; it had the sanction of the venerable churches of the early ages and of the sacred countries of the East.”

“The change from immersion to sprinkling has set aside the larger part of apostolic language regarding baptism, and has altered the very meaning of the word.”

All of these quotations were written by Bible scholars

of world-wide reputation, but not a single one of them is an immersionist in practice. Their scholarship forced them to make these statements. All of them agree in saying that the Greek word used by the Holy Spirit in the New Testament that is represented in the English versions by *baptize* means *to dip, to immerse*: that John immersed; that Jesus was immersed; that the apostles immersed; and that it was the universal practice for thirteen hundred years, except in cases of the sick and infants. No further human testimony should be demanded or required; no more in any court on earth would be required. But such proof could be indefinitely produced, and I have not called a single witness who practices immersion. No further testimony would be needed if these men practiced what they teach; but "actions speak louder than words," and it is said by many persons: "These are Greek scholars and Bible students and men of unquestioned morality and piety; and while they say what you have quoted, they practice differently. They must have good reasons, and we would like to know those reasons." I consider this a reasonable demand, and will comply with it as far as I can, for only some of them have given their reasons.

ADAM CLARKE, the well-known pedobaptist commentator, writing on Col. 2: 12, says: "*Buried with him in baptism*—alluding to the *immersions* practiced in the case of *adults*, wherein the person appeared to be buried under the water, as Christ was buried in the heart of the earth. His rising again the third day and their

emerging from the water was an emblem of the resurrection of the body, and, in them, of a total change of life." Commenting on Matt. 3: 6, he writes: "*Were baptized.* In what form baptism was originally administered has been deemed a subject worthy of serious dispute. Were the people *dipped* or *sprinkled*? For it is certain *baptoo* and *baptizoo* mean both. They were all *dipped*, say some. Can any man suppose that it was possible for John *to dip all the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judea and of all the country round about the Jordan?* Were both men and women dipped? For certainly *both* came to his baptism. This could never have comported either with safety or with *decency*. Were they dipped in their *clothes*? This would have endangered their lives, if they had not with them *change* of raiment; and as such a baptism as John's (however administered) was, in several respects, a *new* thing in Judea, it is not at all likely that the people would come thus provided. But suppose these were *dipped*, which I think it would be impossible to prove, does it follow that, in all regions of the world, men and women must be *dipped* in order to be evangelically baptized?... And may we not presume that if John had opened his commission in the north of Great Britain, for many months of the year he would have *dipped* neither man nor woman unless he could have procured a tepid bath? Those who are *dipped* or *immersed* in water, in the name of the Holy Trinity, I believe to be evangelically baptized; those who are washed or sprinkled with water

in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost I believe to be equally so; and the *repetition* of such a baptism I believe to be *profane*. After all, it is the thing signified, and not the *mode*, which is the essential part of the sacrament." Commenting on Acts 8: 38, he writes: "*And they went down—they (alighted from the chariot into the water.* While Philip was instructing him and he professed his faith in Christ, he probably plunged himself under the water, as this was the plan which appears to have been generally followed among the Jews in their baptisms; but the person who had received his confession of faith was he to whom the baptism was attributed, as it was administered by his authority."

It will be noticed that Dr. Clarke admits that "buried with him in baptism" refers to the *immersions* practiced in apostolic times. If practiced in their time, by them, and with their approval, the question of "mode" should be forever settled for us. He says *baptoo* and *baptizoo* mean both *dip* and *sprinkle*. We are not dealing with *baptoo* now, and he has no authority for saying that either or both words mean *to sprinkle*. The Holy Spirit says that John *immersed* those who came to him confessing their sins, but Dr. Clarke says that he could not have immersed *all* the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judea and of all the country about the Jordan. He could if he continued at it long enough; but we know that *all* here means *many, a large number*, as we are told that he refused to baptize some

who came to him; and if the Holy Spirit said that he immersed many of them, he did it, whether Dr. Clarke thought he could or could not. He says that they would have to have been baptized (if immersed) either naked or have remained in their wet clothes until they dried, and that this would have been indecent and unhealthy; therefore it is possible that, although the apostles *immersed*, John did not, although the same word is used by the Holy Spirit to tell what John and the apostles did. He says that it was a new thing, and the people would not come prepared with a change of clothes. It does not say that they were all baptized the first time they heard. If it is necessary to defend the veracity of the Holy Spirit, we might suppose that some came from their homes day after day and that some came and camped. They were addicted to moving about from place to place, camping, and taking all their possessions with them. He says that even if John immersed and the apostles immersed, *he does not think* that they would have done it if they had been living in the north of Great Britain; therefore as he was living in Great Britain, he was sprinkled! With such reasoning hundreds of thousands of men and women are satisfied. Speaking of the case of the eunuch, he says that *probably* while Philip was instructing him he plunged himself under the water. It is not probable at all. If he did, why did Philip go down into the water? But if he did, why did not Dr. Clarke follow that scriptural example? The water was too cold where he lived!

Then the temperature of the water determines the mode—in the summer time, immerse; in the winter, sprinkle!

Let us go back to Dean Stanley. As we quoted him, he said: "For the first thirteen centuries the almost universal practice of baptism was that of which we read in the New Testament and which is the very meaning of the word *baptize*—that those who were baptized were plunged, submerged, immersed into the water." Yet he practices sprinkling. Why? He answers the question honestly and bravely: "The reason of the change is obvious. The practice of immersion, apostolic and primitive as it was, was peculiarly suitable to the Southern and Eastern countries for which it was designed and peculiarly unsuitable to the tastes, the convenience, and the feelings of the countries of the Forth and West. Not by any decree of council or parliament, but by the general sentiment of Christian liberty, this change was effected.... It is a striking example of the triumph of common sense and convenience over the bondage of form and custom.... It shows how the spirit which lives and moves in human society can override even the most sacred ordinances."

These last two sentences would be regarded as the keenest sarcasm if the writer did not give the strongest evidence of his sincerity—the idea with him being that "the church is the custodian of the faith," and whatever change is accepted by her is lawful, she being the "ground and pillar of the truth."

This is much more reverent than the reason given by Dr. Clarke. Only men of little learning will at this time desire to use in debate the arguments of Dr. Clarke or take a stand upon the statement of a double and contradictory meaning of the word *baptizoo*. Men of more learning take their stand with Dean Stanley on the privileges of Christian liberty and the function of the church. The ground of the controversy has changed.

What is Christian liberty? Liberty to do or not to do things having no relation to salvation—to eat or not to eat meat offered unto idols (1 Cor. 10: 29), release from the yoke of the Mosaic law (Gal. 2: 4; 5: 1, 13; 1 Pet. 2: 16), freedom from Jewish errors and prejudices so blinding the mental vision that it does not discern the true nature of Christ (2 Cor. 3: 17). Christian liberty is freedom from the Mosaic law, but bondage to the law of Christ. We are bondservants— slaves—to Christ. We are not our own; we have been bought with a price.

“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: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the age.” (Matt. 28: 19, 20.) The words *make disciples* is ***maqhteusate***—“to make disciples by teaching.” They were to preach the gospel and by so doing make disciples, and then baptize them, and, after they were bap-

tized, to teach them to observe, or to do, everything I commanded you. Consequently we are shut up to those things that Jesus commanded his apostles to teach to his baptized disciples; and we find those things in the Gospels and in Acts, but particularly in the Epistles. The statement, "and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," is a promise confined to the apostles; and "the end of the world" should be "the end of this age"—equivalent to saying: "I will be with you while you live."

