

According To Pattern

*..... Jack Meyer, Truth In Love, February, 1940.

"See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern that was showed thee on the mount." (Heb. 8:5.) By reading the story of Exodus 25 you will see what the Holy Spirit means to teach in this text, as the author of Hebrews, with the guidance of the Holy Spirit herein quoted from Ex. 25:40. In that chapter God told Moses to build a tabernacle, which was to be a worship center for the people, where the priests carried on the worship ceremonies for the people, and where the Spirit of God communed with the people through their leaders and their sacrifices. Jehovah told Moses how to build the tabernacle, giving him a pattern for it, told him what furniture to place in it, and who should worship in it and how, with instructions to go strictly by the pattern. The record shows that Moses faithfully followed this pattern.

That tabernacle was built under the dispensation of the law of Moses, which governed God's people from Ex. 20 until the cross of Christ, when it was abolished. (Col. 2:14.) Christ promised to send the Holy Spirit to the apostles, who would remind them of His teachings and guide them into all truth. (Jno. 14:26; 16:13.) With the abolishing of the Old Testament law on the cross and the ascension of the Christ back to the Father, the Holy Spirit came from the apostles in Acts 2, as Christ predicted in Acts 1:5-8. From Acts 2 on through the New Testament, the apostles preached and wrote the new covenant (Heb. 9:15-17) of Christ, speaking in words which the Spirit supplied. (1 Cor. 2:12,13.) Hence, God no longer governs His people under the Old Testament law, but under the gospel of grace, the new covenant. (Rom. 6:14; Heb. 7:11,12; 9:15-17.)

The foregoing being true, it necessarily follows that, in quoting from Ex. 25:40 in Heb. 8:5, the Holy Spirit did not intend to teach us to build a tabernacle such as God commanded Moses. Then, why did He quote what God told Moses and put that in the new covenant? Simply to teach us this as Moses was ordered to go by the pattern in building the tabernacle, so we are to go by the new covenant, our pattern, as our rule of faith and practice in all matters of religion. So Jehovah does not include

the act of building in the new covenant, but He does include the principle of obeying the Divine plan just as Moses was to obey.

Now, what would have happened to some of the workmen if they had constructed the tabernacle according to some of the modern religious ideas? Suppose some workman had said: "I know that the pattern calls for this, but I think we should change it. It doesn't make any difference about some of the minor details and nonessentials, just so we follow the general idea and do the best we can." Well, Jehovah did not tell them to change it as they saw fit, but to follow the pattern. Since the pattern came from God, that was the best way to do it, regardless of what they thought about it. (Isa. 55:9.) Moses did not have to argue with them about each detail, but could simply say: "I am not saying that this is my way to do it. All that I am trying to get you to do is to do it as God has said. Follow the pattern." So it should be with us. Preachers are wrong in telling you that it makes no difference as to how you build your worship and serve God, just so you are honest. We must not only be honest, but we must also follow that pattern.

But what is the pattern today? God speaks to us in Christ. (Heb. 1:2.) Christ speaks to us by His apostles. (Jno. 17:8, 20.) They have spoken to us in the New Testament scriptures, which furnishes us "completely unto every good work." (2 Tim. 3:16-17.) We are to make all things according to that pattern, for that is the law under which we are. At no point are we to substitute our modern ideas for what the pattern says. There is no such thing as modernizing, or improving upon, God's plan. This, in short, truly represents the position of Churches of Christ today. In fact, I know no verse of scripture that so plainly represents that position as this one does. Alexander Campbell started no church. He and his associates simply asked the people to lay aside all denominational distinctions and practices, and return to the New Testament pattern, to exactly what that volume said. That explains why we differ from denominations on so many points. At every point of difference we insist that we are arguing the merits of our way over that of our neighbors, but that we have only such practices as the pattern calls for. Those who dissent, then, find themselves in effect arguing with God and His pattern, and not with us.

Our neighbors — who, we cheerfully admit, are sincere, hon-

est, and highly intelligent, so we do not personally reflect upon them — ask us a number of questions, some of which we now give and answer in the light of the pattern. (1) "Why do you Church of Christ people say that there is only one way? We think that one faith is as good as another, if one is honest." But, friends, the pattern says: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." (Eph. 4:5.) Neighbor, why do you think that there are many faiths acceptable to God? Simply because you have been taught that. But someone taught you something not in the word. We are told to "preach the word," (2 Tim. 4:2) and the word says: "one faith." Now, won't you be honest and give up an idea you were taught that is contrary to God's pattern?

(2) "Why do you people teach that there is just one church? That is so narrow." If we had our preference, we would fix it so that every man could "join the church of his choice" and please God, but the pattern says: "I will build my church" (Matt. 16:18); "the church of the Lord" (Acts 20:28); "There is one body" (Eph. 4:4) "For His body's sake, which is the church" (Col. 1:24); "All baptized into one body." (1 Cor. 12:13.) Not a passage in the New Testament refers to the church in the plural, except such a passage as Rom. 16:16, "churches of Christ," referring to congregations.

(3) "Why do you people not baptize infants?" Because the pattern specifies: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mk. 16:16); "Repent and be baptized" (Acts 2:38); "Teach all nations, baptizing them." (Matt. 28:19.) Thus, we baptize only those who can be taught, believe and repent.

(4) "Why do you not use sprinkling for baptism?" Because the pattern defines baptism as a burial. (Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:12.) In no place does the Bible say that baptism is sprinkling. (5) "Why do Churches of Christ say that one must be baptized to be saved?" Because the pattern says that "baptism saves" (1 Pet. 3:21), and one is "baptized into Christ." (Gal. 3:27.) (6) "Why do you people not have instrumental music in worship?" The pattern tells us how to worship, and tells that the music in the worship is to be singing. (1 Cor. 14:15; Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16.)

(7) "Why do Churches of Christ object to denominational names?" The Divine pattern named the church, such as "Churches" (congregations, not denominations) of Christ" (Rom. 16:16); "The Church" (Phil. 3:6); "The Church of the Lord."

Departures from the Faith

*..... Frank L. Cox, Firm Foundation, Nov. 5, 1946.

"But the Spirit saith expressly, that in later times some shall fall away from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons, through the hypocrisy of men that speak lies, branded in their own conscience as with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meat." (1 Tim. 4:1-16).

