



IN THIS ISSUE

[New Translation of the Old Testament](#)

[A Little Leaven,](#)

[Belfry or Benevolence,](#)

[The Mosaical Authorship of the Pentateuch,](#)

[The Scheme of Redemption in Preparation,](#)

[The World and the Christian,](#)

[Obedience to God,](#)

[The Case for Paul,](#)

[Why Men Refuse to Come to Jesus, No. 2,](#)

[The Lord's Supper — A Confession,](#)

[The Land Promise,](#)

[Apostasy,](#)

[Debate on Freemasonry,](#)

Pat Hardeman

Editorial

Bill J. Humble

Jim Sellers

Bryan Vinson

Homer Hailey

Paul Southern

Clinton D. Hamilton

Bonds Stocks

James R. Cope

Franklin T. Puckett

Basil Overton

Alpha and Omega

[CLICK HERE TO RETURN TO AUTHOR INDEX](#)

[CLICK HERE TO RETURN TO SUBJECT INDEX](#)

NEW TRANSLATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

PAT HARDEMAN

The Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament will be published in September of this year! The Revised Standard New Testament appeared in 1946, and has been widely used. Predictions indicate that the Old Testament version may be even more influential than the New.

The Value of Versions

The chief value of modern versions is, of course, their clarity to the modern mind. The beauty of the older translations, their dignity and solemnity, could hardly be excelled, but, it must be admitted, the language of three hundred years ago is frequently less clear than that used in the newer versions. It seems the part of wisdom, therefore, to study the newer versions for the purpose of clarity, if not for beauty of the language. I have often recommended that brethren buy the Revised Standard New Testament and study it in connection with older versions for greater understanding of the original text. Yet in the March Preceptor (page 20) I urged that brethren buy Oswald Allis' penetrating criticism of that version to guard against "concessions to liberalism, loose translations and other inaccuracies in the work." I believe, however, brethren can and should study the new version for the accuracy with which it renders many passages, e.g., 1 Peter 3:20, 21 (I think it is the best translation of this passage I have seen).

I wish to make a similar recommendation relative to the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament. It should be bought and studied because it will render the original of many passages with more clarity than ever before. It will also emphasize the poetic aspect of the Old Testament to a greater advantage than has been done heretofore. Yet, we must be on guard, brethren, against mistakes either in this version or in any other. So let me urge you to buy not only the new version but also the criticisms of it that will appear shortly after its publication.

A Special Appeal

The readers of the Preceptor have an opportunity now to show your appreciation for the kind of material the Preceptor has carried. Each of you will buy a copy of the Revised Standard Old Testament. Buy it from the Preceptor Book House and thus help in giving the paper a wider circulation. You may save souls by this help. This is a real opportunity, for the version is not being sold anywhere yet. But it will appear soon. Get your order in today. Thank you sincerely.



Published Monthly
at
Tampa, Florida
Entered as second class matter, December 5, 1951 at the Post Office,
Tampa, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1879.
SUBSCRIPTIONS
Two dollars per year in advance.
Make all checks or money orders payable to THE PRECEPTOR.
COMMUNICATIONS
Address all communications concerning subscriptions, changes of address,
or articles to THE PRECEPTOR, Temple Terrace Station, Tampa 4, Florida.
Address all orders for or inquiries regarding books and related matters
to Preceptor Book House, 742 Central Avenue, St. Petersburg, Florida.

EDITORIAL

A LITTLE LEAVEN

Though Paul's statement, "None of us liveth to himself, and none dieth to himself," referred to man's relation to God, the principle which it suggests is equally true of man's relationship to one another. No Christian is able to live unto himself, for it is axiomatic that every life exerts some influence on others. This influence is a blessing, a responsibility and a danger. It is a blessing because it radiates the

principles of Christianity, winning lost souls to the world's Redeemer, blessing them with salvation and the Christian with the realization that his life has become instrumental in converting another to Christ. It is a responsibility, since God demands that each Christian use his influence as a light the others, seeing his good works, may glorify the Father in heaven. Finally, influence is a danger; it can be used to deceive, degrade and destroy.

A deceitful and destructive influence in the Corinthian church was the occasion for Paul's quoting a proverbial statement, "Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?" (I Cor. 5:6). The leaven usually used by the Jewish housewife was a lump of old dough, well fermented, which was mixed into the new meal as it was prepared for baking. There are two important ideas which are connected metaphorically with leaven. The first is corruption; the leaven was thoroughly fermented before it became usable. The second is the ability of the leaven to communicate this corruption through an entire measure of meal. When a Christian departs so far from the Lord's standards that his influence becomes negative and destructive, his life exemplifies these two properties of leaven; his unrighteousness acts as a leaven to corrupt and to permeate the entire group with which he associates.

Leaven of Worldliness

The church in Corinth faced many serious problems, and worldliness was not the least important. Paul wrote, "It is actually reported that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not even among the Gentiles, that one of you hath his father's wife." Moral standards in Corinth were extremely low, for it was a wicked idolatrous city where the worship of Venus was connected with a shameful licentiousness; but even pagan Gentiles refused to condone the depths of degeneracy which went overlooked and unreprieved in the

church. A man had his father's wife, and the church had taken no action against him. The leavening influence of this man's sin is indicated by Paul's reproof to the church, "And ye are puffed up, and did not rather mourn, that he that had done this deed might be taken away from among you." Whether their inflated pride resulted from their condoning so grievous a sin or whether it was in spite of it, the fact still remains that the sin had already acted as a leaven to deaden their sense of values; they were puffed up with pride when they should have been grief stricken at the condition of the church. Paul's remedy was to deliver the guilty one to Satan, to "purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, even as ye are unleavened."

These incidents in Corinth teach three vital lessons: (1) life can act as a demoralizing and corrupting influence in an entire congregation; therefore (2) scriptural discipline is essential; so that (3) Christians may be a new lump, serving Christ "with be unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."

When Christian living ceases to be distinguishable from worldly living, the church has lost its reason for existing. There are few who doubt that worldliness is one of the greatest dangers facing the church in our day, and this enemy is doubly dangerous because it penetrates slowly, gradually, insidiously as leaven, corrupting one after another until it has affected the entire congregation.

Leaven of Traditionalism

When Christ warned his disciples to "take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees" (Matt. 16:6), they misunderstood the statement, supposing that he referred to bread. Christ rebuked them for this error and reminded them of the occasions when he had miraculously supplied bread to vast multitudes, after which they understood "that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees" (Matt. 16:12).

The basic error into which the Pharisees had fallen was that of traditionalism, and it was their "teaching" which Christ called "the leaven of the Pharisees." Instead of respecting the Word of God, they had added their traditions which were so numerous and so legalistic that they actually resulted in making void the Word of God. Therefore the Savior rebuked them, "And ye have made void the word of God because of your tradition. Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying, This people honoreth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrine the precepts of men" (Matt. 15:6-9).

Leaven of False Doctrine

Apparently many Jewish Christians failed to "beware of the leaven of the Pharisees," and

the problem of a divided allegiance resulted. For example, the Galatians were attempting to keep circumcision; and it became necessary for Paul to write, "if ye receive circumcision, Christ will profit you nothing. Yea, I testify again to every man that receiveth circumcision, that he is a debtor to do the whole law . . . A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump" (Gal. 5:1-9). The idea that a Christian was to keep circumcision was erroneous, but it was doubly dangerous because it would act as leaven to bring those Christians into complete bondage to the Judaism from which Christ had given them freedom.

An important danger which inheres in every false doctrine is its influence, for one false doctrine can become a breeding ground to produce many others. Observe how the leaven of instrumental music and societies worked within the Christian Church to permeate that entire denomination with a complete disregard for the authority of the New Testament. This leavening influence of false doctrine explains its danger to the church and shows why every error, whether instrumental music, premillennialism or any of the accumulated false doctrines of denominationalism, must be opposed with all the spiritual power at the church's command. To compromise on a single point is to expose a congregation to the danger of all.

Error is powerful in spite of its satanic character; and whether doctrinal or moral, it can act as a leavening influence to corrupt a congregation of God's people. It can, that is, unless its influence is stayed by righteous consecrated lives, by preaching which will not hesitate to contend earnestly for the faith, defining and condemning false doctrine and worldliness, and by elders who will endorse such preaching and administer discipline when it become necessary.

— Bill J. Humble

Restoration and Reaction

"Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for The **old paths**" — **Jer. 6:16**

BILL J. HUMBLE

BELFRY OR BENEVOLENCE

For many centuries the architecture of Roman Catholic buildings has been regarded as an essential and important part of their religion, but within recent decades even the Christian Church has succumbed to this temptation and is laying ever greater stress on their buildings. Such is not surprising; for when the digressives deserted the restoration plea, they found themselves without anchor and have drifted with increasing rapidity into the niche which Isaac Erret carved for them: another respected Protestant denomination. As a respected and fellowshipped sect among sects, they have adopted many if not most of the ideas common among Protestants, including the idea that one's house of worship should be a temple of beauty, expressive of one's religious vanity, and used for nearly every purpose—including worship on rare occasions.

Expressive Architecture

In nearly every issue of the Christian Standard the dedication of a new church building is reported, and one of those dedicated during the past year was the East Point Christian Church, Atlanta, Georgia. The Standard reported that the building contained, among other things, an assembly room suitable for Bible-school or youth activities, a stage, kitchen, dining room' and specially built sound chambers for the organ units. There is nothing particularly unusual about this building, nor was it costly as Christian Church buildings go, but in an interesting paragraph the Standard reported that the building was designed to express the plea of the Christian Church.

"Reporter for the congregation states that in the initial conference of the building committee with the architect, it was specified that the congregation wanted a style of architecture which would as nearly as possible express the message of the New Testament church. He was informed that light and simplicity were the predominant emphasis to be made. Plans, which were drawn and adopted by the congregation, were for an edifice of Georgian colonial architecture" (**Christian Standard**, April 28, 1951).

Their building was to be expressive of their religious plea. In some respects, at least, one must congratulate this Christian Church on a wonderful degree of success. Their adequate provisions for youth activities, stage, kitchen and dining room must express, no doubt, the plea that recreation is an essential and important part of the church's work and must be

provided for adequately. The Lord's money must be used to entertain; woe be unto that church which spends so much of its funds on preaching the gospel and helping the poor that nothing remains for the entertainment of its young people or the congregation's "fellowship dinners!" All recognize that this idea of the church's mission is now common to Catholics and Protestants alike and that adequate provisions are now made for dances, parties, dinners and even bars in their buildings.

And those specially designed rooms for the organ units! How well they "express" the plea of the Christian Church, their apostasy and their rejection of the authority of the New Testament. How much more effectively their organs and choirs imitate Catholicism than New Testament Christianity every student of the New Testament may readily judge.

"Light and simplicity" were to be the predominant features of the architecture of this Christian Church. Unfortunately one sees little of the simplicity of the New Testament worship in their provisions for robed choirs and organs or little of the simplicity of the church's mission in the emphasis placed on facilities for recreation and ,entertainment. The "light" of the glorious gospel of Christ will certainly have a hard time shining through the gloom of innovation and departure. If light is necessary to justify her missionary societies, her corrupted worship and her position as another respected Protestant denomination, the Christian Church will have to find a brighter firmament than the New Testament to accomplish this miracle. "Let there be light," we agree; but let it be the light of God's word. In short, the architecture of the Christian Church does express their religious position well; this we admit. What we deny is that one sees a meeting house of a New Testament church!

Our Present Progress

An article on the Christian Church's "expressive architecture" should do more than condemn them; it should serve as warning and lesson for us. If our buildings are expressive of our attitudes (and they are), we might profit by introspection, by expressing ourselves to ourselves as we express ourselves to others. **It would seem that our buildings at present express one idea above all, the idea of progress.** For this financial and physical progress we may commend ourselves, though with an accompanying warning that physical progress does not necessarily imply spiritual progress. The bridge "across the tracks" was in many cases a long one; but that bridge has been crossed and the results have been good. Not too many years ago the location of the church of Christ was usually in a poorer section of town and difficult to locate; the building was usually inadequate, and often uncomfortable, even poor, dirty and unmarked—as if the brethren were ashamed to own it. In most areas that period of our history has now passed; the little frame building has given way to a commodious structure, well kept and attractive, located on a prominent easily-found corner. Certainly if it is proper to own any building, it is proper to own one which is adequate, clean and attractive; hence our journey "across the tracks" is worthy of the highest praise. It opens new avenues of service, new opportunities for preaching the gospel of Christ.

The Swinging Pendulum

But if the architecture of the Christian Church is to sound a warning, what is that warning? Where may we profit by their mistakes? The answer is simple: **we may profit by recognizing that a pendulum once-set in motion rarely stops before reaching the opposite extreme.** In our buildings the pendulum is now swinging, swinging away from the poverty of the past and toward ..? Toward what? If left unchecked, it is swinging toward the extravagant imitation of Protestant cathedrals and sanctuaries! At present our buildings express progress, which is wholly commendable. The danger lies in the pendulum's continuing to swing until, ten or twenty years hence, our buildings may express the same pomp and grandeur which is characteristic of the denominations now.

The only possible way to avert such sinful extreme is to stop somewhere! This "stop sign" cannot be placed dogmatically at a building of certain size or cost, but it can be judged by certain considerations which ought to govern every building erected by our brethren. Certainly we cannot avoid an extreme if we do not recognize the purpose of buildings. Negatively, they are not hallowed sanctuaries where the presence of God is felt even though they are purchased with the Lord's money. Positively, they are meeting houses, where the saints may assemble in obedience to God's command and for the purpose of worship. Our authority for buildings lies in the command to assemble; for this commandment implies a place of assembly, whether it be the shade of a towering oak, the home of some Christian, a rented hall, or a building owned by the church. Prudence dictates that when a congregation numbers into the hundreds, it becomes a practical necessity for the congregation to own a building in which to conduct its services. Yet in our age, when the "building program" lies at the heart of the church budget, is the result of years of careful planning, and sometimes overshadows the sums spent for benevolence and preaching, it might come as a surprise to some to know that the first century church did not possess buildings. The Christian religion made its vital impact upon the world's civilization, the church was spread throughout the entire Roman world in a single generation, and millions of souls were saved—all without the benefit of church buildings. It was not until the reign of Emperor Alexander Severus (222-235) that houses of worship were first erected. (Newman, **Manual of Church History**, Vol. I, p. 162). Prior to that time the church had experienced the greatest period of growth in its history, all without the contemporary emphasis on meeting houses and building programs. When Paul began preaching in any city, it was his goal to build a church, not a building!