Can we find anything in the New Testament Scriptures teaching us that the church can change commands and ordinances, or that commands and ordinances can be changed by common consent, or that they may be changed to suit climates or social customs? All these questions, except the first, "Can the church change commands and ordinances?" answer themselves. If we were to admit that common consent, climate, or social customs could change the commands of Jesus, we would have but little use for the New Testament. No one has ever pretended to have found New Testament authority for this privilege. Some claim that there is scripture for the first—that the church can change the commands and ordinances—and quote 1 Tim. 3: 14, 15: "These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee with speed; but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." Examining the original of this passage,

we will find that *house of God* should be *the family of God*; *ground* should be *prop*. It would then read: "That you may know in what manner to conduct yourself in the family of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and prop of the truth." It will be noticed that the *church* is said to be the *pillar and prop* of the truth, and not that it is the *interpreter* of the truth. A footnote to this passage in the *Douay Bible* that I have says: "Therefore the church of the living God can never uphold error, nor bring in corruptions, superstition, or idolatry." CALVIN says: "The church is the pillar and basement of the truth, because it sustains it by making it known by its preaching, by preserving it unmutilated and pure, and by transmitting it to posterity." While these two writers differ entirely in the application, they agree in the interpretation. When the Romanist says that the church can never uphold error, he means that the church must determine what is error; and when Calvin says that the church must preserve it unmutilated and pure, he means that the church must decide what is a mutilation and what is impure. We can find no such thought in the New Testament Scriptures. Since the days of the apostles there has been no "deliverance" of the church, and in their day there was none except it were made by their authority. There is no account in the New Testament of two or more congregations, much less of *all* the congregations, meeting *en masse*, or by delegates, or by messengers, or by their elders, to pass upon

any question of doctrine or practice. The Roman Catholic Church is the only religious organization at present that can consistently defend this position. It has a visible head, claiming to be God's vicegerent on earth; and either by convening an ecumenical council or of himself it can declare what is truth and what is error. No other religious organization can do this, because none of them that have a general organization claim to be the church exclusively.

If "the church" is the interpreter of the truth, we must determine what, which, and where is "the church." Catholics deny it to the Protestants; Protestants deny it to the Catholics and to each other. "The church" has no visible organization; it has no human head. "Congregations" of disciples have organization and human heads, but they are not "the church" nor a part of it. The church is a spiritual kingdom, whose head is Christ and whose citizens are the children of God. Every child of God is a citizen of this kingdom. All who have "put on Christ," by putting him on become its citizens. What is necessary to be done to put on Christ is all that is necessary to be done to become a citizen of the kingdom, a component part of the church, the called out and separated of God. Then it cannot be that the church is the interpreter of the truth. *En oikoo* does not mean *in the house*; but it means *family*, or *household*. The church is God's family, or household; and, therefore, "the family of God" and "the church" are two names for the same

thing. Then in what sense is this family the pillar and prop of the truth? The pillar of anything is its main support. *Stulos* does not mean the *ground* or the *basement*; it means a *prop*. The church is the main support and prop of the truth. The pillar strong enough to hold up any weight might be pushed over; but steadied by a prop, or brace, it is sure. We may get Paul's idea better by paraphrasing it: "This letter I have written to you so that you would know how to live and how to teach being a member of God's household; and when I say God's household, I mean all of the people that have been called out by his gospel. These people are living epistles, that are read of all men; they and the doctrine they profess are judged by the lives they live. The gospel is sounded out by their lives. Their lives, if in harmony with it, are its main support. Signs and miracles have been given to confirm it, but the lives of his disciples are its strongest prop. These signs and miracles will cease, and then Christian lives will be the only prop. You and the other members of God's family must live so as to bear witness to the truth and keep it from falling. God has declared that his kingdom shall never fall, and he is using all his children to insure its stability." If Paul did not mean this, I do not know what he meant.

Probably it would be better to briefly state some of the old arguments. The Holy Spirit had three Greek words, meaning three distinct actions, from which to select one to describe the action that Jesus had made

obligatory upon all as a condition of entrance into his kingdom. One class of religionists say that a person can comply with this condition by being either *immersed in water*, *sprinkled with water*, or by having water *poured upon* him. These three words are **baptizw**--*baptizoo*; **rantizw**--*rantizoo*; and **kataxew**--*kata-cheoo*. The first means *to immerse*; the second means *to sprinkle*; and the third means *to pour upon*. If Jesus was *immersed* and had prescribed *immersion*, would he not have used *baptizoo*? He did use *baptizoo*. Did he not, therefore, mean *immerse*? But it is said that, in addition to its meaning *immerse*, it also meant *to wash*, and that washing as a religious ordinance and custom was well known to the Jews and practiced much by them; consequently we can infer that Jesus meant for them to observe the common custom of washing for ceremonial purification. He had several words to select from if such was his meaning. He had **nipw**--*nipoo*— which meant *to wash*. "Peter said, You shall never wash [*niphees*] my feet." (John 13: 8.) Also **pluw**-- *plunoo*. "And were washing [*eplunon*] their nets." (Luke 5: 2.) Also **low**--*louoo*. "And our bodies washed [*lelousmenoi*] with pure water." (Heb. 10: 22.) But he did not select either of these words; therefore he meant something different from the action of these three words. "For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash [*nipsoonti*] their hands carefully, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders." (Mark 7: 3.) This was the very ceremonial washing

that these teachers say Jesus was commanding; yet he used *niptoo*, and did not use *baptizoo*., the word that he used when commissioning his apostles. But it is answered that in the same connection in the next verse it is said that "when they come from the market place, except they wash [*baptisontai*] themselves, they eat not; and many other things there be, which they have received to hold, washings [*baptismous*] of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels;" and that in both places where *wash* or *washings* is used the Greek words are forms of *baptizoo*. The Jews washed their hands up to the elbow frequently; but when they came from market, they washed all over by getting into a bath; and they washed their cups and pots and vessels by frequently dipping them, handles and all, into water. *Beds* or *couches* or *tables*, as in the *Common Version*, is left out of the best Greek texts, but it was in some of the old manuscripts. I make a quotation from the writings of RABBI MAIMONIDES, as I find it quoted in the "Wilkes-Ditzler Debate," page 563: "Wherever in the law washing of the flesh or clothes is mentioned, it means *nothing else* than dipping of the whole body in a laver; for if a man dip himself all over, except the tip of his little finger, he is still in his unclean-ness. Every one that is baptized must immerse the whole body. In a laver that holds forty *seahs* [about one hundred gallons] of water, every defiled person dips himself, except a profluvius man; and in it they dip all unclean vessels. A bed that is wholly defiled,

if he dip it part by part, is pure. If he dip the bed in the pool, although its feet are plunged in the thick clay at the bottom of the pool, it is clean. What shall he do with a pillow or bolster of akin? He must dip them and lift them out by the fringes.”

We will now examine this word *baptizoo* as connected with other words. With the preposition **ej**—*eis*: THAYER says that "*eis* is to mark the element into which the immersion is made." (Page 94.) Mark 1: 9: *Eis ton Jordaneen*—into the Jordan. He says of "**En**, with dative of the thing into which one is immersed." Mark 1: 5: *En too Jordaneen potamoo*—in the river Jordan. See Matt. 3: 11: *Baptizoo umas en udati*—I baptize you in water. John 1: 26: **Egw baptizw 'ev udati**—I baptize in water. John 1: 31: **Egw hPqon en udati baptizwn**—I came baptizing in water. Mark 1: 8: **Egw ebaptisa uha? udati**—I baptized you in water. Luke 3: 16: **Egw nen udati baptizo uha?**—I indeed baptize you in water. The preposition *ej* is used in all these places with the *dative*. In Matt. 17: 15 we have: "Lord, have mercy on my son: for he is epileptic, and suffereth grievously: for oftentimes he falleth [**ej to pur**] into the fire, and oftentimes [**ej to outwear**] into the water." Whatever he did in connection with the fire he did in connection with the water. In Acts 8: 38 we have: "And they both went down [**ej to outwear**] into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him." Whatever the child did in connection with the fire and the water in Matt. 17: 15, Philip and the

eunuch did in connection with the water in this place. Both of them went *into* the water.

From these quotations we learn that both the person baptizing and the one to be baptized went into the water and that he was baptized in the water; that the water was sometimes a river and sometimes a pool. If the "baptizing" was done by pouring or sprinkling, it could not have been done *in* water; if it had been done by pouring or sprinkling, both Philip and the eunuch would not have gone down into the water. I once saw a picture representing John and another man standing in the water in a river about halfway up to their knees and John pouring water out of a horn on the head of the other man!

The figurative allusions to the ordinance of baptism are found in Rom. 6: 4; Col. 2: 12.

"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: 4.) This language can apply to *baptism* only if baptism is *immersion*. Sprinkling and pouring would never have suggested a burial; immersion would. I believe that all commentators of any reputation agree upon this.

"Having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead." (Col. 2: 12.) Here we have the same figure of *burial* to repre-

sent baptism, which could not be a figure of either sprinkling or pouring.