I

By "the faith" the apostle Paul has reference to the system of faith, or wholesome teaching (1 Tim. 4:6). This faith was "once and for all (time) delivered unto the saints" (Jude 6). "Saints," unto whom the faith was delivered, are the ones who "depart" or "fall away." Obviously enough, they are the only ones who can depart from the holy doctrine. The gravest dangers to the Christian religion do not originate on the outside but on the inside of the family of God. It is when they give heed to false doctrines that the people of God become involved in dangerous departures. They cannot give heed to the doctrine of the Lord and the doctrines of demons at the same time any more than they can live during the day and the night at the same time. Men cannot serve two masters, neither can they be-

lieve two masters who teach contradictory doctrines.

II

Christians depart from the faith over various paths, too numerous to mention. We shall point out a few of them, namely:

1. By forbidding where God has not forbidden, thus restricting the liberties of God's people. Two instances are mentioned in the text: one is "forbidden to marry," the other is "commanding to abstain from meats." (See Matt. 15:11) Let us not forbid marriage, or the eating of meat, or the participation in any enjoyment that is not forbidden by New Testament doctrine. The gospel of Christ is the Christian's charter of freedom (Gal. 5:1). No man has a right to interfere with the privileges or the freedom of a Christian, or to restrain where the law of the Lord does not restrain. He who attempts to do so, departs from the faith.

2. By commanding where God has not commanded, binding unnecessary burdens upon the brethren. It is right to bind all that the Lord has bound, but it is a plain departure to bind more

"The greatest friend of Truth is Time, her greatest enemy is Prejudice, and her constant companion is Humility."—C. C. Colton.

than he has bound. This was a sin of the Pharisees (Matt. 23:4; 15:9). The Jewish Christians departed from the faith of the gospel when they tried to bind upon their Gentile brethren the rite of circumcision (Acts 15:1-10). Jesus' yoke (law) is easy and his burden light (Matt. 11:28-30). With all meekness and lowliness of heart, let us accept his law; but resist the commandments of men, calling for "chapter and verse" when they would impose upon us.

3. By allowing that which the Lord has not allowed or authorized in the New Testament, thus abusing their liberty in Christ. Such people "goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ," therefore they have not God (2 John 9). The introduction of innovations into the work and worship of the Lord is a case in point. The Lord Jesus Christ has "all authority" (Matt. 28:18). Everything that we do in word or in deed should be done in his name, or by his authority (Col. 3:17). Where the Master speaks, let us speak; where the Master is silent, let us be silent. Only thus do we honor him and recognize his authority.

4. By teaching that, if the life is right, it does not matter so much what a person believes, thus making void the doctrine. But the doctrine is the divine standard, the rule by which the Lord measures a man's conduct. We cannot know that the life is right except by the doctrine. A man's life cannot be right unless he believes the good doctrine; this is true because life is the outgrowth of the doctrine accepted or believed. Wholesome doctrine makes

a wholesome life; a false doctrine makes a false life.

5. By teaching that, if the Bible doctrine is firmly believed, it does not matter so much how men live. But the Bible doctrine is not firmly believed unless it governs and controls the life. The way men live from day to day is the test of their faith. Faith unaccompanied by works or a good life is dead (Jas. 2:17, 19, 20, 26). Faith in the doctrine is a weak and worthless something unless it is supported by a worthy life. The manner of a man's life is the index to the faith in his heart.

6. By teaching that the purity of the soul may be preserved while the body is immersed in the filth of sin. We must remember that the body is the agent or the instrument of the soul. The body acts only when the soul tells it to act. The body sins only at the consent of the soul. "For from within, out of the heart of men evil thoughts proceed, fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, and evil eye, railing, pride, foolishness: all these evil things proceed from within, and defile the man" (Mark 7:21-23). Before the body transgresses divine law, the heart becomes evil. Therefore, a sinful body indicates a sinful soul, and "the soul that sinneth, it shall die" (Ezek. 18:4).

III

How may we save ourselves and others from the hazards of these departures? In the chapter before us, Paul gives the answer.

"Exercise thyself unto godliness" (v. 17). "Be thou an ex-

ample to them that believe in word, in manner of life, in faith, in purity. . . . Give heed to reading, to exhortation, to teaching. Continue in these things; for in doing this thou shalt save both thyself and them that hear thee" (v. 16). Many departures from New Testament doctrine may be traced to lust, or a desire to sin. The man who loves sin and is

bent on mischief will naturally turn against the power that condemns this mischief. The voice of infidelity is the voice of a sinful soul, crying out against the law that stands in his way and refusing the restraint of God's moral order. How important it is, therefore, that we keep our hearts pure.

Prediction or Prophecy?

*..... R. L. Whiteside, Firm Foundation, Feb. 25, 1947.

The word "predict" comes from a compound Latin word that means, "to say," or "tell, before"; hence, to prophecy. But many words in the course of time have somewhat changed in meaning; "predict" is such a word. In giving synonyms under "foretell" Webster says, "Foretell (Soxan) and "predict" (Latin) are often interchangeable; but predict is now commonly used when inference from facts (rather than occult processes) is involved." Hence when a man considers facts and trends and draws a conclusion as to what will be the outcome, that is a prediction. Did Bible prophecies originate that way? No; ". . . knowing this first, that no prophecy of scripture is of private interpretation. For no prophecy ever came by the will of man: but men spoke from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit" (2 Pet. 1:19-21). If a man should draw a conclusion from facts and trends, such conclusion could, in a loose sense, be called a phophecy, a prophecy of private interpretation, a prophecy

that came by the will of man; but Peter speaks of the prophecy of scripture. Such prophecy is not of the private interpretation of facts and trends. Notice the contrast—"no prophecy of scripture is of private interpretation . . . but men spoke from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit." The passage has no reference to what should be done about prophecy that had already been written; but to weave together a mass of prophecies, most of which have already been fulfilled, and make a scheme for the future, practically amounts to a man-made prophecy—a prophecy that comes by the will of man. Even the prophets did not understand their own prophecies—did not know but that "the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow them," was meant for themselves, till God revealed to them "that not unto themselves, but unto you did they minister these things" (1 Pet. 1:10-12). But it seems that a host of preachers and editors today think they know more about the prophecies than did the prophets who uttered them.

The Attitude Of The Pharisee

*..... R. T. Williamson, Gospel Tidings, October, 1947.

Our attitude toward the great issues of life are important factors in forming character and in determining our destiny for all eternity. People usually act according to their attitude in any given case. If our attitude is bad, then the action will be bad; if the attitude is good, then the action will be correspondingly good. Too, it is altogether possible for one to be right in principle or in an issue, but be wrong and very wrong in the attitude he takes in maintaining that principle or issue.

The attitude of the Pharisees was so uniformly bad that it has become something of a proverb. I wish to take a few of the many recorded incidents that reflect the attitude of the Pharisee and see if perhaps such attitudes are not being perpetuated among religious people.