Since, then, the building is simply a place of assembly where the church comes together for worship and teaching the scripture, it is neither hallowed nor sacred. However, its use must be governed by the work of the church and circumscribed by those same bounds which circumscribe the divine mission of Christ's body. A congregation may erect a building to do whatever the church is authorized to do, functioning as the church. Such being true, it is no more in harmony with God's will to plan to erect part of the meeting home as a recreation hall for young people than it would be to argue that recreation is the divine mission of the

church. Yet it was recently reported in the weekly bulletin of a church whose building had burned, "Since the loss of our building by fire, social gatherings have been curtailed." Kitchens which have been provided for congregational socials or dinners are no more right than a church recreational hall or gymnasium, and the money spent for such a kitchen is an illustration of Christians' using the Lord's money for their own pleasure and not for the Lord's work. The banquet halls and recreation rooms which already appear in some of our buildings are an indication that the pendulum has already swung too far; the "stop sign" has already been ignored.

Rest rooms, class rooms and nurseries are in no way parallel to recreation halls and kitchens. They are planned and provided in connection with the church's assembly for worship. If the church building was never used for any purpose except the Lord's day morning assembly, rest rooms and nurseries would still be needed and used. This cannot be said of kitchens!

Testimony of a Modernist

One prominent Methodist writer, a rank modernist, has recently published a book, **A Firm Faith For Today**; but the faith produced by reading this volume would be rather infirm according to Biblical standards. One chapter is devoted to the church, in which the author emphasizes the changing ideas about the church's mission and work. He writes: "The actual architecture of a certain city church illustrates the change. When it was built seventy-five years ago, the prevalent form of religious education was to undergo the experience of conversion and then share in the class meetings. Architecturally, the religious educational plant of that church consisted of the sanctuary, the altar, and four large rooms, each capable of holding a class of one hundred or more persons. The program of the church consisted of revival services once a year, weekly class meetings, and Sunday-school classes which were distributed throughout the church. **That this setup—with all of its strong points—was inadequate is a simple historical fact.** (Emphasis mine, BJH) Changes were forced upon it because the church was growing weaker instead of stronger under its continued operation. Finally, over the years, these needed changes are articulating themselves in a new type of program which calls for a new type of building plan. One large room is a social hall for games, parties, motion pictures, and other forms of entertainment. Still another large room is being divided into a chapel, the social parlors, the library, and the waiting room of the church. The fourth large room is unchanged in size but a stage has been added for plays, pageants, and musical programs (Bosley, Harold A., **A Firm Faith For Today**, 126).

Recreation halls are needed because preaching is "inadequate," according to this rank modernist! No comment is necessary!

Extravagant and Lavish Buildings

There are few brethren who would deny that our buildings should be attractive, comfortable and adequate for the congregation's needs. Utility and simplicity have always been uppermost in our plans for buildings and should continue to be of greatest importance. A half century ago the "Akron Plan" was particularly popular for church buildings. The basic feature of this plan was an L-shaped building; the smaller wing was separated from the main auditorium by a movable partition and could be used for class rooms as well as for auditorium space. This plan is still in general use. But regardless of what may comport with the ideas of utility and simplicity, there are certain things which assuredly do not. Extravagant and expensive decorations serve only to gratify the flesh and not the spirit. Steeples, spires and stained glass windows may represent a great outlay of money, may be beautiful and perfectly in harmony with the aims and ideals of Roman Catholicism, but one wonders how they may be justified in a building erected by a New Testament church in which to conduct its services. No doubt it is difficult to build a large and expensive building for a large congregation without indulging in the extravagant and unnecessary; but it has been done and it must be done! Otherwise, how shall we account our stewardship to the Lord?

Yet a gospel preacher recently stated, quite seriously, "We need to give more attention to the ministry of church buildings." One wonders just what is included in this particular ministry. Could it have been this ministry of church buildings which Paul had in mind when he admonished, "Do the work of an evangelist. Fulfill thy ministry."

When a congregation spends the Lord's money lavishly and carelessly, there lies a danger to the church over and beyond the mere extravagance itself. This danger is that the congregation will be so burdened financially and saddled with debt that it will be unable to engage in full a program of preaching and benevolence. In other words the Lord's work suffers and souls are doomed, all for the sake of a meeting house which will be a "credit to the community" and "as nice as the 'other denominations' have!" It was recently reported that one congregation which boasts a multi-hundred-thousand dollar building program found itself unable to assist a young man who was a member of that church and in real need financially. One wonders how the Lord will view such statements as, "We couldn't, Lord, because the building fund took all the budget," when the events of Matthew 25 become realty.

Some will misunderstand these statements and accuse the writer of desiring to return to our location "across the tracks," but such an accusation is not true. This article does not condemn the progress we have made; rather it commends such progress. It is not a tirade against large and attractive church buildings; rather it is a warning against the lavish and extravagant, a warning lest we allow our buildings to shout to the world that we have joined them in placing a beautiful building ahead of preaching. When it is a choice between a beautiful \$25,000 spire and supporting several evangelists in destitute fields, the choice should be easy. **When the choice is between belfry and benevolence, between stained**

glass windows and winning lost souls, or between a cross and conversions, who but one devoted to ostentation and worldly pride could hesitate for a single moment?

The foxes had holes and the birds of the air had nests, but the Son of man had not where to lay his head. The apostles and other great preaches of the first century were men more acquainted with sacrifice and want than with luxury and ease. One wonders how the Lord would have felt in one of our modern "church plants" where beauty and luxury threaten to become the order of the day. A costly, lavish and extravagant temple was wholly in harmony with the Jewish system; recreation halls and dining rooms are completely consistent with Catholicism or Protestant denominationalism; but neither is in harmony with the spirit and goal of the New Testament Christianity for which we plead!

Revelation and Reason

"Come . . . let us reason together" — Isaiah 1:18

PAT HARDEMAN

The Mosaical Authorship of the Pentateuch

JIM SELLERS

(The author of the following article is a very young man, having graduated only this June from Florida Christian College. He is the kind of young Christian, and excellent gospel preacher, whom any teacher is happy to commend. His writing bespeaks his mature thinking,, and his life reflects glory to Christ. He is moving this month to Philadelphia, Pa., to work in that difficult field, and to do work at Westminster Seminary, with the ultimate goal of studying archeology at the University of Pa. God bless you, Jim.—P.H.)

The Jewish historian, Josephus, in speaking of the sacred books of the Jews says: "And of them five belong to Moses, which contain his laws and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death" (**Contra Apion**) is This was practically the universal view held by With Jews and Christians until within comparatively recent times when the baneful army of "Higher Critics" began their relentless efforts to destroy the Mosaical authorship of the Pentateuch. The simple statement that Moses wrote the Pentateuch based upon established historical fact and evidence carries more conviction to the unprejudiced mind than all the a priori conclusions that "critics" might concoct.

In order to establish the views of higher criticism, the books of the Old Testament and especially those of the Pentateuch were subjected to a divisive scheme that "discovered" the "original" sources or documents from which the redactor (the imaginary editor who combined the sources) produced the finished product. Following is some evidence offered for the non-Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

Alleged Post-Mosaical Authorship

Whenever a traditional view is rejected some acceptable alternative must be offered. Thus as men came to deny the Mosaical authorship they began to reason that the Pentateuch was not as heretofore had been supposed, a united work written by one man but Was a composite work with several authors. The contention that Moses had used certain old memoirs or documents was properly begun by Jean Astruc in 1753 when he issued his work on Genesis. Although Astruc held to the composite theory, he did not deny the Mosaical authorship of the Pentateuch but rather defended it. Before this time men like Carlstadt

(1480-1541, a contemporary of Luther), Julian the Apostate and probably Porphyry (born c. 232) either denied the Mosaic authorship or spoke disparagingly of it. Around 1800 a more complete abandonment of the traditional view is to be found in the writings of Alexander Geddes, Johann Vater and Wilhelm De Wette all of whom had also gone on to deny the essential historicity of the Pentateuch. However, the view which gained ground is Hupfeld's, and it may be correct to speak of him as the founder of the modern documentary hypothesis; that is, that the Pentateuch consists of four principal documents (the Jehovist, Elohist, Deuteronomy, Priestly which are usually designated by the initials J, E, D and P). This in turn prevailed in a reconstructed form as the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen hypothesis. Hence except for slight variations this theory of diverse documents has been most widely accepted among those who deny the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

Perhaps the question has been raised in our mind, why should men seek to discover documents underlying our Bible, to attribute their authorship to some one besides Moses, and, if such exist, upon what evidence can they be established? To answer the first we submit two observations made by Edward J. Young in his **Introduction to the Old Testament**: (1) The theory is essentially anti- super-naturalistic in character. It is an attempt to explain a divine revelation upon the basis of naturalistic principles, thus doing away with any intervention of God. (2) This system of reconstructing Israel's history is based upon Hegelian philosophy. Hence to give this philosophy, which is merely a development hypothesis, priority over the claims of the Scripture is to follow a subjective scheme of men.

If it could be proved that various writings are underlying the Old Testament, nothing would be lost if it were admitted also that Moses utilized these and was guided by inspiration so that no error could be made. But is there substantial evidence offered for the presence of such documents? Note these three basic arguments advanced: First, that different authors can be discovered by certain peculiarities of style and diction which each used; e.g., "P" uses "create," Genesis 1:1; "possession," Genesis 12:5; "land of Canaan" Genesis 16:3. Now these are supposed to be characteristic of "P" and indicate his individuality, but strangely enough they are used in those sections which admittedly do not belong to this particular writer; e.g., "create," Genesis 6:7 (a J passage) "possession," Genesis 14:11 (an unknown source) is Genesis 15:14 (a J passage); and "land of Canaan," Genesis 42, 44, 47, 50 (J and the documents). In face of conflicting evidence can such an argument be tenable?

Secondly, and probably the strongest argument for partitioning the Pentateuch into various documents, is the presence of "alleged doublets and parallel passages." But upon closer examination these are found to be questions of interpretation and "if exegesis be permitted to remain upon the throne, the documentary analysis will go by the board" (Edward J. Young, **Introduction to the Old Testament**, p. 152). Some could be considered: (1) The account of the creation found in Genesis 2:4bff is supposed to be a repetition of the same story found in the first chapter; hence these two accounts are attributed to different authors. (2) The same is said to be true of the narrative found in Genesis 12:14-20 in which

Abraham deceived Pharaoh concerning Sarah, his wife. When Isaac did the same thing in Genesis 26:6ff, it is claimed that this indicates a duplicate passage which would not have been recorded if just one person had been the author. Others could be given but these are sufficient to indicate the gist of the evidence offered from so-called parallel passages. No one would deny that the accounts are very similar and even in some respects identical, yet upon closer examination it is found that there are such great differences in details as to well illustrate the great subjectivity of the critic's exegesis.

The third reason offered against the Mosaical authorship is the presence of alleged discrepancies which are supposed to be the result of the work of different authors. If such mistakes exist, it would indeed be a strong argument in favor of the document theory. It is strangely mystifying how certain men can contend on the one hand that the Bible is a book of mistakes and contradictions caused by diverse authorship and yet claim that, now knowing all this, it has become more precious to their souls than ever before. Apparently, it wasn't very precious in the first place. But here are a few of these so-called discrepancies: (1) It is said that the order of creation in Genesis 1 is contradicted by that in Genesis 2. In the first chapter the vegetation is made before man but in the second chapter a reversal is supposed to appear, viz., man (vs 7) appears before the vegetable life (vs 9). However, it should be carefully noted that whereas the order of creation in Genesis 1 is chronological, in the second chapter such is not the case. (2) It is further argued that the great horde of Israelites, about 600,000 fighting men (Numbers 1:45, 46) which would probably amount to approximately 2½ million total population, could not possibly have come from the 70 sods that went down into Egypt. But though such an increase might be unusual it was not impossible for the Bible itself indicated the great fruitfulness of the Jews, Exodus 1:7. (3) It has been said that the Israelites who were a wandering, nomadic people could not conceivably observe the Sabbath in the wilderness and furthermore it was a rite borrowed from the Canaanites. Yet neither of these contentions is true for the children of Israel did observe the Sabbath in the wilderness near Sinai, Exodus 16, and also we note that such was not a Canaanite institution but was given to the Jews for the first time at Sinai (Nehemiah 9:13, 14).

Another line of reasoning which the critics have pursued is to select certain portions of the text and claim that it would have been impossible for Moses to have written them. These might be called the "post-Mosaica." For example, in Exodus 16:36 the explanation of the size of an omer is said to refer to a time when the value was unknown for an explanation would have been unnecessary during the age when the omer was widely used. However, it appears that the omer "was not a measure but a small cup, and it is perfectly understandable that Moses might have remarked upon the size of this cup when used to gather manna" (Edward J. Young, **Introduction to the Old Testament**, page 78). Again, Deuteronomy 1:1, "beyond the Jordan" supposedly emphasizes the idea that the writer was in Palestine and referred to "beyond the Jordan" in contradistinction to his location. Thus, they reason since Moses was not in Palestine he could not have been the author. Apparently, this phrase is not used to indicate mere direction, but in a more technical sense giving the name or geographical

location of a certain section of land. It would be the same today for one living on the east of Jordan to speak of himself as being in Transjordan. The mention of Agag in Numbers 24:7 has been called an anachronism, since Agag didn't reign until the days of Saul (1 Kings 15). However, in all probability, the name Agag designated a line of kings and was the general title used much like Pharaoh was used in reference to the rulers of Egypt.

Perhaps in no other field has the post-Mosaic theory met its greatest setback than in As conflicts with archaeology. Some critics have denied the antiquity of writing before 1000 B.C. and further contended that the presence of the "Mosaic Law" in the Pentateuch would not be pre-exilic because codified laws were unknown. But note what the spade of the archaeologist has unearthed. The Ras Shamra texts discovered in 1929 and dating from the 15th and 14th centuries B.C. would push the antiquity of writing much further back than had been admitted. The code of Hammurabi, found in 1901, goes back to the beginning of the second millennium B.C. Thus codified laws were known during the time and before the time of Moses.

Therefore, the voice of archaeology mingled with that of the text itself has helped to write **finis** to the "higher critical" view of the post-Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. But, at the same time, there are constructive arguments that can be offered in favor of the

Mosaic Authorship

It cannot be gainsaid that the strongest point in favor of a single author is the perfect symmetry and harmony of each book itself and of the Pentateuch as a whole. In spite of all the efforts being put forth to prove compositeness such cannot be done without destroying the internal unity. Furthermore the very best possible evidence can be advanced to prove Moses to be the human author.

The Claims of the Pentateuch. The events regarding Amalek were to be written in a book by Moses. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in the book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua: for I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven" (Exodus 17:14). Again we find, "And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord . . ." (Exodus 24:4) This was a record of the laws of Exodus 21-23. In the book of Leviticus, the words "the Lord spake (called or said) unto Moses" appear at least 30 times. In Numbers, we note that Moses wrote the account of the journeys of the children of Israel which would strongly indicate that he wrote the entire "Pentateuchal narrative." And Moses wrote their goings out according to their journeys by the commandment of the Lord" (Numbers 33:2). Finally, referring to the song of Deuteronomy 32, it is said, "And Moses wrote this song in that day, and he taught it to the children of Israel" (Deuteronomy 31:22).