ADAM CLARKE, the great Methodist commentator, says, writing on Rom. 6: 4: "It is *probable* that the apostle here alludes to the mode of administering baptism by *immersion*, the whole body being put under the water, which seemed to say the man is *drowned*, is *dead*; and when he came up out of the water, he seemed to have a resurrection to life. *The man is risen again; he is alive!*" On Col. 2: 12 he writes: "Alluding to the *immersions* practiced in the case of *adults*, wherein the person appeared to be buried under the water, as Christ was buried in the heart of the earth. His rising again the third day and their emerging from the water was an emblem of the resurrection of the body, and, in them, of a total change of life."

"The Pulpit Commentary" (*Episcopalian*), on Rom. 6: 4, says: "The reference rather is to the form of baptism—viz., by immersion, which was understood to signify burial, and, therefore, death. The sense, therefore, is: As our burial (or total immersion) in the baptismal water was followed by entire emergence, so our death with Christ to sin, which that immersion symbolized, is to be followed by our resurrection with him to a new life."

"The Bible Commentary" (*Episcopalian*), on Rom. 6: 4, says: "The expression, 'we were buried,' may have been suggested by the momentary burial beneath the baptismal water. It declares in the strongest man-

ner our union with Christ in death and our entire separation from the former life in which sin reigned. But burial, being the sign and seal which attests the reality of death, serves also to attest the reality of the resurrection; hence the significance which St. Paul attaches to Christ's burial and to our baptismal burial with him. (Compare Col. 2: 12.)"

LANGE'S "Commentary," on Rom. 6: 4, says: "*To be buried* is a stronger expression than *to die*, for the burial confirms death and raises it beyond doubt. It withdraws the dead from our sight and annihilates him, as it were. The same figure is in Col. 2: 12. Buried in death—an oxymoron, according to which burial precedes and death follows, as is illustrated in the immersion into the bath of baptism."

"A Paraphrase and Commentary on the New Testament," by DANIEL WHITBY, D. D., 1744, London (Episcopalian), on Rom. 6: 4, says: "*We are buried with Mm in baptism*. It being so expressly declared here, and in Col. 2: 12, *that we are- buried with Christ in baptism*, by being buried under water: And the Argument to oblige us to a Conformity to his Death, by dying to sin, being taken hence, and this *Immersion* being religiously observed by all *Christians*, for *Thirteen Centuries*, and approved by our *Church*, and the Change of it unto Sprinkling, even without any allowance from the *Author* of this Institution, or any License from any *Council* of the *Church*; being that which the *Romanist* still urgeth to justify his refusal of the *Cup*

to the Laity; It were to be wished that this Custom might be again of general use, and Aspersion only permitted, as of old, in Case of the Clinici, or in present danger of Death."

"PIERCE on Colossians," London, 1729 (Episcopalian), says: "And this putting off the body of the sins of the flesh was signified to you at your baptism; wherein, as persons dead, you were in a manner buried, being put under the water: In which baptism is also represented your resurrection, together with him to a new life, through a belief of the great power of God, who raised him from the dead."

To sum up: We have shown that the Greek word used in the *commission* meant to *immerse*; that it never meant to sprinkle or to pour; that there were words that meant to wash, to sprinkle, and to pour, but Jesus did not use them in speaking of baptism; that the word *baptize*, when adopted, was used in the sense of *to dip*; that *immersion* was the practice for *thirteen centuries*; that it was changed to accommodate sick persons and infants and for convenience; that the change was made without any ecclesiastical legislation—just a habit or change without authority, and almost imperceptibly; that the figurative language of the New Testament in reference to it can signify immersion only; that all commentators and writers of any reputation declare that immersion was apostolic and that Jesus was immersed; that all commentators worth consulting agree in stating that the allusions to "being buried" in Rom.

6: 4 and Col. 2: 12 are to *immersion*. Yet in the face of all this testimony there are learned, pious, and earnest men and women who persist in saying that sprinkling or pouring will do, at the same time admitting that there is not a word of authority for their statement in the Bible. All of them admit that immersion is valid baptism. There is no man living but will say that immersion is safe, while millions will tell you that to sprinkle or to pour is not.

II. WHO SHOULD OBEY THIS COMMAND? "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: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you." (Matt. 28: 19, 20.) "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16: 15, 16.) From these two quotations we would answer: Those who believe what is preached—persons capable of hearing, understanding, and accepting the proposition preached to them. Infants, idiots, and lunatics cannot understand or accept what is preached to them; therefore they are not the ones to obey this command. It is argued that in three of the recorded cases of conversion there were "household baptisms:" therefore infants were baptized. The argument is in this form: "Households were baptized. Infants are in many households; therefore infants may have been baptized." We might answer it in this way: "Households were

baptized. There are unbelievers in many households; therefore unbelievers may have been baptized.”

In Acts 16: 13-15 we have the account of the conversion of Lydia and her *household* in these words: "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 which 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. And she constrained us." Paul and Silas found a company of women assembled for prayer. One is mentioned by name as a business woman, a merchant. She probably had women as servants and clerks. No man is mentioned; and, therefore, it is probable that she was unmarried. Children are not mentioned; therefore it is probable that there were none present. Women only are mentioned; therefore it is probable that the company consisted of unmarried women—Lydia and her women servants and clerks. We cannot use this case for proof that infants were baptized, because they are not mentioned; and the more reasonable inference is that none were present.

The next conversion is that of the Philippian jailer. (Acts 16: 23-34.) Verses 31-34 read thus: "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 meat before them, and rejoiced greatly, with all his house, having believed in God." We notice that he and his house were commanded to believe. Infants could not believe; therefore "his house" meant his servants and officers under him. They spake the word unto him and also (or including) all who were in his house. They could not speak the word to infants; therefore infants were not included in the term "all that were in his house." "And rejoiced greatly, with all his house." Infants could not rejoice; therefore infants could not be included in the term "all his house."

The next case is found in 1 Cor. 1: 16, which reads: "And I baptized the household of Stephanas." This statement is too meager of details to give any light on this question.

It is argued that baptism came in the place of circumcision; that infants were circumcised under the Mosaic covenant, and infants must be baptized under the Christian covenant. It might be sufficient to answer that in the Mosaic covenant it was expressly commanded that infants should be circumcised, but it was not mentioned that they should be baptized in the Christian covenant, and also that it is not intimated

anywhere in the Christian covenant that baptism was to take the place of circumcision, in the controversy between Paul and certain men, who came down from Judea, the record of which we have in Acts 15, it was contended that the Gentile converts must be made Jews by being circumcised before they could be baptized. It was not suggested that baptism came in the place of circumcision, but that circumcision must precede baptism.

Infants cannot obey this command, because they cannot obey any command. In order to have authority for infant baptism there must be a command to parents to have their infants baptized, and there is no such command.

Infants are passive in this matter; they are entirely dependent upon their parents. A believing parent has his baby baptized; an unbelieving parent refuses to have his baby baptized. Both babies die. What difference is there in their condition in the future life? If God made any difference, would he not be an unjust God? We, then, repeat our answer that *believers* are the persons to be baptized.

III. FOR WHAT MOTIVE SHOULD IT BE OBEYED? Has the Holy Spirit given a reason for obeying this command? If he has, then it should be obeyed for this reason. If submitted to for any other reason, is the command obeyed? These are vital questions, and should be carefully considered.

It is necessary at this place to define terms. *Motive*

means that which determines action; *reason* is the intellectual process by which we reach *motive*,; *design* has reference to something definitely aimed at.

I ask the question, "For what *motive* should a man be baptized?" and I mean to inquire what it is that determines him to be baptized.

I ask the question, "Has the Holy Spirit given a reason for obeying this command?" and I mean: Has the Holy Spirit addressed anything to our intellects, so that we could intelligently have a motive for obeying this command?

When I speak of the *design* of baptism, I consider the command from God's standpoint and mean to speak of what he definitely aimed at when he gave the command.

In the commission that we have several times quoted it is said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Salvation is the result of believing and being baptized; therefore the purpose of believing and being baptized is to be saved. If a man were to believe for any other motive than to be saved, would it be the "belief that saves?" We read that "the devils believed," but the promise of salvation was not given to them; consequently they did not believe for that motive, and their believing was not the thing commanded. We read also that certain persons "believed, but for fear of the Pharisees would not confess him." (John 13: 42.) They did not believe in order to obey this command; consequently it was of no advantage to them. A be-

lief that stops short of baptism is not the belief commanded.