The Proud Attitude *

In Luke 18:9-14 we have the interesting and revealing parable of the Pharisee and the Publican. It is said that the Lord spoke the parable for the special benefit of certain individuals that "trusted in themselves as being righteous, and despised others." And in the 14th verse it is seen that the Pharisee's great sin was his pride—"for every one that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted."

An analysis of the parable

shows that the attitude of the Pharisee was one of self-righteous—he trusted in himself as being righteous. Paul speaks of the same attitude prevailing among the Jews of his day when he said, that they "going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God" (Rom. 10:3). God's righteousness consists of his commandments and ordinances (Lk. 1:6), and they are revealed in the gospel of Christ (Rom. 1:16,17). One is righteous before God only insofar as he adheres to or obeys such commands and ordinances. To this effect testified the Beloved John: "He that doeth righteousness (does God's commands and ordinances which are revealed in the gospel of Christ) is righteous . . ." (1 Jno. 3:7).

It is a very common thing today for people to "trust in themselves as being righteous"; they are taught to look within themselves for the proof that they are saved, and to trust in the way they feel about the matter as to whether they are righteous or not. For example, I was in conversation with a lady not so long ago, and in the course of our talk she told me that she knew just when she was saved, for she felt a great load lifted from her soul. She further told me that she was a member of a certain denomination, and was proud of it, and would never be anything else. To my mind this lady's case is a fair

example of the attitude of the Pharisee in "trusting in one's self," and pride in one's own righteousness. In contrast to this the word of the Lord says, "He that trusteth in his own heart is a fool, instead we are commanded, "Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding."

Sometimes the self-righteous attitude appears also in the church. When brethren fail to see eye-to-eye on some matter it presents a wonderful opportunity for some one to fall back on his dignity and assume that "I-am-more-righteous-than-thou" attitude, and bring about untold trouble in the church, even division. I think I know of some place where this attitude prevails; brethren will have nothing to do with one another, will not visit one another's services, possibly for fear that they will be polluted by so doing!

The Boastful Attitude

A second attitude that this parable suggests is the boastful attitude. The Pharisee thanked God that he "was not like other men"—he might as well have said that "he was so much better" than others. He was disposed to "pat himself on the back" for all his good qualities. In his own estimation there just wasn't any one that could compare favorably with him, much less excel him. He liked to "toot his own horn," praise himself, and so on. When he got through extolling his own virtues, it is a wonder that he didn't make the Lord feel a little unworthy! How often this attitude is encountered in this age of the world! Some seem never to tire of delineating what "I have

done"; to hear them talk, one would think that they were in the "Big I" and "Little you" business!

Self-Satisfied Attitude

The third attitude that the parable of the Pharisee reflects is the self-satisfied attitude. To hear the fellow commend himself, you would get the impression that he was pretty well pleased with himself; he asks the Lord for nothing—in fact his whole prayer is devoted to "telling" the Lord what a fine fellow he is. His whole attitude reminds me of the "super-righteous and sanctified" fellow who got up to testify at a "testimonial" service and informed his brethren that he was so sanctified that "he was just about as good as he Lord himself, and was getting better every day."

When I see brethren or churches that are so inactive that they are making little or no effort to improve themselves spiritually or spread the gospel, I feel sure that it must be due to this self-satisfied attitude; they are like the old brother that prayed for the Lord to "bless me and my wife, my son, John and his wife—us four and no more."

The church of the Laodiceans (Rev. 3:14-18) was shot through and through with this self-satisfied attitude. They said, "We are rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing . . ." In their own estimation they were "fixed," just right, independent, self-sufficient and absolutely content with conditions as they were—self-satisfied. How like some of the churches of today! They are satisfied to have one meeting a summer, and one service a

week the remainder of the year; it is difficult—or well nigh impossible—to interest them in any worthy cause outside of their own little group.

Fault-Finding Attitude

Another attitude that was characteristic of the Pharisee, and is of many of today, was the attitude that would cause him to magnify the faults and minimize the virtues of another. Others were extortioners, unjust, adulterers, and in fact there just wasn't anything good to be said for them; but, Oh, how he liked to dwell upon their shortcomings! A little bit of scandal or gossip that will defame someone's character—what a juicy morsel it makes for those with such attitude! Such people are never quit so happy as when "running down" the other fellow; if they ever credit the other fellow with any virtues, it is done grudgingly. This is one of the smallest, most conceited, and ugliest attitudes that I know of. We should always be ready to recognize, give credit for, and magnify, rather than minimize, the merit in others. He who has the attitude of the Pharisee in

this respect is a small soul indeed.

Conclusion

A word to my brethren. We are passing through trying times; yea, "perilous times" are upon us. Satan "desires to have" every one of us "that he may sift us as wheat"; our faith is on trial. Some have slipped, many others are wavering—"halting between two opinions." As we meet the great issues of the Christian life, and as we oppose what we deem to be wrong, let us WATCH OUR ATTITUDES. I fear that much harm has already been done—unintentionally perhaps—by zealous brethren through their attitude in opposing what they consider dangerous trends among us. Let me say again that we can be right in principle and wrong in attitude. We can have the truth and drive people away by our attitude.

Jesus said that "By their fruits ye shall know them," and certainly our attitudes are a part of those fruits. By them we are evaluated of our fellow creatures, and by them we will be judged by our Maker.

Welcome the Strangers at Church

A minister in the pulpit saw a man in a back pew with his hat on. He beckoned to a deacon, who went to the man and asked him if he were aware his hat was on. "Thank God!" said the man. "I thought that would do it. I have attended this church for six months, and you are the first person who has spoken to me." — Christian Victory.

Substitutes

..... Alan E. Stout, Christian Courier

One of the most common traits of man is that of substitution. Sometimes it is of necessity. Sometimes even, the substitution is better than the product desired in the first place. Already, better materials have been manufactured for use in home appliances because our national defense situation has requisitioned the materials those things were formerly made of.

Granting that substitution is sometimes necessary, we must remember that substitution has its place. The wise may substitute for the ignorant, but the ignorant cannot substitute for the wise. God, instead of making every man suffer the consequences of every sin, substituted instead His only son as a payment or sacrifice for sin that every one who will may escape the just penalty for his sins (Heb. 5:8, 9). *But man may not substitute for God.* Nevertheless it has been one of the chief endeavors of man to substitute for the demands of God something he thought would do just as well. It has always failed; *it* never will succeed.