The Testimony of Other Old Testament Books. The book of Joshua contains about as many references to Moses as all the other books of the Old Testament combined. There are

explicit references which designate Moses as the author of the law. Note: "the law which Moses my servant commanded" (1:7) and "written in the book of the law of Moses" (8:31). In Judges 3:4 we read "the commandments of the Lord which he commanded their fathers by the hand of Moses." References to the law of Moses are found in 1 Kings 2:3; 2 Kings 14:6; 21:8; Ezra 6:18 and Nehemiah 13:1. In the prophets reference is often made by merely speaking of the law, e.g., in Isaiah 1:10. Sometimes we read of the "law of Moses" as in Daniel 9:11ff and Malachi 4:4.

The Testimony of the New Testament Writers. The evident fact that Christ recognized the law as being written by Moses should be proof enough that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. In Matthew 19:7, 8, Jesus refers to the commandment Moses had given concerning divorce, found in Deuteronomy 24. In Mark 1:44, the leprous man was told, "show thyself to the priest and offer for thy cleansing those things which Moses commanded." This is found in Leviticus 14:3, 4. Paul in Romans 10: 19, using the term "Moses saith" quoted from Deuteronomy 32:21. Passages could be multiplied but space will not permit. However, it would not be amiss to add that while many will admit the Mosaic authorship of the last four books of the Pentateuch they contend that he did not write Genesis. In answer to this we mention a statement made by Jesus in Luke 24:27. "And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." Jesus Christ is the master teacher. His methods and reasoning are flawless. Hence to contend that he had a logical beginning assumes nothing. Since the scripture says that he began with Moses and all the prophets the conclusion follows that the **logical beginning** would be with the first prophecies found relating to Himself. These are found in Genesis 3:15; 12:3 etc. Since in the verse quoted we note that Jesus **began** at Moses we thus conclude that to begin with Moses is to begin with Genesis 3.

We have not touched the hem of the garment in presenting some of the material concerning the authorship of the Pentateuch, but perhaps enough has been said to cast a little light upon the problems posed by higher criticism, and its multiple absurdities.

Meditation and Edification

"And on his law doth he meditate day and night" — Psalm 1:2

BRYAN VINSON

THE SCHEME OF REDEMPTION IN PREPARATION

From the moment of the conception of a remedial system in the mind of Jehovah every phase of the evolvement and development of it was doubtless in the mind of the Almighty. With the statements of a prophetic character, successively enlarging on this intention, there was a cumulative body of information and evidence available to the interested portion of mankind. A highly desirable effect to be wrought was the creation of an attitude of expectancy with regard to the maturing of this avowed purpose. The God of Redemption is also the God of Providence; and, as redemption is the ultimate in the design of Him who doeth all things well, it is- worthy of acknowledgment that He would direct providence in a course subservient to the ends of redemption.

That Providence has subserved the designs of God toward man is an indisputable truth, and, perhaps, has been as graphically displayed in the life of Joseph, the son of Jacob, as in that of any other person in history. Certainly the seemingly insignificant events of his life, when considered apart from him personally, really assume great importance as links in the chain of divine providence in bringing to pass the predetermined purpose of God toward Israel, which was clearly discernible by Joseph after a series of occurrences in his life (Gen. 45:5). Equally true, and discernibly so, are those contributing factors developed in time which created those conditions in society so propitious for the advent of Christ. As much is suggested by Paul in his statement in Galatians 4:4 where he uses the expression

The Fullness of the Time

"But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Thus inspiration testifies that the Messiah came at exactly that time, or period in time, which God deemed altogether proper and propitious. But he came to redeem, and, since it was that point wherein time attained fulness with respect to the divine purpose we must conclude that all things were most favorable then for the accomplishment of that sought. Then, to say that Christ came to establish his kingdom, but altered his intention because of the obduracy of the Jews is to impeach the statement here made as to the fulness or ripeness of the time of his coming. A reasonable regard and casual concern for the conditions of society as they existed at the time Jesus came should confirm the truth of Paul's statement here. These conditions, when considered in connection with the coming of Jesus

as the Savior of men, naturally require the answer to two questions: first, did mankind need a savior?; and, second, were there those conditions prevailing which would facilitate the dissemination of "the grace of God which brings salvation?" Each of these requires an affirmative answer if we are to accept the force of this expression regarding the timeliness of the Messiah's advent.

It should be observed in considering the first of these questions that man had been in need of a savior through all the centuries from the time of his expulsion from the garden of Eden. However, an awareness of this need had not always prevailed for a lack of a sufficient sense of guilt, and an accompanying recognition of his own inability to save himself. Time, involving four thousand years, was required to teach this much needed lesson to the sons and daughters of men. While mankind, for the greater part, was left to his own devisings as he sought to "work out his own salvation"; nevertheless, God through all this time was maintaining a connection and relation with individuals and, finally, a nation through whom the world should become increasingly educated relative to the omnipotence of God on the one hand, and their own utter impotency on the other. The continuation of moral decline, descending to the plane of bestiality, is noted by Paul in Romans 1. Professing themselves to be wise they became fools, and in the progression of selfhood they declined to entertain a knowledge of the true God. Jehovah, however, did not view as excusable this ignorance of His existence and power; for the invisible things of God—eternal power and Godhead—are to be clearly seen from the creation, being understood by the things which are made. They, consequently, were given up to their vain imaginations and allowed to work all manner of uncleanness in the exercise of vile affections. The Jews were likewise brought under the same sweeping and severe indictment of sin by the apostle in the second and third chapters of Romans. No one can read these first chapters of Romans without perceiving the all-embracing sovereignty of sin and the depths of debauchery to which it had brought the human family.

Thus is to be observed the indisputable need which existed for a Savior to deliver man from sin. Arising, however, with such a recognition of need for salvation is the additional question of whether there was in the possession of man the means and capacity to effect his own deliverance from sin. To this problem a great deal of attention is directed in showing conclusively that there existed no law which could give life—even the law of Moses was unworthy and incapable of securing such an end. "For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." Hence, in the fulness of time God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law that we might receive the adoption of sons. Not only was the law unable to deliver us from sin, but consequently and correspondingly, was it unable to establish a satisfying relation to God as His children.

The second question mentioned above—that is, was mankind in that state or condition

which would afford a favorable dissemination of the gospel involving those conditions bearing on communication of thought from one segment of society to another. The grace of God, we are told, that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men TEACHING US—Christianity is a system—a system of teaching—and its existence and progress is dependent on teaching. Paul left Timothy in Ephesus that he might charge some that they should teach no other doctrine than that which they had received from the apostle. Men are going to be taught something and if they do not receive the truth they will imbibe error. The apostasy resulted from a distaste for the truth and an infatuation for unsound teaching; the greatest peril before the people of God at this hour is the same lack of devotion to, and hunger for, the truth. To teach is to impart ideas, and ideas are clothed in words; and, to learn is to receive ideas or thoughts as embodied in and identified with facts and related truths. Properly speaking, there can be no teaching where there is no learning, and language is the medium of contact between the teacher and the one who is to be taught, and, hence, to learn. Words and ideas are inseparable, the former being the embodiment of the latter.

From this it is readily apparent that the facility with which the gospel was to be proclaimed to all men sustained a vital dependency on the language to be employed. While true that in the infancy of the church the gift of tongues was generously bestowed on and employed by the original proclaimers, yet in the overall evangelization of the world the need for a widely-existing language of prevailing influence was obvious. Too, a language that would be such as to stereotype the heavenly message of redemption was a necessity in order to afford future generations proper assurance respecting the integrity and credibility of this message. In the Greek language at the time of Christ were these demands met.

The political state of human society under the Roman government with the prevailing peace at the time of the Messiah's advent is another advantage contributing to the spread of the truth, as well as the commercial intercourse in the then known world. All of these factors are worthy of a more elaborate notice, but we pass them with this bare mention of them with whatever value of a suggestive nature they may possess.

Preparation Through Teaching

"In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent ye for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight" (Matt. 3:1-3). Here is introduced to us the first prophet sent by God after a silence of four hundred years. He came as the harbinger, or forerunner of Christ. His mission is here defined in a citation from Isaiah, as one of preparation. There was pending a great transition and his objective was that of preparing the people for it that they might be responsive to it, His message was preeminently one of repentance; but whenever and wherever repentance is enjoined sin exists, and certainly the Jews for this reason were in need of repentance. But this appeal to repent had affixed to it as the necessity for it is and

the motive, the approaching kingdom. In other words, the transcendently superior and glorious character of this kingdom entailed a pronounced reformation of those who were to be admitted into it. The principles that should give character to it were of the most elevated kind, and such as the doctors of the law and the philosophers of this world had never perceived. These principles as enunciated by Jesus on the mount give an insight to the pronounced degree of reformation so courageously preached by the Baptist.

His preaching, as well as that of Jesus and His disciples in this period of preparation was confined to the Jews. Among the several reasons which may well be recognized in support of the wisdom of this restriction, there may be noted a few. The law having been given to the Jews to bring them to Christ, they were the ones to whom he should make known his person and mission. The Jews had largely departed from the law of Moses through an attachment for the traditions of their fathers, while still avowing a loyalty and devotion to him. In this respect they largely foreshadowed the condition of the religious communities today, who while professing fealty to Christ, are governed by the traditions of their fathers. Since, however, the law was their tutor to bring them to Christ it was necessary to teach them anew the law as it pertained to the coming Christ. This, then, was a needed work and such as only could be effectively directed toward those to whom the law had been given. The advantages, Paul tells us, which were to the Jews were many and great—but chiefly there had been committed to them the oracles of God. These oracles set forth the purposes of God respecting a Redeemer, and the principles of the New Covenant, which were to be the instrumentalities through which this redemption was accomplished, needed to be taught the people preparatory to their reception of them.

No other prophet before John was greater than he, and his work was of the character that merited his being referred to as coming in the spirit and power of Elijah. The Old Testament closes with the promise of his coming—"Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord; and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse" (Mal. 4:5-6). There can be no misunderstanding as to whom this refers since Jesus applies this to John (Matt. 17:12-13; also Luke 16-17).

Prophetically described and historically recorded, we find that his ministry was to exert a most salutary influence on the society of the Jews in condemning sin, even in high places; to turn fathers and children to each other; and, in so doing, to pull down the hills and fill in the valleys thereby making ready a people for the coming of the Lord. In such a work he made straight the paths of the Lord. With the imprisonment of John, Jesus began where he had left off, and with His disciples preached the approaching kingdom—as at hand—and the need of repentance in view thereof.

Not only in this preparatory effort was personal reformation in the lives of the Jews severely enjoined, but, also, the characteristics of the kingdom to be established sought to

be impressed upon them—especially the disciples of Jesus. A few statements of Jesus with respect thereto might well be noticed in the concluding section of this article.

Statements Descriptive of the Kingdom

In Luke 17:20 the Lord said "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation." There are some thoughts suggested by this statement worthy of reflection. At the time this statement was made the kingdom had not been established, and so far as the expression is descriptive of the state of affairs at the time the Savior here spoke, it would have to do with the distinguishing character of this kingdom as contrasted with the kingdoms of this earth. The word of God being the seed of the kingdom, it follows that as the word was preached and, consequently, infused itself into the hearts and lives of those who embraced it the kingdom was possessed in its inceptive state by them. Jesus further says in this same connection that the kingdom of God is within you, or, as the marginal reading suggests, among you. The word of God was to be implanted in the heart, and taking seizure of it, to work outward in reforming the life. The depiction the Savior gave of the scribes and Pharisees in likening them to whited sepulchers which appeared beautiful outwardly but within were full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness is the very opposite of the conception of the character to be possessed by those in We kingdom. The power of the truth was to be felt inwardly, internally, and to exert a quiet and efficacious influence on men by an affectionate and rational appeal to them.

The kingdom was thus to make its progress first and last, by bringing the weight of its strength to bear on the individual. There was then no mass movement, nor should there be now. All such efforts can but result in the creation of an ecclesiasticism; and the power of all ecclesiastic orders is external rather than internal with respect to the individual. In this consideration is to be found an appreciation of the wisdom of the Lord in founding His kingdom on the basic concept of individual responsibility, and in directing the activities of His church in the channels of individual and congregational effort. To modify the form of organization of this kingdom is, eventually, to corrupt the character of it. The power, simplicity and directness of the truth of the gospel in appealing for and securing enlistments in the service of the King has always been the way of progress and victory. Freedom from all outward display of power and ostentatious parading is a need of this hour when too much confidence is being evidenced in numbers and fine buildings as we vie with denominations for the world's admiration and approval.

As Jesus taught the disciples by parable of the coming kingdom, we shall in the next article note some of them.

Interpretation and Application

"Every scripture inspired of God is profitable" — 2 Tim. 3:16

HOMER HAILEY

THE WORLD AND THE CHRISTIAN

In the book of Revelation there is described in symbolic picture a woman sitting upon a scarlet-colored beast, designated as "the great harlot." She is described as having been arrayed in purple and scarlet, and decked with gold and precious stone and pearls; while in her hand there was a golden cup full of abominations, even the unclean things of her fornication. She is further described as being "drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus."

There is no doubt that as the people to whom John wrote read the message the harlot represented worldly Rome: sustained by her imperial government, and supported by "the peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues.,, Through the past few centuries she has been, to many, the symbol of papal Rome—the Roman Catholic Church—in all of her wealth, outward splendor, and inward corruption. But is the harlot the symbol of religious power and opposition? It seems to me that the beast which (mine up out of the earth, having two horns "like unto a lamb," but who spoke as a dragon, more nearly represents false religions. The likeness of a lamb suggests an imitation of Christ and of sacrifice, while the voice as a dragon is that of falsehood. (The dragon is the devil, Revelation 12:9; and the voice of the devil is that of falsehood, the lie, John 8:44). Further the beast from out of the earth is later described as "the false prophet" (16:13; 19:20), hence, the symbol of all false religions and religious teaching.

If this be correct, that the earth beast represents false religions, then the harlot would not likely represent one of the false religions. This would mean she symbolizes some other enemy of the Lord's people. To me, she more perfectly symbolizes the world—worldliness—with all of its seductive, enticing, and alluring powers which gratify lust. A comparison of her description (chs. 17, 18) with that of ancient Babylon (Is. 13-14; 47:8-15; Jer. 50-51) and ancient Tyre (Ezek. 26-28) seems to carry out this same idea. I recognize that no one can afford to be dogmatic when dealing with the symbols and symbolic teaching of the Revelation, therefore I offer this only as a suggestion. But when studied carefully, it appears that as a symbol of the world and its lusts and seductive powers, she more nearly fits in the general picture than as a religious symbol

At any rate, it is clear from observation of present trends that the most dangerous enemy of the church today is the world, as it seeks to entice the children of God to come and

commit fornication with her. And the tragedy of the story is, that as the daughters of Moab, encouraged by the suggestion of Balaam, so today, through false conceptions of the character of God and exceeding sinfulness of sin, many are yielding to the wiles of modern day daughters of Moab, and committing spiritual adultery with the world.