In Acts 2: 38 we read: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins." These Jews were commanded to do two things *for*, or *unto*, the remission of their sins. The reason for doing these two things was stated, and they were commanded to do these two things for that reason. To do them for that motive was as much the command as to do them at all. The command cannot be curtailed; it is one command, and must be taken in its entirety. The first part, "repent, and be baptized," was not the command; and the latter part, "for the remission of your sins," was not a promise or a reward for repenting and being baptized. It was a command to repent and be baptized for a certain result. The result must be in the mind before the repentance and the baptism. If a man were commanded "to eat for physical growth" and he were to eat to gratify his appetite, he would not be obeying the command. He might have physical growth from eating simply to gratify his appetite, but he would not be obeying the command. If a man were to repent for the motive of obtaining remission of sins, he would be obeying the command that far; but if from false teaching he were to believe that by repenting he had obtained forgiveness of his sins and were to be baptized to fulfill all righteousness or because it had been commanded without any design, he would not be obeying the command.

“The design of a thing is the reason of it; the necessity of a thing is the importance of it. To live is a design of eating, but eating is important to living. Now if a deed, or act, or performance, has no design, it is without reason and, maybe, against reason. He who requires or performs such an act is unreasonable, or he is something worse. Of course Jesus Christ could not be the author of an appointment having no design.” If it is unreasonable to require or to perform an act without a design, to be baptized without having a design in his mind would be unreasonable, and much more so to be baptized having an incorrect design in his mind. He who does not know the design of baptism acts unreasonably when he is baptized.

“I do not say—for I do not believe—that a person must see that baptism is for remission of sins before it can be, to him, a valid baptism.” If to be baptized without a purpose is unreasonable, then if a person is baptized without understanding its purpose, he is doing an unreasonable thing, and doing an unreasonable thing is not serving God. “God has not, in his Bible, said or intimated that when being baptized we must, in order to make the transaction valid, see or believe that we are doing so in order to be forgiven.” But he has commanded us to be baptized for the remission of our sins. When we obey that command, what is OUT reason for obeying it if it is not to obtain remission of our sins, since he has commanded us to be baptized for that purpose? “He who is baptized in order to

remission of sins as his purpose, in the sense and with the feeling that he is to get, therefore (or, rather, *therefor*), so much forgiveness, is a legalist." No one, as far as I know, has ever contended that a man must not serve God from love or gratitude. God has always, in all ages and in all dispensations, presented blessings and curses as inducements for obedience to his commands. He would not have done this if he had not wished men to obey him in order to obtain the blessings. *No* one has ever intimated that a man should be baptized to "get *therefor so much forgiveness*." The Holy Spirit has commanded men to be baptized in order to obtain remission of sins, but it has never commanded men to be baptized because they love God. "Such a one, in being baptized, is not serving the Lord, but *self*, rather." Has God ever commanded men to serve him except to better their condition? To command men to serve him simply for the sake of being served would make him a vainglorious God—just the opposite of the character that has been revealed to us in his holy word. The Holy Spirit said of Peter: "And with many other words he testified, and exhorted them, saying, Save yourselves from this crooked generation." (Acts 2: 40.) The Holy Spirit in this place was surely urging them to serve *self*.

“If one sees that in being baptized he is lovingly, and in the exercise of an abounding faith, obeying his God, his Savior, but does not yet know the blessings in full that shall be his—does not know that the Lord has

promised to remit his sins, to put him into Jesus Christ and make him a member of his church—he has, nevertheless, rendered obedience of the highest order; he has a valid baptism." It is impossible for any one to know anything about baptism from the word of God without knowing its design; and if any one is baptized without knowing its true design, it is because he has listened to and obeyed a perverted gospel. If a man preaches any gospel except that baptism is for salvation, for remission of sins, he is a blind guide, and the one following him will fall into the ditch—be lost. A man is not lovingly and with an abounding faith obeying his God when he listens to a human teacher and shuts his ears to the words of the divine Teacher. A man cannot know anything about baptism from the New Testament without knowing *in full* what blessings are connected with it. Where there is a conflict of human teaching, God requires a man to imitate the Bereans—to search the Scriptures to see if these things be so; and if he does not do it, he will not be held guiltless.

The foregoing quotations are from "Designs of Christian Baptism," by L. B. WILKES, a very thought-fid writer; but in this matter he has permitted his objection to certain crude teachings to lead him to the opposite extreme.

It is taught by some religionists that a man's sins are forgiven before he is baptized, and the question is asked of the person desiring membership and baptism:

"Do you believe that God, for Christ's sake, has forgiven your sins?" The candidate is instructed to answer: "I do." It is then said by the preacher: "Brethren, you have heard the statement just made by this person; what is your pleasure in the matter?" Some one replies: "I move that this person be baptized and received into the fellowship of the church." The vote is taken and the motion is adopted, and at some convenient time in the future he is baptized. The candidate is taught to say: "I believe." Belief comes from hearing. In this case it comes not from hearing the word of God, because God's word says nothing of the kind. Then his belief comes from hearing human teaching—teaching in opposition to the word of God—and it is not true; he is believing a false gospel. If God has declared baptism to be one of his means for remission of sins and commands men to be baptized for that purpose and a man says that it is not a means for obtaining remission of his sins and is baptized for an entirely different purpose, has he been baptized by the authority of God? If a man says, "I believe that sprinkling a few drops of water on the head is Christian baptism," and has a few drops of water sprinkled on his head, has he been baptized?

There is but *one design* of baptism when men are commanded to be baptized, and that is the salvation of men. God had *reasons* for selecting baptism as the act in which remission of sins was consummated, and those

reasons were that it would represent a "washing away," "a burial," a "new birth."

IV. WHO SHOULD BE THE ADMINISTRATOR? The question is not answered directly in the New Testament, but it is answered indirectly. Two answers have been given by Bible students: (1) Baptism is to be administered only by a bishop or ordained presbyter, the latter term having special reference to preachers; (2) any disciple.

Arguments for the *first* answer: (a) Baptism is an ordinance by which men and women are recognized as disciples of Christ and are admitted into church fellowship; therefore it should be administered only by authorized persons. Answer: Baptism is for remission of sins. The believer is commanded to be baptized. He demands baptism, and no disciple has a right to refuse or to deny him the opportunity. Congregational fellowship can be regulated by the congregation. (b) Were all disciples permitted to baptize, abuses would follow and the ordinance would be brought into disrepute. Answer: Men do not ask to be baptized unless they *at least pretend* to be sincere; and if hypocrites, to carry out the deception they would seek the most prominent man they could find to baptize them. Bishops or preachers cannot judge infallibly of a man's honesty, and it is not necessary that they should; and there are many unworthy persons in all religious organizations, the practice of limiting the administrators

to bishops and ordained presbyters not making any difference in the spirituality of the members.

Arguments for the *second* answer: (a) In Acts 8: 4 we read: "Therefore they that were scattered abroad went everywhere telling the good news." In Acts 8: 1 it is said: "And Saul was consenting to his [Stephen's] death. And at that time there was a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem; and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles." There were no "ordained" bishops or presbyters at Jerusalem at that time. The only "ordained"—properly, "appointed"—persons in the church at that time were the apostles, and they did not leave Jerusalem at that time. Those who went and who told the good news were not appointed, or "ordained." The hand of the Lord was with them, and it is said that of those persons to whom the good news was told "a great number believed and turned unto the Lord." (Acts 11: 21.) When the report of this came to the disciples who were at Jerusalem, they sent Barnabas, a man full of the Holy Spirit, to Antioch to see if the Lord was approving of this work. When he came, he saw that the Lord was approving of it, and he exhorted the new disciples that they should remain steadfast. Not a word is said about his baptizing them; therefore the legitimate inference is that they had been baptized by these "unordained" disciples and that a man full of the Holy Spirit declared that the Lord approved of it. This was proba-

bly eight years after the dispersion from Jerusalem; and when many converts had been made in Jerusalem to the truth, then some of these disciples had drifted back to Jerusalem.

In Acts 9: 10 we read that after Saul had been sent, blind, to Damascus, a vision came to a *certain disciple* to go and preach to Saul; and after preaching, he baptized him. The legitimate inference is that he was an "unordained" disciple. This was by the Lord's personal direction, and, therefore, right.

In Acts 10 we read of the conversion and baptism of Cornelius and his household. Peter took six Jewish Christian *brethren* with him. These persons were Gentiles, and Peter and his six brethren had doubts about its being God's will that they should be baptized; and God, to show his approval of it, sent the Holy Spirit upon them; and then Peter told these six *brethren* to baptize them. We have no reason to believe that any of these brethren had ever been "ordained."