I Man attempts to substitute sincerity for the truth. Is not the doctrine, "It makes no difference what you believe, just as long as you are sincere," a very popular one? Saul of Tarsus was a sincere religious man worshipping God according to his conception of the scriptures, yet at the same time

he was "chief of sinners" (I Tim. 1:15; I Cor. 15:9). In regard to this false doctrine of the devil let us examine Phil. 1:18, "Whether in pretense, or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice." Here we find rejoicing because insincere men preached the truth, but nowhere in the Bible have we read where God or any faithful man of God rejoiced when a sincere man preached an error. Jesus said, "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:32). Nothing else will do.

II Men have also sought to substitute excuses in the place of a surrender to the will of God. They have used the excuse of ignorance; but ignorance will not suffice. "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent" (Acts 17:30). This excuse, or that of inconvenience, lack of time, wickedness, or any other excuse will not take the place of a complete surrender.

III Some have sought to substitute prayer or sacrifice in the place of obedience to the truth (I Samuel 16:22). "Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, to hearken than the fat of rams." In Romans 6:17, 18, we read, "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you.

Being then made free from sin ye became the servants of righteousness." Only obedience to the doctrine of Christ will save us. No amount of sacrifice or good moral living will take the place of it. Christ is a Savior to only those who will obey him. (Heb. 5:8, 9). The Bible teaches us that faith in Christ, repentance from sin, confession of Christ, and baptism for remission of sins are necessary before the promise of salvation is ours (Mark 16:15, 16; Acts 2:38; Rom. 10:10). Prayer is of no avail if we neglect to obey these commands. Paul was a penitent believer, had confessed Christ, and was praying, yet he was told, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins" (Acts 22:16). If these commands are neglected even our prayers are an abomination (Proverbs 28:9). We are destined certain eternal punishment if we neglect to obey this gospel while we have opportunity in this present world (II Thess. 1:8).

Many have thought to substitute the precepts of men for the doctrine of Christ. We cannot hope for a happy resurrection unless we remain faithful to the doctrine (I Tim. 4:16). Those who teach any other gospel or doctrine rest under the curse of God (Gal. 1:9). Those who are deceived by false doctrine are likewise condemned (Matt. 15:9, 14). A curse instead of a blessing will be a surprising disappointment to them in the day of judgment (Matt. 7:22, 23). We are so likely to be deceived that we are admonished, "Let God be true, but every man a liar" (Rom 3:4). The only sure preventive measure against false doctrine is to "search the scriptures daily, whether those things were so" (Acts 17:11).

V Entertainment has been substituted for the worship of God. The items of divinely appointed worship are these, eating of the Lord's supper, prayer, singing, teaching of the Word, and giving of our means to support the work of the Lord. All these are to be performed on the first day of every week (Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2; Eph. 5:19, 20). This is a simple system in which all men can engage and glorify God. But some have substituted an elaborate system of entertainment by which to glorify themselves. One of the very first lessons man was ever taught is that God will not accept a substitute for an item of worship. See Genesis 4:5, concerning Cain and Abel. Men have originated all sorts of religious entertainments in lieu of worship according to the truth, so many in fact, that we could not begin to mention them. But none of these will please God. We are commanded to *sing* in worship; the substitution of a mechanical instrument to play in the worship will not please God. We are commanded to give, "lay by in store as we have been prospered." God will not accept merchandising substitutes such as pie suppers, chicken dinners, ice cream socials as a means of raising funds to carry on His work. He said *give*.

VI Men who claim to be Christians have substituted for religious activity many varied social functions. In James 1:27, pure religion is defined "to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." While many of these social activities are not wrong in themselves, they cannot be substituted for visiting the sick, etc. I may have dined, spent an evening

with the most Godly of Christians, but that would not relieve me of remembering the poor. God has ordained that the church should preach the gospel to all the world. We cannot substitute a missionary society to do that work and please God at the same time. God has ordained that members of the church should edify

and strengthen each other in the church. We cannot organize fraternities and societies to do the work of the church and please God in that substitution. We had better learn to be active in the church simply as members of the church and glorify God in the church (Eph 3:12).

God Is Light

A tender child of summers three,
 Seeking her little bed at night,
 Paused on the dark stair timidly,
 "Oh! mother! take my hand!" said
 she,
 "And then the dark will all be
 light!"

We older children grope our way
 From dark behind to dark before;
 And only when our hands we lay,
 Dear Lord, in Thine, the night is day,
 And there is darkness nevermore.

Reach downward to the sunless days,
 Wherein our guides are blind as we,
 Our faith is small and hope delays;
 Take Thou the hands of prayer we
 raise,
 And let us feel the light of Thee!
 —J. G. Whither.

A Proclamation

(The Lord's Supper)

*..... A. G. Hobbs, Jr., Christian Worker, Sept. 5, 1947.

"For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." 1 Cor. 11:23-26 (American Standard Version).

I. THE LORD'S SUPPER PROCLAIMS CHRIST.

a. It proclaims his historicity.

The fact that Jesus Christ of Nazareth is a character of history cannot be successfully denied. There is more evidence that Jesus lived than there is that Socrates lived. All memorials are traceable to some person or event. Every memorial had to have a beginning. The Lord's Supper today is a memorial. Who started it? Jesus Christ of Nazareth. So the Lord's supper stands before the world today proclaiming that Jesus lived and walked and talked among mankind. It is an unanswerable argument for Christianity.

b. It proclaims his death for the sin of the world. Not only does

it proclaim his death, but also that for which he died. When Jesus instituted this memorial he said:

"For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. — Matt. 26:28.

Since His death was such a cruel one, it proclaims the most intense suffering and agony in order that men may be saved. It proclaims the shedding of innocent and precious blood—the fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness. Zech. 13:1.

c. It proclaims the Mission of Christ. Why did Jesus suffer, bleed and die? All that man may be saved. Why did he come to earth? To seek and save that which was lost (Lk. 19:10); but he had to die in order that man may be saved. Hence as the Lord's Supper proclaims the death of Christ to a lost world, it also proclaims the mission of Christ and the purpose of His death.

The life of all flesh is in the blood (Lev. 17:11). When man sins, he forfeits his life for the wages of sin is death (Rom. 6:23). The righteous must die a physical death, but Jesus delivers from the second death—eternal punishment.

d. It proclaims His coming again. So, as faithful disciples,

assemble weekly around the Lord's Table it is a proclamation to all that Jesus is coming again. This is a great truth that is blazoned on almost every page of the New Testament. As soon as Jesus ascended, the Apostles were assured of His coming again:

"And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which was taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." Acts 1:9-11.