The World

When the Bible speaks of "the world," it speaks not of the beautiful earth God created and which belongs to Him, nor does it have in mind the good things which God has given us richly to enjoy. But it refers to a spiritual realm, a realm over against the kingdom of God, and antagonistic to it. Writing of the Christian's warfare the apostle said, "For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places" (Eph. 6:12). This clearly indicates that it is a spiritual realm, controlled by spiritual powers, and involving spiritual conflict.

Christ and the Bible writers speak of "the god of this world" who blinds the mind and keeps it in darkness (2 Cor 4:4). They speak of "the prince of this world" who was then being judged (Jn. 12:31; 16:11), and who had nothing in common with Jesus Christ (Jn. 14:30); of the "rulers of this world" who were coming to naught, and who knew not the Christ nor His mission (1 Cor. 2:6, 8); of "the sons of this world" (Lk. 16:8), and of their wisdom, which wisdom was foolishness with God (1 Cor. 1:20; 2:6; 2:18) is of "the fashion of this world" which fashion passes away (Rom. 12:2; 1 Cor. 7:31) is and of the "care" of this world, which robs the Christian of fruit bearing, and God of fruit rightfully His (Matt. 13:22).

Over against this array of spiritual powers and characters of the world, the Bible reveals God as "the Father of lights" (Jas. 1:17), who, Himself, is light (1 Jn. 1:5). It reveals Jesus as "the Prince of life" (Acts 3:16), exalted by God to His own right hand, "a Prince and a Saviour" (Acts 5:31). Over against the "rulers of this world" and its darkness, there are "principalities and powers" in God's own heavenlies (Eph. 3:10), with judges, wise counsels, and rulers in the kingdom of God is Matt. 19:28; 1 Cor. 12:28; Heb. 13:17). There are "the sons of light" (Lk. 16:8), a "wisdom from above" by which God's sons are to live (Jas. 3:17), and a "fashion" not according to the life of lust, but after the holiness of God (1 Pet. 1:14) is and instead of cares, there is a "peace which passeth understanding" (Phil. 4:7). These two groups are antagonistic, incompatible, diametrically opposed one to the other, and with no middle ground on which they can peacefully meet.

Worldliness

As "godliness" sums up the spirit and conduct of the man in Christ, so "worldliness" sums up the spirit and behavior of the men of the world. Paul wrote to the Ephesians of

having been made alive, though they had been dead through trespasses and sins, "wherein ye once walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the powers of the air, of the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience; among whom we also all once lived in the lusts of our flesh, doing the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest" (Eph. 2:1-3). This presents an excellent explanation of what "worldliness" is: it is a manner of conduct, a walk, "according to the course of this world," patterned after the world. It is a manner of behaviour in accord with the standard of Satan, the prince of the powers of the air. It is a manner of conduct demonstrating the same spirit that works in the sons of disobedience. It is a life lived after the lust of the flesh, doing the desires of the flesh and of the mind, rather than after the Spirit and teaching of Jesus Christ, doing the desires of the Holy Spirit.

John establishes further the meaning of "the world" and "worldliness" when he wrote, "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the vainglory of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world" (1 Jn. 2:15-16). A worldly person is one who seeks the things which gratify these lusts rather than seeking "the things which are above, where Christ is" (Col. 3:1-4).

Peter throws additional light on the subject when he wrote of the precious and exceeding great promises of God, saying, "that through these ye may become partakers of the divine nature, having escaped from the corruption that is in the world by lust" (2 Pet. 1:3-4). Corruption is in the world; it is in the world by lust. A worldly person is one who unlawfully gratifies his lusts simply for lust's sake. He is one who lives according to the course of this world, after the ways of the prince of the world, after the spirit that works in the children of the world. He is one who, by thus indulging his lusts, corrupts his spiritual and moral life from the simplicity and purity which is in Christ (2 Cor. 11:3).

Over against these is the Christian, who, as a partaker of the divine nature, shows forth the excellencies of God who called him. He is one who crucifies the flesh with the lusts and the passions thereof (Gal. 5:24). There is no compatibility between the two.

One is not "worldly" simply because of the surroundings in which he must work or live; nor is one "spiritual" merely because he attends services on Lord's day and maintains a refined air about himself. Adam and Eve were worldly in the garden of Eden, surrounded by every good provided by God. Daniel was "unworldly" in the midst of all the pomp and corruption of Babylon and the court of at least three different Babylonian kings. In the minds of too many persons, the idea of worldliness is expressed only in card-playing, drinking, dancing and such like. While it is true that these are practices of the world, and when engaged in by Christians express a spirit of worldliness, there are others more subtle but equally as destructive to the spiritual quality of Christian character. A few of these are here suggested.

Expressions of Worldliness

Pride. Pride is that spirit of conceit and arrogance that exalts self and self-achievement to a place that overshadows or sets at naught God and His providence in the life of the individual. It boasts a self-righteousness in which the individual trusts, while setting all others at naught, as manifested by the Pharisee at prayer (Lk. 18:9-14). It deceives the heart as it encourages a false sense of security, trusting in economic and physical advantages which overlooks the fact that God governs the universe, and that the destiny of all is in His hand, as demonstrated by the Edomites (Ob. 3, 4). It leads to boasting of self-achievements, glorying in what the individual has accomplished and in what "we are doing," while forgetting that in all things God exalts and God abases. This spirit is reflected in Nebuchadnezzar and his boast, but whom God rebuked (Dan. 4:28-30).

The trend of the age toward magnificent and expensive meeting-houses may or may not be an expression of pride. Only God can be the true judge in such matters. But when they are erected to gratify a sensual ambition, or to "out-do the denominations," or to "make an impression upon the people whom we are trying to reach," it is evident that the spirit "According to the course of this world, of the prince of the powers of the air, and of the spirit that worketh in the sons of disobedience" has taken over. The disposition is then one of worldliness.

Another expression of pride being manifested today is in parading academic achievements while advertising the gospel. What prompts men to announce and introduce preachers as "Doctor" Preacher? Such titles add nothing to the power of the preaching, nor tell anything of the preacher's knowledge of the word of God. They only parade the fact that he has achieved the worldly distinction of possessing a degree from a worldly institution. If any motive other than pride so prompts this type of advertising, I should be grateful for enlightenment as to what it is.

Boasting of achievement is another expression of pride. One of the most impressive teachings of the Bible is that of the place given God in the thinking and accomplishments of those early Christians. When reporting of the work done in new fields, it was not what "we have done," but "what God had done with them" (Acts 14:27). The power was not of themselves, but it was "God who worketh in you" (Phil. 2:14). When considering possibilities for achieving objectives, it was God "that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us" (Eph. 3:20). When comforted, it was God, "the God of all comfort, who comforteth us in all our affliction" (2 Cor. 1:3, 4). When considering contributions to the poor, or to any work of benevolence, it was God who was able to make all grace abound, enabling them to give and to do (2 Cor. 9:8-11). In the battle against sin and death, it was "Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. 15 My. And so on and on one might go. Always, it was God!

This is the spirit of humility commended by Jesus. Pride is the opposite. Pride manifests itself today when individuals or congregations plan without God, who build to any end other than that of the glory of God; men who, when they have worked, boast of "our program," and of what "we have done." As congregations grow numerically and financially strong there is a tendency to exalt self, leaving God out. When worldly glory and achievement are attained, the tendency is to forget God in the glory of personal greatness. The spirit is inspired by lust, and when gratified, "the corruptions which are in the world by lust" have begun to set in.

Popularity. Another expression of worldliness, which goes hand in hand with pride, is the disposition and desire to be popular. A bid for popularity by individuals or by congregations under the leadership of worldly-minded preachers or elders is but an expression of the worldliness defined above. It is said of the Jerusalem church that they continued in certain things, "praising God, and having favor with all the people" (Acts 2:47). By the definiteness of its message, its good works, and the holy conduct of its members, a congregation may have favor of the same kind, and yet not be popular. Its favor will be in the form of respect, recognition of its good, and approval because the people must admit that it is right. But nowhere is it said that the church was ever popular with the world or with the people of the world.

Too often the bid for popularity begins with individuals who seek business advantages. Competition in business today is keen. Worldly minded business men, whose concern for the dollar is greater than their concern for the integrity of the church and for the glory of God, scruple not at compromising the purity and aggression of the church for popularity with the world. Also, ambitious men who seek places in politics or civil offices are conscious of the fact that the stronger the church and its stand for Christ and His teaching, the greater will be the opposition to them if they are holding equally strong for these principles.

Then, too, there are those whose lodge relationships tend to weaken their firmness for -scriptural "peculiarity." Fraternizing with lodge-brothers who are infidels, members of denominations, or nothing at all, tends toward the desire to make the church more popular by compromise and a different type preaching from that demanded of Scripture. As a member of the body, such an individual contributes his influence toward the desire that the church be more popular and not so rigid.

These are a few of the straws in the wind, telling us which way it is blowing. Yielding to pride, courting popularity, and practices of a kindred nature are clandestine flirtations with the world, which ultimately lead to spiritual adultery and the corruption by lust of the purity of the church. But more on this same theme next time.

Doctrine and Dogma

"But speak thou the things which become sound doctrine" — Titus 2:1

EUGENE W. CLEVINGER

OBEDIENCE TO GOD

PAUL SOUTHERN

(Note: The following article by Paul Southern of Abilene Christian College is presented to the readers of this column with our commendations of its worth. E.W.C.)

The subject of obedience is an important theme which should engage the thought of every responsible person. Rebellion against constituted authority seems to be a trait inherent with mankind. On every hand we witness infractions of constitutional, statutory, and social laws. Hence, it is not surprising to find persons who transgress the laws of God.

The Bible contains some very definite commands relating to man and his obedience to divine authority. In fact, it teaches that salvation from sin in this world, and eternal happiness in the world to come depend upon man's obedience to God.

In the Bible the word obedience is used most often in the sense of subjection to the will of God—i.e., faithfully doing his commandments. Many things are done in the modern religious world under the guise of obedience. There are many admixtures with vain wisdom and philosophy. There are many deviations and substitutes. With an open Bible and an honest heart, let us examine the subject to see just what obedience to God means.

The Negative Approach

We approach the subject first from a negative standpoint. Harkening to the voice of Satan certainly is not obedience to God. Adam and Eve listened to Satanic perversions and were banished from the garden of Eden. "And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat; and she gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat" (Gen. 3:4-6). Immediately their eyes were opened and they began to feel their guilt and shame. And since sin seeks concealment, they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons, and then tried to hide from God amongst the trees of the garden (Gen. 3:7, 8).

Obedience to God does not mean simply listening to the voice of the people. King Saul was once commanded to destroy the Amalekites, including Agag the king, "both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass" (1 Sam. 15:3). But Saul kept Agag alive, and the choice sheep and oxen. He tried to excuse himself on the ground that the people demanded it. Samuel said unto him: "Because thou hast rejected the word of Jehovah, he hath also rejected thee Rom being king" (1 Sam. 15:23).

But Saul insisted that the people saved the chief of the devoted things to sacrifice unto Jehovah God. At this point Samuel reminded Saul that obedience to God means more than mere sacrifice. "Hath Jehovah as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of Jehovah? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft and stubbornness is as idolatry and teraphim" (1 Sam. 15:21-23).

Paul teaches that the same principle applies to New Testament work and worship. "And if I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and if I give my body to be burned, but have not love, it profiteth me nothing" (1 Cor. 13:3). Furthermore, no man loves the Lord unless he is submissive to the divine will, for "If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments" (Jno. 14:15).

A wicked falsehood has come down through the ages. The ancients had a proverb: "Vox populi, vox Dei," i.e., 11 the voice of the people (is) the voice of God." There is not a word of truth in the statement. The voice of the people built the golden calf at the foot of Mount Sinai. While Moses was in the mount receiving the tables of stone, "the people gathered themselves together unto Aaron, and said unto him, Up, make us gods which shall go before us." From their jewelry a calf was fashioned, and before it an altar was built. "And they rose up early on the morrow, and offered burnt-offerings, and brought peace-offerings; and the people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play" (Ex. 32:1-6). Thus the voice of the people was diametrically opposed to the voice of Jehovah.

In like manner the voice of the people crucified the Son of God. Pilate asked the question: "What then shall I do unto Jesus who is called Christ?" The multitudes replied, "Let him be crucified" (Matt. 27:22). The voice of the people has given America the damnable liquor traffic, the evils of divorce, and the wicked devices of gambling. Yea, more; the voice of the people has given some cities in the United States their "red light" districts, where men and women barter their souls for a mess of licentious pottage. In view of these facts, we are forced to admit that the multitude is usually wrong. God is right and cannot be wrong; hence we must submit to his authority.

Following one's conscience is not necessarily obeying God. Conscience is a creature of education, and serves as a judge instead of a guide. At one time Paul persecuted the church by "breathing threatening and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord," that he might bring

them bound to Jerusalem (Acts 9:1-2). In this persecution he was conscientious, for we hear him say: "Brethren, I have lived before God in all good conscience until this day" (Acts 23:1). And again; "Herein I also exercise my self to have a conscience void of offence toward God and men always" (Acts 24:16). Unfortunately, Paul's conscience was directly opposed to the will of God. The mother of Xerxes sacrificed one hundred slaves upon the altar every time her son won a victory in battle. In this cruel activity she obeyed her conscience, but no sane person would affirm that she obeyed Almighty God.

It should also be observed that obedience is more than a mere calling on the name of the Lord. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 7:21). In their pain and anguish many troubled souls will say in that last great day: "Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name, and by thy name cast out demons, and by thy name do many mighty works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: Depart from me, ye that work iniquity" (Matt. 7:22, 23).

Following one's feelings is not obedience to God. "There is a way which seemeth right unto a man; But the end thereof are the ways of death" (Prov. 14:12). Paul said: "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. And this I also did in Jerusalem: And I both shut up many of the saints in prisons, having received authority from the chief priests, and when they were put to death I gave nay voice against them" (Acts 26:9, 10). No intelligent person can question that Paul did wrong in following his feelings. It is dangerous for anyone to depend upon his feelings in religious matters. Jeremiah said: "O Jehovah, I know that the way of man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps" (Jer. 10:23).

The Positive Approach

Thus we have observed that the grace of God with respect to salvation has been abused by theological perversions. We are aware of the fact that after all is said and done we are sinners saved by grace. No man merits salvation on the strength of his own goodness alone. But there are certain conditions that must be met before we become the recipients of divine grace. The same grace that sacrificed Jesus on Calvary's cross for the sins of the world also stipulates certain conditions as prerequisites to salvation. "The grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men, instructing us, to the intent that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly and righteously and godly in this present world" (Titus 2:11-14).