Some writers have taught that each congregation should select some member of the congregation to baptize, but there is not an intimation of such a practice in the New Testament. Some have claimed that men who evangelize, by virtue of evangelizing, are the baptizers. In so far as whoever persuades a man to be baptized is the one to baptize him, if the one persuading is authorized to baptize only those whom he persuades, then so far is he authorized to baptize, but no farther is he specially authorized. The general pro-

hibition to women's taking a public part in the church would eliminate them from preaching and baptizing in the general statement that all the disciples at Jerusalem "were scattered abroad," and "they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word." Under the supervision of the apostles, the woman was considered a part of the man, and was not counted separately in her relation to other men or other women. She was treated as an independent person in hearing and obeying the truth; but after coming into the church, as far as her relation to the world was concerned, her individuality was lost.

Some writers have gone so far as to imagine conditions under which it would be proper for unbaptized persons to baptize believers; but no such intimation is given in the New Testament, and we had better let God take care of such cases. The rule, as we learn it from the New Testament, is that the person who shows another the plan of salvation and persuades him to accept it is the person to baptize that person, unless he requests some other disciple to do it.

STUDY VII.

PRAYER AND SPECIAL PROVIDENCES.

"And it came to pass, as he was praying in a certain place, that when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, even as John also taught his disciples. And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Father, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we ourselves also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And bring us not into temptation." (Luke 11: 1-4.)

"And Jesus answered and said unto them, Verily I say unto you, If ye have faith, and doubt not, ye shall not only do what is done to the fig tree, but even if ye shall say unto this mountain, Be thou taken up and cast into the sea, it shall be done. And all things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive." (Matt. 21: 21, 22.)

"And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask me anything in my name, that will I do." (John 14: 13, 14.)

"And if any of you lacketh wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all liberally and upbraideth not;

and it shall be given him. But let him ask in faith, nothing doubting." (James 1: 5, 6.)

"And this is the boldness which we have toward him, that, if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us," etc. (1 John 5: 14.)

"Is any among you sick? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him." (James 5: 13-15.)

"And in like manner the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity: for we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered; and he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." (Rom. 8: 26, 27.)

Men talk much about prayer and special providences, and much of this talk is cant and nonsense. In spiritual matters men are largely slaves to tradition and custom. Much of our beliefs and acts of worship are examples of the "blind leading the blind." Men sometimes become restive under these conditions and kick aside the Bible instead of the misinterpretation of it. The Bible, rightly understood, will never give cause for offense. It can, more than any book or man, cry out "to be saved from its friends." It has been nearly always the men who have professed the greatest love for

it who have most abused it. Jesus said to the scribes and the Pharisees: "Thus have ye made the commandments of God of none effect by your traditions." (Matt. 13: 6.) Theologians have followed in their footsteps. The Bible must be studied as a whole and with reason. It cannot be "scrapped." Its statements must be studied in their connection. We must accept as true, in beginning the study of the Bible, that it is true and that there is no contradiction in its statements, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelation. If there is an apparent contradiction, it is of human origin, either a faulty translation or a failure on our part to correctly understand it. Paul's advice to Timothy should be written upon the desk of every Bible student: "Give diligence to present thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, handling aright [rightly dividing, or applying] the word of truth." (2 Tim. 2: 15.)

We must understand that the Bible is divided into two parts—the *old* and the *new* Scriptures—and that these pertain, respectively, to the *old* and the *new* covenants. We must keep constantly in mind the differences of these two covenants: that the *old* was material—fleshly—and the *new* is spiritual; that in the *old* God dealt directly with men, but in the *new*, through a Mediator; that in the *old* men were punished and blessed in the earthly life, but in the *new*, in the life to come. We must also remember that nothing in the *old* covenant is binding upon us, because we are not

parties to it. There may be items in the old covenant that are also in the new covenant. These are binding upon us, *not* because they are in the old, but because they are in the new. The people of the United States, after their separation from Great Britain was established, were not under the laws of Great Britain; but after this changed relation, the people of the United States declared that in those cases not covered by any new laws made by the United States the "Common Law of England" should be the law. Now this "Common Law" was binding upon us, not because it was the law of England, but because we had made it our law. Some of the laws of the old covenant are binding upon us, not because they are the laws of the old covenant, but because they have been incorporated into the new covenant.

With this understanding, we will not go back beyond the memorable day of Pentecost, spoken of in Acts 3: 1, to find the law under which we are living, except to those statements made by Jesus anticipatory of the setting up of his kingdom and which were restated in some form by his apostles. These preliminary and fundamental facts we will now apply to the questions under consideration.

In studying the subject of *prayer* it is well to understand in the beginning that we are considering it in relation to Christians—to God's children—and not to alien sinners. We cannot conceive of alien sinners' praying under the new covenant. They cannot pray for par-

don, because the terms of pardon are given; they cannot pray for light, for "the light" has come into the world; they cannot pray for mercy, because God is ready and anxious to show his mercy just as soon as they will permit him. God does not have to be reconciled to man, but man to God; and, therefore, the alien sinner cannot pray that he may be reconciled to God, because God has told him how to be reconciled; and, moreover, he would never pray to God to reconcile him to God, to break down his rebellious heart, if his heart, his love, and his desires had not already turned to God. "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.)

Religious teachers often repeat and have their disciples repeat and parents teach their children to repeat what is called "the Lord's Prayer," and which we have quoted at the beginning of this study. Ought we who are living under the new covenant to repeat that prayer ? Ought parents to teach their children to repeat it or any other prayer? Answering the last question first. I say emphatically that they should not. Children are either alien sinners or are without sin. No alien sinner can pray that prayer or any other. If sinless, they cannot say, "Forgive us our sins;" if sinless, they are too young to comprehend anything in the prayer; and, therefore, it is mockery. Parents sometimes teach their little children the rhyming prayer:

Now I lay me down to sleep,
I pray the Lord my soul to keep;
If I should die before I wake,
I pray the Lord my soul to take.

In this prayer, in one line they are taught to ask God to take care of them, and in the next line are taught to doubt his doing it. Then they are taught to ask God to do something that the child has no conception of and about which the parent has no doubt whatever. What kind of training is this? Every parent knows that his prayer, or the child's prayer, has no influence over the child through the night and that if the child should die, God would save its soul, because he has declared: "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. 19: 14.) Ought we who profess to be disciples of Christ, living under the new covenant, to repeat that prayer? It was given to his disciples before *the* day of Pentecost, and has not been reenacted since then. "Thy kingdom come." His kingdom came on *the* Pentecost; therefore we can-not pray for anything to come that has already come. Some commentators say that this prayer can be made now in the sense of his kingdom coming in its fullness. If the Holy Spirit has anywhere directed us to pray for his kingdom to come in its fullness, then let us pray for it "to come in its fullness;" but do not let us repeat the Lord's Prayer and pray for his "kingdom to come," as he then taught his disciples to pray, because he taught them to pray for it to *come, to be set up, established;* and this was done on Pentecost. "Give

us day by day our daily bread." We know that God does not give us day by day our bread, but that we have to work for it, or pay for it, and that we have to make provision for the future. If we were to repeat this prayer, it would be without faith. He had called his disciples away from their daily duties, the labors and occupations by which they made their bread; they were doing God's service, and hence they had a right to expect God to support them, and they could pray in faith for God to give them day by day their daily bread. But we have not quit our business affairs to serve God—not even the preachers, for they get a support for preaching; and even if they are preaching without pay. God did not call them to do it. They have done it of their own choice, and they must take the chances of the people's supporting them. If they have done it from love of their fellow-men, as good soldiers, they must expect to suffer hardships and run the risk of doing without their daily bread sometimes. The other petitions are reenacted in the new covenant, and hence we can pray them.

Is the statement made in Matt. 21: 21, 22, and which is the second scripture quoted at the beginning of this study, applicable to us? To say that it is, is to say that we have no faith, that there is no faith in the world, because we all know that no one can perform a miracle—that no man by his word can wither a fig tree or move a mountain. We have no right to say that there is no faith in the world. The statement, "And all

things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive," is unlimited, except by believing. They could believe that they had the power to do these things, because the Lord had given them this power; but he has never given or promised us this power, hence we cannot believe that we have it.

The same unlimited promise is made in John 14: 13, 14; but it was made under the old covenant and has not been renewed in the new covenant; and, therefore, it is not for us.