For this great event Jesus ever warned that we be ready. It will be a day of reckoning, a time of rewards—both good and bad. Those who deny His divinity and ignore His death must face Him at the judgment, nevertheless.

So the Lord's Supper preaches a great sermon each Lord's Day. It proclaims to the world the historicity, the death, the mission, and the coming again of Jesus.

It is an object lesson not only to the lost of the world, but to little children. One of the first lessons that the writer ever received on the death of Christ was in reply to asking why the Lord's Supper was being observed. This has been the occasion of many receiving their first lesson on the death and second coming of Christ.

The Passover served as an occasion for teaching the children:

"And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service? That ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians, and delivered our houses. And the people bowed their heads and worshipped." Ex. 12:26,27.

II. THE LORD'S SUPPER PROCLAIMS

The Kingdom Of Christ Established.

"And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Lk. 22:29,30.

The Apostles took their thrones of authority on the day of Pentecost and began their judgment of the "twelve tribes of Israel." Acts 2:1-41. The first church was over the houses of the children of Israel composed wholly of Jews, proselytes to sacrifice of the Lord's passover, who passed the Jewish religion. As soon as it was established, the worship including the Lord's table was started:

"And they continued steadfastly in the apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayer." Acts 2:42.

The Christians in Corinth were eating the Lord's supper around the Lord's table.

"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread

which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" 1 Cor. 10:16.

"Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and the table of devils." 1 Cor. 10:21.

Here we find without question the table of the Lord, but Jesus said that his table was to be in His kingdom. Therefore the kingdom had been established and was in existence at this time. This refutes the theory that the kingdom of Christ is not now in existence but will be established when He comes again. If this kingdom is not now in existence, and a person is not in it, he has no Scriptural authority to eat at the Lord's table.

1. The Lord's table was to be in His kingdom. Lk. 22:29,30.

2. The Lord's table was in the church in Corinth. 1 Cor. 10:21.

3. Therefore the church in Corinth was the kingdom of Christ in Corinth.

1. The Lord's Supper, after Jesus instituted it, was not to be observed until the kingdom of Christ was established. Lk. 22:29,30.

2. The Church in Corinth observed the Lord's Supper. 1 Cor. 10:16-21.

3. Therefore the kingdom of Christ had been established and was in existence then.

To Be Continued.

"The So-Called Church of Christ"

*..... E. A. Emmons, Jr., The Way Of Life, July, 1947.

Sectarian preachers, like the devil, hate the truth taught by the churches of Christ, and being unable to meet real issues, often turn to sarcasm and ridicule. An example of this is seen in their frequent use of the expression: "The so-called church of Christ." In the March 5, 1947, issue of "The Church Press," Editor Glen V. Tingley used the expression in connection with a report on the Porter-Tingley Debate. In the April 30, 1947, issue of the same paper, Walter Hemingway, pastor Bessemer Gospel Tabernacle, made use of the same expression. I recently received a letter from a

denominational preacher in which he made frequent reference to the "Campbellites," and declared that he could not sincerely call us "the church of Christ." These are but a few examples of many instances in which sectarian preachers "poke fun" and ridicule at the Lord's Church by referring to them as "the so-called Church of Christ."

What Is Meant By This Expression?

By using this expression these sectarian preachers intend to imply, first of all, that we call our-

permitted. Those who are concerned both for the present safety and the future glory of Zion must awaken to the need of the hour. They must come alive to the fact that a false and dangerous idea of the Lord (which is in truth a deadly heresy) is abroad in the land — and is threatening the church.

A close study of the Old Testament prophets will reveal that their preaching was always God-centered. If the people were particularly inclined to dishonesty and cheating, the prophets preached on the justice of God; if impurity and immorality were outstanding, the prophets preached on the holiness of God; if the times were heavy with fear and forebodings as in times of threatening national disaster, the prophets preached on the eternity and power of God; if idolatry were becoming popular, the prophets preached on the omnipotence, unity and exalted glory of God. Thus always the particular problem to be met was solved by a preaching on the character of God.

“So it must be today. Since people become like that which they worship, and since “we shall be like him for we shall see him even as he is,” we must emphasize the true nature of Christ. His kindness and gentleness must be prominent in that picture (he is the lamb of God) but so also must be his fearless and militant aggressiveness (he is the Lion of Judah). Any preaching which presents one side of him without the other is destructive of Christianity and should not be tolerated.

A Proclamation

(The Lord's Supper)

*..... A. G. Hobbs, Jr., Christian Worker, Sept. 18, 1947.

VI. PROPER OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER PROCLAIMS RESPECT FOR A DYING REQUEST.

The Lord's Supper was instituted “the night in which He was betrayed.” He was almost right in the jaws of death. The hearts of the apostles were troubled and saddened. Jesus knew that His time was at hand. The command to observe the memorial Supper of the Lord in remembrance of Him can well be

considered as a dying request. The last words of dying friends linger long in the mind. As a rule their last requests are respected, and carried out as far as possible. Will we respect this dying request of the Master? To do so involves not only observance of the Lord's Supper, but also the observance of it in the exact way that we are taught in the New Testament to observe it. Observing it in the way we want to instead of the way Jesus teaches us is not respecting his dying request. Let us note the manner, the time, and the frequency of partaking of the Lord's Supper:

a. The Manner:

Wherefore whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord. 1 Cor. 11:27 (A.S.V.)

The manner of partaking is the point of emphasis. No one is really worthy to partake if viewed from the standpoint of our own personal merit. Although a person is unworthy, he can partake in a worthy manner. How can one partake in a worthy manner? By partaking decently and orderly, and discerning the Lord's body.

"For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." (1 Cor. 11:29). We should put our hearts into the worship; understanding and meditating upon the sublime significance of the atoning death of Christ wherein His body was broken and His blood was shed.

When sincerely and properly observed, the Lord's Supper is a means of spiritual strength — when improperly observed, spiritual weakness is the result. (1 Cor. 11:30).

b. The time: The first day of the week — and no other day.

"And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight." (Acts 20:7).

There is absolutely no authority to have the Lord's Supper on Wednesday night, Thursday night, or any other day except the first day of the week — known on the calendar as Sunday. Respect for the dying request of Jesus means that we will ob-

serve his memorial on the day the church at Troas did — history proves that this was the day that the early disciples celebrated the Lord's Supper. All memorials have a set day for observance. This one is no exception.

c. The Frequency: The first day of every week. Many quotations could be given to prove that the early disciples observed the supper of the Lord on the first day of every week. This fact is undeniable. The church of Christ acts by Divine authority. We are trying to please the Lord, and fulfill his dying request. So we follow the approved example of the church at Troas and meet upon the first day of the week to break bread in order that we may be approved of the Lord. Every week has a first day — so we meet on the first day of the week. Therefore every Lord's Day we "Proclaim the Lord's death till he come." We believe in salvation through the death and blood of the Lord and the same are made prominent in our services. In 1 Cor. 11: 23-30, Paul is discussing the manner of partaking. In Acts 20: 7, we are told how often the Lord's Supper was observed.