In His message to this generation God says that obedience to the gospel stands between the alien sinner and salvation. "But thanks be to God, that, whereas ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered; and being made free from sin, ye became servants of righteousness" (Rom. 6:17, 18).

Obedience to God evidently involves doing the will of God. Jesus said: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven" (Matt. 7:21). When the apostles were forbidden to preach in the name of Jesus they said: "We must obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29).

Obedience in the New Testament sense means hearkening to the voice of truth. "Sanctify them in the truth: thy word is truth" (Jno. 17:17). Peter said: "Seeing 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).

In a study of obedience to God it should be remembered that Jesus is the spokesman to this age "God having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son" (Heb. 1:1, 2). God declared the authority of Christ to this dispensation when he said: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him" (Matt. 17:5). We do not look to Moses or Elijah for the plan of salvation to day, but to the Lord Jesus Christ and His Spirit-guided apostles.

In his second sermon Peter quoted from Moses the following statement: "A prophet shall the Lord God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me; to him shall ye hearken in all things whatsoever he shall speak unto you. And it shall be, that every soul that shall not hearken to that prophet, shall be utterly destroyed from among the people" (Acts 3:22, 23). Therefore, we must look "unto Jesus the author and perfecter of our faith" (Heb. 12:2). The attitude of the penitent should be, "Lord is what wilt thou have me to do?" (Acts 9 1). In answer to the question, Jesus says to all the world, "keep my commandments." We are thankful that his commandments are not grievous, for they are lined with love and filled with sympathy, Therefore, let every soul who has not obeyed the gospel ponder well the following statements of Holy Writ.

Plan of Salvation

In the first place, obedience involves faith. Without faith it is impossible to please God, (Heb. 11:6). One must believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, (Acts 16:31) for "except ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins" (Jno. 8: 24). But the faith that saves must be coupled with obedience. "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith working through love" (Gal. 5:6). "And the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem exceedingly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith" (Acts 6:7). The church in Jerusalem increased in direct ratio to the number of persons who obeyed the gospel.

On Pentecost obedience to the word saved about 3,000 Jews from their sins and the Lord

added to the church daily such as were being saved (Acts 2:37-47). With faith in their hearts toward Jesus Christ, they cried out and said: "Brethren, what shall we do?" Peter answered: "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." Thus he bound repentance with faith and baptism as a condition of pardon. In this way he echoed the mind of the Master who said "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem" (Lk. 24:47).

But before penitent believers were baptized in New Testament times, they professed their faith in Christ. From Paul we learn that "with the heart man believes unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation" (Rom. 10:10). He further says that God highly exalted Jesus, "and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father" (Phil. 2:9-11).

Such a penitent believer who has confessed his faith in Christ goes down into the waters of baptism fully prepared to put off the old man and put on the new. "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). We know that baptism is essential, for Jesus said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mk. 16:16). "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ" (Gal. 3:27).

On man's part, sanctification is a matter of faithful obedience to God's word. When Paul preached in Corinth on his second missionary tour, "many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized" (Acts 18:8). Later the apostle wrote them two letters, and addressed them as "sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints" (1 Cor. 1:2).

Every blessing promised to man is predicated upon obedience to God. No responsible person can be saved without obedience. "Unto them that are factious, and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, shall be wrath and indignation" (Rom. 2:8). On the other hand, God will bless those who keep his commandments. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city" (Rev. 22:14).

CHRISTIANITY and CATHOLICISM

"For the mystery of lawlessness doth already work" — II Thess. 2:7

CLINTON D. HAMILTON

THE CASE FOR PAUL

Different lines of reasoning are used by Catholic authors in presenting their claims for the supremacy of the apostle Peter. One line of reasoning is that employed by James Cardinal Gibbons in his **The Faith of Our Fathers**. Cardinal Gibbons argues for the primacy of Peter because the "Gospels" and Acts give him prominence above the other apostles and leaders in the church.

Peters Alleged Supremacy

Under the heading, "**Exercise of the Primacy**," Gibbons gives a number of instances which he believes prove his contention (**The Faith of Our Fathers**, pp. 83-88). They are as follows. (1) In the first twelve chapters of Acts Peter stands above all the others because of his prominent part in the ministerial work. (2) Peter's name is first in the list of the apostles with Judas Iscariot being last. Peter is called by Matthew "**the first apostle**." (3) Peter performed the first miracle after the church began. (4) The first sermon preached after the establishment of the church was Peter's. (5) Peter was the first one to preach to the Gentile people. (6) Peter took the lead and did all the speaking on the occasion of choosing Matthias as the successor of Judas. (7) The first speech recorded at the Jerusalem conference was that of Peter and after he spoke the multitude held their peace. (8) James and the OTHERS agreed with Peter's statement without a dissenting voice. (9) When James and Peter were imprisoned, the church offered up prayers for Peter because, says Gibbons, the church "cannot yet spare the commander-in-chief." Gibbons concludes saying, "Does not this incident eloquently proclaim Peter's superior authority? In fact Peter figures so conspicuously in every page that his Primacy is not only admissible, but is forced on the judgment of the impartial reader" (**ibid.**, 85).

And so it is that some Catholic writers argue for the complete supremacy of Peter in his relationship to all the other apostles. This reasoning might at first seem plausible but under investigation it fails in its purpose. That this may be shown let us turn to an

Examination of Catholic Claims

Prominence does not prove superiority in authority. In Matthew 10 Peter is listed as first

but the assertion that this expression means **first in authority** is without foundation in fact. In the listing of the apostles, Matthew puts Peter's name first which may give him prominence but the contention that it refers to authority is baseless by context and concurrence of scriptural usage. Peter does take a prominent part in the work of the church in the first twelve chapters of Acts but on this ground Paul is superior as he holds undisputed prominence in the last fifteen chapters.

Peter accompanied by John went into the temple in Jerusalem. At the door, Beautiful, a man asked alms of them; both of the apostles fastened their eyes on him and Peter said, "Look on us." After gaining the man's attention by this statement and telling him they had no money to give him, Peter healed him. But the fact of Peter's healing him does not prove his superiority for John had the same power which Jesus had given to him as well to all the other apostles. Peter evidently did not think that he had any superior authority for he said, "why fasten ye your eyes on us, as though by our own power or godliness we had made him to walk" (Acts 3:12; emphasis mine, CDH).

The other apostles preached on the day the church began just as Peter did. "And **they** were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave **them** utterance" (Acts 2:4). It is true that the only sermon recorded is Peter's. The people upon hearing the message cried unto Peter and the other apostles as to what they should do. Peter gave them the answer. But all the apostles had been invested with the power to loose and bind just as had Peter (Matt. 18: 18) is there is no superiority here when examined in the light of other scriptures. God did make choice among" the apostles and designated Peter as the one to preach first to the Gentiles but that does not prove superiority.

In the selection of Matthias, there is not anything to indicate Peter's primacy. True, he, under the guidance of the Spirit, said that the scripture must be fulfilled by choosing a successor to Judas. But in this action his power is counted no more than the others. He was the one whom the spirit led to bring the action about, is there is no indication of supremacy.

Because of Judean teachers who came to Antioch urging the brethren that they should observe circumcision, Paul, Barnabas and certain other brethren were sent to Jerusalem to confer with the apostles and elders there with regard to the question. When they all gathered to consider the matter, Peter was the first to speak and reminded them that it was God who sent him to the Gentiles and that they (Gentiles) were to be cleansed by faith also. He then said that Gentiles should not be burdened with a yoke which none of them nor their fathers could bear. James spoke and gave his sentence. The record says, "Then it seemed good to the apostles and the elders, with the whole church, to choose men out of their company, and send them to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas" (Acts 15:22). They also sent a letter to the Gentile converts which in part said, "For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit, **and to us**, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things" (Acts 15:28). The superior authority did not reside in Peter but all had equal authority under the guidance of the Spirit "for it seemed

good to the Holy Spirit, and to us" what to command. All had the same authority! There could be no "dissenting voice" if each were led by the Spirit. In this case each one who spoke was and all testified in the letter to the guidance of the Spirit.

The assertion that the church could not do without its "commander-in-chief" has no proof in the text. Prayer being made by the church for Peter does not argue that he was the supreme ruler and possessed the supremacy among the apostles. It proves nothing more than that Christians loved him and thus prayed to God on his behalf. God miraculously released him from the prison. But in the account as given in Acts 12 nor in any other scripture is any significance as to Peter's primacy attached. It is therefore from the imagination of a man's own mind not from the mind of God!

The Case for Paul

In the same fashion as Gibbons and some others advance the case for the primacy of Peter, a better case can be made out for Paul. It is to this that I wish now to direct your attention. (1) Paul was a bachelor and thus would on this ground, meet the qualifications stipulated by the Church which its proponents affirm "changes not." 1 Corinthians 7:7 together with 9:5 show this bachelorship of Paul to be true. On the other hand Peter was married (Acts 8: 14; 1 Cor. 9:5) and thus would be in direct violation of ecclesiastical regulations governing priests in the Catholic Church now. (2) As Peter was the apostle to the Jews so Paul is the great apostle to the Gentiles. There are many more Gentiles within the Catholic Church than Jews. Paul then preeminently being the apostle to the Gentiles (Acts 9:15; Gal. 1:16, 2:7, 8) he ought to be honored instead of Peter according to the type of reasoning used by some Catholics. (3) The book of Acts devotes far more space to the work and labors of Paul than to any other of the apostles or early disciples. If this kind of reasoning is valid with reference to Peter's prominence in the first part of the book of Acts, then it is just as valid when used in connection with Paul. On this basis an "impartial reader" would be constrained by the elaborate treatment of the work of Paul by the inspired writer, to exalt Paul to a position of superiority rather than Peter.

(4) The following words of one who had the mind of Christ (1 Cor. 2: 16) forever shatters the claim of Peter's supremacy. "I am become foolish: ye compelled me; for I ought to have been commended of you: for in nothing was I behind the very chiefest of apostles, though I am nothing" (1 Cor. 12:11). Again, "For I reckon that I am not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles" (1 Cor. 11:5). But for affirming such a belief we must blush if the Catholic contention that Peter is the "chief apostle" be true. One of two things is true: either Peter is not supreme in authority or Paul is a liar! He was not behind "the very chiefest apostle." How much higher in authority could he be?

(5) Paul's testimony further renders the Catholic claim false which the following points conclusively prove. Fourteen years after his conversion Paul went to Jerusalem by

"revelation" (Gal. 2:2). Upon his conversations with those of repute he had this to say, "But from those who were reputed to be somewhat (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth not man's person)they, I say who were of repute imparted nothing to me: but contrariwise, when they saw that I had been intrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision even as Peter with the gospel of the circumcision (for he that wrought for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision wrought for me also unto the Gentiles); and when they perceived the grace that was given unto me, James and Cephas and John, they who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision; only they would that we should remember the poor; which very thing I was also zealous to do" (1 Gal. 2:6-10) In these words Paul's authority is just as great as that of Peter or any of the others "of repute." It is readily apparent that Paul and none of the others recognized any singular power or authority as being possessed by Peter. It is generally agreed among Catholics that to be in the presence or audience of the Pope imparts something to the fortunate person. But in the meeting referred to above the reverse was true. If Catholic teaching be true, then see what a position they are in with reference to this scripture — Paul, a lesser light, received nothing but contrariwise Peter and the others received something. There may have been a notion prevalent, and evidently there was (Gal. 2:2, 6), that some were greater than others but Paul did not honor it (Gal. 2:6). His authority, honor and rank was on the level with that of Peter (Gal. 2:8). What an opportune time for Paul to appeal to Peter for authority for what he did in his ministerial work! No, friend, his authority was from God and it was not subject to the will of any other apostle, Peter included.

(6) "But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Cephas before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest as do the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, how compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" (Gal. 2:14). This action of Peter and those with him is referred to as "dissimulation" or hypocrisy (Gal. 2:13). Paul evidently saw nothing in the position of Peter to deter him in condemning him when he thus is walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel." Gibbons tries to answer this objection by saying that St. Bernard and others inferior to the Pope have rebuked him and at the same time still held in honor his exalted office. But this very instance in Galatians 2 is presented for the pointed purpose of showing that Peter was not superior. This was the point under consideration; Paul gave this incident to further substantiate his position stated in Galatians 2:2-10. Those who thus answer this objection in the manner of Gibbons must give attention to this evident truth. Gibbons further says, "Nay from this very circumstance, I draw a confirming evidence of Peter's supremacy. St. Paul mentions it as a fact worthy of record that he actually **withstood Peter to his face**. Do you think it would be worth recording if Paul had rebuked James or John or Barnabas?" (Gibbons, **Ibid.**, p. 86). The context of Galatians 2 answers this objection beyond a shadow of doubt. Some questioned Paul and Barnabas's teaching. They went to Jerusalem to those "who were reputed to be somewhat" but Paul comments on this in these words, "whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth not man's person." A lot of comfort this gives the Catholic

position! If Peter were supreme, Paul said that it made no difference to him. And remember that Paul was an apostle who had "the mind of Christ." Paul mentions his withstanding Peter for the express purpose of showing that Peter was not his superior as an apostle. How weak the doctrine that has to be supported by such a use of the scripture.

Paul mentioned in Galatians I his first visit to Jerusalem during which he talked with Peter and James, the Lord's brother. This visit with Peter was for "fifteen days" but others of the apostles he did not see. Paul related this visit to show that the truth he preached was "not after man" nor "did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ" Gal. 1:11, 12). The entire context shows that Peter was not superior nor did Paul work under his direction or receive his teaching from him. Using the type of argument some do in advancing Catholic claims, we could declare the supremacy of Paul because he exercised discipline on an apostle something of which we have record of no other apostle doing. (7) Paul could truthfully say, "Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as one beside himself) I more; in labors more abundantly, in prisons more abundantly, in stripes above measure, in deaths oft" (2 Cor. 11:23). From verse 24 through verse 27 he gives numerous hardships that were his lot. From this standpoint and using the same type of argument referred to above, why not look on Paul as supreme, because of his more abundant labors? (8) In addition to these outward cares, Paul says "there is that which presseth upon me daily, anxiety for all the churches" (2 Cor. 11:28). Where is the passage that shows Peter in the light of having in his care all the churches? Using the same line of argumentation previously referred to, would you not be forced to admit Paul's superiority rather than that of Peter?