Now we come to statements made under the new covenant. In 1 John 5: 14 we read, "And this is the boldness which we have toward him, that, if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us;" and in James 1: 5, 6 we have the promise of a specific thing if we ask for it: "And if any of you lacketh wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all liberally and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him. But let him ask in faith, nothing doubting." In order to receive an answer to our prayers we *must ask in faith, without the shadow of a doubt*. Many persons pray for special blessings, but qualify the prayer by saying: "If it be in accordance with thy will." Is there any faith in that prayer? Not a particle. How could there be, when you had doubts about God's answering it? No prayer so qualified is ever answered. To ask anything according to his will he must have previously revealed his will to us. The only revelation that we have of his will is what we find in the New Testament Scriptures. If he

has revealed in them what we should ask for, we have no right to ask for anything else; and, therefore, we have no right to add to our prayer, "If it be thy will," because we ought to know what is his will. *Boldness* should be *confidence*, or, literally, *the boldness graving out of confidence*.

We come now to consider what is meant by the promise in James 1: 5, 6: "If any of you lacketh wisdom, let him ask of God, . . . nothing doubting." Let us accept as the correct meaning of the word *wisdom* in this place, "the knowledge and practice of the requisites for godly and upright living." Now let us have the entire passage: "Count it all joy, my brethren, when ye fall into manifold trials; knowing that the proving of your faith worketh patience But if any of you lacketh the knowledge and practice of the requisites for godly and upright living, let him ask of God,... and it shall be given him." The word *fall* is understood to mean *so to fall into as to be encompassed by tests; temptations means tests; patience means endurance*, or steadfast perseverance. With these correct definitions substituted it will read: "Count it all joy, my brethren, when ye so fall into many kinds of tests as to be encompassed by them; knowing that the proving of your faith produces endurance.... But if any of you lacketh the knowledge and practice of the requisites for godly and upright living, let him ask of God,... and it shall be given him." Or, to put it in our idiom: "Rejoice.

brethren, when various kinds of tests of your faith, that you cannot escape, come upon you, because these tests will make you stronger; but if any of you are conscious of any weaknesses in your moral natures, that may yield to these tests, ask God to help you, and he will." We have no doubt of this promise, and we can make this prayer without a shadow of doubt or without any inclination to add: "If it be thy will."

We have now reached James 5: 13-15, a statement of the Holy Spirit that has caused much perplexity to Bible students. Sometimes by first deciding what a passage of scripture cannot mean we may determine what it does mean. "Is any among you suffering?" *Suffering* is not bodily suffering, but *persecution*. If any of you are being persecuted for Christ's sake, let him pray for strength to hold steadfast to his faith. "Is any cheerful? let him sing praises to God." Of course this means spiritual cheerfulness. "Is any among you sick?" The Greek word here rendered by *sick* is in many passages represented by the English word *weak*. It primarily means physical sickness, but in many places it is used figuratively. "Who is weak, and I am not weak?" (2 Cor. 11: 29.) "In all things I gave you an example, how that so laboring ye ought to help the weak." (Acts 20: 35.) "But take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to the weak. For if a man see thee which hast knowledge sitting at meat in an idol's temple, will not his conscience, if he is weak, be em-

boldened to eat things sacrificed to idols? For through thy knowledge he that is weak perisheth, the brother for whose sake Christ died." (1 Cor. 8: 9-11.) In these passages it is translated *weak* five times, and in the five places it means spiritual weakness or spiritual sickness. In the passage under consideration the two preceding sentences speak of spiritual conditions. Why should not this one? Or why should the change be so abrupt? In the same sentence reference is undoubtedly made to spiritual sickness. Suppose we read it this way: "Is any among you suffering persecution for being a Christian? let him ask God to strengthen him. Is any cheerful on account of his spiritual relation to God? let him sing songs of praise to God. Is any among you weak spiritually? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, having anointed him with oil in the name of the Lord."

It is necessary to give special attention to the next clause before we make a translation. "And the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him." Let us notice first *prayer*. There are *four* Greek words in the New Testament that are translated by *prayer*. That is always suspicious. Each Greek word should have a different word in English. That is the only way to make a translation.

In 1 Tim. 2: 1 we find: "I exhort therefore, first of all, that supplications [*deceseis*], prayers [*proseuchee*],

intercessions [*enteuxeis*], thanksgivings [*eucharistias*], be made for all men.”

Now in Luke 1: 13; 2: 37; 5: 33 *decesis* is translated by *prayer*.

In 1 Tim. 4: 5 *enteuxis* is translated by *prayer* in the *King James Version*.

In Acts 18: 18; 21: 23—the only places in the New Testament where *euchee* is found, except in the passage under discussion—it is translated by *vow*; but in James 5: 15 it is translated *prayer*. *Proseuchee* is always translated by the word *prayer*. In James 5: 15, "And the prayer [*euchee*] of faith shall save him that is sick," an exception is made in using *prayer* instead of *vow*. Suppose we do not change the word, but let it be *vow* in James 5: 15, as it is in the other places, and it would read: "And the vow of faith [to be more faithful to God] shall save him that is wearied [*kamnonta*] spiritually.”

The word *save* is *soosei*, and means *to rescue from danger*, physical and spiritual. (See Rom. 5: 9; James 5: 20.)

In this passage there are two words that are translated by the same English word, *weak*. Of course this is incorrect. The two Greek words must have different ideas in them.

We will now give a correct and literal translation of the entire passage: "Is any among you suffering persecutions for being a Christian? let him ask God to strengthen him. Is any one cheerful on account of

his spiritual relation to God? let him sing songs of praise to God. Is any among you weak spiritually? let him summon to himself the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, having anointed him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the vow of faith [to be more faithful to God] shall save him [spiritually] who is discouraged.”

From this exegesis we learn that the entire passage has reference to the spiritual, and not to the physical, condition of the man. The anointing with oil may have a ceremonial connection with the taking of a vow.

We have now reached Rom. 8: 26, 27: "And in like manner the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity: for we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit himself maketh intercession for *us* with groanings which cannot be uttered; and he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to *the will of God.*" No one who is candid will say that this passage as it stands has any meaning to it. What the Holy Spirit said in this place through Paul has sense in it, but we have either not the correct Greek text or a very faulty translation.

In "An American Commentary on the New Testament" the commentary on *Romans* is by Albert N. Arnold and D. B. Ford, and on verses 26, 27 we have the following language: "' LIKEWISE THE [HOLY] SPIRIT ALSO HELPETH OUR INFIRMITIES' (joins his activity with our weakness) in waiting for final re-

demption. The absence of adequate power in ourselves for this patient waiting is plainly implied. The singular, *infirmity*, is doubtless the correct reading. 'FOR WE KNOW NOT' (literally, *for the what we should pray as it is proper, we know not*). The neuter article at the head of this clause gives it a 'substantival character' and renders it more prominent. *For* assigns the reason why the Spirit intercedes. 'As WE OUGHT.' 'According to the present and ever-varying needs' would be a good paraphrase for the brief, but comprehensive, Greek phrase. Illustrations of the truth of the proposition here stated are abundant. For example: Abraham interceding for Sodom (Gen. 18: 23-33); Moses, for permission to enter Canaan (Deut. 3: 23-27); Paul, for the removal of the thorn in the flesh (2 Cor. 12: 8, 9); Augustine's mother, that her son might not go to Rome (yet his going there led to his going to Milan, where he was converted). It was a saying of Pythagoras that 'men ought not to pray for themselves on account of their not knowing what is expedient for them.' [The soul of our Redeemer, as we read in John 12: 27, was once troubled, or perplexed, in regard to the definite object which should be prayed for; yet whatever his desired petition might have been, he was always enabled to add, "Father, glorify thy name;" and: "Not my will, but thine, be done." Should not every right prayer be accompanied by these words? Certainly the Spirit "helpeth" our infirmity; and though it is not here supposed that he gives

us words to speak, yet it is possible that he may at times "indite" our petitions and give us assurance that they will be fully answered. Yet I think that these cases are of rare occurrence and that the Christian is seldom assured by the Spirit that the bringing to pass of his will would be best for him or for others, or would be the most for God's glory, and that his prayers will thus be answered to the letter. We know of no test that will enable us uniformly to distinguish between the Spirit's assurance and mere self-assurance. We do know that many most devoted Christians have been deceived on this point. They have firmly believed; they have had full assurance; yet God has not answered their prayers in the way and form desired.] 'BUT THE SPIRIT HIMSELF.' Plainly the Holy Spirit and so confirmatory of the same application of the same phrase in verse 16. 'MAKETH INTERCESSION FOR US WITH GROANINGS WHICH CANNOT BE UTTERED. 'The words *for us* have not sufficient manuscript support. These *unuttered groanings*, though traceable to the Holy Spirit, take place *within our hearts*, agreeably to verse 23 ('groan within ourselves'). [The Spirit, as another "Helper," or "Advocate" (*Common Version* and also *Revised Version*, "Comforter"—John 14: 16), intercedes with God for us and "uses the human organs for his sighing, as he likewise does elsewhere for the speaking." This interceding of the Spirit of God in us, with groanings for God's help in our behalf, is something we cannot comprehend; but in one

point of view it seems akin to the suffering and intercession of our divine Lord—if not in us, yet in the flesh—" for us men and for our salvation."]"