"And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight." (Acts 20:7).

Does the religious body to which you belong meet on the first day of the week to break bread? Does it add mechanical music according to the command of David? or follow the authority and commands of Christ under the New Testament and use vocal music? (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16). Let us humbly follow the instructions of the Lord and worship according to the New Testament!

The church of Christ in your community extends a most cordial welcome to all. "Come thou with us and we will do thee good!"

The Dickson Cook Book FREE

Get a copy of the Dickson Cook Book FREE by sending in a years subscription to the "Gospel Digest". Only \$2.00 per year. There is no better way to preach the gospel to lost souls than through the pages of religious literature. The "Digest" will do the work. Send your subscription to the GOSPEL DIGEST, Fayette, Alabama.

Who Should Eat *the* Supper?

..... Gus Nichols, Sound Doctrine

The Bible says nothing about "close communion;" neither does it mention "open" or "free" communion. It simply teaches all Christians to "eat the Lord's supper" in their worship upon "the first day of the week" (Acts 20:7). This was a stated purpose of public assembling. They came "together to eat" (I Cor. 11:33). But who were required to partake of the supper? Of course, no police force is to be used in the church, either to bar unworthy people from communing, nor to induce people to obey the truth and do as commanded. It is to be a matter of teaching. The gospel "is the power of God" to regulate human conduct, in the realm of religion (Rom. 1:16).

DISCIPLES OR APOSTLES

When the supper was instituted by Christ, his apostles were the only ones mentioned as present. It was on the evening of the passover, and Jesus sat down "with the twelve" (Matt. 26:20). The record says, "As they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it," etc., and instituted his supper—"the Lord's supper" (I Cor. 11:20-23). All of the disciples were to partake of the supper. In referring to the cup, the Lord said, "Drink ye *all* of it" (Matt 26:27). These disciples had been baptized by John the baptizer (Matt. 3:11). Some say Judas was not present at the institution of the supper.

BAPTIZED BELIEVERS

On Pentecost, Peter preached Christ unto the multitude assembled, and when many believed, and asked what to do, Peter said unto them, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts 2:38). Now note the results of the preaching of the gospel, and who it was who broke bread, or ate the Lord's supper. It says, "*Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls, and they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers*" (Acts 2:41, 42). Here, those who "gladly received" the word, and were "baptized" are the ones who are said to have continued in "The breaking of bread," which Paul says was the "communion" (I Cor. 10:16). Hence, the "Lord's supper" is for those who have obeyed the gospel and been added by the Lord unto his church. It is for baptized believers.

EXAMINE YOURSELVES

When Paul said, "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup" (I Cor. 11:28), he was talking to the church at Corinth, and not to outsiders (See I Cor. 1:1, 2). These

people were baptized believers. In reference to their conversion, Luke says, "Many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized" (Acts 18:8). Paul says they were all "Baptized-into one body" (I Cor. 12:13). This "one body" is called the "church" (Eph. 1:22, 23). Hence, we see again that the Lord was instructing members of the church when he said "let a man examine himself, and so let him eat."

SUPPER IS IN THE KINGDOM

Christ appointed unto his disciples the kingdom, and said, "That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom" (Luke 22:30). Note that the Lord's table is "in" his "kingdom." Hence, it was not intended for outsiders. Jesus tells us one must be baptized to enter the kingdom. He said, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John 3:5). All who have been delivered from the power of darkness are in the kingdom of Christ. "And hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear son" (Col. 1:13).

FOR ALL THE CHILDREN

Those "Born of water and of the Spirit" are children of God (John 3:5). The new birth made them children, and put them in the house, or family of God, which is the church (I Tim. 3:15; 4, 5). It made them citizens of the kingdom (I Peter 2:1-11; Eph. 2:12-20). And since the Lord's table is "in" his "kingdom" (Luke 22:30), all members of the family of God, or all "citizens" of the kingdom, have the right to eat the

Lord's supper. None of the children are to be barred from their Father's table.

THE POINT IN CONTROVERSY

Baptism is, then, the point of controversy. Those who narrow the right to commune to those baptized upon a confession of faith in Christ are also divided into two or more groups. First, the "churches of Christ" teach that the Lord's supper is for baptized believers, and that these are conditions of salvation (Mark 16:15, 16; Acts 2:28; 22:16). Hence, we teach that the Lord's supper is for all of God's children, or what is the same, it is for all who have been baptized upon genuine faith and repentance. A second group of religious people teach that the supper is for those properly baptized, (they say), but they teach baptism is a "nonessential" as far as salvation is concerned, and that all are first of all saved before baptism, but the supper, they say, is not for all children of God, but is only for those of His children properly baptized. Of course, we believe that we are teaching the truth about the matter, and are consistent in saying the supper is for all of God's children, and yet it is for those properly baptized upon faith in Christ. The group, or groups, teaching otherwise are, in our judgment both unscriptural and inconsistent in that they bar some of God's children, according to their theory, from their Father's table, and this they do by making what they call a nonessential a bar to the Lord's table. They say baptism is "nonessential to salvation," and yet they make it essential to the Lord's table. In

theory, they exclude some of the Father's children from their Father's table; whereas, in the New Testa-

ment, the supper was for all the saved, and salvation was promised after baptism (Mark 16:16).

The Church of Christ Can It Be Identified Today?

..... Jess F. Doggett, Sound Doctrine

1. It is in existence and the New Testament identifies it by these marks of identity: (1) Its foundation. (2) Time and place it was established. (3) Its organization. (4) Its worship. (5) Name of its members. (6) Way or manner of entering it.

2. Founded on Christ (I Cor. 3:11). This excludes all others, such as John the Baptist, Apostle Peter, Luther, Wesley, etc.

3. Established in Jerusalem A. D. 33 on first Pentecost after resurrection of Jesus (Acts 2; Isaiah 2). If your church was established at any other time or place it is not the church of Christ and is therefore a useless and sinful organization (Matt. 15:9).

4. Has no human organization, but the Bible says it is composed of saints (all Christians are saints)

elders and deacons (Phil. 1:1). Any church having a greater organization than this is not the church of Christ.