(9) Of the twenty-seven books of the new Testament fourteen were written by Paul if we count Hebrews. Three-fourths of our New Testament was written by Paul. Peter wrote two short books. Catholics must admit, if they accept Paul's revelation as from God, that he is their greatest teacher and on this basis would be the most prominent and pre-eminent of the apostles. He would also be higher in honor because the Lord chose to make so much of his will known through him. Yet Gibbons argues that because Peter's sermon was recorded in Acts 2 and other similar events, he is supreme. Reasoning that way, the case for Paul is a thousand times stronger. (10) It is also argued that because Paul went to see Peter that he acknowledged his primacy. If this be a legitimate and valid reason for so believing, would not Peter's appeal to Paul indicate his primacy? Consider this in the light of the above contention: "And account that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given to him, wrote unto you; -as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things" (2 Pet 3 At My Hen is an appeal to the writings of Paul by Peter. I say, if it is right to argue that Paul is inferior to Peter because he visited him, how much better an argument to declare Paul superior because Peter appealed to his writings. (11) Gibbons reasons that since many learned men believe that "Babylon" in Peter's first epistle refers to Rome, one can conclude that he was there. He further adds that tradition seems to support this. just two observations on this will suffice. If "Babylon"

is a figurative expression for Rome then how embarrassing it must be to Catholics to try to dodge the book of Revelation, There is no tradition for more than a hundred years after the time Peter was supposed to be in Rome declaring that he was. We must have contemporary proof! But on the other hand the scripture itself declares Paul to have been there for at least two years (Acts 28:16-31). Acts 28 reveals that he was busy preaching and teaching though a prisoner. The evidence is far stronger for Paul's being bishop of Rome than for Peter. How weak the Catholic position is to have to lean on the poorest tradition. How much stronger the case for Paul!

Of course, people who respect God's revelation and the mission and work of the apostles do not account any one apostle as having the primacy. But you can see what an excellent case can be made for Paul when using the line of reasoning employed by the late eminent American Catholic leader, Cardinal Gibbons. May each one of us resolve to turn to the Lord, listen to his final revelation and respect the authority of every apostle and ascribe to none a title never given him by God and worn by none of them.

Precepts and Principles

BONDS STOCKS

WHY MEN REFUSE TO COME TO JESUS

“. . . And ye will not come to me that ye might have life” (Jno. 5:40).

Life is precious. Dying men fight desperately to hold on to life.

But depicted here are dying men who spurn the offer of eternal life, and turn their backs on the life giver!

Why do those who are spiritually sick turn up their noses at the Great Physician? Jesus gave the answer in John 5:42: "But I know ye, that ye have not the love of God in you."

Two of the many conditions which contribute to keeping people away from Christ were discussed in the preceding article. They are:

I. Some think they do not need Christ. They are counting on morality to save them. Morality is necessary, but, apart from Christ it does not save (Acts 4:12; Eph. 5:23; Isa. 64:6).

II. Some do not understand that they want Christ. All men really want Christ, because they want the things that only Christ can give, but some think they want other things. Some prefer the praise of men to the approval of God (Jno. 12:42, 43). The love of sin keeps many from coming to Christ (Jno. 3:19).

Now let us notice some other conditions that keep people from coming to the Savior.

Some Do Not Love the Truth

III. Some refuse to come to Christ because they do not love the truth. Christ is the personification of divine truth. In John 14:6 he said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the father but by me." The word of God is the vehicle of truth, as we learn from John 17:17: "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth."

Those who come to Christ must come in the way appointed by the word of truth. Those who do not love the truth cannot come to the Father in God's appointed way.

In 2 Thessalonians 2:10-12 Paul writes of those who do not love the truth: "And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of

the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

You will note that God does not send delusion to people until, because of their hatred of truth, they have hardened their hearts against Christ. A lady in Louisiana who teaches a Sunday School class in a denominational church, attended regularly a series of gospel meetings. She was convinced that the truth was being preached. She said: "I know that preacher is preaching the truth, but I just can't bring myself to let those children in my Sunday School class down!"

Who could possibly be letting any one down by standing up for the truth? If that lady loved her Sunday School children as much as she thought she did, would it not have been her greatest desire to teach them the truth? This lady, and others like her, need to learn that such disregard for the truth, if not eradicated, will lead to damnation.

Some are Victims of Prejudice

IV. Some refuse to come to Christ because they are victims of prejudice. They have their own conception of Christianity, They are loyal to their own religious party and creed, and they cannot see pure Christianity because of the smoke screen of sectarian error that mars their vision.

Many people are so wedded to their own opinions that they have haughtily said with respect to some Bible doctrine, "Why, I wouldn't believe that if you showed it to me in the Bible!"

Those who are so filled with prejudice come under the same classification as that previously discussed-they do not love the truth. Jesus spoke of such people in Matthew 13:15: "For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have (Nosed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them."

Stephen used the most scathing language in describing those whose prejudice caused them to turn away from Christ (Acts 7:51-59). He preached the truth but the Jewish lead did not love the truth. So, because they were full of prejudice, they stopped their ears, and went about the hellish business of murdering one of God's fairest noblemen.

A young man in Tennessee, after hearing several gospel sermons, said arrogantly, "Why I had rather go to hell with my friends, than to go to heaven with that preacher!" Prejudice!

Some Hide Behind Failure of Christians

V. Some refuse to come to Christ because they have been unduly influenced by the conduct of some professed Christians. They observe in the lives of some professed Christians something that is inconsistent with Christianity, and they excuse their disobedience on the failure of these weak church members.

But this is altogether the wrong basis. "So then every one of us shall give account of **himself** to God" (Rom. 14:12). Christianity should be judged, in the final analysis, not by the mistakes of Christians, but by the perfect example set by the Christ whom Christians propose to follow.

The fact however; that some do refrain from becoming Christians because some professed children of God make their lives a misrepresentation of Christianity should cause all of us to think of our deep obligations as disciples of Christ. We need to ponder seriously the words of Jesus in Matt. 18:6: "But whosoever shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a milestone were hanged about his neck and that he was drowned in the depth of the sea."

And in 1 Corinthians 8:12 the Holy Spirit tells how careful Paul was: "Nevertheless we have not used this power, but suffer all things lest we would hinder the gospel of Christ." Christians should be very careful of their conduct lest they do anything that might hinder the conversion of the people of the world to Christ.

Some Worship Their Parents

VI. Some refuse to come to Christ because they are afraid it would be a reflection on their parents. Many, when they hear the gospel preached in its purity, realize that it is quite different from the way their parents were taught.

Their parents were good people who were sincere in their religion. It is not easy to convince people that such good parents could have been so wrong. And, thinking more of their earthly attachments than they do of pleasing God, they say, "Well, if it was good enough for my parents, it is good enough for me!" And there have been those who are gone so far as to say that, if their parents were not saved, then they themselves do not care to go to heaven! They judge what it takes to please God, not by what the Bible says, but by what their parents believed, taught and practiced.

In many cases, their parents may never have heard the true gospel is But, regardless of that, Jesus taught that those who exalt the religion of their parents above that revealed in the Bible cannot be saved. "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more &an me is not worthy of me" (Matt. 10:37, 38).

If those who are declining to obey the gospel because they feel that it would be a

reflection on their parents would think seriously, they might have altogether a different view of the matter. Sometimes those whose parents have passed on say, "My parents were good people and they did not think it was necessary to obey the gospel." Parents who love their children want them to do what is right. If you are hesitating to obey the gospel because of the stand your parents took, think about it this way: Your parents loved you. If you have had an opportunity to learn truths that your parents did not know, do you not feel that they would want you to embrace whatever truth you learn?

It is God who is to be pleased, and not our ancestors. If we would go to heaven, we must worship Jehovah and not practice ancestor worship.

Some Fear Failure

VII. Some men refuse to come to Christ because they are afraid. They fear that they cannot be successful in the Christian life.

They know that they are weak and sinful. They magnify their faults and weaknesses, and say that it is useless for them to become Christians until they are sure they can, as they express it, "hold out." The Holy Spirit promises that we will have help in "holding out:" ". . . he which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ" (Phil. 1:6).

Our Lord has made this precious promise: ". . . him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out" (Jno. 6:37).

Suppose the farmer should reason this way: "I won't plant a crop this year because I might make a failure." Or a man who wants to go into business might say, "I won't go into business because I might fail."

The idea that a man must not become a Christian until he is sure he can make a success is a misconception. In the first place, your being a successful Christian does not depend upon your own human strength, but upon your abiding attachment to Christ. "There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it" (1 Cor. 10:13). God has promised that those who give themselves to Christ and who depend upon Christ to deliver them from temptation will be successful.

Some Think They Have Already Come to Christ

VIII. Some refuse to come to Christ because they think they have already come to him. They have been taught the modern popular doctrine of salvation by faith only-that all

one has to do to come to Christ is simply to believe, and that one is saved the very moment he believes.

It is very popular for preachers to tell folk today that it is not necessary for them to obey the gospel to be saved. If you listen to the radio very much you hear a great deal of the do-nothing philosophy in religion-the idea that man is saved by the grace of God upon the basis merely of a mental assent to the divinity of Christ, and a mental or passive acceptance of him as Savior, without doing those things that God has ordained in order to our salvation.

The Bible clearly teaches that one must come to Christ in God's appointed way and a careful study of the New Testament will convince any fair-minded student that the way that one must come to Christ is by obedient faith (Rom. 1:5 A.R.V.). The Bible positively states that one must obey the gospel in order to be saved. "And to you who are troubled rest with us. when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels. In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Thes. 1:7-9).

The same faith is taught in 1 Peter 4:16, 17: "Yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf. For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us, what shall be the end of them that obey not the gospel of Christ."

Some Have Allowed Satan to Rob Them

IX. Some refuse to come to Christ because they have allowed Satan to snatch the word of God out of their heart. "Now the parable is this: The seed is the word of God. Those by the wayside are they that hear; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved" (Luke 8:11, 12).

There are those who hear the word, are impressed with the reasonableness of the gospel, but who allow the considerations of the flesh to cause them to turn away from Christ. Satan snatches the word from their hearts.

Some are Victims of Procrastination

X. Some refuse to come to Christ because of the spirit of neglect. They intend to obey the gospel, but they have a disposition to postpone their obedience. They excuse themselves on various grounds, and like Felix, seek a more convenient season.

If you are among those who are inclined to procrastinate with respect to your obedience of the gospel, you need to be awakened by the cry of the Holy Spirit, in 2 Corinthians 6:2, ". . . behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation."

Those who are inclined to be neglectful of this most vital matter should read the testimony of the Holy Spirit in Hebrews 2:3. This sentiment, even though it is addressed to those who are Christians, applies in principle to those who have not become Christians: "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him?"

"Boast not thyself of tomorrow: for thou knowest not what a day may bring forth" (Prov. 27:1).

Why Keep Jesus Waiting?

"And ye will not come to me that ye might have life." Isn't that a pathetic statement? But it need not apply to you. You can come to Christ, and those who come to Christ will have life—life more abundant, life everlasting!

Won't you lay aside every excuse, overcome every seeming obstacle, take your stand now for Christ, come to him believing in him as the Son of God, repenting of every sin, confessing your faith in his divinity, and being baptized — immersed in water for the remission of sins?

Would you be free from your burden of sin? There is power in the blood — power in the blood of the lamb slain from the foundation of the world, power in the blood poured out for remission of your sins! Why keep Jesus waiting? Come, accept his invitation, accept it now, before it is too late! Jesus Christ is the hope of the world!

PRECEPTOR PERCEPTIONS

JAMES R. COPE

THE LORD'S SUPPER — A CONFESSION

For the Christian the Lord's Supper is a confession. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come" (1 Cor. 11:26). The word "show" as here used simply means to declare, proclaim, or make known. This is what the apostle affirms of the Lord's Supper. It is a confession.

What Does the Christian Confess in the Lord's Supper?

1. **He confesses the death of Jesus.** This is what the passage says: "Ye do show the Lord's death." This memorial feast stands as a witness to the death of Jesus with all the implications that death entails. Whatever the Bible declares about the death of Jesus the Lord's Supper attests. It affirms the historicity of his life, for had he not lived he could not have died. It affirms the historicity of his death and the benefits derived therefrom. Whether it be considered from the divine viewpoint or the human, the Lord's Supper affirms whatever may be revealed about the purpose of Jesus' death. If the sacrifice of his Son was necessary to the satisfying of God's sense of justice in considering the reconciliation of sinful man, the Lord's Supper testifies to this justice. If the giving of his Son was the expression of infinite love for a lost world, the Lord's Supper bears witness to that love. If there must be a mediator between God and man, the Lord's Supper affirms the sufficiency of Christ as that mediator. If a high priest is necessary in the divine scheme, the Lord's Supper avows Jesus to be fitted for that office. If the sinfulness of man must be viewed in all its heinousness, the Lord's Supper stands as a perpetual reminder of that sin and the infinite interest of Jehovah in its removal.

2. **He confesses the second coming of Christ.** "Ye do show the Lord's death till he comes." In the communion of the body and blood of Jesus (1 Cor. 10:16), the DISCIPLE looks forward as well as backward and has fellowship with the death of his Lord but not with a dead Lord. He eats and drinks with a living Lord, the one who was dead but is now alive forevermore, who, though dead, "dieth no more" for "death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God" (Rom. 6:9, 10). In the same line of thought Paul writes: "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation" (Heb. 9:28). The Lord's Supper, then, comprehends everything from the death of Christ till his second coming. It is the summit of faith upon which the Christian places his feet and with panoramic view sweeps everything before and after him. In it he connects the past with the future and rejoices at the prospects of his eternal redemption made real at the

Lord's second advent and made possible by the Lord's sacrifice of himself.

3. He confesses the validity of the New Covenant. When Jesus instituted the Supper he said, "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt. 26:28). Luke's record says, "This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you" (Luke 22:20). That the Old Covenant was to cease and a new one to be established was foretold by Jeremiah: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of Egypt . . . but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more" (31:31-34). In Hebrews 8:8-12 Jeremiah's prophecy is quoted by the Holy Spirit and the following comment made concerning it; "In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old" (8:13).

The foregoing passages establish the point that in God's Plan there are two covenants, they old and the new. The cessation of the old and the establishment of the new were both foretold by the prophet. The old covenant was dedicated with blood, and this blood foreshadowed the blood of the new covenant to be shed by Christ, as Hebrews 9:18-26 declares: "Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover he sprinkled likewise with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."

Hebrews 9:20 is a quotation from Exodus 24:8. The similarity between this statement by Moses at the dedication of the Old Covenant and the statement of Jesus when he gave the Lord's Supper is readily seen. Note them: Moses—"This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined upon you;" (Heb. 9:20), Jesus—"This is my blood of the new testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt. 26:28). That the blood of Christ

dedicated and made valid the new covenant is clear from the following: "But Christ being come a high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, **but by his own blood** he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" (Heb. 9:11-14). It is the blood of Jesus, then, that makes the new covenant valid and thus purges its subjects from sin, sanctifies, and makes them meet for the Master's use, "for by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified" (Heb. 10:14).