This commentary is no more intelligible than the text. The only solution that I can give, while it is not entirely satisfactory, is more so than any I have seen. "And in like manner the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity." I would prefer to translate: "And also the Spirit aids our weakness." The *weakness* refers to our impatience to realize the freedom of the glory of the children of God. I would prefer "*also*" to "*in like manner*," as I can find nothing that this resembles. Also, in addition to the encouragement that our hope gives us, we have the assurance that the Spirit is also helping us. In reference to this realization of being the children of God, we do not know how to pray, for the Spirit has not revealed to us how we should pray about this; but we know that the Spirit is praying for us, not "with groanings which cannot be uttered," but with unuttered desires. The Spirit cannot help any one by *groanings*, and we cannot conceive of groanings not uttered. The Greek word does mean *groanings*; but as that makes no sense, we must use some derived word. I would prefer *unrevealed aspirations*, but it might convey a false idea to some minds. The Spirit is in sympathy with us in this matter, and in this way is making intercession for us; for God, who knows all heart secrets, knows what are the desires of the Spirit. It is a very highly figurative and metaphysical utter-

ance, and we must be allowed latitude in its interpretation. It further strengthens us in our contention that we must not pray for material things.

But, in any event, this has no reference to ordinary praying, because we do know how to pray. "Every scripture inspired of God *is* also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work." (2 Tim. 3: 16, 17.) If this is true, then we know how to pray. Every Christian accepts this utterance of Paul as true; then the statement in Rom. 8: 26, 27 does not mean ordinary praying.

It is held by some persons that it is impossible sometimes for us to determine whether we should pray for a certain thing. An illustration something like this is given: "I know that I am to feed the hungry, but just which one of the hungry ones I ought to feed I may not know. Must I ask God which one? Must I say to God: 'O Lord, here are two men to be fed. I am rather inclined to feed A; and as I am not able to feed them both, I pray you to direct me to feed A; but not my will, but thine, be done?'" Of course this prayer would not be answered. A man must decide such questions for himself, being very careful to feed the hungry to the extent of his ability. There is no sin in making a wrong choice between A and B, but the danger lies in not feeding the hungry to the extent that he should.

A man cannot pray in faith when he asks for a certain thing about which he does not know God's will; and God does not answer that prayer when he gives something better than, but entirely different from, what was asked.

I quote from L. B. WILKES' "Tract on Prayer;" and it is always a pleasure to agree with him, for he is an honest, intellectual, God-loving, and lovable man. He says: "Suppose a man should find himself without food. Should he not at once seek to know God's will on the subject? But suppose he should say: 'God is able to give me food. He can command the stones into bread if he will. He has said, "Ask, and ye shall receive;" and Jesus taught his disciples to say: "Give us this day our daily bread. "; He falls upon his knees and pours out his anxious soul to God in prayer for bread. Suppose you God would give him bread? No. But why not? He asked, but did not receive, because he asked amiss." God had never promised to give bread. He had provided means whereby men could obtain bread by their own exertions. But suppose the person could not work, was a paralytic, and was alone. Would God answer his prayer for food? He has not promised it, and no one knows of an instance of his doing so; but we know of numberless instances where he did not do it and where they starved to death. Do you suppose that God willed these to die of starvation and that he willed it that food came to the others, so that they lived? Nay, verily. "Now there were some

present at that very season which told him of the Galileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices. And he answered and said unto them, Think ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because they have suffered these things?" (Luke 13: 1, 2.)

I wish to make one more quotation from my personal friend and brother: "In many of the so-called 'great revivals' of our times there is, no doubt, a true awakening of sinners on a large scale. Many are brought to see and feel that they are sinners and made to cry out for the salvation of God.... Sinners are taught to believe that to pray for this salvation is the seeking that God requires, and this is the special divine prescription for this case. Well, they do seek in this way, but do not find. Now, why is it that so many of these seekers fail to find? That there is a fault somewhere no one can fail to see. The fault is not in God or his word. It is still true that those who seek according to the text shall find. But these do not find. Often, at least, it is not the fault of the seeker, so far as honest, earnest prayer is concerned. Yet failure is confessed. If their guides would commit themselves entirely to divine guidance, as they ought, they should have no difficulty in learning the true cause of failure and the way to correct their mistakes. If Jesus has prescribed a definite way in which the sinner must seek salvation, then, of course, in this way only is salvation to be sought, if it is to be certainly obtained.

Sought in this divinely-prescribed way, it is, of course, always found; sought in this way, there are no failures. It is not much to the credit of a man to be found demonstrating, even in appearance, that the promises of God fail when brought to the test. Yet this is the rule, rather than the exception, in many of the so-called 'great revivals.' The whole question, then, resolves itself into one of fact: Has the way in which the sinner must seek salvation been given by the divine Master? The question is one not of possibilities or of power; it is one of fact. Nor is the fact one to be guessed at; it is to be determined by a direct appeal to the word of God, where, if at all, the fact is to be learned. This appeal having been made, I ask: Do the inspired records say that the sinner—the one who has never been forgiven—must pray for the forgiveness of his sins, with the specific promise that upon *that condition* he shall be forgiven? I answer: *They do not.* There is no such statement or intimation in the word of God. If God had so conditioned the sinner's salvation, then, unless he is unfaithful concerning his promises, no man ever did, since the promise was made, pray for the forgiveness of his sins and fail to obtain.... This modern revivalism is good in that it mellows the soil in which to sow the good seed of the kingdom; it is an almost unmitigated evil in that it sows tares in that prepared soil.... There may possibly be a shorter route to individual and national infidelity, with all its multiplied evils and speedy

ruin, than the one we are now considering; but on no other road can quicker time be made and by no other will the last station be more certainly reached. I have said so much on the subject of modern revivals in connection with the question of prayer because prayer is about the *Alpha* and *Omega* of the sinner's duty in order to salvation as taught in them. True, the sinner is told to believe; but, then, he is told to pray for faith.”

We come now to consider some scriptures that are generally quoted to sustain the doctrine of *special providences*, but before considering them I desire to call attention to certain facts in connection with this subject. (1) All prayers, to be acceptable, must be made in faith. (2) We cannot believe anything pertaining to God unless God has revealed to us his will concerning that thing. (3) God cannot answer prayers concerning temporal things without producing confusion in the material world. (4) We never can tell whether our prayers for temporal things have been answered, and, therefore, cannot give God the credit for them. (5) Jesus is King of, and we are citizens of, a spiritual kingdom; and as Christians, God will grant only spiritual blessings, and we should ask only for spiritual blessings, for in a spiritual kingdom are there only spiritual blessings.

“Go to now, ye that say, To-day or to-morrow we will go into this city, and spend a year there, and trade, and get gain: whereas ye know not what shall be on the morrow. What is your life? For ye are a vapor,

that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away. Contrariwise, ye ought to say, If the Lord so intends, we shall both live and do this or that." (James 4: 13-15.)

"For it is better, if the will of God should so will, that ye suffer for well-doing than for evil doing." (1 Pet. 3: 17.)

These quotations were dictated by the Holy Spirit after the kingdom was set up. We dwell with much insistence upon the necessity of understanding the proper application of the Scriptures, dwelling with emphasis upon the patriarchal, Mosaic, and Christian dispensations, but have singularly overlooked the importance of properly understanding that formative period of thirty or forty years between the ascension of Jesus and the death of the last apostle—the period when the New Testament Scriptures were being written. From the time when Jesus "went away," when the Comforter came, until the apostles were "led into all truth," there was a very different condition of affairs to what there has been since. During that period Christians were under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit, because the New Testament Scriptures were just then being written, and they were conscious of it and the apostles insisted upon it. Since the New Testament canon has been completed, the Holy Spirit has exerted his influence through the word that he gave to the world; and we say this because it says so and because we know that since that time no one has come to a knowledge of the truth

except through a knowledge of the New Testament Scriptures. Paul says: "So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome. For I am not ashamed of the gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." (Rom. 1: 15, 16.)

"Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name." (John 20: 30, 31.)

"Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you. And he, when he is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye behold me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world hath been judged. I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth." (John 16: 7-13.)

With these explanatory observations understood, we can now understand these scriptures that teach "special providences." The quotation from James 4: 13-15, concluding, "Contrariwise, ye ought to say, If the Lord so intends, we shall both live and do this or that," was written as a rebuke to those who thought

that they might with impunity say: "We will for several years give all our energies to accumulating wealth, and then will give our service to God." The Holy Spirit shows them that they could not do that, as they could not control their lives; that service to God must be paramount, and they must say in their hearts: "If, while serving God, we can make money, we will do it; but serving God will be our first consideration." This scripture has made many spiritually-minded persons adopt this formula of speech in connection with their secular and spiritual affairs. We often hear, "If the Lord will, I will preach at this place on the first Lord's day in June;" or: "The Lord willing, there will be services here to-night." The writer, at the time of writing these words, has the use of a hall every second Sunday, and other religious organizations have the use of it on the other Sundays. Suppose I were to announce, "I will preach in this hall, the Lord willing, on the second Sunday in next month," and it should turn out that the third, fourth, and first Sundays should be lovely days, but when the second Sunday came, it was a downpour of rain. What must I conclude, and what must the people conclude? If I believed in special providences, could I keep from concluding that the Lord did not wish me to preach at that place at that time and that he did wish the others to preach, and would not the people conclude that God was favoring the others? But if it should be reversed the next time, would we not conclude that God wished to have all sorts of doctrines

preached by all sorts of men; that he was the author of confusion? And would not the people have the right to conclude that "one church was as good as another? "

In the scripture under consideration only the question of living is considered. The uncertainty of life is dwelt upon to show that we cannot safely give the present to ourselves and the future to God, because the future is uncertain. In a sense God gives every creature life, and in the same sense he takes it away. No one will say that by a special providence God gave him life, and he should not say that by a special providence he took it away. By the laws that God gave to govern the material world he gave us life, and by the same laws he will take our life from us. How should we speak of the future? "I will preach in this hall on the second Sunday in next month, at eleven o'clock in the forenoon, provided there are no hindering causes."

"For it is better, if the will of God should so will, that ye suffer for well-doing than for evil doing." (1 Pet. 3: 17.) It is understood that this language was used during the apostolic dispensation; and if the common interpretation is correct, we need not make it applicable to Christians now. If we will turn to the next chapter and commence reading at verse 12, we will have the key to the whole matter: "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial among you, which cometh upon you to prove you, as though a strange thing happened unto you." This translation is not warranted. It was made to fit the prevailing theory.

The word that is represented by *fiery trial* means the fire used by the assayer to test the purity of a metal, and is used here, figuratively, of the severe calamities or persecutions in the midst of which they were and which would test them. The word that is translated by *to prove you* is not a verb, but a noun, and means *the trial of man's fidelity, integrity, virtue, constancy*, etc. The correct translation would be: "Beloved, do not think that these fiery persecutions that have come among you for a test to you are out of the ordinary, as though an unusual thing was happening to you." This correct translation teaches the very opposite lesson to the one usually drawn from it. The Christians were probably just beginning to feel one of those persecutions under Nero that even now shock the world when narrated, and the Holy Spirit said to them: "Do not think that these calamitous events that are involving you, that are as severe in their intensity as the assayer's fire that melts the most obdurate metals that he is testing and which will test your fidelity—do not think such calamities are uncommon and that an unusual misfortune is being inflicted upon you, for such is not the case. But you are disciples of Christ; and as he suffered a cruel death for you, so do you rejoice that in such suffering you can show your gratitude to him, so that in so proving your fidelity to him you may, when he comes in his glory, be partakers of it. If you are made to suffer because you wear Christ's name, you are blessed because you share the glory of God. But do not be deserving

of this persecution by being evil doers, for afflictions are glorious only to those who are like Christ." Instead of this affliction's being a special providence of God to test them it is expressly declared that it is not.

In Acts 21: 14, after it had been revealed what was God's will and after the disciples had failed to persuade Paul to change his intention, then the disciples said: "The will of the Lord be done." In all matters where God has revealed his will we should say, "The will of the Lord be done;" and we should not fight against it. We know that it is the will of the Lord for me to preach as much as I am able under my environments of material laws; and I should say, as far as my willingness to preach is concerned, "The will of the Lord be done;" and I should preach as much as I can, for such is "the will of the Lord." Paul used the expression very often, and he did it very correctly, because he was acting under Christ's special direction; but none of us are so acting in this age of the world.

STUDY VIII.

THE CONVERSION OF THE WORLD.

“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: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the age.” (Matt. 28: 19, 20.)

"And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." (Mark 16: 15, 16.)

This subject has to be considered from *three* standpoints— (1) God's conditions of pardon, (2) how those conditions are to be made known to the world, and (3) how men can appropriate those conditions.

I. GOD'S CONDITIONS OF PARDON. The two quotations at the beginning of this study set forth plainly the terms upon which men may be pardoned. We find that there are two items upon which salvation is conditioned—belief and baptism. Salvation is conditional; it is not arbitrary. Of course man could not pardon himself. The supreme power must do the pardoning, and this pardoning must be either arbitrary or conditional. The Universalist admits that it is conditional,

but contends that the condition was for Christ to fulfill, and that he did comply with it; therefore the salvation of all men is assured; and these scriptures are quoted: "For while we were yet weak, in due season Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: for peradventure for the good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, shall we be saved from the wrath of God through him. For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by his life." (Rom. 5: 6-10.) "So then as through one trespass the judgment came unto all men to condemnation; even so through one act of righteousness the free gift came unto all men to justification of life." (Rom. 5: 18.)

On the other extreme, the Calvinist, while admitting that salvation is conditional and that the conditions must be complied with by men, contends that men cannot comply with these conditions unless God gives them special power to do so and that from the beginning God has selected those who shall have this power, and quotes these scriptures: "And for this cause he is the mediator of a new covenant, that a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were tunder the first covenant, they that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance."

(Heb. 9: 15.) "For whom he foreknew, he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren: and whom he foreordained, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified." (Rom. 8: 29, 30.)

It cannot be that these two doctrines are correct, because they are contradictory. If the scriptures first quoted are to be received, then the Universalist is incorrect, because one of them says, "he that believeth shall be condemned," and the other says, "baptizing them." We know that some do not believe and some are not baptized. The Calvinist is in error, because Jesus said: "Both 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." (Rev. 22: 17.) A common-sense rule of interpretation accepted by every one is to interpret an obscure statement by one that is perfectly plain. In the quotation from Rom. 5: 6-10, as used by Universalists, we find that the expression, "For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by his life," implies that a reconciliation had been effected and that upon this reconciliation the future salvation was predicated. The statement that "while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us," does not affirm, or even imply, that we were *reconciled* to God; but, to the contrary, many

statements of scripture and our own experience bear testimony that we were not reconciled to God by the death of Christ. It must be borne constantly in mind that by the death of Christ it is demonstrated that God was reconciled to us, but not sinners to God. The failure to remember this fact has led to much erroneous teaching and many foolish practices by many religious people. The effort by many preachers is to first get sinners reconciled to God and then hold them in agony ("repentance," they style it) until God can be influenced by prayers, tears, and agonizings to be reconciled to the sinners. God manifested his love to all sinners by giving his Son as a sacrifice to take away their sins, but God's providing this sacrifice did not blot out or forgive their sins until sinners accepted the sacrifice. God would save every sinner if the sinner would cease to be a sinner and accept the salvation. "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.) This statement positively shows that *only* those who *received* him, who *believed* on him, could become his children; and it also shows that some did not receive him.

Upon the other extreme, the passages quoted by Calvinists to prove that only those whom God has specially called can believe on or receive him are misapplied and misinterpreted. Heb. 9: 15 and Rom. 8: 29, 30 are the passages quoted and relied upon. "They that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal in-

heritance;" and "whom he foreordained, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified." What is stated in these two passages? "They that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance;" and a whom he foreordained, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified." He foreordained some, and these he called to eternal life. He called some, not all. Those that were called did receive the *promise* of eternal life.