5. Its worship consists of the following:

(1) Giving as God has prospered (1 Cor. 16:1, 2; I Cor. 9).

(2) Praying with the understanding (I Cor. 14:15).

(3) Teaching the Bible as God's word (I Thess. 2:13).

(4) Singing with spirit and understanding (I Cor. 14:15).

(5) Eating Lord's supper on first day of the week. No other worship is acceptable (Acts 20:7).

6. Study these marks of identity. Does the church of which you are a member have them? If not it is not the church that Jesus built. Beware of any other! (Matt. 15:9).

Henry Ward Beecher on Infant Baptism

..... F. M. Green, From an Old Tract

When men claim for infant baptism scripture precedent or command, they are most certainly ignorant or dishonest. I am perfectly aware that a charge of ignorance is a grave charge to make, but I am just as positive that it is often a too true one. I am also aware that it is a grave charge to make against any one that he is dishonest. But there is no middle ground; a man is either for or against. He is either ignorantly against, or dishonestly against. Ignorantly against is honestly against, as far as the individual is concerned, and it is refreshing to see a distinguished man come right out and be honest with himself and to others in a question of so much *made* importance as infant baptism.

May 8, 1864, Henry Ward Beecher, who had several children before him to baptize, made the following remarks concerning the act: "When we dedicate our children to baptism, it is not designed to produce any direct effects on the subjects of it. Neither when they are grown up, nor when they are infants, does baptism produce any direct effect upon the subjects. Upon them the ordinance and act of baptism is simply declaratory. It declares an effect—that is all. It does not make a change, nor seek to make a change."

Now, probably, not one in a hundred of all the ministers would be as honest in their statements. They would claim that it was an outward act representing some "inward grace," or something else equally mysterious.

Supposing that some would object to the act, Mr. Beecher says: "People object to the baptism of children, because children can not take any vows on them. They do not need to. All that baptism means is a divine work. But it is objected that the child can not understand the act. It does not need to. The work of God's Spirit on the human heart is not conditioned upon our understanding it. It is God's free gift. And though the child does not understand what is being done in the act of baptism, that does not alter the fact that God's Spirit dwells in and moves upon the heart of the child. But it is still further objected that infant baptism is nowhere commanded in scripture; that it is known to be of ecclesiastical origin; that it is founded on a theological doctrine which, now, all Protestant sects have repudiated; that the practice has become superstitious; and that it stands in the way of a scriptural manner of employing the ordinance. And it is claimed that for these reasons it is not obligatory, and should be discontinued."

I am certain that the above is about as strong a statement of the objections to infant baptism as can be given. I am convinced that they are made, too, for the purpose of presenting every objection in its strongest light. If all its advocates were equally honest in the statement of objections, and in meeting them by concession or argument it would add much to the interest of the whole subject.

Mr. Beecher says: "I concede and I assert, first, that infant baptism is nowhere commanded in the New Testament. No man can find a passage that commands it; and if it can stand only on this ground, we may as well give it up first as last. Secondly, I affirm that the cases where it is employed, as in the baptism of whole households, are by no means conclusive and without doubt; and that if there is no other basis for it than that, it is not safe to found it on the practice of apostles in the baptism of Christian families; therefore I give up that which has been injudiciously used as an argument for infant baptism. And, thirdly, I assert that the doctrine that, as a Christian ordinance, it is a substitute for the circumcision of the Jews, is a doctrine that is utterly untenable, to say nothing more. If there were no other argument than this for it, I should not blame those who rail at it and set it at naught. It is not commanded by scripture; there is no well-attested case of its administration in the New Testament; and it is not brought down as a substitute for circumcision."

The above words are strong words on this question. They have the ring

of honesty about them. There is no odor of uncertainty about them certainly. There is a positiveness which is truly refreshing. There is no command for it, or example of it, or anything for which it is a substitute, in the scriptures. Upon what ground can it be defended then? Mr. Beecher continues: "Show me a thing which experience proves to be good, and I fall back on the liberty which is vouchsafed to every Christian, and which is set forth in the New Testament, and say—By this liberty I do it; there is my warrant, and there is my authority. The New Testament teaches that there is for man the largest freedom to go to God in any way he pleases. That is the charter of Christian liberty. And if experience shows a certain ordinance to be good, it is your right to adopt that whether scripture points it out or not. I like to see a man out and out, whether he is on my side of a question or not. If he practices anything which is not in conformity to the New Testament, as a religious rite, I like to have him say: 'I do this on my own authority. I know no scripture for it.' This relieves him, at least, from the charge of wresting the scriptures."

But Mr. Beecher supposes some one to persist in "demanding a scripture text for this ordinance, and asks: "Where is your text for baptizing children?' I reply that there is none. And if I am asked: "Then why do you baptize them?' I say: 'Because it is found to be beneficial.' And if men say to me: 'Do you think the baptism of children a divine ordinance?' my reply is, that I believe an ox yoke is a divine ordinance. When men found out that shaping a piece

of wood across the neck of the ox was the way to get the use of his strength, that piece of wood became a divine ordinance."

In this unique style does Mr. Beecher get rid of all the objections to his practice, in the absence of any scripture in favor of it. To my mind he states the case exactly—there is just as much scriptural authority for an ox yoke as there is for "infant baptism." One is an invention of men, so is the other.

Mr. Beecher also acknowledges

that "when men say that it originated from a dogma that all Protestant Christendom set aside," it is true. From the Roman Catholic Church not only has infant baptism sprung, but sprinkling and pouring (for baptism) also. It is the harlot mother for a thousand abominations. I am glad to see men who obey her laws, honestly confess that they do so and claim for them no scripture warrant. Mr. Beecher's sentences ring with honesty, however much we may differ from his conclusions.

"HOW CAN DADDY LEAVE THE STORE?"

"Can a maid forget her ornaments, or a bride her attire? Yet, my people have forgotten me days without number" (Jer. 2:32).

"And the care of this world and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful" (Matt. 13:22).

Another thing that causes people to forget God is *the care of life*. Often the business man is too busy running *his* business to pay any attention to the Lord's business. Some of you have heard tell about the storekeeper whose little boy said to his mother, "*Mother, will Daddy ever go to heaven?*" "Yes, son, what makes you ask such a question as that?" "*Well, Mother, how can he ever leave the store?*" That father couldn't leave the store to go to church and to worship God, so the little boy wondered how he could even leave the store to go to heaven. But rest assured my friends that papa will leave the store; when death comes and calls his name. Yes, and you may get too busy with your little affairs to pay any attention to the Lord's affairs, but when death calls around, you are going to give up your little affairs, and you are going to find out that after all they are not so very important.