In his observance of the Lord's Supper, then, the Christian confesses the validity of the new covenant because the blood of Christ is that which gives power and effectuality to it. In this feast he bears witness that every thought of his heart, every word of his mouth, and every deed of his life, prompted by his relationship to the testator of the New Covenant, is registered with approval in heaven. Not because of any inherent righteousness within the person who performs such deeds but because (I the righteousness transmitted to the New Covenant by the testator of it, is his approval possible. It is with this consciousness that disciples should partake of the sacred feast. "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, discerning the Lord's body" (1 Cor. 11:28, 29).

4. He confesses the existence of the kingdom. At the giving of the Lord's Supper Jesus said, "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom" (Matt. 26:29). From this we conclude that the Lord's Supper was to be a feature of Its kingdom. Wheresoever, therefore, we find the observance of the Lord's Supper by those for whom it was intended, we find the kingdom of God. Acts 20:7 shows the disciples at Troas observing the "breaking of bread" and 1 Corinthians 10:16 and 11:20-30 reveal the church at Corinth communing with Christ in the Lord's Supper. The kingdom existed, therefore, for the Lord's Supper was observed.

5. He confesses the identity of the kingdom and the church. The Supper was to be in the kingdom, but 1 Corinthians 11 shows the "church of God which is at Corinth" (1 Cor. 1:2) participating in its observance. Unless, therefore, it can be shown that the Lord's Table was removed from the kingdom and placed in the church, we necessarily concluded that the church and the kingdom are identical in their ruler, citizenship, and law. Christ is the king of the kingdom and head of the church; Christians are citizens in the kingdom and members of his church; the apostles' doctrine is the law of the kingdom and rule of the church, and it was the apostles' doctrine which gave direction concerning the proper observance of the Lord's Supper in the church at Corinth. Jesus said, "I appoint unto you a kingdom, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom" (Lk. 22:29, 30). 1 Corinthians 10:21 shows

that the church of Christ cannot partake "of the Lord's table and the table of devils" at the same time, thus not only identifying the church and the kingdom again through the Lord's table, but also identifying the kingdom of God (Matt. 26:29) with the kingdom of Christ "my kingdom" (Lk. 22:30).

When Does the Christian Make this Confession?

The text says, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink &is cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." How oft is "as often?" This question is answered in the New Testament by the practice of the disciples regarding the observance of the Lord's Supper.

When Jesus gave the Great Commission he told the apostles to baptize those taught "teaching them (the baptized ones) to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt. 28:18-20). If the apostles followed the Lord's instructions, whatever the church (baptized ones) practiced in its assembly, it practiced at the apostles' instructions. Acts 20:7 shows that "upon the first day of the week" the disciples at Troas "came together to break bread." This church had been planted according to the apostles' doctrine and hence had been instructed not only in **what** was to be done with reference to the Lord's Supper but **when** it was to be done also. It was the "first day of the week," the record declares.

The presence of Paul in the meeting and participation in that service is proof positive it was by apostolic approval and instruction that the first day of the week was the day peculiar to the observance of the Lord's Supper. This point is further enhanced by the fact that Paul and his company waited in Troas seven days after arriving there before having opportunity to "break bread." The purpose of the assembling was to "break bread" and the assembling occurred on "the first day of the week." Had there been no "breaking of bread" in that assembly there is no reason to think there would have been an assembly of any kind by the disciples on "the first day of the week." The same verse in the New Testament that authorizes Christians to meet together at all on the Lord's Day shows unmistakably the primary design of their assembling-that which brought them together. While teaching, prayer, and other acts of edification undoubtedly characterized the meeting once it had taken place, the fact remains that the object of their assembling was "to break bread," to observe the Lord's Supper. Since the first day of the week came every eighth day and since every week has a first day, we conclude that "as often" as the first day of each week came, each first day the disciples assembled to break bread. And the first day of the week, each week, every week, like the brethren at Troas, disciples now come together "to break bread" and thus "show the Lord's death till he come."

The Land Promise

FRANKLIN T. PUCKETT

(Note: I regret that this did not reach us in time for the July issue. The argument from the cities of refuge is new to me; I have never seen it used. We take pleasure in passing it on with our sincere commendation to the readers of the Preceptor. We hope to have other articles in the future from brother Puckett. H.H.)

Premillennialists tell us that God's promise to give the land of Canaan to Abraham and his seed has never been fulfilled. Since His promises do not fail, there must be a future fulfillment. Consequently, when Jesus comes the Jews will be miraculously converted as a nation, the righteous dead will be raised, and these all, with the living saints, will be returned to Palestine to inherit the land according to the promise. A great program of political aggrandizement is built up for these miraculously converted Jews and the Wes from among the Gentile," The kingdom is established and the millennium begins to roll merrily along.

There are many insuperable difficulties which premillennialists must face in trying to prove their doctrine, but if it can be shown that the land promise has already been fulfilled, the basis for their whole visionary scheme will be removed, and the theory will collapse for lack of foundation on which to rest. I propose to prove that God has fulfilled that promise.

Preceding Events

The Lord had promised to make of Abraham a great nation through multiplying his "seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore." Since it was impossible to reach such marvelous numerical proportions during Abraham's lifetime, this promise could only be fulfilled in his posterity. Consequently it passed on to Isaac and Jacob (Gen. 26:2-4; 28:3, 4). When in a time of famine Jacob and his sons went down into Egypt, God said: "Fear not to go down into Egypt; for I will there make of thee a great nation" (Gen. 46:3). In that land "the children of Israel were fruitful, and increased abundantly, and multiplied, and waxed exceeding mighty; and the land was filled with them" (Ex. 1:7). Stephen declared that "when the time of the promise drew nigh, which God had sworn to Abraham, the people grew and multiplied in Egypt" (Acts 7:17). This rapid increase was because **the time of the promise drew near.**

When "there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph" (Ex. 1:8), Israel was subjected to great affliction. God heard their cry "and with an high arm brought he them out of it" (Acts 13:17). By faith they crossed the Red Sea and came to old shaking Sinai. There God made a covenant with them, saying, "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation" (Ex. 19:6). They were at this time as the stars of heaven for multitude (Deut. 1:10). It is evident that God's promise to Abraham regarding the development of a

great nation was fulfilled in these events.

God now spoke unto Israel, saying: "Ye have dwelt long enough in this mount: turn you, and go to the mount of the Amorites, and unto all the places nigh thereunto, in the plain, in the hills, and in the vale, and in the south, and by the sea side, to the land of the Canaanites, and unto Lebanon, unto the great river, the river Euphrates. Behold, I have set the land before you: go in and possess the land which the Lord sware unto your fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to give unto them and to their seed after them" (Deut. 1:6-8).

Coming to the border of Canaan twelve spies were sent to search out the promised land. They all reported that it was a good land, but ten said that the strength of the cities and the size of the giants made it impossible for them to take it. This so discouraged the children of Israel that they plotted to make them another captain and return to Egypt. Their lack of faith provoked God to swear that none of that generation above twenty years of age save Caleb and Joshua should enter into the land.

The Promise Fulfilled

After wandering forty years in the wilderness, Moses died and was buried in Moab. Those who had provoked God at Kadesh-Barnea now lie sleeping in the wilderness. Under the direction of God, Joshua led their children into the "land flowing with milk and honey." So successful were they in driving out the enemy and possessing the land, that it was said: "And the Lord gave unto Israel all the land which he sware to give unto their fathers: and they possessed it, and dwelt therein. And the Lord gave them rest round about, according to all that he sware unto their fathers: and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them: The Lord delivered all their enemies into their hand. There failed not ought of any good thing which the Lord had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass" (Josh. 21:43-45). Notice: (1) God gave unto Israel **all the land** which he sware to give unto their fathers; (2) Israel possessed **all the land** which God sware to give unto their fathers; (3) they dwelt in **all the land** which God had sworn unto their fathers. Now, if there is any part of the promised land which Israel did not receive, possess, and dwell in, this scripture is not true. But; if the passage be true, they received every foot of ground which God had promised. If they received it, the promise was fulfilled; and if the promise was fulfilled, premillennial claims regarding it are false. One cannot believe the Bible and premillennialism at the same time.

The Cities of Refuge

God ordained that there should be six cities of refuge; three east of Jordan, and three in the land of Canaan. "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye be come over Jordan into the land of Canaan: Then ye shall appoint you cities to be cities of refuge for you . . . And of these cities which ye shall give

six cities shall be for refuge. Ye shall give three cities on this side of Jordan, and three cities shall ye give in the land of Canaan, which shall be cities of refuge" (Num. 35:9-14).

When the children of Israel were encamped on the plains of Moab, Moses said unto them, "When the Lord thy God hath cut off the nations, whose land the Lord thy God giveth thee, and thou succeedest them, and dwellest in their cities, and in their houses; thou shalt separate three cities for thee in the midst of thy land, which the Lord thy God giveth thee to possess it" (Deut. 19:1, 2). The succeeding verses show that these were cities of refuge. Then we read: "Wherefore I command thee, saying, Thou shalt separate three cities for thee. And if the Lord thy God enlarge thy coast, as he hath sworn unto thy fathers, and give thee all the land which he hath promised to give unto thy fathers; if thou shalt keep all these commandments to do them, which I command thee this day, to love the Lord thy God, and to walk ever in his ways; then shalt thou add three cities more for thee, beside these three" (Deut. 19:7-9).

They were to have three cities of refuge from the time God cut off the heathen before them until the day when he enlarged their coast and gave them all the land which he had promised to give unto their fathers; but when the promise is fulfilled and they have all the land, three cities more were to be added to these three. As long as the promise is only partially fulfilled, there were to be three cities of refuge; when the promise is completely fulfilled, they were to add three cities more making a total of six. if, therefore, we can find six cities of refuge appointed, it will be proof positive that God had fulfilled his promise in its completeness.

Now turn to Joshua 20:1-8: "The Lord also spake unto Joshua, saying, Speak to the children of Israel, saying, Appoint out for you cities of refuge, whereof I spake unto you by the hand of Moses . . . And they appointed Kedesh in Galilee in mount Naphtali, and Shechem in Mount Ephraim, and Kir-jath-arba, which is Hebron, in the mountain of Judah. And on the other side of Jordan by Jericho eastward, they assigned Bezer in the wilderness upon the plain out of the tribe of Reuben, and Ramoth in Gilead out of the tribe of Gad, and Golan in Bashan out of the tribe of Manasseh."

Six cities of refuge are here appointed; three east of Jordan and three in the land of Canaan. Furthermore, they were appointed by direct command of Jehovah. Since this was to be done when God enlarged their coast and gave them all the land he had promised to give, it follows that he thought he had fulfilled his promise. Since Joshua and the children of Israel carried out the appointment, they thought that the promise had been fulfilled. God thought he had given them all the land; Joshua and the children of Israel thought they had received it all; but now more than thirty centuries this side of that day a premillennialist jumps up to say, "God did not give them all the land, therefore, the Jews must be regathered to the land of Palestine and receive the promise." I am reminded of the old Jew who listened to an atheist sneeringly deny that God had any part in creation, and then silenced him with

the question: "Was you der, Charley?" I am confident that God and the children of Israel know more about what took place than these wild speculators today. They were there and are competent witnesses. The appointment of the six cities of refuge stands as irrefutable proof that the land promise was fulfilled. Having been fulfilled it belongs to the past and has no part in God's program for the future.

A Premillennial Dodge

Sometimes premillennialists, when faced with such convincing proof, will admit that God fulfilled his promise to the Jews of Joshua's day, but deny that it was fulfilled to others included in the promise, thereby claiming that such makes necessary a future fulfillment to them. John R. Rice, Fundamental Baptist, cries: "What is going to happen to Abraham? Was Abraham there when Joshua took the children of Israel into that land? Did Abraham possess it, live on it? . . . Abraham lived in tents all his life and died in faith not having received-the promise. Now was that fulfilled? God's promise to Abraham has not yet been fulfilled (**Oliphant-Rice Debate**, page 42).

Agin he says, "I admit that generation moved to Palestine, but what about Abraham, Jacob, and Isaac, to whom God promised to give the land? Yes, the Jews moved to Palestine. God fulfilled his promise to that generation of Israel, but that was not the same as his promise to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. But what about the Lord's promise to them? They are heirs of the same promise and they died without having received it. How about that?" (**ibid.**, p. 38).

And again, "God will keep his promise to Abraham and the remnant of his seed, even though multitudes of Jews Ted in unbelief and were lost" (**Ibid.**, p. 41).

That Abraham was included in the land promise is evident (Gen. 13:15: 17:8); and that he died without having received it is also quite clear (Act 7:5) is but it does not follow that he must be raised from the dead and national Israel be restored to Palestine in order for the promise to be fulfilled unto him. This is a conclusion which has no foundation in truth.

After Abraham came into the land of Canaan, God appeared to him and gave him assurance that his seed should be as the stars of heaven for multitude. It is said that Abraham believed in the Lord and it was counted to him for righteousness. Then God said: "I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees to give thee this land to inherit it" (Gen. 15:7). Abraham asked is "Lord God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?" (v. 8).

The Lord replied. "Abram, know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge; and afterward they shall come out with great substance. And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old

age. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again: for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full" (v. 13-16).

This is God's own explanation of how Abraham would receive the promise. He had brought him out of Ur of the Chaldees to inherit this land. Abraham asked: "How shall I know that I shall inherit it?" God told him that he could know of a surety that though his seed should dwell in a strange land and be subjected to bondage they should come hither again in the fourth generation. The iniquity of the Amorites being not full prevented the fulfillment of the promise before Abraham's death. He would go to his fathers in peace and be buried in a good old age. But his seed would come hither again from a land of bondage. Hereby Abraham was to know **he would inherit the land.** Hence, in that day when God brought the children of Israel up out of Egyptian bondage and gave them the land of Canaan the promise was fulfilled to Abraham. When the land was given to his seed, he received the inheritance. God's explanation that thus it should be ought to satisfy John R. Rice and all other premillennialists.

Apostasy

BASIL OVERTON

Possibly the most uncalled for false doctrine taught is the doctrine of "once in grace, always in grace," or "the impossibility of apostasy." If there were only one passage in the Bible that taught the possibility of falling from grace, that would be sufficient to show that one can be lost after becoming a child of God. God does not have to repeat something He says before what He says becomes the Truth. But, for emphasis sake, God has given us many, yea hundreds of statements in His word which teach that a child of God not only can, but will be lost, if he becomes disobedient. Prominent among those who teach the false doctrine of the impossibility of apostasy are the Baptists. Unfortunately, the Baptists teach such a heresy, but more unfortunately, many members of the body of Christ practice it! Many members of the church of Christ seem to think that they cannot be lost; they seem to believe that they can live just as they please and still be saved in that everlasting kingdom of our Lord just because they are members of the church of Christ. Truly, one must be a member of the Lord's church to be saved in heaven. But, just being a member of His church is no assurance that that one will be saved eternally in heaven. Every member of God's house must be faithful to the Father to be saved.

Faith, whether the faith of an alien sinner, or of a child of God, is dead if it does not work. How dead? just as dead as a body is dead without the spirit, and that is mightily dead! A body without the spirit is so dead that regardless of how much it is loved, ere long after it is dead, it is buried. "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also" (James 2:26). "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love" (Gal. 5 -6).

I do not say that one who is saved from his alien sins by obedience to the gospel can return to his former state, or condition. But, I say that if one goes back to the pollutions of the world and serves Satan after obeying the gospel, he will be in a worse condition than what he was in before he obeyed the gospel! The reason that I say this is because Peter said it "For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them" (2 Peter 2:20, 21).

Just the book of Hebrews ought to convince anyone that it is possible for a child of God to become unfaithful and consequently be lost, unless that unfaithfulness is repented of. In fact any one of the many passages in Hebrews which show the possibility of falling from grace, ought to be convincing. Read the following passages, all of which are in the Hebrew epistle, and see if you think a child of God can be lost Space does not permit an explanation

of these passages; but really they are too plain to need any explanation. Besides this, what they say is worth far more than all that I might say about them. Here are the passages as found in the American Standard version of the Bible:

"Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things that were heard, lest haply we drift away from them. For if the word spoken through angels proved steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great a salvation? which having at the first been spoken through the Lord, was confirmed unto us by them that heard" (Heb. 2:1-3). "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of a heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, even Jesus; ... but Christ as a son, over His house; whose house are we, if we hold fast our boldness and the glorying of our hope firm unto the end" (Heb. 3:1, (1 "Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, like as in the day of the trial in the wilderness" (Heb. 3:8). "Take heed, brethren, lest haply there shall be in any one of you an evil heart of unbelief, in falling away from the living God: but exhort one another day by day, so long as it is called Today; lest any one of you be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin: for we are become partakers of Christ, if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence firm unto the end" (Heb. 3:12-14). "Let us fear therefore, lest haply, a promise being left of entering into his rest, any one of you should seem to have come short of it. Let us therefore give diligence to enter into that rest, that no man fall after the same example of disobedience" (Heb. 4:1, 11). "For as touching those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come, **and then ell away**, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame" (Heb. 6:4-6). "Let us hold fast he confession of our hope that it waver not; for he is faithful that promised:

A man that hath set at nought Moses' law dieth without compassion on the word of two or three witnesses: of how sorer punishment, think ye, shall he be judged worthy, who bath trodden under foot the Son of God, and bath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the spirit of grace?" (Heb. 10:23, 28, 29). "Looking carefully lest there be any man that falleth short (falleth back from marginal reading) of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby the many be defiled; . . . See that you refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not when they refused him that warneth them on earth, much more shall not we escape who turn away from him that warneth from heaven" (Heb. 12:15, 25). "Be not carried away by divers and strange teachings: for it is good that the heart be established by grace" (Heb. 13:9).

Besides the foregoing passages there are hundreds of other similar passages in God's word which likewise teach that children of God can become unfaithful and be lost. -It is manifest that the apostles preached that children of (God can apostatize. Paul said: "But though we, or an angel from heaven should preach unto you any gospel other than that which

we preached unto you, let him be anathema (accursed)" (Gal. 1:8). There are thousands of preachers who are called "good mixers," "jolly good fellows good neighbor," and who even answer to the tide of "Reverend," and are called good preachers, etc., but they teach the damnable heresy that children of God cannot so sin as to be finally lost. God does not say let them be called "good mixers Reverend," etc., but he says, "let them be accursed." God help us all to preach just what the apostles preached. It is not preaching that saves, but that which is preached. For people to be saved, the gospel that the apostles preached must still be preached.

Debate on Freemasonry

FINAL AFFIRMATIVE

AN EXPLANATION

This will bring to a close my part of this discussion. I think the readers are due this explanation. When I agreed to debate this issue I held the position I have been affirming, but, while making preparation for the debate I came upon the statement quoted by Omega that Masons look upon the Ebb as a "symbol" of the will of God. I immediately asked to be released from my obligation of debating the proposition stating that I could not, and had no desire to, defend such a position. After talking it over we agreed to proceed as planned until Omega introduced the statement then we would close the discussion. Accordingly we presented Masonry in as favorable a light as possible, (that of an opinion). But it can't be defended on that ground. A Christian can't assent to the Bible being "one" of God's revelations. If **any Mason** can give a reasonable scriptural answer to this Masonic utterance; I want to see it. As long as that proposition stands there is but one conclusion: Christians can't consistently be Masons.

This discussion will not have been in vain if it shows the indefensible position of a Christian being in Masonry.

AN EXHORTATION

I believe I was "sold" on Masonry as much as any man who ever entered it. I did not appreciate criticism of it or my relation to it. I didn't realize its weakness until I began preparation to defend it; the more I read the more certain I was it couldn't be defended by a Christian. You Christians who are in the lodge start reading your books, note them carefully, judge them fairly, and I assure you, you won't stay in the lodge.

I have enjoyed very much 'this exchange of ideas with Omega. I am glad he could put his finger on the very point that decided me against the lodge. I wonder who talked to you? I hope to meet you some day, until then.

I am
Sincerely yours,
Alpha

FINAL NEGATIVE

All who love the truth and appreciate men of conviction will sincerely rejoice at Alpha's

renunciation of Masonry. Because of the **Preceptor** brethren's judgment that it would be best to keep the discussion anonymous it was expected that some would say it is a "put-up job". The only answer we can possibly make to that charge, and still abbe by the request of the brethren who made space available for this debate, is to ask that you take the word of the **Preceptor** brethren that the disputants are sincere and that things have been represented fairly. As far as I have been able to Sam, not one of the staff writers for the **Preceptor** has ever been a Mason; hence, none of them is qualified to have done the debating. Various ones of them have preached against Masonry, and written against it, and from these works I have drawn valuable aid, but I was past Master of the lodge and have written from first-hand experience. This could be documented were it not for our agreement to keep it anonymous, yet I have heard many, who did not know I was Omega, say that the anonymous feature of the debate was one of its most valuable features. It is a joy to me to learn that the debate will be published. I am content with the good done in this debate and will be glad to see other material added to make it a valuable publication. I did not know of Alpha's understanding of the erroneous position that the Bible is only a "symbol of the will of God however that will is expressed"—before the debate started, but I am certainly happy that he is honest enough not to try to uphold that. If, as Alpha now says, "**any Mason** can give a reasonable scriptural answer" to my arguments, let him communicate with the **Preceptor** brethren and they will let me know of it, and we might consider his arguments for Masonry. I certainly believe I can successfully deny the proposition Alpha has affirmed in this debate with any man on earth, Mason or non-Mason. But now, a brief resume of the arguments.

ALPHA'S ARGUMENTS

Alpha said in his but affirmative that Masonry is a matter of opinion, and therefore, a Christian can be in it. I countered with seven things in Masonry inconsistent with Christianity. Alpha now agrees that Masonry cannot be defended as an opinion. Masonic opinion, Masonic doctrine compromises and contradicts "the faith once delivered."

Alpha's second affirmative was principally an attempt to answer my seven inconsistencies. He got stuck on the first one, admitting 'that Masonry is a religion but a human religion. He said, "it teaches men to perform their duties to God, and their fellowmen" (p. 19, Feb. **Preceptor**). I smashed that statement to smithereens by showing: (1) it teaches Baptists and Methodists and Mormons to perform their duties to God without telling them what the specific duties are, hence fellowships them in that business of performing religious duties such as prayer, songs, in short, **worship**. (2) it also teaches the Mohammedan to perform the duties to his God outlined in the **Koran**, and the Buddhist to perform his duties according to the Buddhist scriptures. This was the "back-breaking straw". Alpha's "answer" to Matt. 23:9, 10, "Call no man . . . father . . . Be not called Master", was that the motive, not the title, is the wrong part. It is a pity Jesus did not say this. To accept the title of "Most Worshipful Grand Master" violates Matt. 23:10, regardless of the motive. Alpha's logic would force him to call a Catholic priest "father" so long as the priest's motive was right!

Then Alpha said, "The Lodge points each member to The Book, and says, 'Therein is eternal life, build on it'" (**Idem.**). Now he admits that the Masons teach that the Book, the grand old Holy Bible, is only a "symbol of the will of God," not that will itself. So actually Masons teach eternal life is founded on, and in, a "symbol of the will of God" rather than on, and in, the will of God itself. Alpha is certainly right in saying no Christian can consistently be in an order that teaches that. Alpha's statement that Masonry stands for "better morality and better relationships," at first explained in terms of the U.N., now takes on the aspect I said it had. I quoted Mackey who said that "The Landmarks of Masonry are so perfect that they neither need nor will permit of the slightest amendment" like adding to them the "belief in the divine authenticity of the scriptures" (June **Preceptor**, pp. 19, 20). So that now it appears Masonry teaches that Masonic morality which is "the morality of every creed of antiquity" (Pike, **Morals and Dogma**, p. 541), is better than specifically **Biblical** morality. What Christian could contend for the imperfection of Christian morality over against the "perfect" landmarks of Masonry?

When I charged Alpha with giving the impression at Masonic funerals, in Masonic obituaries, etc., that Masonic brethren who are not brethren in the Lord had been taken to heaven without being members of the New Testament church, he answered that Masons don't go back on the principle that eternal life is to be had by building on "The Book". In fact said Alpha, "Anything a Mason may say has this principle behind it" (Feb. **Preceptor**, (p. 19). But now it comes out that Masons can go to heaven, by their teaching, no matter which "revelation" or book they build on, for the Bible in the lodge is only a "symbol of 'the will of God.'" This denial that the Bible is **the will of God** colors every argument Alpha has made. Yes, Masonry does teach that their dead **non Christian** brethren have gone to the "Grand Lodge above, the Lodge not made with hands". I quoted that from the Masonic Journal, official organ of the grand lodge of Ky.

Alpha's third affirmative was devoted to proving something I never denied, i.e. that Masonry is not a sectarian religion. I never said it was! It is a **mongrel** religion, fellowshiping men of all "revelations" and "gods". Then in the same affirmative, Alpha pulled a "beaut". He argued that a Christian can be in Masonry because "if Masons understood the implications of their position they would obey the gospel". I replied that since "The Bible and Bible alone is the religion of Protestants" (Chillingworth), "if Protestants understood the implications of their position they would obey the gospel". Hence, Alpha's reasoning would justify being in a denomination just as much as in the Lodge. I said, since neither Masons nor denominations obeyed the implications of their position, therefore they both walk by the same rule (the Bible theoretically), according to Alpha. Now comes the real **faux pas!** Alpha replied, the leaders of the restoration movement were denominationalists who obeyed the implications of having the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice. **But he never drew the conclusion!** The conclusion to that reasoning would have to be, **therefore, it is right to be members of both Protestant denominations and Masonic lodges!** Whew! And Alpha is reputedly a gospel preacher! I'm certainly glad he has changed!

Get it again. (1) Membership in Masonry is right because "if Masons understood the implications of their position they would obey the gospel". (2) Similarly, the leaders of the restoration movement were denominationalists who understood the implications of Protestantism's claim to go by the Bible alone. These are Alpha's two premises. Now the logical conclusion Alpha never drew, but which is the **only logical** conclusion from those premises, is that "it is right to be members of both protestant denominations and Masonic lodges." I wonder if "**any Mason**" could fix that up?

Alpha's fourth affirmative had nothing new except to emphasize that Masonry only teaches eternal life to one whose life "has been directed by divine truth." (May **Preceptor**, p. 18). Now it appears the "divine truth" is not the Bible in the Masonic lodge, because the Bible is "only a symbol of the God however that will is expressed", according to Masonry. No matter that the Bible is the only book in American lodges. **These lodges in America still deny every day that the Bible is the will of God by saying it is only a symbol of God's will.**

Alpha's fifth affirmative tried to deny that "Masonic symbols are the working tools by the use of which we are seeking to form ourselves into perfect stones for that building which is to be our eternal home" (Masonic Home Journal, July 1, 1950). In trying to deny it, he denied the "official organ of the Grand lodge of Ky.", also every Masonic monitor or handbook I have seen. Then Alpha pulled another "beaut"! He quoted Mackey's eulogy of the Bible on page 136 of the Encyclopedia of Freemasonry, but **never commented on page 101** which he had just promised to answer. But now, thank God, Alpha says p. 104 in Mackey is enough to keep every Christian out of the lodge. As to the symbols such as Acacia which, Mackey's **Lexicon of Masonry** says, "signifies a Mason who **by living in strict obedience to the obligations and precepts of the fraternity, is free from sin.**" Alpha said, at first, that I literalized the symbols too much. But then he quoted Mackey at length to set me right on the symbols (June **Preceptor**, p. 17).

But he quoted too much! Hear a part of his quotation in which Mackey tells the meaning of the symbols of the first three degrees: "The third degree is simply emblematic, innocence must for a time lie in the grave; at length, however, to be called is . . . to a **blissful immortality.**" There are two kinds of immortality, or rather states of those who have immortality, "those that have done good to the resurrection of life and those that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation" (Jno. 5:28, 29). Note that Masonry promises not just immortality, but a **blissful** immortality to its members. All of its ritual imply it and its funeral services state it.

Alpha's sixth affirmative was given mainly to lamenting that the Bible was regarded only as a "symbol of the will of God" and claiming that I emphasized the "religious" feature too much. Well, to say the Bible is only a "symbol" is **infidelity**. Little wonder I spent most of my time on that! Then to see, as I do, and Alpha does now, that the religious feature of

Masonry involves fellowship on the basis of mongrel revelations, is enough to cause much emphasis to be put on that. So much for Alpha's arguments. God bless you for having given them up now, my brother. Now that all may see the point at which Alpha bowed out, I give the argument that convinced him.

(1) Masonry says build on "the Book" to get eternal life.

(2) But because it wishes to have in its bosom men of every religion and all revelations, Masonry regards the Bible everywhere it is found in the lodges only as "a symbol of the will of God however that will is expressed" whether in the Bible or in the Koran et. al..

(3) Therefore, Masonry, **as Masonry, teaches** the doctrine of many revelations, and of salvation in all religions.

Can "any Mason" prove this is "consistent with the obligations of the Christian religion?"
I say no, NO!

Sincerely,
Omega

MASONRY DEBATE TO APPEAR IN BOOK FORM

The debate on Freemasonry plus a large appendix of material not covered in the discussion appearing in the PRECEPTOR is to be published in a book, approximately 150 pages, 5 1/4" x 7 3/4", heavy paper binding. Pre-publication price is \$1.25 per copy and this offer stands until September 15. After that date the price will be \$1.50. Why not take advantage of this saving by sending your order now?

Address: PRECEPTOR BOOK HOUSE, 742 Central, St. Petersburg, Florida.