Roy Mason

Origin and Progress of Pouring and Sprinkling

(From a work, published by the Am. Bap. Pub. Soc., entitled "A History of Baptism, by Isaac Taylor Hinton, A. M., Pastor First Bap. Church, New Orleans." 1846.)

It would seem that in France, in the eighth century, many of the clergy had, in cases where immersion was impracticable or very difficult, volunteered to modify their practice by pouring or sprinkling, as the case might require. *Such a practice, however, in this case, having the sanction of no ecclesiastical authority*, the French clergy availed themselves of the opportunity presented by the presence of Pope Stephen II (who, having been driven from Rome by the Lombards, had fled to France, to claim the protection of Pepin) to inquire, among other points of difficulty, if, in certain cases, pouring or sprinkling might not be considered as valid baptism. Stephen, well inclined to accommodate the French clergy by the promise of their royal master to take up his cause, and to expel the Lombards from his dominions, gave such a reply as they desired. The precise question proposed was, whether, *in case of necessity* occasioned by illness of an infant, it were lawful to baptize by pouring water out of the hand, or a cup, on the head of the infant. Stephen answered: "If such a baptism were performed, in such a case of *necessity*

in the name of the Holy Trinity, it should be held valid."

This answer of Stephen's is *the first public authority* for private baptism, and *for sprinkling*. The learned Basnage observes, "that it allows sprinkling only in case of imminent danger; that the authenticity of it is denied by some Catholics; that many laws were made after this time in Germany, France, and England to compel dipping, and without any provision for cases of necessity; therefore, that this law did not alter the mode of dipping in public baptisms; and that it was not till five hundred and fifty seven years after that the legislature, in a council at Ravenna in the year *thirteen hundred and eleven*, declared dipping or sprinkling indifferent."

That immersion was the mode in which our ancestors in the "fatherland" were baptized is manifest, not only from the history of baptisteries and founts, but from the earliest historical records.

Venerable Bede states that the king and queen of the Northumbrians "having been instructed in the word of Christ's salvation, were washed in

the River Glen as the bath of remission." Immediately after he speaks of Paulinus baptizing in the Swale, as no oratory or baptistery was as yet erected.

In process of time, however, *the French fashion of sprinkling began to grow popular*, as is evident from its frequent denunciation by the provincial councils. The following of these ecclesiastical assemblies issued decrees enforcing immersion: York, A. D. 1106; London, A. D. 1200; Salisbury, A. D. 1217; Worcester, A. D. 1224; Exeter, A. D. 1287; Worcester, A. D. 1306.

It is, certainly, a singular circumstance, that the reformed churches should have fallen into the error of the church of Rome, not only in their practice respecting the subjects of baptism (the antiquity of which might have formed some kind of excuse, though a very inadequate one), but in the then recent innovation of sprinkling. Although, however, this is the present practice of the reformed churches of Europe, it was far from being the case generally in the earlier days of the Reformation.

How the English reformers understood the matter is clear from the first liturgy of King Edward VI, which required baptism to be administered by trine immersion. "What greater shame can there be, than a man to professe himself to be a Christian man because he is baptized, and yet he knoweth not what baptisme is, nor what strength the same hath, nor what the *dyppynge* in the water doth betoken . . . when God is added and joyned to the water, then it is the *bathe* of regeneracion . . . a *bathe*

that washeth our soules by the Holy Ghoste, as Saynct Paule calleth it, saying, God hath saved us thorowe hys mercye by the *bathe* of regeneracion . . . for baptisme and the *dyppynge* into the water doth betoken that the olde Adam, with all his sinne and evel lustes, ought to be drowned and kylled by daily contrition and repentance."

In like manner William Tyndal, otherwise calley Hychins, speaks of baptism:—"The *plungynge* into the water sygnyfyeth that we dye and are *buryed* with Chryst, as concernynge the old lyfe of Synne which is Adam. And the *pullynge* out agayn sygnyfyeth that we *ryse agayne* with Chryste in a newe lyfe."

It is a singular fact that *sprinkling* was *not substituted* for immersion, either in England or Scotland (however it might have been resorted to in cases of danger), *till after the Reformation*. Edward VI and Elizabeth were both immersed, as the records of royalty testify. The successor of Elizabeth (James I) was from Scotland, and had been initiated into sprinkling by the Scotch divines, who had imported it from Geneva, and he favored its practice in England. During the Protectorate, when Presbyterianism was in the ascendant, the *Assembly of Divines* debated the manner in which baptism should be directed in their formula, and decided *by a vote of twenty-five to twenty-four*, that sprinkling alone should be mentioned, without reference to immersion. This decision, however, had nothing to do with the ritual of the Episcopal church, which at the restoration again became the national church, and which still re-

tains the *direction* for dipping, although it has admitted the *practice* of sprinkling.

The Edinburgh *Encyclopedia*, than which a more able or satisfactory witness could not be produced, thus describes (in the article on baptism) the introduction of sprinkling into Scotland: "In this country, however, *sprinkling was never used in ordinary cases till after the Reformation*. During the persecution of Mary, many persons, most of whom were Scotsmen, fled from England to Geneva, and there greedily imbibed the opinions of that church. In 1556, a book was published at that place, containing 'The Forms of Prayer and Ministration of the Sacraments approved by the famous and godly learned man, John Calvin,' in which the administrator is enjoined to 'take water in his hand, and lay it upon the child's forehead.' These *Scottish exiles*, who had renounced the authority of the pope, implicitly acknowledged the authority of Calvin; and, return-

ing to their own country, with Knox at their head, *established sprinkling in Scotland.*"

Can any historical evidence be more complete respecting the time and the causes of the introduction of the *innovation of sprinkling*? May I respectfully ask the pedobaptist who reads this (Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, or Methodist),

1. Whether he has not been kept in ignorance of these facts?

2. Whether those clergy who withhold these facts from their flocks do not take upon themselves an undue and dangerous responsibility?

3. Whether he will have independence enough to take any adequate means to ascertain if these statements can be denied? And, finally, whether, if they can not be gainsayed, he will remain *unbaptized*, and in a state of disobedience to the King of kings?

FEAR

Fear is entirely based on a consideration of some possible, personal, evil consequence coming down upon me from the clear sky above me. Love is based upon the forgetfulness of self altogether. The very essence of love is that it looks away from itself, and to another.

Nothing so demoralizes the forces of the soul as fear. Only as we realize the presence of the Lord does fear give place to faith.

—Sarah Smiley.